

Dr. Henry Smith

On the Authenticity of Kainan (Luke 3:36; Genesis 11)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y15s5bqRZrc>

Today my presentation's actually on a particular text variant in Genesis 11. So I'm just doing a quick introduction here related to the larger project that ABR is doing. You can go online on our website to find out more about it. The best way to do that is you type in the word "primeval" in the search box. That word comes from William Henry Green's article in 1890, "primeval chronology" is what he called it where he made an argument against the chronological interpretation of the text. But that's a way you can look at the research that's been done so far.

I'm not going to be defending that view today or covering the wide variety. If you're familiar with dealing with these two genealogies, you know that it covers a wide spectrum of disciplines: exegesis, text, literary structures, genre, hermeneutical principles, what kind of hermeneutic do we use to interpret these texts, non-canonical texts such as Demetrius the chronographer, Josephus, the Book of Jubilees, the Church Fathers and, of course, text criticism.

So there's a whole spectrum of disciplines and, of course, here at NEAS also there's a bearing of archaeology on the question. So there's a lot that goes on here in the discussion of this particular subject.

Just as a quick overview. As most of you know, we're going to zero down here on the numbers a little bit from Genesis 5 and 11: the Masoretic text, the Septuagint, and the Samaritan Pentateuch. Here's a typical chart of some of the divergences that are found in the three main witnesses. It doesn't include all the divergences, but just the main fundamental ones.

And, of course, in the history of the church, there's been debate about adjudicating the textual variants. How do we understand where the variety of numbers came from. And, in particular, when they're interpreted chronologically, and, of course, I'm fully aware that there's disagreement in evangelicalism about that. But fundamentally, if you take the chronological interpretation, you yield different chronologies for both epochs and in totality.

So, the age-long question has been where did the textual variants arise? How did they arise? And what are the explanations for them? Again, that part of the project is not what I'm going to be talking about today.

So, we have three main phenomenon that have taken place with the numbers proper.

1. First, we've got clearly large-scale, deliberate alterations of the text. That's clear. They're not just scribal errors.
2. Although, point two, there are scribal errors in some of them, particularly in the Septuagint manuscripts, because of the number of manuscripts that were produced, particularly by the church. And there's a couple readings in the MT that I believe are also minor variants, such as Eber's remaining years.
3. And then there's also instances of harmonization, that's deliberate harmonization, particularly in the Samaritan Pentateuch. Terah's lifespan is the classic example, it has been reduced to 145 by Samaritan scribes. And then the post-Flood lifespans are harmonized additions to the texts. They're not original. They've been added into the Samaritan Pentateuch and also the remaining years have been deflated.

So there's a lot going on in all of this.

One of the issues that arises in the discussion of sorting all out all this data out has to do with Kainan, the son of Arpachshad in the Septuagint and also in Luke's Gospel chapter three—his genealogy that extends from Jesus back to Adam.

So, there's been again an age-long question about the authenticity of this particular patriarch. Where did his name come from? Is it original? Is it an addition to the text? Is it the result of a scribal error, and so on. A number of different theories have been proposed in the academic literature.

So I'm going to ask my friend Don, here, to hand out a free copy of *Bible and Spade* to everyone. You can take a copy in exchange for this freedom, it's not free. If you would sign up for the ABR newsletter, I would appreciate it. You're on the honor system if you already received the newsletter. You may take a copy of the magazine anyway and you can follow along. What I'm doing today sort of is [in the article that's published here](#) in this issue of *Bible and Spade*.

This is a layman's version article of hopefully a more in-depth one that I would like to publish sometime in 2019. This is nice because it's got nice pictures in it of some manuscripts that have been discovered.

My talk has to do specifically with the authenticity of Kainan in Luke 3:36 and then you've got this conflicting witness. Now you'll see that the name is inserted here between Arpachshad and Shelah. If you take the chronological interpretation, you can see what the numbers are based on that. But regardless, even if you don't follow that interpretation, the question of Kainan's authenticity still exists and needs to be, in my view, adjudicated. It seems like a little esoteric subject, but I think it's of interest. You'll find it in the commentaries, particularly on Luke, different varying opinions about it.

So here's where the conflict arises *per se*. Maybe not conflict, but conflicting data maybe is a better way to say it.

The first thing we noticed quite obviously is that Kainan is absent from the Masoretic text. He's also absent from the Samaritan Pentateuch. And in the Masoretic text in four places that Kainan simply is not in the text. This is something that has to be taken seriously. Obviously, the value of the Masoretic text to us has high importance.

