

## THE ORIGINAL HUMAN AUTHOR OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS

In 1985, Donald J. Wiseman<sup>1</sup> edited and reissued a work entitled *Ancient Records and the Structure of Genesis: A Case for Literary Unity* that reflected a 1936 limited edition study done by his late father, P. J. Wiseman. The original title had been *New Discoveries in Babylonia about Genesis*.

Chapter II (pp. 24-38) features a concise chronological register of the major archaeological discoveries in Babylonia and how these substantiated the Biblical record. In the third chapter, Wiseman recounts how the excavations revealed that rather than the ancient periods reflecting progressively more and more primitive conditions until traces of civilization ceased altogether and aboriginal man appeared, advanced cultures were found to have existed in the lowest strata. Indeed, the evidence of the sudden abrupt appearance in which civilization appears in the record was seen to thoroughly expose the previously prevailing assumption that early man had advanced by slow steady progress until finally, after the elapse of an infinite prolonged period of time, culture emerged. Wiseman caps this in the fourth chapter with a pericope on the methods and materials used by the early scribes in their writings (c.3000 BC).

Moreover, due to their brevity, clarity, and content, these three chapters are deemed most valuable reference material, a prize for anyone's library. But these are not the soul of the book, neither do they even hint at its intended message.

The Wisemans'<sup>2</sup> thesis begins with the observation that as there is neither any statement in Genesis directly referring to Moses as its author (as in the other four books of the Pentateuch) nor any declaration in the New Testament given by Christ or His apostles that Moses actually wrote or spoke the words they quote from Genesis, Moses is therefore not the original author of that book. They do acknowledge that Moses was the author of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy; however the material contained in the Book of Genesis presumably had been originally transmitted in written form by other men. Moses supposedly simply compiled and organized these ancient sources into a chronological narrative. To the Wisemans' and their followers, certain "literary" problems which text critics have identified in Genesis demand that Moses did not receive his information by direct revelation from God but that he is merely its "editor", not its author.<sup>3</sup>

The elder Wiseman noted on the wedge-shaped script bearing clay tablets from Mesopotamia a certain recurring specific literary form. The form was comprised of a title, followed by the body of the text which was then concluded with a certain scribal device known as a *colophon*. The colophon "generally contained the name of the owner or scribe and some attempt at dating" the writing.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, since the colophons or "catch-lines"<sup>5</sup> appear at the end of a tablet (or a series of tablets), they must refer to the material written *before* it. Further, the name in the colophon normally was the name of the owner and/or writer of the tablet.<sup>6</sup>

Using these archaeological records as a model, Wiseman assumed that the pattern taken from the profane writings held for the sacred as well and applied the above findings to the Book of Genesis.

---

<sup>1</sup> A former Professor of Assyriology at the University of London and Assistant Keeper (Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities) at the British Museum, D.J Wiseman is also a renowned author and lecturer - a noted evangelical scholar. His many publications include: *Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings (626-556 BC) in The British Museum* (1956); *The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon* (1958); *Peoples of Old Testament Times* (1973); and *Nebuchadrezzar and Babylon* (1983).

<sup>2</sup> D.J. shares the views of his late father (d. 1948).

<sup>3</sup> D.J. Wiseman, *Ancient Records and the Structure of Genesis: A Case for Literary Unity*, (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1985), pp. 11, 20, 69, 74 etc. The Wiseman theory was intended to overthrow and replace the completely erroneous "documentary hypothesis" (also known as the JEDP hypothesis) proposed by Jean Astruc in Paris in 1753 and championed by the liberal modernist, Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918).

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17. To date, colophons have only been found in association with clay tablets.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 8, 57, 104.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 68.

He concluded that the presence of a colophon was indicated by the recurring phrase, "These are the generations (Hebrew (twɔlwɔt) = tol<sup>o</sup>doth, meaning histories, family histories, genealogies) of ...", and that this phrase was the key to the "literary" structure of Genesis.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, that by these colophons Moses was recording the names of his sources of information<sup>2</sup> much as we place footnotes or endnotes to document our references today.

