Theomatics vs. Other Literary Works
An Objective Assessment

Many people have asked the question: Does anything like theomatics exist elsewhere besides the Bible—particularly in other Hebrew and Greek literary works? Have you checked out other religious works to see if similar patterns can be found? What about the apocrypha? What about the Book of Mormon? What about the Koran? Are you really sure that theomatics is exclusive only to the Bible text?

The following will answer these questions conclusively. And in a pronounced and credible manner that anybody can easily understand.

What is interesting to note, is that the people who generally raise these sorts of objections, have never really thought through the **mathematical nature and logic** of theomatics, or truly understood the fact that theomatics is a phenomenon that is absolutely **impossible** to exist anywhere—in any work of literature! Anywhere! Anytime! And under any logical conditions. Yet people who are sophisticated mathematically, after even a hasty and perfunctory examination of this subject, have immediately seen the light—they never felt that the "other works of literature" argument was even an issue worth considering. The following will clarify why.

The first part below is an email from a person in an atheist organization, who after a perfunctory review of the theomatics web site, proliferated his objections. This will be followed by a similar statement in a personal email from a man by the name of Mark Perakh, who is one of the world's leading debunkers of ELS and the Bible code. Following his comments is my lengthy reply to him—comparing theomatics to the story of Robin Hood. Mr. Perakh never responded to this rebuttal, there simply was no possible way he could effectively refute the axiomatic logic that was placed directly in front of him.

Comment From Atheist Organization:

"Theomatics is indeed interesting, but it has a fundamental flaw. In order to show that a text has unique structural attributes, two tests are necessary: Firstly, you have to show that no other text has similar structural attributes. There is an abundance of Hebrew literature, all of it open to similar analysis, and much of it dealing with the nature of the Messiah. However, none of it has been examined for similar "theomatic" patterns, to my knowledge. Similarly, there is a non-trivial amount of

Greek literature which needs to be similarly examined. Unless this is done, then theomatics remains a set of curiosities. In summary, theomatics does not provide an adequate null hypothesis for its conclusions. It cannot be construed as proof on any sort of basis. It neither shows that all other Greek and Hebrew texts are not written by G-d, nor does it show that the Bible does not contain numerical structures that contradict each other. Calling this sort of number play proof shows a deep need to confirm belief, and no need to test it."

Mark Perakh, along with his colleague Brendan McKay of Australia National University, is one of the world's leading debunkers of ELS or the so called "Bible Code" discoveries. These Bible code discoveries have not even the slightest relationship to theomatics, and have now been disproved by world renowned mathematicians. Here is Mark's web page.

http://www.talkreason.org/articles/Codpaper1.cfm#methodology

It should be mentioned that in comparison to ELS, theomatics does not contain the same flaws, either in the scientific testing procedures, or in the scientific conclusions drawn from the data.

Letter from Mark Perakh:

Hi, Del.

Thank you for your message. I have briefly reviewed your web page, and do not feel it was sufficient to form any firm opinion of it. I may, if you wish, offer just two tentative remarks.

1) Permuted texts are not valid control texts because randomization destroys the multifaceted order present in all meaningful texts but absent in randomized texts. The entropy of the randomized texts is normally much larger than for non-randomized texts, and any quantitative characteristic of a text is expected to have near extreme value for the original, non-randomized text.
2) Meaningful texts other than the Bible are though legitimate control texts. You mention that the phenomenon you claim to have discovered is not present in any text other than the Bible. Regretfully, you did not provide in your page any description of such measurements with other texts.

Again, I have only briefly gone through your page and possibly have not really grasped what and how you performed your experiments. Therefore please consider the above remarks as very tentative, or, if you prefer, just ignore them.

Regards,
Mark Perakh

Note: Later Mark read **The Original Code in the Bible**, and stated that "it was very well written," but did not formulate any conclusion on it. Here now is the response I sent him to which he never replied.

Theomatics vs. Robin Hood

Dear Mark:

Thank you for the quick reply. I'll try to address your concerns, which I do appreciate. The major reason that theomatics has not been universally recognized, is that so few people have taken a close and comprehensive look. Those who have, are completely "blown away" by the degree and finality of the evidence. But from that point on, they don't seem to know what to do with it. The conclusions and implications are obvious, and the mathematics, unimpeachable.

Your example on "permutated texts" does not apply in this instance. We do not randomize in the manner as you describe. You are correct in stating that you "have not really grasped how [I have] performed [the] experiments." So I will try to explain this in as simple a manner as possible. You will find the fundamental basis of my logic flawless.