Also in the Samaritan Pentateuch as well in Genesis 11 and 10:24. We also have external witnesses such as Josephus in his post-Flood genealogy, Kainan is not present. Nor is Kainan present in Codex Vaticanus in 1 Chronicles. Now Brooke and McLean's text critical work on 1 Chronicles was done in the 1930s and there hasn't been an updated one done on the Septuagint since then. But they do follow Vaticanus as being original, and therefore Kainan is absent in their view in the original version of 1 Chronicles of the Septuagint.

As we move on, we also have various Church Fathers, Theophilus of Antioch, Julius Africanus, and Eusebius—all of them it appears that Kainan is not in their Septuagint manuscript of Genesis 11, which is quite interesting. The fact that that's not the case, and I'm going to provide a general overview of what I think that reason may be for that later in my talk.

Now conversely, we have again in conflict here quite a bit of data that has Kainan present. And this is where the problem comes in of trying to sort out is this individual original. First we have

no manuscript of the Septuagint before the 12th century that excludes Kainan, no excellent manuscript. So you can go through **Weaver's** Text Critical Apparatus, for example, and you can find almost every manuscript known to us contains Kainan in Genesis 11.

Add to that we have Demetrius the Chronographer, who wrote around 220 BC, comes down to us through Eusebius. But he's very precise in his calculations. He does three calculations to the time that Jacob enters into Egypt. He does it from the creation of Adam, he does it from the Flood, and then he does it from Abraham's departure for Canaan at the age of 75. And when you do all the matrix of data, his post-Flood chronology has to include Kainan in order to be accurate. So while he doesn't mention Kainan, his numbers require that Kainan was in his text.

And then we have compounding the situation even further, The Book of Jubilees, which also includes Kainan. Jubilees is from a Hebrew-based text of Genesis according to VanderKam and many other experts on the subject of Jubilees. He's found in chapter eight verses one through five. There's a story of his life there nestled between Arpachshad and Shelah.

Then we go on and we find that he is in fact in 1 Chronicles of Codex Alexandrinus, so that conflicts with Codex Vaticanus. Now Vaticanus is a century earlier and that's something that has to be considered when weighing the value of the evidence.

And we have Hippolytus of Rome, who is a significant witness, not only because the manuscripts are all the way in Rome proper, they come from the early 3rd century AD, and he does a genealogy not only of Luke, but also of Genesis 11 and Genesis 10:24. He connects people living in his day to people in Genesis 10. And he mentions Kainan, as does Augustine in the fourth century.

So, what do we do with all of this data that's available to us as it relates to Kainan? Well I'm going to give a proposal for what I think may have happened in the transmissional history. And, again, no matter what your view may be of interpreting Genesis 5 and 11, a decision should be made as to whether or not Kainan was original to the text.

Some have argued that Kainan arose as a scribal error in an early manuscript of Luke. It was picked up from a very similar name in Genesis 5 Kenan, one of the patriarchs who lived before the Flood. And then when it got inserted accidentally into the Gospel of Luke, it was universally accepted by the church. This would have to happen very quickly and universally throughout the Mediterranean world. Then the church, not in a conspiracy proper, but sort of organically, because there was no central authority structure to control all of this, would have interpolated his name back into Septuagint, into Jubilees, and the 40 known manuscripts of Luke.

This is a common argument that's made to explain Kainan's origin—a scribal error picked up in the Gospel of Luke and then accepted by the church rather universally. Scholars who've argued for this include:

- Andrew Steinmann, who had an article in *JETS* last year [2017], where he challenges the authenticity of Kainan,
- The creation scientist Jonathan Sarfati,
- Mills did a Th.M. thesis at Dallas Seminary in the late 1970s,
- And then another writer back in the 19th century [William Brown Galloway] have made this same argument that this is the origin of Kainan.

There's been other explanations you'll find in some of the literature, some esoteric theories that the Ptolemies were threatening the Alexandrian translators to expand the chronology to equal Egyptian chronology and Kainan is a red flag to warn the people of God. You'll find kind of strange ideas like this in the literature. But really, those kind of things don't hold up to scrutiny.

But this is the most serious explanation to exclude Kainan that I've been able to find. So, I thought it would be of interest to us to just sort of take a look at a couple of manuscripts that we find.