Admittedly, it is well known that the formula, "These are the generations of ...", occurs eleven times in Genesis:

- (1) 2:4, the heavens and the earth;
- (2) 5:1, Adam;
- (3) 6:9, Noah;
- (4) 10:1, the sons of Noah;
- (5) 11:10, Shem;
- (6) 11:27, Terah;
- (7) 25:12, Ishmael;
- (8) 25:19, Isaac;
- (9) 36:1, Esau;
- (10) 36:9, Esau again; and
- (11) 37:2, Jacob.<sup>3</sup>

Indeed, it is the most prevalent, distinctive phrase contained therein. Wiseman maintains that these are internal clues revealing that the actual authors of the Book of Genesis were Adam, Noah, the sons of Noah, Shem, Terah, Ishmael, Isaac, Esau, Jacob, and (from Genesis 37:2b to the end) Joseph.<sup>4</sup> He further contends that Moses inserted the formula to clearly indicate the source of the information available to him and the names of the persons who originally possessed the tablets from which he gained his knowledge. To Wiseman, these colophon divisions based upon the Patriarchs listed above constitute the framework of the Book of Genesis.

Again – for clarity – it must be reemphasized that as the formula, "These are the generations of ...", is found in the *concluding* sentence of each section; it supposedly points back to a narrative *already* recorded.<sup>5</sup> To illustrate, when Genesis 6:9a states: "These are the generations of Noah" it is to be understood that this colophon refers to the owner or writer of the tablet, rather than to the history of the person named. That is, "These are the generations of Noah" does not necessarily mean "This is the history *about* Noah" but the history written or possessed *by* Noah.<sup>6</sup> Noah wrote and/or possessed the tablet from the period concluding that sentence *back* to the former such phrase. Thus Noah supposedly wrote down on clay tablets Genesis 6:9a back to 5:3, not 6:9a forward to the next occurrence of the phrase at Genesis 10:1 as one might normally expect. The formula is said not to be the beginning of a list or narrative but its ending – it is the author's closing signature.

Consequently, Moses supposedly compiled and edited Genesis from actual first-hand (or at least relatively near) accounts written by the men who were living at the time the recorded events took place – and not supernaturally by revelation from God many years later in his own day. The only exception is the first use of the phrase which covers Genesis 1:1-2:4. As no author is named,

---

<sup>1</sup> Wiseman, *Ancient Records and the Structure of Genesis: A Case for Literary Unity*, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 144.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 60, 68-69. Wiseman is not the first to observe this phenomena; his was to systematize the colophons into theory.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 96-97, 104-105. Being void of colophons, Wiseman believes Genesis 37:2b-50:26 were written on papyrus or leather.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 68.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 67.

Wiseman suggests that the author was God Himself who wrote it<sup>1</sup> very soon after the act of creation – much as He later wrote the Ten Commandments upon the stone tables.

Now all this theory is important to Wiseman because such would establish that we have firsthand human eyewitness accounts of all that transpired within the bounds of the Book of Genesis. In addition, it also supposedly documents that the Genesis account was actually passed down in written form and not, as some erroneously surmise, by word of mouth and thus be dependent on the memory of man.<sup>2</sup>

Although there remain other points in his study, this constitutes the primary thesis found in *Ancient Records and the Structure of Genesis*. As P. J. Wiseman's work is not generally well known, it has not yet obtained a substantial following. Recently, however, it has begun to gain a wider circle of acceptance due largely to the aforementioned reprint by his son and the appearance of a brief synopsis of the theory in several widely distributed works.<sup>3</sup>

The appeal of the Wiseman explanation among evangelical,<sup>4</sup> conservative Christianity is quite strong because of its implications. Rather than Genesis having a late date, as is universally taught in non-evangelical circles, it implies that Genesis 1-11 is a transcript of the oldest series of written records in human history. It contends (as does this author) through the information contained in chapters 1-11 that the first humans created by God would have had great intelligence, language capabilities, and been fully informed by God as to their origin. It argues that the Genesis Creation and Flood descriptions are the original and true historic narratives of these events and were not derived from the very different and polytheistic Babylonian accounts. It also supports the fact that monotheism was man's original religious view and not a later evolutionary refinement from an earlier polytheism. The theory further serves to falsify the widespread idea that Genesis chapters 1 and 2 give conflicting accounts of creation and also suggests that the higher critical theories relative to the composition and date of the Book of Genesis are factually bankrupt.