In order to illustrate all of this, let us take for example the story of Robin Hood (or any anything else from any work of literature ever written by man upon earth). We could do this experiment in English, or German, or we could even translate the story into Hebrew and Greek.

Now let us go through the entire book, extract all the phrases from that story where the name "Robin" is used. There obviously would be hundreds of instances. Let's have the computer take every phrase where the word Robin appears, with four words in front of Robin, and/or four words in back of Robin, and extract all the phrase combinations. We are going to limit our search to phrases that have a five word maximum length.

"And he took his bow and <u>Robin</u> Hood shot the arrow as Little John looked on."

As you can see, with the "five word rule," we end up with a phrase nine words in length

"(5) took (4) his (3) bow (2) and (1) <u>Robin</u> (2) Hood (3) shot (4) the (5) arrow."

Now we will assign numerical values to all the English letters and words in this story, using the same sequence (or any other sequence) that theomatics uses for the Hebrew and Greek text of the Bible.

A = 1
B = 2
C = 3
D = 4
E = 5
F = 6
G = 7
H = 8
I = 9
J = 10
K = 20
L = 30
M = 40
N = 50
O = 60
P = 70
Q = 80
R = 90
S = 100
T = 200
U = 300
V = 400
W = 500
X = 600
Y = 700
Z = 800

Now when we take this sequence of allocations, the word Robin has a numerical value of 211. The other words have the following values "theomatically":

TOOK = 340
HIS = 117
BOW = 562
AND = 55
ROBIN = 211
HOOD = 132
SHOT = 368
THE = 213
ARROW = 741

Now the computer can sit down and calculate every phrase combination possible (five words and less), that include the word "Robin" in the phrase. Here are just some of the mathematical possibilities.

```
ROBIN  =  211
ROBIN HOOD  =  343
AND ROBIN  =  266
AND ROBIN HOOD  =  398
BOW AND ROBIN  =  1226
ROBIN HOOD SHOT  =  711
BOW AND ROBIN HOOD  =  1358
AND ROBIN HOOD SHOT  =  766
… etc. etc.
```

Again, all the mathematical possibilities for all the phrase combinations are possible in this phrase that: (1) include the word "Robin," and (2) the length is limited to five words or less in both directions from the central word "Robin." The total number of possible phrase combinations according to these rules would be 15.

Shown below is a binomial computer print out showing all the mathematical possibilities for all the phrase combinations. The "1" indicates which word(s) are tabulated, and the "0" indicates no words were calculated from within that portion of the nine word phrase. The numbers in the left column are the total values for the words and phrases.

```
211      000010000
266      000110000
343      000011000
828      001110000
398      000111000
711      000011100
945      011110000
960      001111000
766      000111100
924      000011110
1285     111110000
1077     011111000
1328     001111100
979      000111110
1665     000011111
```

Now let us suppose that someone comes along and claims that there is some sort of Divine design, or supernatural signature—distinctive results that are anomalous yet measurable—within these numerical values **in the phrases that refer exclusively to Robin Hood**. They claim that there is a phenomenon present that these numerical values exhibit (the values to letters sequence shown above), that is **exclusive** to proving this so called "God designed miracle." Here is how it would work.

The name Robin Hood, adds up to 343. This is truly a "remarkable" number, because it is the cube of 7 (7 x 7 x 7 = 343). So now let us suppose that someone claims that if you break this number down to, say 49 (7 x 7), it will be discovered that virtually all the references to Robin Hood exhibit this "miraculous" multiple of 49.

So the first thing we are going to do is go through all the above, and see if we can find **another** multiple of 49. We go through all the above phrase combinations, and we can't find a 49, but "amazingly" we find three more examples that are within one or two numbers (the clustering concept in theomatics) of 49. The phrase "his bow and Robin Hood" equals 1077. This number is 49 x 22 -1. In other words, 49 x 22 = 1078, which is one number more than the "miraculous" value of 1077 that we discovered with this phrase. Additionally, we find two more phrases (one of them non sensical). Here are the results.

$$ROBIN\ HOOD\ =\ 49 \times 7$$
$$HIS\ BOW\ AND\ ROBIN\ HOOD\ =\ 49 \times 22 - 1$$
$$AND\ ROBIN\ HOOD\ SHOT\ THE\ =\ 49 \times 20 + 1$$
$$ROBIN\ HOOD\ SHOT\ THE\ ARROW\ =\ 49 \times 34 + 1$$

This is pretty remarkable? So guess what we are going to do now. We are going to go through the entire story of Robin hood, and look at the hundreds of times the word Robin appears, to find all the **additional multiples** of 49 possible, that are within the cluster of one or two numbers of the multiples of 49.

