
Letters

WHO WROTE GENESIS?

Dear Editor,

I read with interest Dr Taylor's research on the anaphoric colophons of Genesis.¹ Readers may be interested to know that Christian apologist Francis Schaeffer was familiar with Wiseman's work, and though not completely convinced of its certainty, still observed that:

'... inspiration would be in the choice of the material used. It would be parallel to Hezekiah's men copying out the proverbs of Solomon (Proverbs 25:1).'²

The internal evidence strongly suggests that Adam wrote Genesis 2:5-5:2 himself. It is extremely unlikely that Moses would have edited the colophon in Genesis 5:1, *'This is the book of the generations of Adam . . .'* (**New American Standard Bible**). This is the first occurrence of the word 'book' in the Bible, and the Hebrew word translated as book is 'cepher'. This word, according to the definition in **the Theological Word Book of the Old Testament**, exclusively refers to some type of written record. Interestingly, the only record of the Cainite line is in Adam's book; after his death the account moves quickly through the godly line to Noah. Apparently, only a few excerpts of these antediluvian records were included in Genesis and none of the colophons incorporated until Noah's in Genesis 6:8. Adam, as well as being the first zoologist, farmer and many other firsts, was also the world's first historian and writer.

John Goertzen,
Winona Lake, Indiana,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

REFERENCES

1. Taylor, C. V., 1994. Who wrote Genesis? **CEN Tech. J.**, 8(2):204-211.
2. Schaeffer, F. A., 1972. **Genesis in Space and Time**, Inter-Varsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, p. 128.

ORIGIN OF LANGUAGES

Dear Editor,

For some years I have been waiting for an article in your journal on the origin of languages. My hope was raised when Elizabeth East wrote on the genetic tree, with a reference to the origin of languages.¹ As an amateur prehistorian (specialising in Europe) I often have to deal with the evolutionist theories of language origin. To my dismay I see that some creationists simply take these evolutionist notions on board and speak of the Indo-European language as if it is factual. We should remember that the evolutionist theory has little or nothing in common with the statements of Genesis chapter 10.

Although I am not a specialist in this field, I have developed a model of languages in Europe for my own use. Archaeological data, myths, legends, and place name studies seem to indicate that Gomer with his three sons, and Meshech, Magog and Tubal were the original settlers of Northern and Eastern Europe. This makes seven languages. Tiras and Javan with his four boys seemed to have settled Southern Europe. Now, prehistory is notorious for its jumble of conflicting theories. By the nature of things it is difficult, and often impossible, to find 'good' evidence. My little working theory probably has some major defects.

A major obstacle to good science is the isolation in which so many of its practitioners work. Ideally, a study in the origin of languages should consider related fields. But this is not all, the present theories on the prehistory of Europe are dependent on evolutionary doctrines. Dating is a real trouble here. Dr Osgood, in an article in your journal, did some brilliant work re-dating the Middle East cultures.^{2,3} This sort of work has to be done with prehistoric European cultures too. This work should be combined with a thorough re-interpretation of the available material. The outcome would be a different, and

hopefully more truthful, prehistory than we have at present. If I may hazard a guess, we could find that the Stone Age in Europe (excluding the kitchen middens which stretch far into the Bronze Age) did not last more than one generation. I see these people as the pioneers, who trek in front of the main body of population. It would not be prudent to allocate one language (Indo-European) to these groups of pioneers. Their tongue would rather conform to that of their kin in the main body of the multi-lingual Danubian-bandceramic culture. It has been noted by archaeologists that, when this Danubian culture of the first agrarians settled in middle Europe, this culture lost its coherence and divided into four related yet distinct cultures. Gomer and his three boys? This first settlement of the tribes did not leave any apparent linguistic trace in the area concerned. Soon the four cultures part way and each takes a section of Northern Europe. There still is little or no linguistic trace from these cultures, despite claims of Indo-European origin of certain place names.

Within a century or two there seemed to be a major upheaval in Europe, which resulted in the migration of three nations of Eastern Europe. These three, the battle-axe, the corded ware, and the globular amphora, overran Germany and Scandinavia, and eventually settled throughout Northern Europe. The situation at that time was that *'seven languages'* were spoken in Northern Europe.

Apart from archaeological evidence of the abovementioned theory-guesswork, there is a legend by Snorri Sturluson, in the *Heimskringla*, concerning the first war in Europe (the Asir and Vanir). This evidence, if correctly associated with the archaeological time, suggests a melting together of the disparate peoples of Early Bronze Europe. One can only guess what language and blood mixing took place over time. There still was another period of movement in the

population and consequent changes in language patterns. This one is better known by the archaeologist and is practically ignored by those of other sciences. At approximately 1235 BC evolutionary time, or approximately 800-850 BC real time, the displaced peoples of Europe, including of the North, harassed Egypt and other places in the Middle East. This was the time when Greece was over-run and changed languages. Some people claim a connection between the Irish and Greek language, the evidence for this notion being very feeble to say the least, but still not entirely impossible.

