

Primeval Chronology Revisited: Genesis 5 and 11 and Their Potential Impact on Biblical Archaeology

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mpZg-jTpwo&t=16s>

My name is Henry Smith. I'm with the Associates for Biblical Research and my presentation this morning is on the issue of the so-called primeval chronology in Genesis 5 and 11. My interest in this subject goes back about 15 years. But when back at that time I was a relatively new Christian and had no formal Bible training of any kind. I didn't know Greek or Hebrew or anything, but I was interested in the subject. But I vacillated continuously on how to interpret these passages because I didn't have enough knowledge of the subject.

Then in the last few years we began a project with the ministry of ABR related to this subject. In the last two years I've been able to spend some time on it rather intensely and so the project continues. We ask for your prayers for that. And we're hoping that I'll be able to publish a book, hopefully in 2019, called *From Adam to Abraham*. In that I'm going to make the case for the Septuagint's preservation of the original numbers from the text of Scripture.

I'm going to tell you up front my perspective, what sort of conclusion I've reached here. Sometimes you wait for the conclusion at the end. I'm going to tell you up front and then we'll walk through some of the reasons why I've kind of drawn that conclusion.

So, we asked for your prayers for that. You'll find a handout that Scott's going to hand out now. This is a list of some articles [Slide with items 2–4] that have been published and are in the process of going to be published. If this subject interests you, the handout has a list of them. And then there's one article as well that was published in *Bible and Spade*, the second article that I co-authored with Jeremy Sexton. So these are some important articles, recent ones hopefully important on the subject.

And then these are some upcoming ones [Slide with items 5–7]. Again, I ask for your prayers for this. I'll be presenting at the conference on Creationism in Pittsburgh and then a couple of other articles. A new one in *Bible and Spade* on some unique problems in Genesis 5. So, hopefully we'll see some success with some of these articles. If you want to see the updates, they're on the [ABR website](#). So that's my commercial.

We're going to jump right into this question of Genesis 5 and 11. If you read through it, it's the famous begat passages. So-and-so begat so-and-so, and he was this many years old, and he lived this many years afterward, and he lived this many years, and he died.

So, there's two main thrusts of the research project. The first is to what I believe is appropriate in terms of the text is to reestablish the chronological interpretation as what I believe is the correct interpretation, to go carefully and thoughtfully through the texts. And I'm going to talk a little bit about some of those texts today, show you some of the syntax and why I believe that's the correct way to interpret the text of Genesis 5 and 11.

Now if you look at the history of interpretation on this subject, you'll see that the view on it was unanimous, which is rather unusual when you think about you come to a conference like this and you think about all the disparate disagreements and viewpoints about every subject that you can

imagine. But when you look at the history of the interpretation of Genesis 5 and 11 you have thousands of years of a unanimous consensus that the text yielded a chronology across a vast geographic spectrum, an ideological spectrum, a theological spectrum. So, whether it was Jewish historiography, Christian fathers, *Pseudepigrapha*, you name, it everybody saw it as yielding a chronology.

That's an important consideration when we weigh the subject. It doesn't tell us that that means it's correct, but in terms of the history of the Church and the history of interpretation, it is important for us to evaluate the past—how those in the past have interpreted the text of Scripture.

But in the late 1800s along came William Henry Green of Princeton and he published an article where this term primeval chronology comes from—the chronology before the time of Abraham. He advocated a non-chronological interpretation. His argument was that there were gaps in the chronology of Genesis 5 and 11. Thus, you could not calculate a chronology from Adam to the Flood and from the Flood to Abraham. It was an open-ended period of time.

B.B. Warfield picked up on that and said this could be stretched to 200,000 years, whatever time the scientists need to accommodate this time period, it accommodates it because it's not necessarily an interlocking chronology.