The first one is the Berlin Genesis Papyrus. This is a very interesting discovery. It's from the late third century AD. It was found in Egypt. It is in fact the oldest known excellent manuscript that preserves the Book of Genesis of the Septuagint. And so therefore, its value is it has good value to us in terms of understanding the textual transmission of the Septuagint and the Book of Genesis in particular.

Here's a nice high-resolution photograph from the University of Warsaw from Genesis 34. You'll see that the manuscript is mutilated. This is very common throughout the entire manuscript. A lot of lacunae in it. In some places the text is preserved quite nicely. It's written in a very unique sort of capitalized but cursive script. It's not full cursive but it's not uncial text. Uncial text is sort of a mix and it's very difficult to read. So if you go online, you look at it. It's very hard to transcribe.

Now, the unfortunate thing is that the fragment that contained Genesis 10 and 11 was destroyed in the Berlin Museum during the Second World War. But fortunately there was a scholar at the University of Michigan, Henry Sanders, who had photographed and facsimiled it. So I contacted the Berlin Museum and found out that it had been destroyed. Then I contacted Michigan to see if they had pictures [or microfiche??]. [13:30] But they didn't have it. I ran into a dead end. But I did find a low-resolution version from the book online.

You can find this at archive.org. Here is an image of the manuscript of Papyrus 911. And here's the transcription by Schmidt and Sanders. Schmidt was a German scholar. You'll see the text critical reconstruction here. The black is what was extant in the text. You can see that in the folio. The rest of it is conjecture based on other manuscripts. You can see three instances of Kainan in the text. I don't know if the line is red enough for you. Line 18, line 21, and line 23. So it's clearly visible in the text. Two of them you can still see now.

This is blown up. It's a little bit fuzzy. You can read the bottom one here. You can see the kappa, the alpha, the iota, the nu, alpha, and it's sort of smudged over here. But this one looks really good up top as line 20. You can plainly see that's Kainan from Genesis 11.

So, really cool that we could find this, that this has been preserved. It's sad that it was destroyed, but I was grateful that Schmidt and Sanders at least took photographs of it, and we have it in the text so we can see it.

Their reconstruction seems to be pretty good. You can see how difficult this is to read though. It's interesting how hard these letters are to read. It must have been very difficult for them to transcribe this particular manuscript. So that's just one example from the Septuagint evidence, the earliest one.

Here we have from the Gospel of Luke, if you look through the text critical apparatus—is that the right word apparatus plural—apparati, you’ll read in NA28 the long list of Luke manuscripts that preserve Kainan.

Now what’s interesting, we have a deviation here in the spelling. You’ll notice the mu on the end here of Kainam and there’s also Kainan. Now that seems a little bit odd. I haven’t quite figured out yet what the origination of the scribal error is exactly. To me, though, that does point more to authenticity and not sort of a universal organic conspiracy to change the name. Because you would think if that were the case, that the name would be consistently spelled. I’m only suggesting that as a possibility, however.

So it’s in Sinaiticus you can see here and also in Vaticanus. And the NA28 editorial staff has deemed **Kainam** the original. [16:22]

Then we have Kainan which is found in Alexandrinus and this long list of witnesses from New Testament manuscripts, including a 4th century AD Latin manuscript. So as far as the volume of New Testament manuscripts, it’s pretty overwhelming that Kainan was original to Luke. But that’s not the only consideration when we’re weighing variants. There are other factors that have to be taken into account. But this certainly favors his inclusion.

Now scholars who argue against Kainan’s inclusion in Luke hang their hat very heavily on \mathfrak{P}^{75} . Those of you may be familiar with that, that is considered the earliest known manuscript of Luke. It is excellent condition in most places. If you read through New Testament critical scholarship, it’s considered second century. There’s some new debate about that. Another new scholar, Brent Nongbri wants to push it to the fourth century. But nonetheless, there’s a pretty good consensus about that.

What we’re going to do is examine \mathfrak{P}^{75} a little bit today. So this is the image that’s left of \mathfrak{P}^{75} for Luke 3 on the [Vatican website](#). As you can see, there’s very little of it that’s visible. There are a couple of letters here from the definite article. You can see the tau up here, and then the omicron, upsilon. How Luke wrote the names was to Kainan, to Arpachshad, to Shelah, to Peleg. “The son of” is the implication. That’s how it’s translated. But he just used the definite article. He did not write **huois** as son as a shortened version.

But you can see here this is only includes Luke 3:34–35. I don’t even know if it includes that much. It’s so small. [Verse] 36 is not even listed on the Vatican website anymore. And so this is problematic because we can’t really examine \mathfrak{P}^{75} to see if we can see if Kainan’s missing or not.