The outline above gives a different picture of the prehistory of Europe than the orthodox teaching. This is partly because most sciences change when a new generation takes over. The modern archaeologist is generally not as hostile to myths and legends as the old guard. Still, there are elements in the above view which are abhorrent to the evolutionist, who cannot accept the idea that man was civilised when he entered Europe. When we see the bones of a Neandertal we may theorise that he or she had seen the Tower of Babel, and may even have worked on it. To the evolutionist the grunting Neandertal has more appeal.

I am not qualified to answer the many questions that language brings up. Maybe there is someone who is prepared to write an article for the **CEN Technical Journal** on the origin of language, and in the process demolish the anti-Biblical evolutionist model.

John H. J. Kramer,
Buxton, New South Wales,
AUSTRALIA.

REFERENCES

1. East, E., 1991. A critical examination of the genetic tree constructed by Cavalli-Sforza and colleagues. **CEN Tech. J.**, 5(1):29-41.
2. Osgood, A.J.M., 1986. A better model for the Stone Age. **EN Tech. J.**, 2:88-102.
3. Osgood, A. J. M., 1988. A better model for the Stone Age — Part 2. **EN Tech. J.**, 3:73-95.

DINOSAURS AND DRAGONS

Dear Editor,

I was awe stricken by the article Dinosaurs and Dragons by D. (Lee) Niermann, in the **Technical Journal**.¹ As I read the article and looked at the pictures of the dragons, I saw in Figure 6 on page 90, a drawing of the wyvern. I took a second look and yes, it was very similar in appearance to the Piasa Bird of Alton, Illinois, United States of America. The place where I was born and raised.

A picture of the Piasa Bird, painted on the bluffs of the Mississippi River, was seen by Father Jacques Marquette and Louis Joliet on their journey down the Mississippi in 1673. According to Marquette's diary, the Piasa

'was as large as a calf with horns like a deer, red eyes, a beard like a tiger's, a face like a man, the body covered with green, red and black scales, and a tail so long it passed around the body, over the head and between the legs, ending like a fishes' tail.'

*'The bird which the figure represents is called by the Illini Indians, "The Piasa" (pronounced Pie-a-saw), meaning the bird that devours men'.*²

I wanted to let the author know about this so he could take a trip down the Mississippi and add more to his story. There apparently are more of these myths, so-called, throughout the United States and Canada, if someone could chase them down. I believe that all these so-called myths are based upon factual events from the past. Job 40:15 quotes God as saying he made the behemoth along with Job. God on the fifth and sixth days of creation created the birds, the creatures of the sea, and the creatures that move along the ground, Genesis 1:20-25. I do believe the Bible in that all creatures lived with man on this planet.

Harry W. Gustine, Jr.,
Amanda, Ohio,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

REFERENCES

1. Niermann, D. (Lee), 1994. Dinosaurs and dragons. **CEN Tech. J.**, 8(1):85-104.
2. **All Around Alton**, Greater Alton/Twin Rivers Convention Bureau, p. 4.

COBE DATING

Dear Editor,

I would like to make a correction to the paper written by A. W. (Bill) Mehler¹ which appeared in your journal. As a contractor for NASA since 1985 I have good information concerning the sensitivity limits of the Cosmic Background Explorer satellite (COBE). That sensitivity was one part in about 30,000. In order to achieve the sensitivity of one part in 100,000, the data had to be 'massaged' through computer enhancement. The work was done at the University of California at Los Angeles, Berkeley, and Santa Barbara by researchers George Smoot, Charles Bennett, Edward Wright and Alan Kogut.² I say 'massaged' because with computer enhancement it is a prerequisite to know what is being searched for, which means that the data analyst brings a pronounced personal bias to the procedure. The discovery of anisotropy of one part in 100,000 is questionable to anyone who knows how the original data was processed and who is objective about cosmos origin theories. Those having a further interest in this matter should read the reference article in **Physics Today**, June 1992, pages 17-20.

Robin Rushing,
League City, Texas,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

REFERENCES

1. Mehler, A. W., 1994. The origin of the universe: a creationist evaluation of current scientific theories. **CEN Tech. J.** 8(2):223-237.
2. Smoot, G., Bennett, C., Wright, E. and Kogut, A., 1992. **Physics Today**, June 1992, pp. 17-20.