So Green's article was sort of obscure for quite a while. But in the mid-1900s, 20th century, it began to supplant the old view and eventually reached the consensus in conservative scholarship. You read through conservative literature, commentaries, articles and this is the majority viewpoint now—that there's not a chronology and there are gaps. And so therefore it can accommodate, in terms of archaeology and history, longer periods of time. You'll inevitably read that in the conservative literature.

So, there's much to say about this and hopefully in the book, I'll be expanding on it in great detail. But the fundamental argument that Green made that you have to look for when you read the literature is his conflation of genealogical versus chronological gaps. This is the fundamental point.

In his article Green pointed out a lot of places in Scripture as analogies where you have gaps in the genealogies. Classic examples are Ezra [7], Matthew [1], Exodus 6, and Ruth 4. Matthew 1 is the classic example. It's a constructed genealogy of 14 folks going back to the genealogy of Jesus. There are names missing. It's obvious from that. That's the purpose of Matthew's intent is to create a genealogical structure as he's writing it.

And so Green used these examples to try to argue that in Genesis 5 and 11 it's the same phenomenon. There's a genealogical gap. And so, this is the viewpoint that has sort of held swag. But the problem with this approach is it conflates the idea of a genealogical and a chronological gap. So just because there's names missing in a genealogy doesn't mean if Scripture gives us data that we don't have a chronological intent and it doesn't necessitate a chronological gap. I'm going to show you that here in just a few moments.

Let's take a look a little bit at the grammar of the text. This is very typical of through the genealogies. It's a very repetitive in the syntax and the grammar and the literary structure all throughout the two genealogies.

Here we have the example of Jared. So Jared, "when he had lived 162 years, he brought forth his son, he brought forth Enoch." Now you'll see a couple of things here in the Hebrew text. The

first is it's very important is that the Hebrew verb *yalad* is used here. This is in the hiphil form and that's causative. Now the reason why the author is written this way is because the obvious causative role that the father plays in the birth of his descendant. It's obviously the woman is the one who physically gives birth. So, it makes sense that he uses the causative form. It appears 55 times in Genesis 5 and 11. All throughout.

You have this relationship between Jared, at this particular time, *yalad*, he brings forth or he caused to be born. That's how the text appeals that's what the hiphil is. It's a causative form and the direct object is Enoch. You see that. So the one who receive is the recipient of the action in the 162nd year of Jared's life. It's very precise the way the genealogy is written, the syntax.

The Masoretes added the maqaf to make sure that you understood that it's Enoch and not somebody else who's the recipient of the action, who's participating in the activity. That's how the hiphil works. So, it's very precise the way that it's written syntactically.

Then if you go on, the next part of the formulaic way that this is repeated, is it expresses how the individual patriarch lived, how many years after he brought forth this particular patriarch. The pattern is Patriarch A. So, you have Jared, Enoch, Mahalalel, Methuselah, Lamech, Noah, for example, all the way through.

The way it's written again is the hiphil, but this time it's in the infinitive form. So you have after, and it's a construct infinitive *yalad* again, hiphil of *yalad*. After he caused him to be born he lived eight hundred years. So, it's very precise syntactically the way that it's written. And again, then the hiphil of *yalad* is used again to express that he had other sons and daughters. It doesn't tell us anything about them, doesn't tell us their names, doesn't tell us when they were born, but nonetheless it expresses this relationship that Jared is the one who caused this other person to come forth in this particular year of his life.

This makes Genesis 5 and 11 different than all of the other genealogies—very different because most of the other ones, if they have numbers, they just usually talk about the lifespan if they have any numbers at all. They do not contain the begetting age by and large, and they don't contain this formula with the remaining years. So this is what makes Genesis 5 and 11 unique.

I think this is where Green was in error in conflating the other genealogies with this. This syntax is very precise in the way that it's written. And again, if you look through it in the Hebrew and in the Greek you'll see the kind of precision that it's written in.

