



MT, SP, or LXX? Deciphering a Chronological and Textual Conundrum in Genesis 5 ENDNOTES

¹ Jeremy Sexton, “Who Was Born When Enosh Was 90?: A Semantic Reevaluation of William Henry Green’s Chronological Gaps,” *WTJ* 77, no. 2 (September 2015), pp. 193–218; Jeremy Sexton and Henry B. Smith Jr., “Primeval Chronology Restored: Revisiting the Genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11,” *Bible and Spade* 29, no. 2–3 (Spring/Summer 2016), pp. 42–49; Henry B. Smith Jr., “Once More: Primeval Chronology—A Fresh Look at the Genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11,” *CRSQ* 2018 (forthcoming); Jeremy Sexton, “Evangelicalism’s Search for Chronological Gaps in Genesis 5 and 11: A Historical, Hermeneutical, and Linguistic Critique,” *JETS* 60 (March 2018, forthcoming). Also see supportive arguments in: Smith B. Goodenow, *Bible Chronology Carefully Unfolded* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1896); Samuel R. Kulling, *Are the Genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11 Historical and Complete, That Is, Without Gaps?* (Reihan, Switzerland: Immanuel-Verlag, 1996); Travis Freeman, “The Chronological Value of Genesis 5 and 11 in Light of Recent Biblical Investigation” (PhD Dissertation, Southwest Baptist Theological Seminary, 1998); J. Paul Tanner, “Old Testament Chronology and Its Implications for the Creation and Flood Accounts,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 172, no. 685 (January 2015), pp. 24–44. Future research will critique claims by evangelical and critical scholars that the numbers in Gen 5 and 11 should be read as: symbolic, hyperbolic, non-literal “honorific formulae,” non-historical, allegorical, dependent on Mesopotamian sexagesimal numbering, secret codes or messages, or requiring knowledge of pagan ANE literature or other archaeological/anthropological discoveries in order to be understood and interpreted correctly.

² Sexton (2015), pp. 210–218; Sexton and Smith Jr., 45–49; Henry B. Smith Jr., “Methuselah’s Begetting Age in Genesis 5:25 and the Primeval Chronology of the Septuagint: A Closer Look at the Textual and Historical Evidence,” *Answers Research Journal* 10 (2017), pp. 169–179; Henry B. Smith Jr., “From Adam to Abraham: An Update on the Genesis 5 and 11 Research Project,” *Associates for Biblical Research*, April 26, 2017, <http://www.biblearchaeology.org/post/2017/04/26/From-Adam-to-Abraham-An-Update-on-the-Genesis-5-and-11-Research-Project.aspx>; Henry B. Smith Jr., “The Case for the Septuagint’s Chronology in Genesis 5 and 11,” in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Creationism*, (International Conference on Creationism, Pittsburgh, PA: Creation Science Fellowship, 2018, forthcoming). Also: Charles Hayes, *A Dissertation on the Chronology of the Septuagint* (London: T. Woodward, 1741); John Jackson, *Chronological Antiquities* (London: Noon, 1752); William Hales, *A New Analysis of Chronology and Geography, History and Prophecy*, vol. 1: Chronology and Geography (London: C. J. G. and F. Rivington, 1830); Nathan Rouse, *A Dissertation on Sacred Chronology* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1856); G. Seyffarth, *Summary of Recent Discoveries in Biblical Chronology, Universal History and Egyptian Archaeology* (New York, NY: Henry Ludwig, 1859); Michael Russell, *A Connection of Sacred and Profane History, from the Death of Joshua to the Decline of the Kingdoms*, ed. J. Talboys Wheeler, 2nd ed., vol. 1, 2 vols. (London: William Tegg, 1865); Goodenow, 1896.

³ Lita Cosner and Robert Carter, “Textual Traditions and Biblical Chronology,” *Journal of Creation* 29, no. 2 (2015), pp. 99–105; Benjamin Shaw, “The Genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11 and Their Significance for Chronology” (PhD Dissertation, Bob Jones University, 2004), pp. 60, 75, 216. Shaw proposes that the LXX/SP begetting ages are original in Gen 11, but the MT/SP begetting ages are original in Gen 5.