So maybe after looking at a number of instances (say a dozen or more), we come up with the following.

"And Robin Hood fell to the ground and cried out."

$$ROBIN\ HOOD\ FELL\ TO\ =\ 1421\ (49 \times 29)$$

"He then chased Robin through the woods of Sherwood Forest."

$$HE\ THEN\ CHASED\ ROBIN\ =\ 1615\ (49 \times 33 - 2)$$

"And Little John threw the bow to Robin Hood from the tower."

$$THE\ BOW\ TO\ ROBIN\ HOOD\ =\ 932\ (49 \times 19 + 1)$$

So after checking through numerous references, we have the following list of "phenomenon."

$$ROBIN\ HOOD\ =\ 49 \times 7$$
$$HIS\ BOW\ AND\ ROBIN\ HOOD\ =\ 49 \times 22 - 1$$
$$AND\ ROBIN\ HOOD\ SHOT\ THE\ =\ 49 \times 20 + 1$$
$$ROBIN\ HOOD\ SHOT\ THE\ ARROW\ =\ 49 \times 34 + 1$$
$$ROBIN\ HOOD\ FELL\ TO\ =\ 1421\ (49 \times 29)$$
$$HE\ THEN\ CHASED\ ROBIN\ =\ 1615\ (49 \times 33 - 2)$$
$$THE\ BOW\ TO\ ROBIN\ HOOD\ =\ 932\ (49 \times 19 + 1)$$
… etc. etc.

But this does not stop here. Believe it or not, when we go on through the entire story of Robin Hood checking out many +hundreds of references, we discover—amazingly—that in virtually every instance to where the word Robin is specifically mentioned, there is a multiple of 49—a short explicit phrase containing in it the word "Robin." In Fact, after trying this and that, we come up with a list of over 100 examples of the 49 "phenomenon." Each reference to Robin exhibits a phrase with **completely different** words (all unique from the previous examples) that are non redundant. But according to the ground rules each successful hit must contain the word Robin, and fall within the cluster of the multiples of 49, and all the feature phrases must be five words or less in length.

The Conclusion

It would not take very long for any person with any degree of mathematical common horse sense, to see that this exercise is futile and absurd. It would be impossible for any phenomenon to exist (if the numbers are all equally random). In looking through all the various phrase combinations, one would expect to find a multiple of 49 only within the framework of the null hypothesis, which is randomness. That means that for every 49 numbers looked at, only one of them (on average) would be directly divisible by 49. The chance of being a direct hit or also within +1, +2, or -1, -2, would be 49/5 = 9.8, or approximately one in every 10 numbers (on average).

Again, any person with even an elementary or third grade comprehension of math would realize that it would be impossible for all the example references to Robin to produce multiples of 49 that were not accidental. Only one in so many would be **expected**, i.e. one in 9.8 to yield any positive result. In fact, it would be theoretically impossible to achieve any significant results beyond chance expectation (the null hypothesis). Similarly, in rolling a dice, one would expect any number 1 to 6, to only occur once every six throws, on average. In flipping a coin 500 times, the results would "always" produce 250 heads and 250 tails (or something close to that figure). Same principle.

But let us say that after checking a whole list of references, our investigator just can't seem to get "on track" or find any significant results with the number 49, so he goes back and tries it again. This time he takes just the word Robin, which had a value of 211. He goes back through all the references looking for multiples of 211 (a prime number), but can't seem to get any positive results with that number either. If that does not work, he then tries to break it down, to say the number 71. Why 71? He discovers that Robin falls within the cluster (71 x 3 = 213), and 213 is 211 + 2, so he is now playing by the ground rules and has his first 71. He then goes through all the references to Robin looking for more multiples within the cluster of 71.

I think you can see by now, that this whole thing is absurd. One would be no more likely to find a divine design or supernatural signature—even in the Bible text—by this or any similar method—than looking for design with the story of Robin Hood. OR IN ANY OTHER WORK OF LITERATURE!

Furthermore, let's say our investigator tries to tell you, that after he compiles his examples, that,

(1)   The only values that can produce these results of 49, are the **standard allocations** shown above (A=1, B=2, C=3, Z=800, etc.) No other assignment of numbers to letters will work.