So now here's a very important point that's related to this issue of genealogical relationship. And that is depending on the information that Scripture gives us, the hiphil can point to either an immediate son—so in the case of Adam, Adam begat Seth. We know that Seth is Adam's direct son. We know that from other data in Scripture. But it also can point to a remote ancestor. So, it could be a grandson, a great grandson, a great-great-grandson. The context will tell us or other data from Scripture will tell us what that relationship is.

But here's the rub or here's the key point that has often been missed in the literature. In theory when we say that Jared *yalad* Enoch, he could be his grandson, he could be his great-grandson, he could be his great-great-grandson. It doesn't matter what the relationship is genealogically because his life is interlocked in the 162nd year. So in that year of Jared's life, Enoch is born. It doesn't matter if Enoch is his son or his grandson or his great-grandson.

That's the key point in understanding the syntax of Genesis 5 and 11, in my view. We have no other data from Scripture to tell us if Enoch is definitely Jared's direct son or if he's a remote

descendant. But in terms of chronology, it doesn't matter because the syntax interlocks the relationship. This is a critical point and you'll read in the literature over and over, folks who will argue for the gap view will say *yalad* can refer to a remote descendant, *yalad* can refer to a remote descendant. And that's true. There's no question that that's the case.

In Ruth 4 in particular, you'll see if you read through Ruth 4 it uses the hiphil of *yalad*. And it's not always a direct father-son relationship. But Ruth 4 has no numerical data. It doesn't give begetting ages. It doesn't give lifespans. It doesn't give any of that data. It just says so-and-so begat so-and-so. You have to figure out what that relationship is. But in Genesis 5 and 11 it's quite different.

This is the key, in my view, in arguing how do you interpret this. I have found it's just impossible to get out from underneath the force of the syntax. And so, I've concluded through the research that the chronological interpretation is what makes sense, because that's what the syntax leads me to believe. So, I submit that for your consideration as you consider this. Perhaps you've held the to the gap view or heard the gap view, you got to look closely at the syntax as you wrestle with the issue of chronology in these two genealogies.

So again, the relationship between Jared and Enoch is irrelevant as it relates to chronology. Green conflated genealogical and chronological gaps and this is a fundamental point that you should come away with as you analyze this particular question.

Now a couple articles that are important: Jeremy Sexton's article in the *Westminster Journal*, which is on the ABR website, deals with the syntax in great detail. He and I became friends through this project in the providence of God. He'll be publishing another article in *JETS*, hopefully coming up next year following up on that and going through the syntax in great detail. I submit that for your consideration as you weigh this. So, now that's the first thrust of the research, is to look at the syntax and the interpretation of the text, the numbers, and all that.

Now the second question is what do we do with the numerical divergences that are in the three witnesses? You have three witnesses to the text. You have the Masoretic Text, you have the Septuagint, and you have the Samaritan Pentateuch—three witnesses and they have numerical divergences in them. The numbers diverge and therefore when you calculate a chronology, each one yields a different chronology. So the obvious question to us is how do we determine which is the original? Where does the evidence lead?

What I've been trying to do in the research is try to present a historically grounded viable theory that can adequately explain the large-scale alterations to the numbers. In fact these divergences are further evidence of chronological intent. The reason the numbers have been changed in some of the manuscripts is because the ancients interpreted chronologically. The fact that the numbers have been altered is evidence of ancients saying we believe this yields a chronology when we interpret it.

Here's just a [chart](#)—a lot of numbers coming at you. You can go to the ABR website to pull up this article that I wrote on the subject [*Answers Research Journal* Volume 10, 2017, p. 170] but as you look through the numbers, you can see there are divergences, and we'll talk about a couple of those in just a few moments.

Here's a summary of what you get when you go through, and you add up the numbers. The Masoretic Text gives you about 1,656 years from Adam to the Flood and you have the post-Flood period for a total of about 2,000. You'll see the Samaritan Pentateuch, even though the

total is close to the Masoretic, the two epochs are quite different in terms of the time period. And then in the Septuagint you have even other divergences in the numbers.