⁴ James D. Purvis, *The Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect*, 1st ed. (Harvard University Press, 1968); John Bowman, *Samaritan Documents Relating to Their History, Religion and Life* (Pittsburgh, PA: The Pickwick Press, 1977); Alan D. Crown, *The Samaritans* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989); Magnar Kartveit, *The Origin of the Samaritans*, Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 128 (Leiden: Brill, 2009); Robert T. Anderson and Terry Giles, *The Samaritan Pentateuch: An Introduction to Its Origin, History, and Significance for Biblical Studies* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012); Benyamim Masdaka and Sharon Sullivan, eds., *The Israelite Samaritan Version of the Torah: First English Translation Compared with the Masoretic Version*, 1st ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013); Stefan Schorch, “A Critical *Editio Maior* of the Samaritan Pentateuch: State of Research, Principles, and Problems,” *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 2 (2013): 1–21; Emanuel Tov, “The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Proximity of the Pre-Samaritan Qumran Scrolls to the SP,” in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint*, vol. 3, VTSup 167 (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2015), 387–428; Reinhard Pummer, *The Samaritans: A Profile* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016); Timothy Lim, “The Emergence of the

Samaritan Pentateuch,” in *Reading the Bible in Ancient Traditions and Modern Editions: Studies in Memory of Peter W. Flint*, ed. Andrew B. Perrin, Kyung S. Baek, and Daniel K. Faulk (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2017), 89–104.

⁵ Anderson and Giles, p. 18. Modern scholars generally claim that the final and irrevocable schism between the Jews and Samaritans likely took place when John Hyrcanus destroyed the Samaritan Temple on Mt. Gerizim in 111–110 BC (cf. Jn. 4:9). It is not my goal in this article to advocate or critique views on the history of the Samaritans.

⁶ Despite its many updates and changes, “The Samaritan Pentateuch is thus a strong witness to the antiquity and purity of the tradition in the MT, since the proto-MT had to be modernized and popularized in the second century BC so that it could be understood.” Peter J. Gentry, “The Text of the Old Testament,” *JETS* 52, (March 2009), p. 24.

⁷ Paul D. Wegner, “Current Trends in Old Testament Textual Criticism,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 23, no. 4 (January 2013), p. 467, n. 19.

⁸ Ellis R. Brotzman and Eric J. Tully, *Old Testament Textual Criticism: A Practical Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016), pp. 45–46.

⁹ Paul D. Wegner, *A Student’s Guide to Textual Criticism of the Bible: Its History, Methods and Results* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2006), p. 170; Anderson and Giles, p. 166.

¹⁰ Wegner, *A Student’s Guide*, pp. 170–171.

¹¹ Ronald S. Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1-11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 119–148. The 3 letters have been either transposed or misread (Gn 10:4; 11:30, 31). For Genesis 5 and 11, Hendel (p. 130) ascribes originality to only two numbers for singular readings from the SP, 62 for Jared’s begetting age, and 67 for Methuselah’s. His ascriptions are incorrect.

¹² Wegner, “Current Trends,” pp. 475, 477; Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible: Revised and Expanded*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2011), pp. 50, 221.

¹³ Sexton, pp. 210–218; Sexton and Smith Jr., pp. 45–49; Smith Jr., “Methuselah’s Begetting Age,” pp. 173–74, nn. 7, 23–24; Smith Jr., “The Case for the Septuagint’s Chronology in Genesis 5 and 11,” *ICC* 2018 (forthcoming).

¹⁴ Anderson and Giles, pp. 71–103; Purvis, pp. 17–87; James M. Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven: The Restoration Of Sacred Time And Sacred Space In The Book Of Jubilees* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 50–51; Wegner, *A Student’s Guide*, p. 170, n. 53–54; Tov, *Textual Criticism*, pp. 80–90.

¹⁵ Gentry, “The Text of the Old Testament,” p. 24.

¹⁶ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, p. 81.

¹⁷ Hendel, p. 87.

¹⁸ Hendel, p. 73; Shaw, p. 63, n. 1. This is a harmonization, but not a “plus”, since no text has been added.

¹⁹ Todd Hanneken, “The Book of Jubilees Among the Apocalypses” (PhD Dissertation, Notre Dame University, 2008), p. 142, n. 88; James Vanderkam, *Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), pp. 17–22.

²⁰ Eugene Ulrich, “Empirical Evidence for Scribal and Editorial Transmission of Second Temple Religious Literature,” in *Insights Into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East: What Does Documented Evidence Tell Us about the Transmission of Authoritative Texts?*, ed. Reinhard Muller and Juha Pakkala, 1st ed. (Leuven: Peeters, 2017), p. 45.