The foregoing position appeals to the conservative Christian, of which this author unashamedly numbers himself, because it is felt by its advocates to offer real empirical evidence as to the validity of the various accounts recorded in the first book of the Holy Writ. But it is folly to think that pagan academia as a whole, or liberal and/or even compromising Christendom will submit to such testimony. The expectation that the stated theory offers is but an illusion, nor is it needed. Far better evidence has been amassed against the uniformitarian-evolutionary world view of science by numerous well schooled academicians and scientists, yet with limited – albeit significant – results.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 87-90.

<sup>2</sup> Wiseman, *Ancient Records and the Structure of Genesis: A Case for Literary Unity*, *op. cit.*, pp. 67, 106.

<sup>3</sup> Marvin L. Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1992), pp. 213-222 and Robert W. Faid, *A Scientific Approach to Biblical Mysteries*, (Green Forest, AR: New Leaf Press, 1993), pp. 11-23 etc. Only recently have I learned, to my dismay, via personal correspondence with Dr. Henry Morris, a much admired acquaintance, that he has long been enmeshed by this theory: *The Genesis Record*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1976), pp. 22-30. Lubenow's acceptance of the Wiseman theory is also especially disconcerting for the present author who has had a 14 year professional career during which he held varying positions of responsibility as Paleontologist, Geophysicist, District Geophysicist, Geophysical Manager, and Regional Geophysicist with Texaco and Tenneco respectively. Having majors in the disciplines of Geology, Chemistry, Mathematics, Theology, Education, and a minor in Physics as well as being an ordained Minister (SBC) and having twice served as adjunct Professor at Continental Bible College in Brussels, Belgium (1976, 1984), the writer of this paper has profited much from Professor Lubenow's excellent book as well as his other works. He not only is well informed on the subject matter, but is a fine conservative Christian gentleman as well. *Bones of Contention* is the best the present author has read on the subject of Paleoanthropology, a subject with which he is not a little familiar. Thus for this ex-evolutionist, Professor Lubenow's 19th chapter represents a momentary lapse in an otherwise thorough and most praiseworthy work. It is because of the high regard with which I hold him & Dr. Morris that this point so grieves me for I fear that with their lucid well researched style they will convince many others of the validity of Wiseman's incorrect theory.

<sup>4</sup> Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, *op. cit.*, p. 222. Professor Lubenow summation is both concise and most incisive, consequently he has been cited almost verbatim. Moreover, the present author completely agrees with him doctrinally on each and every point, but for differing reasons - as shall be seen in the rejoinder which follows.

Despite all of the above appeal for the consistently Christian position and the excellent manner in which the Wisemans have outlined their thesis, it is nonetheless wrong. It is wrong because in numerous ways it violates one of the very foundational pillars upon which the Wisemans based their proposition – that of internal Scriptural evidence.<sup>1</sup> That which follows is not intended to be a complete point-by-point refutation of their work. Rather, it will only demonstrate from a purely Biblical perspective the fallaciousness of the major pillars upon which it rests – the remainder falling with the main superstructure.

First, we remind our readers of the basic fact that the divine oracles of the Old Testament were given to the Jews – and the Jews only – to both write and preserve (Rom.3:1-2; cp. Psa.147:19-20), *never* to the Gentiles or non-Jews. Therefore on the authority of Romans 3:1-2, we proclaim the simple truth that all Scripture, Old and New Testaments alike, was written exclusively by Hebrews – and that of necessity includes the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles.<sup>2</sup> Thus when we apply this clear

---

<sup>1</sup> Wiseman, *Ancient Records and the Structure of Genesis: A Case for Literary Unity*, op. cit., p. 148. Here Wiseman states that the foundation he used was the internal testimony of Genesis, supported by the external corroboration of archaeology.