My colleague, Scott Stripling, told me a year and a half ago when I started really getting into this, that you've treaded out into very deep waters and he's very correct about that. It's not just deep waters, it's the subject has been an abyss of research. But it's been very rewarding to try to figure out what happened in these witnesses to the text.

So, I'm going to give you some outline of what I think are good arguments, hopefully, for your consideration. First is just from a broad standpoint there's been a couple of different approaches. The liberal critical scholarship has tried to figure this out in more depth than conservative scholarship, but their theories about the origin of the Old Testament, end up leading to conclusions for those of us who have a high view of Scripture, it's not compatible with the orthodox view.

Here's Ronald Hendel's perspective. He says that the problems in Genesis 5 and 11 are accounted for by the theory that a redactor incorporated the book of the generations of Adam into a pre-existing text. So, the idea is there's these pieces of Genesis floating around out there and somebody brought it all together at the end and it created chronological errors. So, it's a human work and the errors are there and then the people came along later to try to fix it. That's fundamentally what Hendel's arguing.

Of course, we would approach it differently from a from an orthodox standpoint, that the original numbers are correct but they've become garbled in history and we want to try to reconstruct them. They've been preserved by the Lord through history. That's the perspective that I'm taking.

So, we have two phenomena in Genesis 5 and 11. We have large-scale deliberate alterations. There's no question that the numbers have been changed mostly on the order of 100 in the begetting ages. So the question is from a theoretical standpoint, have they been inflated or have they been deflated?

And then there's some scribal errors that you find in the manuscript particularly in the Septuagint. And those are pretty easily identified. You can explain the reasons for those scribal errors relatively easily.

So just to give you a couple examples. Going back to our [chart](#), you'll see, for example, how the begetting ages ... take a look at Adam up here for the Masoretic and the Samaritan Pentateuch. They match. But the Septuagint is 100 years longer. Then you move down through the history. You go in the Samaritan Pentateuch, now the numbers have changed, when you get down to Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech. These numbers all match the book of Jubilees, but they diverge from the other two witnesses.

You can see this all has to be worked out, try to figure out how to explain how these phenomena have occurred in the biblical manuscripts. Why have they been deliberately changed in this particular way?

So those are examples. We have the unique problem with Lamech. All the numbers are different—the ages, the lifespan, the remaining years. But then we also have consistencies that show us this goes back to one textual tradition. The lifespans are quite consistent in the early part of the pre-Flood period across all three witnesses. Noah's numbers are all the same and the same with Shem all the way across three witnesses.

The phrase “two years after the Flood” in Genesis 11:10 is found in all three witnesses. And in many external witnesses these numbers are also found, particularly Noah’s numbers. It’s clear that whoever decided to change some of the numbers left these numbers alone.

Now you go to the post-Flood period and now the begetting ages match better between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint. You have the unique issue of Cainan, which is a doctoral thesis in and of itself, to be honest with you. And then these matching numbers between the two witnesses. So, you have a lot going on here. There’s a lot to try to unpack, to figure out, trying to restore the original numbers.

As I said, the liberal scholarship has just thrown up its hands and said you can’t fix it and conservatives generally just haven’t done anything with it, because if the non-chronological interpretation is true, then the numbers aren’t really that important anymore. Trying to figure out the begetting ages, it doesn’t matter because if it doesn’t yield a chronology, it doesn’t really impact archaeology. It doesn’t impact apologetics. It just it doesn’t matter.

You don’t see a lot of attempts in the conservative literature to try to figure out this problem. So that’s my take on that as far as trying to reconstruct the numbers. You can see the task is rather large.

I’m going to give you an overview. I decided that I would just summarize what I call the Septuagint Inflation Hypotheses. This is the idea that the Masoretic retains the original numbers and the Septuagint has been deliberately inflated. So that’s what I call it. There’s a number of different theories in the literature to express why people think that the Septuagint translators inflated the chronology. I’m going to show you reasons why I think this hypothesis fails.