However, we can draw on some previous scholarship that was done. There’s been a number of scholars who have studied \mathfrak{P}^{75} . I’m going to draw on Martin and Kasser’s 1961 work where they document what it is they saw in the \mathfrak{P}^{75} manuscript. There are other studies, Comfort and Barrett, Swanson, and a couple of others. They fundamentally agree with each other. There are some disagreements on a couple of the letters, but the agreement is fundamentally the same.

I’m going to follow Martin and Kasser. The yellow is what they record as extant and the white is conjectured reconstruction of the text.

So what we’re going to point to here that’s of significance, I think, if you go down to line four you can see here we have [19:20] **Reu, Rhagau in the Greek. Phalec, ??, Peleg, Eber**. And then it drops down to line five and we have here the definite article and then the conjectured reconstruction of Shelah. Then Arpachshad, unmistakably Arpachshad there with his unique spelling. Kainan is absent in this reconstruction. Seems reasonable.

Now as I looked closely at this, I was looking for evidence of Shelah here and there isn't any in any of the academic literature. No one has witnessed the letters from Shelah being at the beginning of line five.

Then I noticed this large space over here underneath [20:01] Serug. This line is 29 letters long and I went through some sections of \mathfrak{P}^{75} and counted various widths. It's anywhere from 21 to 31 or 32 letters in width, depending on the size of the lettering. And I thought well, maybe there's an alternative reconstruction that's possible and I think it is equally plausible. It's possible that this reconstruction is equally plausible based on the visible evidence.

You'll see now under [20:29] Serug I have placed Shelah at the end of the line and put Kainan here just to see how the length and widths of the line would fall. Again, there is no visible evidence for Shelah in the manuscript. So we don't know for sure if Shelah was down here at the bottom, or the possibility I'm proposing, perhaps an alternative, can't prove it, but an alternative reconstruction words here and Kainan may have appeared here. Again, all we have for sure is the definite article in the front.

So now the one question that came up for me was, there's six letters in Kainan, there's four in Shelah. Could it have fit? When you look at \mathfrak{P}^{75} you can see quite a bit of variation in the size of the lettering. So I think this is a plausible text critical reconstruction. Now I'm not suggesting with certainty that Kainan's in \mathfrak{P}^{75} because there is no visible evidence for it. But what I am suggesting is that what has been followed in the scholarship that Kainan is absent from \mathfrak{P}^{75} cannot be determined with certainty. And, if that is not certain, then that removes \mathfrak{P}^{75} from the argument against Kainan's inclusion in Luke's Gospel.

I'm hoping to publish a more in-depth version of this beyond the *Bible and Spade* article to try to make this argument that it's possible. We'll have to do some measurements of the of the letters in \mathfrak{P}^{75} and look at some other areas. But the thought process is that this is an equally plausible reconstruction of the text.

Therefore, as Gordon Fee concluded in 1966, that his absence from \mathfrak{P}^{75} is not demonstrable from the extant text and that is the conclusion that I've drawn. It's not demonstrable. It's possible, but not demonstrable from the text.

So, if one is arguing against Kainan's inclusion in Luke and is using \mathfrak{P}^{75} as a witness, if that is now off the table, that takes away from the strength of that argument. Unfortunately, \mathfrak{P}^{75} has been ruined in this area and we don't have any direct evidence. We have to depend on the scholars who have claimed that they've looked at it and reconstructed it.

So now as I was exploring this further, I did not find any other discussions of what I found with another manuscript of Luke and that is Papyrus⁴. Now this has been dated anywhere from [AD] 150 to about 225. There are disputes in the academic literature, but it's somewhere in that range. Maybe a little bit later. Unlikely to be earlier. AD 150 is pretty early, probably too early. But you'll find in the academic discussions that sort of date range for \mathfrak{P}^4 .

Now \mathfrak{P}^4 is documented in the raw data, but not in academic discussions of Kainan in particular. So it's just not talked about. But as I want to show you here, we're going to find evidence for Kainan.

It's housed in Paris. That's supposed to be a high-resolution image, but it didn't come through very well. And here's some of the dates by a couple of different scholars that have dated it. There are disagreements in the literature. It's not by much, 75 to 100 years. Wasserman has argued that

the text itself is very close to Vaticanus and \mathfrak{P}^{75} and so that's an argument in favor of its dating of the same time period.