<sup>2</sup> Floyd Nolen Jones, *The Septuagint: A Critical Analysis*, 6th ed., rev. & enlarged, (The Woodlands, TX: KingsWord Press, 1994), pp. 53-54. Contrary to nearly all modern scholarship, Luke was *not* a Gentile. The Romans 3:1-2 citation is in itself absolutely conclusive and serves to correct any and all who instruct otherwise, viz.: "What advantage then hath the Jew? ... Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." Luke penned more text than any other N.T. writer - more than either Paul or John. Were Luke indeed non-Jewish, the Lord not only failed to honor His testimony in Romans 3, He also entrusted more of the N.T. text into the hands of a Gentile than those of His "chosen people".

The contrary evidence foremost in the mind of the scholars, is gleaned from the 4th chapter of Colossians. Here, Paul closes his letter by listing the various people that are with him as he writes (Col.4:7-13) as well as the names of several of those to whom the letter is addressed (Col.4:15-17). Among those whom Paul lists as being at his side, some are said to be "of the circumcision" (i.e., Jewish, vs. 11). It is generally acknowledged from the syntax and context etc. (and probably correctly so) that they are the 3 mentioned immediately before the "circumcision" reference in verse 11: Aristarchus, Marcus, and Jesus called Justus. As Paul mentions Luke (vs. 14) after the "circumcision" allusion (vs. 11), it is deduced that he must not be Jewish. However, this argument has little force. A careful reading of the Colossian passages discloses that verses 7-8 are introducing Tychicus, the letter bearer, to the Church. They also give commendation and new status to his travel companion, Onesimus, whom they have known in the past as a runaway slave who seems to have stolen from Philemon, a wealthy member of their congregation (Philemon 10-21). Clearly then from the context, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus are grouped and introduced next - not because they are Jews, but rather because they are the only three with Paul (other than Tychicus whom they now behold) whom the church at Colosse does not already know. Their nationality is thereby not given for the purpose of ethnic grouping, but for the purpose of identification and information concerning the three. The proof of this is straightforward for as we read verses 12-14 it becomes abundantly clear that the Colossians already know Epaphras, Luke, and Demas. This is what they have in common and is the reason for the positioning of their names. Thus, Tychicus and Onesimus are listed together as they are the bearers of Paul's letter to the church; Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus are grouped together because they are not known by those of Colosse; Epaphras, Luke, and Demas are so placed because, being already known by that local church, they need no introduction. This is the obvious correct and true reason for the arrangement of the names in the fourth chapter of Colossians. Hence, we see there are reasons other than that of merely racial or national background involved as to why Luke was not included among those of the "circumcision". From this it may be seen how imprudent is it to erect a tenet on such trivial, flimsy evidence. Yet this is the *strongest* offered by those who would have us accept that Luke was indeed a Gentile - and that against the clear testimony of Romans 3!

The lame argument that "Luke" (or Lucas, Philemon 24) is a Gentile name and not Jewish is of no force. Not only is it common practice today in countries throughout the world to give children non-ethnic names and even those of famous people from any place or any time frame (i.e., African-Americans naming sons "Washington" or "Roosevelt" and Hispanics naming sons "Jesus") - the Scriptures furnish similar examples. "Alexander" is manifestly a Greek or Macedonian name, yet Acts 19:33-34 mentions an "Alexander" and states that he is a Jew! "Apollos" is unmistakably a Greek designation but Acts 18:24 records that he is Jewish. Moreover, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus - the very names given in Colossians 4 and said to be "of the circumcision" - are all Gentile designations! Throughout his ministry among the Gentiles, Paul used his Roman name rather than his Hebrew (i.e., Saul) as did Peter (Hebrew name = Simon) In fact, most Jews who lived in the Diaspora used two names: the Jewish was used in the synagogue, and the Gentile in business dealings. Thus, "Luke" could well have been the public or professional (as a Doctor) name of a Jew who lived among the Gentiles. More examples could be furnished but what need; the mouth of two or more witnesses has spoken - the matter is incontestable and closed. Their third proof is similar. Namely, that Luke's profession as a physician is evidence that he was non-Jewish, yet on several occasions Christ referred to physicians; hence the practice existed in Israel at that time (Luk.4:23; Mat.9:12). Thus, we have seen that the arguments used to support the opinion that Luke was a Gentile are neither compelling nor well founded.