I have about nine reasons listed and that’s coming up in my *CRSQ* [Creation Research Society Quarterly] article. I’m just going to give you a couple here today.

One is that there’s no ancient witnesses that support it. The earliest I’ve been able to trace the ideas back to 1834. So, you don’t have anybody from antiquity saying that this is what happened to the Greek text, that the translators inflated the chronology.

The other is the claim is usually that the Septuagint translators inflated the chronology because they wanted to match Egyptian chronology. You’ll find that in many sources. I found at least 25 different sources that say that that’s what happened. The problem with that is as Paul Ray says here, it’s inadequate. The Septuagint chronology is not long enough to match Manetho’s chronology or other ancient Egyptian chronologies. And so it doesn’t achieve the alleged apologetic goal that it supposedly was done for.

And another reason comes from Old Testament and Septuagint scholarship, that they maintain by and large that the numbers that are in the Septuagint came from the Hebrew text. They were not invented by the author of the translators but they come from the Hebrew text.

Here we have probably one of the quintessential experts on the subject of Dead Sea Scrolls and so on. He says although the Septuagint has been translated into Greek the numbers should not be ascribed to the translator, but the Hebrew *Vorlage*, the text behind the Septuagint translation. They did not recalculate the lists and so on. His view is it’s highly unlikely that it’s the Septuagint translators that changed the numbers.

To compound that problem for the hypothesis is the fact that [there are] the higher numbers in Genesis 11 in the Samaritan Pentateuch.

So, if the Septuagint translators inflated the chronology, one has to explain well, why did the Samaritans inflate only the post-Flood chronology? Because they wanted to match Egyptian chronology. That argument doesn't really hold very well.

These are two independent sources that have the higher numbers in the post-Flood period. It really falls apart the idea. And again, it shows that the numbers in Genesis 11 match the begetting ages. And therefore, the theory can't explain that.

Again, I'll show you the numbers. Really from Shem all the way down through, with the exception of Cainan, which is a unique problem, the begetting ages match all the way down until the time of Nahor. So, the inflation hypothesis just doesn't work for the Samaritan Pentateuch.

Now I'm going to just talk about two other pieces of evidence that I believe point to deflation, meaning the Masoretic has been deflated and not inflation, meaning that the Septuagint has not been deliberately inflated. So, these are going to be spelled out in a couple of these articles.

The one is the handout. The *Bible and Spade* has a very brief overview and then hopefully my *CRSQ* article coming up in the spring will explain this further.

But let me give you a couple of arguments. So, we've got internal evidence, which I'm going to talk about, and then external evidence. External evidence is referring to authors that refer to Genesis 5 and 11 in antiquity and they record the numbers, Josephus being a classic example. What kind of text did he have in front of him and what numbers did he have? This gives you a snapshot into the state of the Genesis text in that particular time period.

So these external witnesses help us to try to reconstruct what happened in the manuscripts. I believe this is a critical part of the investigation, that the manuscript evidence alone is not sufficient. It tells us a lot and usually in text criticism it's sufficient in and of itself. But this unique case we need this external evidence to help us put it together.

I'm going to give you two sources that I've found in my research that I think support the longer chronology. The first is this sort of obscure witness called *LAB* [*Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*]. It's from the *Pseudepigrapha* and it chronicles biblical history from Adam to Saul. It's a Jewish non-canonical work and those of you familiar with the Jewish writings from that period, you know they wrote ubiquitously on the Scriptures, their commentaries, and apocalyptic literature and all that.

But *LAB* is one of those histories. It records the begetting ages for the patriarchs before the Flood from Seth to Lamech and it records the longer chronology. So, here's a witness, a snapshot witness, from the first century.

Now this is important. When I first discovered *LAB*, I had no knowledge of what *LAB* was or anything about it. So, I had to do a lot of looking into what the experts said about it, to see if it would help me in my theory.