²¹ Most modern scholars argue that the length of the jubilee is 50 years and not 49, claiming that the author of *Jubilees* changed the length of the biblical jubilee (Lev. 25) from 50 to 49 years. For example: Roger T. Beckwith, *Calendar and Chronology, Jewish and Christian* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 238; Robert H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees, Or, The Little Genesis* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902), p. lxxviii. This position has been refuted by careful historical and exegetical arguments by Rodger C. Young, “The Talmud’s Two Jubilees and Their Relevance to the Date of the Exodus,” *WTJ* 68 (2006), pp. 71–83, who states: “There is rather weighty evidence from ancient records that the Jubilee cycle was forty-nine years in length, not fifty years as assumed by most modern commentators.”

²² Zvi Ron, “The Book of Jubilees and the Midrash on the Early Chapters of Genesis,” *JBQ* 41, no. 3 (July 2013), p. 143; James C. VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 523–544.

²³ Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (London: Brill, 2007), p. 84. Also: Larry R. Helyer, *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period: A Guide for New Testament Students* (Downers Grove, Ill: IVP Academic, 2002), p. 125; J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, *Primaevial History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1-11 in the Book of Jubilees* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), p. 373; VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon*, p. 523.

²⁴ James Scott, “The Chronologies of the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Book of Jubilees,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), p. 74.

²⁵ Paul J. Ray, “The Duration of the Israelite Sojourn in Egypt,” *Bible and Spade* 20, no. 3 (Summer 2007), pp. 85–96. The 430-year duration in Egypt alone is also found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, 4QExod^b. Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, and James R. Davila, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert: Volume XII. Qumran Cave 4: VII: Genesis to Numbers* (Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 113–117.

²⁶ Leslie McFall, “The Chronology of the Book of Jubilees,” 2013, <https://lmf12.files.wordpress.com/2014/01/chronology-of-jubilees.pdf>, p. 24.

²⁷ Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, p. 101.

²⁸ Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, p. 101, n. 67. While *Jubilees* only covers the period from Adam to the Conquest, the author would have been familiar with I Kings 6:1.

²⁹ Charles, p. 115.

³⁰ McFall, “The Chronology of the Book of Jubilees,” esp. pp. 25–30. For an extensive exposition of *Jubilees*’ artificial chronological system, see: Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, pp. 73–158, 235–249.

³¹ Another work from this same era, *The Testament of Moses*, places Moses’ death at 2500 AM, using 50 years per jubilee instead of 49 years. The artificial nature of this chronology, and jubilean influence, is obvious. J. Priest, “Testament of Moses,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume I: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 1st ed., 2 vols. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1983); Beckwith argues that the chronology of *The Testament of Moses* and *Jubilees* are very similar because they flow out of the same ideological context, p. 264.

³² The only exceptions to this are the begetting ages for Noah (500, 502) and Terah (70), which are attested in the SP, MT and LXX, and other external witnesses such as Josephus. But even with Noah, the author of *Jubilees* ascribes the wrong son to each begetting age (Table 3).

³³ Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, p. 46.

³⁴ John T. Rook, “Studies in the Book of Jubilees: The Themes of Calendar, Genealogy, and Chronology” (PhD Dissertation, Oxford University, 1983), p. 134.

³⁵ Lester Grabbe, “Jubilees and the Samaritan Tradition,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), pp. 147, 150, 152. The SP itself yields 1307 years.

³⁶ Bowman’s discussion of the *Tulidah* is particularly helpful. Like *Jubilees*, it also contains numerous chronological errors, pp. 39–61.

³⁷ Hendel, pp. 69–71; Charles, p. lxxvii.

³⁸ Charlotte Hempel, “The Place of the Book of Jubilees at Qumran and Beyond,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*, ed. Timothy Lim et al. (London: T&T Clark, 2004), pp. 187–198; Aharon Shemesh, “4Q265 and the Authoritative Status of Jubilees at Qumran,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), pp. 247–60; Hindy Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 30 (1999), pp. 379–410.

³⁹ Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, p. 9, n 14.

⁴⁰ C. T. R. Hayward, trans., *Saint Jerome’s Hebrew Questions on Genesis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p. 35.

⁴¹ For a full analysis of the Methuselah question in the LXX, see: Smith Jr., “Methuselah’s Begetting Age.”

⁴² Hayward, p. 36.

⁴³ *Jubilees* does not record the remaining years and lifespans for the antediluvian patriarchs, except for the lifespans of Adam (*Jub.* 4:29) and Noah (*Jub.* 10:15). These are expressed by the author in actual years, not with the usual formula of jubilees, weeks and years.

⁴⁴ Jerome does not mention Jared's numbers, but it is clear they were reduced by the SP to reflect *Jubilees'* Gen 5 chronology as well.

⁴⁵ Goodenow, p. 314. Note that jubilees cycles were initiated with the Law of Moses. The author of *Jubilees* has retroactively imposed them on the entirety of biblical history prior to that time.