To the contrary, Romans 3:1-2 straightforwardly states that the chief advantage of being a Jew was that they were the God chosen national vehicle through which He gave revelation to the human race. Therefore the burden of proof is on

Biblical fact to the Wiseman "compiler" theory its erroneousess is laid bare for Scripture undeniably teaches that Abraham was the first Jew. Thus as non-Jews neither Adam, Noah, Noah's sons, Shem, nor Terah could have possibly been the human vehicles through which the Holy Spirit imparted Sacred Writ. The Romans 3:1-2 passage absolutely disqualifies them from consideration. However, being Jewish, Moses does meet this basic Biblical requirement. For the Biblicist, this single particular alone should settle and forever close the matter, but there is more.

According to the "compiler" rationale, the second tablet containing Genesis 2:5-5:2 was written by and/or belonged to Adam, Genesis 5:3-6:9a to Noah, 6:9b-10:1 to the sons of Noah, 10:2-11:10a to Shem, 11:10b-11:27a to Terah, tablet series 7-8 containing Genesis 11:27b-25:19a to Ishmael and Isaac, and tablet series 7-11 on which were inscribed Genesis 25:19b-37:2a to Esau and Jacob.<sup>1</sup> Yet this is preposterous for now unregenerate lost men have supposedly become the instruments through which the Holy Text has been given and come down to us.

Tablet 6 is said to have been written and/or owned by Abraham's father, Terah – yet Joshua 24:2 declares him to have been a pagan who worshipped and served gods other than Jehovah (although he did accompany Abraham on his journey to Canaan as far as Haran). Likewise Esau, for whereas the Old Testament portrays him as, at the very least, a man of little faith and commitment to the Living God, the New Testament utterly condemns him as "profane" (godless, blasphemous, or sacrilegious; Heb.12:16-17). But the Scriptures reveal that the method of revelation was that "holy men of God spake (or wrote) as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (II Peter 1:20-21, KJB) – "holy men of God" such as David, who testified: "the Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was in my tongue (II Sam.23:2). The notion that God used men such as Terah and Esau as either the scribes or guardians of His Word is totally unworthy. Surely this consideration alone relegates the "compiler" theory to oblivion for any clear thinking Bible believer.

Although no such unmistakable statements are recorded against Ishmael and thus he well may have been a true believer, that preserved in Scripture concerning him certainly leaves him far short of the God determined standard displayed in the lives of the other dedicated chosen vessels who were the recipients of written revelation (as Joshua, Samuel, Ezra, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Amos, John, Paul, Peter, Luke etc.). To suggest placing Ishmael's (or Terah's) name alongside these should immediately expose this tenet of Wiseman's as highly undeserving our consideration.

---

those who claim that Luke was somehow an exception to this Biblical decree. Yet we have already seen that the evidence from the names listed in Colossians etc. is far too vague, inconsequential, and inconclusive for us to accept as justification to override the Romans testimony. Moreover the Romans 3:1-2 statement is so clear and unambiguous, a later written Scripture of equal or superior clarity must be found and offered to overwhelm its witness. But the Holy Writ has never indicated that God ever changed His established rule of using only the Hebrews to record His revelation.