(2)   Furthermore, this person asserts that the multiples of 49 only occur beyond chance expectation **within references specifically to Robin Hood**. In other words, "God" designed and planned all these numerical values so that only phrases that speak about Robin Hood—each of the words and their numerical values have been exclusively arranged (by Divine Intelligence of course) to produce multiples of 49.

If somebody claimed to have discovered such a thing, what would you say Mark? Would you believe them?

But this is exactly what theomatics claims to be able to do. This is what theomatics is all about. This is precisely what theomatics has discovered within the Bible text. And the odds for even the most basic patterns are millions and billions to one against the null hypothesis. We are thus witnessing a supernatural miracle with theomatics. One that you (or anybody else) will find impossible to debunk.

Testing the Hypothesis

Now, let's get back to the story of Robin Hood. How would we test this hypothesis? How would we test similar theomatic claims? How would we disprove the 49 multiple "miracle?"

Well, we can take another book about Robin Hood I suppose, or even the words from one of William Shakespeare's plays related to another topic, and look to see if we can find phrases that produce 49's that go beyond chance expectation. (We obviously would be no more successful in those attempts, either.)

Yet for a simpler and more objective comparison, would be to simply **randomize** the alphabet. That way we can compare apples to apples. After all, if there is no significance to the first set of allocations (which any bona-fide skeptic would insist can only produce randomness), **would it not be completely reasonable to expect another assignment— KNOWN FOR SURE TO BE RANDOM—to not get any better results?**

Why not?

	Standard	Randomized
	A = 1	A = 6
	B = 2	B = 5
	C = 3	C = 3
	D = 4	D = 9
	E = 5	E = 8
	F = 6	F = 2
	G = 7	G = 1
	H = 8	H = 4
	I = 9	I = 7
	J = 10	J = 30
	K = 20	K = 70
	L = 30	L = 50
	M = 40	M = 80
	N = 50	N = 10
	O = 60	O = 20
	P = 70	P = 40
	Q = 80	Q = 90
	R = 90	R = 60
	S = 100	S = 700
	T = 200	T = 200
	U = 300	U = 400
	V = 400	V = 500
	W = 500	W = 800
	X = 600	X = 100
	Y = 700	Y = 300
	Z = 800	Z = 600

So here now, is how all the same words stack up with the randomized values.

TOOK = 310
HIS = 711
BOW = 825
AND = 25
ROBIN = 102
HOOD = 53
SHOT = 924
THE = 248
ARROW = 946

So here Robin equals 102 instead of 343, or 49 x 7. Now we can look for multiples of a number similar in size—say the number 51 (since 102 = 51 x 2).

I hope by now you can begin to see the logic. It should be obvious, that either two allocations (the first set or standard ones with 49, and the random ones with 51), should

by all reasonable logic, have an **equal chance** of producing any supposed "phenomenon." If our investigator friend produced, say 111 phrases from the story of Robin Hood that were multiples of 49, all I would have to do to **debunk** his findings, is **demonstrate**, that I could find 109 similar phrases from Robin Hood with the number 51, only I would use the randomized values instead. That would blow apart his argument that the first set of allocations have supernatural/divinely orchestrated/God inspired significance.

Theomatics has completely tested by computer the hypothesis against (potentially) 403 septillion random permutations to the Hebrew and Greek alphabets. The following three conditions, as they accurately define theomatics, will nail the coffin lid shut on this issue.

(1) Nothing can produce this phenomenon except the **standard numerical allocations** to the letters of the Hebrew and Greek alphabets, of historical record. All other allocations of numbers to the letters of the alphabet only produce randomness. The standard arrangement has a total of 403 septillion randomized permutations possible. Only the historical sequence works.

(2) This incredible phenomenon **only exists in the Bible** text, and apparently in no other work of literature ever written by anyone.

(3) Yet even in the Bible text it does not occur at all **until there is a specific theological connection or common Hebrew/Greek word usage** between the instances (like all the references to the birth of Christ, or all the references to light and darkness, or all the time the word "evil" is used, etc.)

When it comes to theomatics, item #3 is the clincher. Why would these consistent and spectacular patterns **only occur with words and phrases having related meaning or theological concept**? These results prove that neither (1) the numerical allocations to the letters, and (2) the Bible text itself, is the cause de forte. Phrases taken at random from the Bible exhibit no consistency, they are just random. Only when the #3 condition is applied, does the miracle appear. **And why would the same integer consistency with the same topic exist and PREDOMINATE in BOTH the Hebrew Old Testament and Greek New Testament—two completely different languages?**

The scientist in Germany after thoroughly analyzing theomatics, and who did the analysis debunking the fellow in Texas who set up a website that attempted to falsify theomatics (with a testing procedure that was invalid and not even applicable to theomatics), stated the following:

"A hierarchy of theological aspects is hard to imagine."

http://www.theomatics.net/11.3.html

Theomatics can provide literally tens of thousands of examples of spectacular phenomenon from our research files—**none of which can even be remotely touched by a randomization test** (and that does not even include the clustering phenomenon which is even more impressive and completely independent to the mentioned procedure).

