

solar system impacts at the time of the Flood, but I have several objections to that. First, it fails to account for the unique features of the moon. Second, the crater density of heavily cratered terrains, such as the lunar highlands, suggests an extremely high impact rate. That high rate appears too catastrophic to me to have merely caused the Flood. Such a titanic calamity should have taken precedent as the instrument of God's judgment, rather than the water that prevailed upon the earth. Third, a general mass of debris would be difficult to clear from the solar system in a few thousand years.

Wayne has suggested that an interstellar swarm of debris swept through the solar system at that time. I concede that this would answer this final objection. However, that suggestion is not as far removed from my suggested source, a comet swarm. The only differences are that my comet stream would have directly affected only a few bodies in the solar system and leaves the possibility of a return visit by the stream.

This sort of speculation is only in its infancy. It is a real pleasure to have such fine individuals as Wayne Spencer involved in this. It is my desire that my modest proposal act as a catalyst to stir up the thinking and discussion of others.

Danny Faulkner
Lancaster, South Carolina
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The third day — Precambrian skeletons in the closet?

I was somewhat taken with Carl Froede Jr's paper on Precambrian metazoans,¹ in particular the statement, *'The presence of animal traces within these deeply buried strata means that they cannot be Creation*

Week rocks.' Those of your readers who have considered Precambrian fossils will perhaps recall a proposal by Wise, that microbiotas existed in the seas by early Day Three of Creation Week, thus explaining the fossils of the Precambrian.² Wise suggested that the process of continental elevation led to deposition of Precambrian sediments, which entrapped and buried Precambrian fossils in what he calls the 'Day Three Regression'. (Regression, as I understand, implies a return of the waters to a former state or location. If so, I hardly think it a suitable substitute for *'the gathering together of the waters'*³ on the third day. Possibly he meant recession.)

The foregoing proposal, it would appear, rests on whether Precambrian fossiliferous rocks are third day, or Flood sediments.

In this vein of thought, it was stated by Max Hunter⁴ that:

'Oard⁸⁹ [Hunter's reference⁸⁹ seems to be a nonentity] questions the need for geological activity on Day 3, noting that the earth was in the process of being created "very good" (Genesis 1:9-13) and that God could have raised the dry land without erosion and sedimentation.'

I believe that Oard's proposal under examination is not without a healthy measure of sound reasoning, and is complimentary to Froede's quest for a better understanding of the forces that historically formed the earth's sedimentary legacy. Bear with me in my attempt to verify this claim.

Psalm 104:8 (*'mountains rose, and valleys sank'*, a **third day Divine construct**), tells us that on the first day of Creation, the submarine lithic surface was as *'void and without form'* (untenanted and featureless), as the water that composed its swaddling cover. From the moment of the all-prevailing command to gather together, the transportation process, unhindered by any vestige of flow impediment was undoubtedly accomplished with the barest degree of superficial lithic turmoil. I have suggested in an unpublished paper that the rising continents, though fracturing, were ingesting wa-

ter (I offer this process as forming the *'fountains of the great deep'*), so in like manner it was absorbing, not yielding, sedimentary products.

When did the fossil-bearing sediment originate? I believe a third day interpretation is not acceptable scientifically, and is certainly biblically extravagant!

William Tompkins
Toronto, Ontario
CANADA

1. Froede Jr, C.R., Precambrian metazoans within a young-earth Flood framework, *CEN Tech. J.* 13(2):90-95, 1999.
2. Wise, K.P., Precambrian fossil record, *CEN Tech. J.* 6(1):69, 1992.
3. Genesis 1:10b, KJV.
4. Hunter, M.J., Pre-Flood/Flood boundary in the earth's mantle? *CEN Tech. J.* 10(3):351, 1996.

So-called error in Luke 3:36

I was surprised at the non-cautionary approach taken by Larry Pierce with respect to the alleged error in Luke 3:36 (i.e. that Cainan is a supposed addition in the genealogy through copyist error).¹ He states:

'The evidence from Josephus and Gill shows conclusively that the extra name Cainan is not part of God's original Word, but due to a later copyist's error.'

Really? Was he there? **His reliance on extra-biblical sources to try to correct God's Word reminds me of another dangerous trend in the creation-evolution debate — that of interpreting Genesis according to extra-biblical 'scientific' sources.** This trend is dangerous and contributory to the undermining of faith in the veracity and surety of God's Word.

Even Dr Morris, whom Mr Pierce cites, is far more cautionary in his approach to the supposed error. Never does he say that the presence of Cainan

in the genealogy is conclusively an error. Preferring to allow the possibility of his own error, he instead states the following:

*'Although the question is unsettled, the weight of evidence does seem to be in favour of the Hebrew text as it stands ...[the] insertion [of Cainan] in Luke 3:36 is most likely a copyist's error.'*²

The words Morris uses — 'unsettled', 'seem' and 'most likely' — are all cautionary terms and show that Morris approached the topic warily with respect to extra-biblical sources.