Furthermore as recorded in Acts 21, Luke was with Paul on his last trip to Jerusalem and seems to have been an eyewitness to Paul's arrest at the Temple. The crowd was aroused by Jews from Asia who charged, among other things, that Paul had brought Gentiles into the Temple area. Luke records that Paul had not so done, but as these Asian Jews had earlier seen Paul in the city with Trophimus the Ephesian, they had assumed Paul had brought that outsider into the Temple grounds with him. The false accusation aroused the populace into a frenzy which resulted in Paul's arrest at the Temple Mount by several hundred Roman soldiers under the command of Claudius Lysias (21:32, cp. 23:26). The point is that when the Jews accused Paul of polluting the Temple by bringing Gentiles therein, why did they only allude to Trophimus? Why did they not include Luke who was also with Paul in the streets of Jerusalem (21:15-18, e.g., "we", "us")? The fact that Luke was not mentioned in the accusation is a most convincing indication that he was not a Gentile. Indeed, after joining the second missionary journey at Troas (Acts 16:10, the change here of the personal pronoun "they" in vv. 6-8 to "we" indicates that Luke, the narrator, had joined Paul's company), Luke accompanied Paul on several trips back to Jerusalem at which time they reported on their travels to the apostolic church (here and Acts 18:21), yet the issue was never raised over his being a Gentile. It is therefore concluded Luke was not named in the accusation when Paul was arrested because it was well known that he was a Hebrew, and this should be acknowledged as confirming evidence to our thesis.

As stated initially, it must be concluded that Luke was a Hebrew. The notion that he was a Gentile is based on little more than tradition. The Biblical account strongly evinces his Jewishness, and we must always hold to the Scriptures over tradition when the two conflict. The infallible Word of God is the source and fountain for all real wisdom and scholarship.

<sup>1</sup> Wiseman, *Ancient Records and the Structure of Genesis: A Case for Literary Unity*, op. cit., pp. 60, 68-73.

Along these lines it should be added that according to a strict application of Wiseman's own formula Ishmael wrote or owned all of Genesis 11:27b to 25:12 leaving only the scant section of 25:13 to 25:19a for Isaac. Further, Esau is presumed to have written or owned all of Genesis 25:19b to 36:9 whereas Jacob supposedly only engraved or possessed from there to 37:2a. Thus even if it were not for the aforementioned rejection of Esau on spiritual grounds, we should still be hard pressed to accept that such actually represents the historical facts. Are we expected to seriously accept that Esau was God's instrument for preserving around 10 chapters of Genesis, twenty percent of the book's entire content, and Jacob as the source for only about half a chapter in view of: "As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated" saith the Lord of hosts (Rom.9:13). Are we to believe that Ishmael was the writer and/or preserver of around 14 chapters (over 20 percent) but Isaac was merely entrusted with a meager 7 verses. Apparently the bondwoman's mocking son who was cast out became the heir and possessor of a most precious inheritance, second only in excellence to that which the chosen heir of promise received (Gen.21:1-21, Gal.4:21-31). We think not!

Further, Wiseman's canon that the eleven times repeated colophon (i.e., "These are the generations of ...") is always found "in the *concluding* sentence of each section and supposedly points *back* to a narrative *already* recorded" does not really always read as naturally as does a forward reading. Remember, his formula is said not to be the beginning of a list or narrative but rather a "closing signature" following a list of ancestors – not a heading followed by a register of descendants. Admittedly, if the "compiler" proposal were true, some of his eleven could be seen to fit into such a scheme and thereby not be deemed unreasonable. However Noah, his sons, Terah, etc. seem clearly to fit better with the opposite "traditional" interpretation (i.e., heading followed by descendants).<sup>1</sup>

Finally, the Wiseman thesis fails when it contends that as there is neither any statement in Genesis directly referring to Moses as its author (as is found in the other four books of the Pentateuch) nor any declaration in the New Testament given by Christ or His apostles that Moses actually wrote the words they quote from Genesis, Moses is therefore not the original author of that book. Jesus said that Moses "wrote of me" (John 5:46). The undeniable first allusion to which our Lord could have referred is to Himself as the fulfillment of the "seed of the woman" prophesy. And where was that written? – Genesis 3:15. Further, the Gospel of John declares that Moses "*gave*" the law (7:19), not Moses gave 80% and compiled/edited the remainder – he *gave* it. To lessen the full force of the obvious intent of such a statement is intellectually irresponsible and morally wrong.