For example, Louis Feldman, who just recently died, was a very well-respected scholar of ancient Judaism. He saw *LAB* as being a Pharisaic work. So, a work of the Pharisees, not Egyptian, or not Hellenistic, but Pharisaic. And unanimously the scholarship says that not only that they had the longer numbers, but they were using a Genesis text, a Hebrew text of Genesis. This is fascinating because if the numbers were inflated in the Septuagint, then it has to explain why *LAB* was using a Hebrew text that looks very much like it had the higher numbers in it. Very fascinating witness *LAB* is in my view.

So you can see the numbers. One of the things that makes *LAB* unique in its witness is it records the remaining years in Genesis 5. Now most people in the ancient writings weren't interested in that because that doesn't affect the chronology. What affects the chronology is the begetting age. And then, of course, they were interested in talking about the lifespans because it was so fascinating how could somebody live to be 900 years old. And they would explain all the reasons why they believe that was the case, the theological argument. But the point is that *LAB* records the longer chronology.

One of the most important reasons why I believe this supports the witness in Hebrew is because of Lamech's begetting age. You see down here of 182. That is not the number that's in the Septuagint, it's 188. This is the number found in the Masoretic Text. This is evidence, in my view, of support for the fact that *LAB* was written in Hebrew and came from a Hebrew text. You can see an outline of that and some of these articles that are going to be coming up [see Table 2 slide].

Now the second witness that's extremely important to us is Josephus. Usually, his numbers on this subject are just dismissed because they say, "well, he was just parroting the Septuagint." That's the usual response that you'll see in the literature. If one looks very closely—and again this is another abyss that I was drawn into because once I started seeing that Josephus was a witness to Genesis 5 and 11, now I had to go understand Josephus scholarship. So you can see that this has taken me down a number of deep rabbit trails, but nonetheless important ones.

Here's a couple statements from Josephus, just to give us an overview. "The history of the Bible is 5,000 years. I've recorded this. I've translated it from the Hebrew into the Greek." So, there's a couple statements. He claimed to use Hebrew text. The modern scholarship on Josephus as it relates to Genesis—they all say that he was using a Hebrew text when he was writing about the Pentateuch and particularly the Book of Genesis.

So, I'll give you just three examples from well-known Josephus scholars:

1. Henry Thackeray, he died in 1931, is still a very well-respected Josephus and Septuagint scholar.
2. Feldman, again, who I just said recently passed away. He documents how *LAB* and Josephus are closely related at the level of the Hebrew text. Very important for this study.
3. Then the French scholar, Nodet, who has looked closely at Josephus's use of the Pentateuch. He believed that the Hebrew text that he was using was very close to the text behind the Septuagint.

So, you see in the scholarship of Josephus, not that he was using the Septuagint in Genesis, but that he had a Hebrew text. And that means in my view that the numbers that he recorded were from the Hebrew text and not the Septuagint text.

Now another important part about this Josephus research has been the very difficult task of looking at the manuscript evidence. Because in the literature you read all these conflicting opinions about Josephus and what he was using. Josephus was confused in his chronology. He was using both chronologies. He was using the Septuagint. So, what I said I'm going to put all that aside. I have to find out what the manuscripts say.

So fortunately, Thackeray did quite a bit of work on the text critical reconstruction. And then I was able to get a copy of Niese's apparatus in *Logos* and get to the heart of the matter to see

what the manuscript evidence says. And overwhelmingly I think Thackeray's work, and then some refinements, show that he was using the longer chronology for sure.

Again, just one point that I'll add that's very important. For Lamech, this is this is very important because the Josephus manuscripts are split on his begetting age. But the lifespan is 707. Now it looks to me like the 770 digit dropped out in the transmissional history of the Greek. But nonetheless it was originally 777, which is what's in the Masoretic Text. That is not what's in the Septuagint. The Septuagint number is different, it's unique.