In light of *'the foolishness of God is wiser than men'* (1 Corinthians 1:25a), would it not be advisable to accept the Traditional Text reading of the Authorised Version for Luke 3:36? The majority of all Greek manuscripts available today have the name of Cainan as being present in this verse.³ Nowhere in the genealogies presented in Genesis 11 or 1 Chronicles 1 does it state that these are necessarily complete. What if God in His wisdom chose to reveal Cainan in Luke 3 for perhaps a yet-to-be-determined reason? Also, the inclusion of Cainan does not give any ground for an old earth theology — all it shows (for those who believe the reading to be correct) is that there is at least one hole in the genealogies of Genesis and 1 Chronicles.

It borders on the ludicrous when Dr John Gill states *'for certain it is, there never was such a Cainan'* whilst acknowledging that the reading is *'in many Greek copies, and in the Vulgate Latin, and all the Oriental versions, even in the Syriac, the oldest of them.'*⁴ How can he state that Cainan never existed without coming against the veracity of these historical witnesses saying differently? Perhaps he has bought into the Westcott-Hort philosophy that the oldest manuscripts are the best without taking into account that these sources may have been corrupted and remained unused (and thus less worn out) because of their corruption.⁵ It would be wiser to see Satan's method for what it is: *'Yea, hath God said...?'* (Genesis 3:1a).

Pierce also cites Dr Jonathan Sar-

fati but neglects to note the cautionary nature of Sarfati's explanation of the supposed error in Luke 3:36. Sarfati gives a fictional account of how a copyist might have inserted Cainan without stating that this was definitely the case; *'but suppose an earlier copyist...'*⁶ Although I disagree with his conclusion that the Cainan inclusion is an error, I must applaud his use of cautionary language in his fictional supposition, perhaps something that Pierce has neglected to do.

Craig Savage
Geelong, Victoria
AUSTRALIA

References

1. Pierce, L., Cainan in Luke 3:36: insight from Josephus, Letters to the Editor, *CEN Tech. J.* 13(2):75–76, 1999.
2. Morris, H.M., *The Genesis Record*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, MI, p. 282, 1976.
3. *'[T]he New Testament text first printed by Erasmus and later by Stephanus (1550) and Elzevir (1633) is in full agreement with the Traditional Text providentially preserved in the vast majority of the Greek New Testament transcripts. This printed text is commonly called the Textus Receptus (Received Text). It is the text which was used by the Protestant Reformers during the Reformation and by all the Protestants everywhere for three hundred years thereafter.'* Hills, E.F., *The King James Version Defended*, The Christian Research Press, Des Moines, Iowa, pp. 106–107, 1984.
4. Note on Luke 3:36, in: Gill, J., *An Exposition of the Old and New Testament; the whole illustrated with, taken from the most ancient Jewish writings* (nine volumes), London: printed for Matthews and Leigh, 18 Strand, by W Clowes, Northumberland-Court, 1809: Edited, revised and updated by Larry Pierce, 1994–1995 for *Online Bible CD-ROM*.
5. *'[W]e might even be suspicious of old manuscripts, especially if they contain many errors. This suggests they'd have been rejected as master copies anyway.'* Taylor, C.V., *Bibles with Holes?* Assembly Kingswood Press, Underwood, Queensland, p. 35, 1988.
6. Sarfati, J.D., Cainan of Luke 3:36, *CEN Tech. J.* 12(1):39–40, 1998.



Larry Pierce replies:

If what Mr Savage has said is so, then we have a greater mystery. It is obvious that the extra Cainan was not in copies of the Septuagint (LXX) that existed in about AD 100, otherwise Josephus would have used it. And further information comes from Julius Africanus, (c. AD 180–250), *'the first Christian historian known to have produced a universal chronology.'*¹ In his chronology (tabulated below), written in c. AD 220, he also omitted this mysterious Cainan.² The numbers of years in his chronology (right column), identical to those of the LXX (clearly inflated from the reliable Masoretic Text^{3,4}), show that he must have used the LXX — but no Cainan even as late as AD 220!

Adam to Noah	2262
Arphaxad begat Salah	135
Salah begat Eber	130
Eber begat Peleg	134
Peleg begat Rue	130

I think we have more than enough evidence that would stand up in any court of law to show that every single copy we have of the LXX text was corrupted some time after AD 220. The copies of the LXX available to both Josephus and Africanus did not include this spurious generation. It is also not in either the Samaritan Pentateuch or the Hebrew manuscripts.