But we are not finished. For only three verses afterward, the Lord Jesus Himself testified that Moses "*gave*" the Jews circumcision (John 7:22, circa October A.D. 29). Indeed Acts 15:1 (c.52 A.D.) and 21:21 (c.60 A.D.) also affirm that Moses was the source through which the token of circumcision was given to the Hebrew people. And where, we ask, did Moses "*give*" the token of the covenant between Jehovah and Abraham and his "seed after him; where did Moses *give* circumcision? Was it given in Exodus? In Leviticus? In Numbers or Deuteronomy? Physical circumcision is mentioned three times in Exodus, once in Leviticus, not at all in Numbers, and "circumcision of the heart" is referred to twice in Deuteronomy, but was it "*given*" in these books of the Law? The answer is a thundering – NO! Circumcision was "*given*" by God to Moses in **Genesis** chapter 17, beginning at the tenth verse and continuing through verse 27. Thus when our Lord spoke at John 7:22 of Moses as the "*giver*" of circumcision, He attested as unmistakably and clearly as language permits to the human authorship and recipient of the revelation of the Book of Genesis. One does not have to say the words "Moses wrote the Book of Genesis" to convey that Moses wrote the Book of Genesis. The internal evidence – in context – has spoken. The "compiler" theory is Scripturally unfounded, forever slain by the two-edged sword of the Word of the Living God.

---

<sup>1</sup> To bolster his theory, Wiseman cites Matthew 1:1 (p. 63). Yet whereas this colophon does give a list of ancestors rather than descendants and seemingly supports this tenet of his, it is obviously an "opening" *tol'doth* - a heading - and not a "closing signature". The same is true for Num.3:1, Ruth 4:18, and I Chr.1:29. This casts serious doubt on his "closing" determination.

As to the method by which God imparted Scripture to His chosen human authors, let each carefully and prayerfully read the following until revelation and perception comes:

Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake *as they were* moved by the Holy Ghost. (II Peter 1:20-21, KJB)

Then the LORD put forth his hand, and touched my mouth. And the LORD said unto me, Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth. (Jeremiah 1:9)

... this word came unto Jeremiah from the LORD, saying, Take thee a roll of a book, and write therein all the words that I have spoken unto thee ... (Jeremiah 36:1b-2a; also see 36:4, 27-28)

The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word *was* in my tongue. (II Samuel 23:2)

Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, (Mat.1:22)

For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received *it not as the word of men*, but as it is in truth, the word of God, ... (I Thes. 2:13)

This paper has demonstrated beyond any reasonable doubt that the Word of God contains compelling unmistakable evidence that Moses is the human author, not merely the compiler and/or editor, of the Book of Genesis – all so-called perceptions of "literary" problems notwithstanding. Indeed, the preceding passages demand that all writers of Scripture received their information by direct revelation from the Living God, Moses and the first book included. They neither merely passed on oral traditions nor copied from earlier written documents.<sup>1</sup> The Scriptures do represent eyewitness

---

<sup>1</sup> Because the first three Gospel accounts contain so much material in common that they may be arranged as a synopsis, they have been labeled the Synoptic Gospels. Over the years much has been written regarding the relationship of the Gospel of Mark to the accounts of Matthew and Luke. New Testament criticism alleges that: (1) Matthew and Luke used practically all of Mark in preparing their respective Gospel accounts, (2) Matthew and Luke recorded nearly identical matter for much that is not found in Mark; therefore they both used a second source in common (i.e., "Q" for the German *quelle* or "source"), (3) "Matthew and Luke make improvements in many places." "Matthew smoothes ... introduces words he prefers", etc., and/or (4) Mark wrote his gospel under the influence of Simon Peter, etc.

The above commonly appear in Biblical literature and have come to be known as the so-called "Synoptic problem". This hypothesis asserts that the similarities and differences between the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke present a conundrum that may only be resolved by assuming a literary relationship among them. Thus, to the adherents of this position, the various evangelists must have copied from each other or consulted the same written source(s) or both – that the Gospels are the result of interdependence among the three "Synoptic" writers. Indeed, the claim is even made by many that Matthew and Luke handled Mark "critically" (i.e., as text critics). The seductive nature of this snare is so subtle that even the greatest Greek authority America has yet produced, the Baptist scholar A.T. Robertson, was enmeshed in its vortex [Robertson, *A Harmony of the Gospels for Students of the Life of Christ*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1922), pp. vii, 255-256.].