Now we're going to look in this section over here to the right and I'm going to change the image a little bit so you can read it better. Then I'll show you some of the reconstruction that you can see here.

Let's start with Jared. We can see a couple of letters from his name. Over here is Enoch. It's pretty clear. You can move up here and see the end of Methuselah's name. Here's the theta. You can almost see the mu there, his definite article. Then Noah's father, Lamech. That's very, very clear, the definite article and three of the letters. Arpachshad unmistakable. His unique spelling, unique name. I thought when I have a son maybe I'd name him Arpachshad. It wouldn't give him problems at school at all.

Now moving up we've got Shelah. Right here we can see the lambda, alpha. Peleg. And moving over here, Eber. And then this beautifully preserved section with Kainan. The definite article, the upsilon, kappa, alpha, an erasure, and then it looks like what is the nu. There's no question about it. That is Kainan in \mathfrak{P}^4 .

Now I found that in the academic literature, but after I looked at the image. So it was kind of exciting. I felt like I found something new, and it turned out it wasn't new. It wasn't new at all. But it had not been discussed in arguments relating to the authenticity of Kainan. That's the key here. It was in the literature and here we have proof positive of it, unlike \mathfrak{P}^{75} , which we just cannot determine with any certainty.

So as I mentioned, we have this sort of conflicting data that we're dealing with of trying to figure out, well, if Kainan is original to Luke, he's not original in the Masoretic text, but he's in the Septuagint, and he's in this witness, he's not in that witness. What do we do with all of this data?

Again, I gave some explanations that I found in the literature, and I just can't explain all of the data. So I've come up with an overarching idea. I think it sort of is drawn out of Old Testament text criticism from what I've read in the academic literature. I can't prove it because we don't have access to a lot of this stuff before the third century BC. I mean there's just very little text. I mean obviously in archaeology we find some Hebrew text, but not manuscripts of the Bible, and certainly not extensive ones.

So if you'll follow along with me, I admit here that this is conjecture and it can't be proven. But I'm trying to develop a theory that explains the data. We have all this data. How do we explain it?

So we know, and this is a pretty common consensus in the Old Testament text criticism world, that the exile sort of created three major archetypes in the Hebrew text—the splitting up of the Hebrew, the Israelite community: in Israel, and Babylon, and in Egypt. Of course, they went to other places during the exile, but these are sort of where the three archetypes went to. That's the general idea.

In Egypt in particular, we know from the Elephantine Papyri and the temple there, that the Jews were worshipping [27:36] **Yaho**, right? That's the name that they used as far as south Aswan in the fifth century BC. So this is very early.

The Hebrew text behind the Septuagint. We know that they had a Hebrew text in Egypt when they translated the Pentateuch in the early 3rd century BC.

So, my thought process is, somehow in this matrix is how this problem arose. Here's a very typical representation of the theories behind the development of the text, and then it's splitting apart. I'm not necessarily advocating this. It's just one representation that you'll find very common of the different archetypes that split up as a result of the Babylonian Exile.

And here's another representation—very similar. Egypt, Palestine, and Babylon. And then we'll talk a little bit about how messy things get with the Septuagint down here at the bottom. The church was competing, we had three competing texts, as Jerome says, at his time.

So I'm suggesting that Kainan—and this is a little radical—because you won't find this in the literature that I'm aware of, that Kainan dropped out of a major archetype by means of parablepsis and mental error.

I'm suggesting this happened very early. The Consonantal text is very repetitive in Genesis 5 and 11. The syntax is repeated over and over again. Very similar in Genesis 11. The numbers are very similar. So, there's a possibility of a slip of the eye and a mental error as the scribe was writing.

And, of course, I'll have to justify this in an academic paper to show that I've tried to work it out. I have about 80 percent of it worked out, but I think that that's what happened. And then to compound things, the only way to account for Genesis 10:24 and 1 Chronicles is to surmise that when they discovered that Kainan was missing in Genesis 11, they harmonized the text. It's really the only way that I think it could have happened.

Because you can't say that they were all scribal errors that came and fell out of all these verses by accident. That's just not a feasible idea. But we would call this "benevolent harmonization". That is a phenomenon in scribal activity. Again, I admit we can't prove this, but it could be the explanation for why the Kainan fell out and then it was harmonized internally by scribes in the other texts.

Now that this main [archetypal] line would have had to have preceded the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Masoretic text, because it's not in the Samaritan Pentateuch. And this compounds the problem even further. So my thought has been, if I'm right, this had to happen very early in the transmissional history of the text.