In my view, the fact that this lifespan matches the Masoretic is evidence that Josephus was using a Hebrew text. If he was using the Septuagint, he would have recorded 188 and 753 as the lifespan.

As we wind down here, and I've not been able to find any witness now conversely. So, I went through some of the Septuagint evidence, what I think supports the Septuagint. I know it's been a boatload of data dumped on you. That's why I gave you those handouts so you can look into it further.

There are no external witnesses that testify to the MT's timeline for Genesis 5 and 11 before the 4th century, before Eusebius tabulates them. And so, this is important because we have external witnesses to the Genesis text. Everything before the second century is longer chronology. Every single witness. And yet the MT's numbers are not found in a reliable witness until Eusebius.

This is another important consideration as you weigh the arguments.

Since we're down to five minutes, I'm going to skip over this quickly because I do want to talk about archaeology for just a minute. We're in NEAS [Near East Archaeological Society] right? But here's a contradiction in the Masoretic chronology. Genesis 25:8 says that Abraham was a good old man and he died at 175 years old. In the Masoretic text this is contradicted by four points:

1. Eber is still alive and more than double that age.
2. Shem died 25 years before Abraham.
3. Noah two years before Abraham's born.
4. And then Genesis 11 indicates that each one of the patriarchs had other sons and daughters, which means all the descendants would have lived to these similar ages.

In my view this is internal evidence that contradicts the statement in Genesis 25:8 and is evidence of deflation in the MT. It's not consistent internally. So, I believe this is an internal argument that shows the MT's been deflated and the Septuagint is more consistent with that statement. Noah has been dead for centuries and so on and so on.

I'm sorry I'm going through that quickly. Let's talk about, quickly, first I believe that the Septuagint chronology, the evidence is substantial for its originality. So, I'll let you weigh that argument. I want to encourage evangelical scholarship to critically re-examine this question, certainly invite other people to participate in research, critique my viewpoint. I want to get it right.

Let's talk about archaeology. So, 3300 BC is the date of the Flood yielded from the Septuagint. You've got number of issues. If you're going to look at the archaeology before Abraham but after the Flood, what do you do with that? What do you do with the dates?

Here's some big-picture stuff you got to consider. First you got to think about what you think the scope of the Flood was and how it would have impacted the archaeological record. So, you got to decide exegetically, hermeneutically, historically, the scope of the Flood and its destructive force. How that impacts archaeological evidence and how you interpret it.

What do you believe about that will affect your model, that will affect Carbon-14 dating. If the Flood is universal, it would have covered the whole planet and buried the whole carbon cycle and messed up the whole Carbon-14 cycle. If it's not universal and it's regional, that would change the whole way you look at the Carbon-14 dating before the time of Abraham.

You got to put that into your model as you consider it. And then you've got to evaluate the evolutionary paradigm and how the long ages impact this kind of model. Is man the product of slow development or was he fully mature when he came off the ark and reestablished civilization? This is a key consideration in my view.

Think of Tom Hanks being on Castaway Island. He's a fully mature, intelligent image of God, but he's been separated from civilization, and he becomes what? He becomes a caveman—not because he's a Neanderthal, but because he's been put into a very Neanderthal kind of situation. This is the situation in the post-Flood world if you believe the Flood was universal. I'm saying all that as part of the NEAS Society to think about, first of all, the interpretation of the Septuagint, the numbers, the date of the Flood, and all of these variables that go into looking at the archaeological evidence.

The Tower of Babel has to be another consideration as you weigh a model for post-Flood archaeology, pre-Abrahamic archaeology.

And the last consideration is the Table of Nations in Genesis 10. All of those factors have to be taken into account.

I know I crammed that into three minutes. So, I apologize for that, and you're out of time and I'm out of time. So do we have time for questions?

Big question on the MT's deflation: read the our general theory on that in the Bible as a paid article that I handed out. It has to do with messianic chronology and I'll leave it at that.