⁴⁶ Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, p. 101.

⁴⁷ Sexton (2015), pp. 215–216; Sexton and Smith Jr., pp. 47–48; Smith Jr., “Methuselah’s Begetting Age,” p. 169, nn. 3, 4, 8. Also see endnote 51.

⁴⁸ Deliberately deflated chronological works such as the rabbinic *Seder Olam*, *Jubilees*, and the *Testament of Moses* are all ideology interrelated in various ways. For more, see: Beckwith, *Calendar and Chronology*, 1996.

⁴⁹ Hales, p. 281. Technically speaking, if Jared's begetting age was reduced to 62, and Methuselah and Lamech's numbers were left alone, Jared would have died before the year of the Flood. It is possible that the rabbis saw the three patriarchs as a “chronological package,” and decided to leave Jared's numbers alone. Perhaps they felt Jared's death would have been too close to the deaths of Methuselah and Lamech. Or, after evaluating their chronological deflation scheme in its totality, they did not “need” the extra 100 years for their chronology, and decided to leave Jared's figures alone. Jared's 162 is preserved in the *Seder Olam*, the “official” rabbinic world history (*ca.* AD 140–160) written by the very same rabbis who I propose deflated the MT's chronology. Heinrich W. Guggenheimer, ed., *Seder Olam: The Rabbinic View of Biblical Chronology* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1998), p. 3. Interestingly, Sexton has documented references to a lost Hebrew text whose antediluvian chronology was 1556 years instead of the MT's 1656. This lost text may have contained a begetting age of 62 for Jared. “Who Was Born,” p. 215, n. 125.

⁵⁰ The rabbinic creation date in the *Seder Olam* is 3761 BC. Had they adopted *Jubilees'* post-Flood chronology instead of creating their own, it would have made the date of Creation 275 years earlier, 4036 BC. This would have placed Jesus' life and ministry shortly after 4000 AM, allowing him to remain a Messianic candidate. For more on the 4000 AM date, see: Sexton (2015); Sexton and Smith Jr. (2016); Smith Jr., “Methuselah’s Begetting Age.”

⁵¹ The survival of Jerome's SP manuscripts with the correct numbers shows how difficult it was for ancient scribes to significantly change the sacred text and prevent the changes from being discovered. This further illustrates the unique position the post-70 AD rabbis found themselves in: they had complete authority and control over the Hebrew texts that had survived the destruction of the Temple. They were able to change the texts, *and*, control the future dissemination of new manuscripts in Israel. Their unique historical circumstances allowed them to cover up the evidence for their chronological deflations in the MT's primeval chronology. Sexton and Smith Jr., pp. 47–48.

⁵² Smith Jr., “Methuselah’s Begetting Age,” p. 171, nn. 8–12; Hendel, p. 146.

⁵³ Sexton and Smith Jr., pp. 48–49; Smith Jr., “Once More: Primeval Chronology—A Fresh Look at the Genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11,” *CRSQ* 2018 (forthcoming).

⁵⁴ See n. 13.

⁵⁵ Jack Finegan, *Handbook of Biblical Chronology*, Revised Edition (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998), p. 145; F. Fallon, “Eupolemus: A New Translation and Introduction,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1983), pp. 861–72; Ben Zion Wacholder, *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1974).

⁵⁶ Smith Jr., “Methuselah’s Begetting Age,” p. 172.

⁵⁷ Tov writes: “Although the LXX has been transmitted into Greek, these details [the numbers in Gen 5/11] should not be ascribed to the translator, but the Hebrew *Vorlage*... they did not go as far as to recalculate the logic or system of genealogical lists. The LXX translation of Genesis is relatively literal, although some freedom in small details is recognizable, but no large scale translational pluses, minuses or changes are found in this version... Accordingly, any recalculation of chronological lists by

a translator is highly unlikely. Furthermore, the LXX version of the lists has much in common with the SP, especially in chapter 11, strengthening the assumption that the two phenomena took place at the Hebrew level.” Emanuel Tov, “The Genealogical Lists in Genesis 5 and 11 in Three Different Versions,” in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint*, vol. 3, VTSup 167 (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2015), p. 221, n. 1; Similarly, Johann Cook, “The Exegesis of the Greek Genesis,” in *VI Congress of the IOSCS*, ed. Claude E. Cox, SBL, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 23 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986), 116; John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, Society of Biblical Literature, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 35 (Atlanta, GA: Scholar’s Press, 1993), p. 73.

⁵⁸ Smith Jr., “The Case for the Septuagint’s Chronology in Genesis 5 and 11,” *ICC* 2018, forthcoming.