Now conversely, it's pretty certain the Alexandrian translators had a text, the Hebrew text with Kainan in it. There's no explanation for his existence in Genesis 11 and 10:24 in all of these Septuagint manuscripts. We also have Demetrius the chronographer, which I mentioned before. That's a witness to the Septuagint, so that it was early. He's the earliest witness to Genesis 5 and 11 that we know of.

And then what really, really makes it interesting is Kainan's presence in the Book of Jubilees. This is fascinating because some of the Ethiopian manuscripts, which are much later, have Kainam in them, which is a fascinating development. So was his name originally Kainam? Richard Bauckham wrote an article in 1991 arguing that perhaps this was the original name, not Kainan, but Kainam, which is fascinating because we find this in the Luke manuscripts and the [31:45] M828 editors deemed Kainam the original in Luke 3. So this archetype perhaps being split off very early, perhaps it's what explains this matrix of data.

And then to make things even more complicated, we also know from the academic literature that the translation of the rest of the Septuagint was not done in Alexandria. It was done later all the way down to about 130 [BC], which is the date that Peter Gentry argues for—perhaps in Israel.

So maybe they were working with a Hebrew archetype that was different than the one that was used by the Alexandrian translators, and therefore may have not originally been in the Septuagint's original version of 1 Chronicles. So, if you're not completely confused by this point, then we can go on and add to this matrix.

Jewish recensional and retranslation activity began in the second century BC down into the era of the church where they were updating their translations. Think of it as, "Hey, listen. We had the King James. Now we want to update to the ESV. We want a better translation. We're using what we believe are better Hebrew texts to do so." And therefore, the texts were often changed in the direction of the proto-Masoretic text.

So this really, really messes up all the data. This is very complicated. All of it is very complicated. But again, I think what explains the data the best is the mess that was created by this.

As you can see down at the bottom here, this is sort of the standard understanding of the translation and dissemination of the Septuagint. Once you get into the church era, it gets even messier because you've got the Jewish recensions, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotian, and you've got three texts that the church was debating about.

So there's a lot going on here, that is happening and probably in my view explains why Theophilus, Africanus, and Eusebius didn't have Kainan in their Septuagint text. Because there was harmonization, retranslation, all kinds of stuff happening. But Hippolytus and Augustine did have his name.

And then Luke. What text was he drawing on? Well, the easiest text to draw on to do his genealogy would have been 1 Chronicles. He could have used Genesis 11, but 1 Chronicles would have been the easiest text to use in terms of just copying the names, because he wasn't recopying the ages or the life spans or any of that. So it's possible that Luke was using a Septuagint text. It doesn't look like he was using a Hebrew text according to some of the scholarship I've read on that.

So, I'm arguing at this point, and I'm certainly open to change my mind on this because again I don't have direct evidence of all of it, but I think that instead of being definitive evidence against Kainan, the textual complexities, the external witnesses, actually might support a larger argument favoring his inclusion.

And, of course, this needs to be worked through possibly in the original Hebrew and I'm pretty persuaded that Kainan is original to the Gospel of Luke based on the weight of the evidence, the amount of evidence that is available to us.

So, the theory that Kainan originated as a scribal error in Luke, I don't think can be sustained. I think it's impossible, especially when you look at the witnesses before the era of the church—Demetrius and Jubilees and the Hebrew text underlying the Septuagint. I just don't see how that can work based on all the evidence.

So it leaves us with ... this is my theory as to the deal with Kainan. I'm certainly open to any another theory, but I haven't found one. So, unless I come up with another imaginative idea, this is kind of the angle that I'm going to pursue with it.

Hopefully we'll publish another article coming up this year and complicate the situation much further than it already is. [See Dr. Smith's article published after the presentation:

<https://biblearchaeology.org/research/topics/biblical-chronologies/4432-on-the-authenticity-of-kainan-son-of-arpachshad>]

So thank you. Do you have any time for questions?

Question: Do you think that therefore, you know with the exception of Josephus, that this could point let's say to the 150 to 200 AD period of when this was done?

Smith: Now you're adding another complicating factor because, see if you read through the academic material in Josephus, most people think, well, he was just following the Septuagint because he uses the higher begetting ages. But when you read the Josephus material, they argue that he had a Hebrew text of Genesis when he was writing his text. So that's another interesting point that's mixed in there. And, of course, that makes sense that Kainan was missing if he was in fact using Hebrew text, it would have been long gone in his Hebrew text.