It should be obvious to even the most casual observer, that if God (or no else) **did not pre-arrange or engineer words and phrases, any set of random allocations should work just as easily.** Dr. LaVerne Stanton of California State University, Fullerton (former chair of the statistic and quantitative method department), wrote a complete report on this method as being a valid means to either prove/disprove theomatics.

THERE ARE NO CHARACTERISTICS IN ANY LANGUAGE ANYWHERE IN THE HISTORY OF MANKIND, WHERE A PERSON COULD USE THIS METHOD, AND THE LANGUAGE OR GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURE ITSELF —WOULD BE THE EXPLANATION FOR PRODUCING MULTIPLES OF SPECIFIC NUMBERS RELATED ONLY TO THE MEANING OF SPECIFIC WORDS AND THEOLOGICALLY RELATED TOPICS AND CONCEPTS— WHERE THE LANGUAGE ITSELF OR ANY INHERENT LINQUISTIC CHARACTERISTIC, COULD POSSIBLY BE THE EXPLANATION. IT WOULD BE LUDICROUS AND CATEGORICALLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR ANYBODY TO CLAIM SUCH A THING. A PHENOMENON OF THIS NATURE IS NO MORE LIKELY IN ANY WORK OF LITERATURE THAN FINDING PROVABLE PATTERNS IN THE GREATER DALLAS-FORT WORTH PHONE BOOK (trying to demonstrate that people with specific last names have phone numbers containing multiple factors unique to their names—obviously phone numbers are random and a Smith phone number has just a good of chance of being divisible by 113 as a Jones phone number).

Likewise IN THE BIBLE, words or phrases dealing only with specific topics and the numerical values of the words associated with those topics and theological concepts, are no more likely to produce unequivocal patterns.

At the time the Bible was written, all the words with their numerical values were fixed and had developed within an unpresuming natural historical/cultural framework. So when the Bible writers penned the text, they were STUCK with words that had already come into existence. There is no possible way they could have engineered the words in order to make words and phrases containing definitive theological concepts—match specific numerical totals, or contain specific multiples and clustering characteristics. Yet that is what would be required in order for theomatics to work. And that is precisely what God sovereignly and supernaturally did with theomatics when He "secretly" designed words and their numerical values within the unpresuming framework of spontaneous cultural development. And later inserted those words juxtaposition into the Bible text.

Furthermore, it is ludicrous to think that 40 different men over 1600 years, all had a secret conspiracy among themselves to make sure that the phrases referring to Satan worked out to multiples of 276. There is not a stitch of historical evidence that any such conspiracy ever existed (or that men played shuffle board games with words and their numerical values).

Only divine omnipresent and omnipotent intelligence could accomplish such a feat.

The Question Still Begs?

But certain people will probably still ask: "How do you know for sure? Maybe there are other works out there containing a similar phenomenon? Maybe God has put his stamp on the Koran?"

Yes, I suppose that one could always make that hypothetical argument. But there are "billions" of literary works published, many of them religious works, over the course of history. Which one(s) do you want us to check out? Which topics? Which multiple factors? How many tests would I have to perform to prove the point and convince a person of randomness? Doing a few simple tests (and getting a null/random result), would be as easy as falling off a log. Duck soup! Slam dunk!

Similarly, how does one know whether or not a certain name in a certain phone book from a particular city from a particular year, does not contain a phenomenon? Obviously, no one would consider it even reasonable to insist every phone directory in the world be examined to prove that point.

So the obvious conclusion is that it would be **impractical** to check out other works of literature, because every piece of literature ever written would have to be thoroughly analyzed. This reminds me of the current space telescopes that listen 24 hours a day to "star noise," trying to find one needle of intelligence in the cosmic haystack. The computers process trillions of signals and have so far found nothing but random noise.

Still, when it is all said and done, people (who are probably looking for an excuse do dismiss this phenomenon) will always make the argument that there might yet be something like theomatics, somewhere out there in the real world.

I certainly will not hold my breath. And I don't think a lot of capable mathematicians will either.

Sincerely,
Del Washburn