The first two speculations cited above compose the supposed solution to the Synoptic problem, the "two-source" theory. This solution [or indeed any other - among other hypothetical solutions is the "four document hypothesis" which purports that the Gospel writers used four common sources in order to bring their accounts into final form. These supposedly were "M", Mark, "Q", and "L"; see Richard N. Soulen, *Handbook of Biblical Criticism*, 2nd ed., (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1981), p. 75.] is the cornerstone of New Testament criticism. It represents one of the long-established certainties in that discipline. Remove it and "Humpty Dumpty" falls.

This author's examination into the writing of several leading proponents, however, surprisingly yielded nothing of scientific reasoning or logic by way of proof. What then! Are we actually to suppose that Matthew and Luke have been among the most wicked plagiarizers of all time for they neither once cite nor credit Mark or poor "Q". How unprofessional, unscholarly, petty, and ungenerous! Small wonder modern scholarship doubts their ungracious and ungrateful testimonies. Nay! Rather, wicked is the conjecture that Matthew and Luke proceeded in such a high-handed manner. Oh Christian, repent!

The Gospels, as well as the other books of the Bible, are clearly written as to be self-evident that the authors are portrayed as first-hand witnesses and/or direct receivers of divine revelation. By the very demand of Scripture, nothing less would suffice as a legitimate and legal testimony. Countless hours of wasted work and research will continue by the academy in search of a final resolution, but such will never come forth because the "problem" is not a genuine problem. The "problem" did not arise from painstaking study of the internal data; it is an artificial, synthetic contrivance that has been foisted upon the Synoptic Gospels from without.

Moreover, not only does this writer find that the Synoptic problem cannot be proven, he concludes the problem does not exist. Thus it is that this author categorically rejects as spurious and vacuous not only the entire Synoptic problem, but

accounts which have been reported, not by fallible human observers, but by One who never missed or forgot the actual relevant facts. Man is and has been both the receiver and guardian of the God-given revelation, but he absolutely is not the *source* of Sacred Text. No Biblicist should allow himself to be deceived by any such declaration, no matter how scholarly and appealing the idea may be packaged. The eleven "troubling literary" instances of the repeated phrase are the result of God's speaking the words of Genesis to Moses who wrote them exactly as directed – with God Himself speaking the eleven historical breaks at the appropriate places in the text.

Floyd Nolen Jones, Th.D., Ph.D. – 1997

---

all other such myths which over the years have arisen from the fancies of men's imaginations and are contrary to the simplicity found in the Holy Writ. For these and other reasons, such deliberations are nowhere to be found within the confines of this study: "... yea, let God be true, but every man a liar ..." (Rom.3:4).

For a detailed exposé of the fallacious nature of the so-called "Synoptic Problem" see Eta Linnemann, *Is There A Synoptic Problem?*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1992), pp. 9-15, 24-27. Over the years, the current author has studied several refutations to the Synoptic problem and other historical-critical theological propositions. By far the best I have found to date has been Linnemann who was herself formerly a proponent of the two-source solution of the Synoptic problem and taught historical-critical theology at the University level. A student of Rudolf Bultmann and Ernst Fuchs, Linnemann is uniquely competent, knowledgeable, and authoritative. She is extremely clear, concise, thorough and easy for the layman to follow. Her book is replete with charts, graphs, and tables which walk the reader through technical studies relevant to historical, form, and redaction critical hypotheses. Upon her subsequent conversion, she broke with higher-critical scholarship and has written this and *Historical Criticism of the Bible* rebuking its abuse of Scripture. She was lecturer and honorary professor of New Testament at Philipps University, Marburg, West Germany and is now teaching at a Bible institute in Batu, Indonesia. For a concise exposure of the Synoptic hypothesis see: Floyd Nolen Jones, *Analytical Harmony of the Gospels*, (The Woodlands, TX: KingsWord Press, 1999), Appendix A, pp. 285-295.