All these predate the New Testament Greek text. And while Josephus was not a Christian writer and would not have been influenced by copies of Luke genealogies, Julius Africanus was a devout Christian. In his *Epistle*

to *Aristides* ch. 3, he made an extensive study of the genealogies of both Luke and Matthew. In fact he quotes Luke 3:23.⁵ Hence, Africanus had copies of both the Gospel of Luke and Matthew. So one cannot claim that Africanus did not know about Luke's gospel or his genealogies. If the copies of Luke's writings had this spurious Cainan, no doubt Africanus would have amended his chronology to include it.

In fact, the earliest known extant copy of Luke, the 102-page (originally 144) papyrus codex of the Bodmer Collection labelled P⁷⁵ (dated between AD 175 and 225⁶), omits the extra Cainan. Thus the reading in Luke 3:36 cannot be shown to exist before AD 220.

Whether Cainan is an interpolation simply has no relation to the debate between the Westcott/Hort (W/H) text vs the so-called *Textus Receptus* (TR) or Received Text. The W/H text also includes the Cainan in Luke 3:36, because it is supported by the 4th century Codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, which were written about a century after the interpolation likely occurred.

John Gill certainly couldn't have been influenced by the W/H theory because he lived about a century before! And Gill was probably the greatest Hebraist of the 18th century and staunchly defended biblical inerrancy, and only very rarely pointed out textual problems.

Henry Morris is also well known as a staunch defender of the KJV and the TR. Finally, I myself am no fan of the W/H theory.

So now that we have eliminated ideas of W/H influence, we are still left with the question: Where did this reading then come from? Sarfati's suggestion seems plausible, but of course we shouldn't be dogmatic about it. As for the cautionary approach by Morris and Sarfati, neither was aware of the evidence from Josephus, Africanus and Gill, so their caution is warranted given the knowledge they had at the time.

It is curious that Craig seems to have overlooked another article in the same issue as my letter: Sarfati's critique of a book by the outspoken

'progressive creationist' Hugh Ross.⁷ Sarfati rebutted Ross's assertion of gaps in the genealogy, with strong grammatical arguments that the Genesis genealogies are an unbroken sequence. Sarfati also re-stated that he thought that the Cainan in extant copies of Luke 3:36 was spurious, and probably inserted after the time of Josephus — and even cited my letter in support.

Based on the evidence given in my original letter plus this additional information, it is most likely that this reading in Luke 3:36 is not original but a post-AD 220 interpolation. Given the unsettled state of Greek textual criticism, I would not use the Greek text to contradict the Hebrew. If you wish to use the reading in extant copies of Luke to 'prove' gaps in the Hebrew genealogies, you are on shaky ground. To prove me incorrect, all Craig has to do is produce an authentic manuscript of Luke that contains this reading and was written before AD 220. If he can, I am wrong. If he cannot, the question remains open.

Most people are unaware of the thousands of variations in the Greek manuscripts. They were not copied with nearly the precision of the Hebrew text. Indeed between the published Greek New Testament by Stephanus in 1550 and the text for the 1611 King James Version (as reconstructed by Scrivener in 1884) there are about 250 variations. Between the Stephanus text and the 1991 reconstruction of the (mainly Byzantine) Majority Text by Dr Robinson *et al.*⁸ there are about 1500 variations.

It is important to note that the TR is based on very few manuscripts of the Byzantine family, and must not be confused with the Majority Text — a distinction blurred in much KJV-only literature. (If you wish to include the Alexandrian text, then there are about 7500 variations. However, I am not an admirer of the Alexandrian text.)

If you wish to bet the farm on the accuracy of the current Greek text, where will you be in a few years when scholars amend it again?

Larry Pierce
Winterbourne, Ontario
CANADA

References

1. 'Africanus, Sextus Julius', *The New Encyclopædia Britannica* 1:136, 15th Ed. 1992.
2. *Ante-Nicene Fathers* 6:131, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA, 1994.
3. For a defence of the Masoretic text vs the altered LXX, see Williams, P., Some remarks preliminary to a biblical chronology, *CEN Tech. J.* 12(1):98–106, 1998.
4. I have suggested elsewhere that the rabbis who translated the LXX in Alexandria in the 3rd century BC arbitrarily added about 700 years to the biblical chronology to make it agree with the exaggerated Egyptian chronology of the Egyptian priest Manetho (fl. c. 300 BC). See Pierce, L., In the days of Peleg, *Creation* 22(1):46–49, 1999.
5. *Ante-Nicene Fathers* 6:126, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA, 1994.
6. Geisler, N.L. and Nix, Wm. E., *A General Introduction to the Bible*, Moody Press, Chicago, revised and expanded, pp. 390–391, 1986.
7. Sarfati, J.D., Genesis questioned by billions of years beliefs: A review of *The Genesis Question* by Hugh Ross, *CEN Tech. J.* 13(2):22–30, 1999.
8. Robinson, M.A., Pierpont, Wm.G. and McBrayer, Wm.D., *The New Testament in the Original Greek according to the Byzantine/Majority Textform*, Original Word Publishers, Atlanta, GA, 1991.