

# Extensive Messianic Prophecy Corruptions and Flood-Related Chronology Errors Disqualify the Septuagint (LXX) as a Reliable Source for Creationist Research

Jeffrey P. Tomkins, David W. Daniels, and James J. S. Johnson\*

## Abstract

There has recently been an interest in the creation science community to promote what is today called the Septuagint (LXX), a controversial Greek translation of the Old Testament that also contains the noncanonical Apocrypha. The recent reason for doing so, it appears, is that the LXX can be used as a justification for an expanded biblical history, both before and after the Flood. Ironically, the LXX reports erroneous chronology data that, if true, would require Methuselah to have survived the Flood (in addition to the 8 historical survivors) by about 14 years—and no LXX advocate has offered a forensically reliable remedy to this error. Meanwhile, as complicated chronological/genealogical arguments have waged back and forth between proponents and opponents, the “elephant in the room” is the pervasive textual corruption that clearly exists in what is today called the LXX, which renders it a forensically unreliable text-source. Contrary to claims that the LXX closely follows the Masoretic Hebrew outside of a few chronological differences, the LXX (in its variant forms) often differs significantly from the providentially preserved Hebrew text of the Old Testament. Our analysis of key Messianic prophecies in the LXX, compared to the Hebrew, reveals a disturbing trend of textual corruption. This preliminary study will show that five pivotal Old Testament Messianic prophecies have been severely altered in the LXX, so as to remove their otherwise clear prophetic connection to the New Testament mission and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. We propose that these LXX corruptions were introduced during the late 1<sup>st</sup> Century AD (at the earliest), with further corruptions being added in later centuries, most likely by Messiah-rejecting Jews and/or by Scripture-altering pseudo-Christian Alexandrian scribes.

---

\* Jeffrey P. Tomkins, [jtomkins@icr.org](mailto:jtomkins@icr.org); David W. Daniels; and James J. S. Johnson, [jjohnson@icr.org](mailto:jjohnson@icr.org)  
Accepted for publication November 11, 2019

## Introduction

The Septuagint (LXX), in the forms now available to us, is a Greek and often loose and inaccurate (compared to the Hebrew Masoretic Text) translation of the Old Testament Scriptures. The LXX also contains the noncanonical apocryphal writings sprinkled throughout. The Roman Catholic church has been one of the largest advocates of the LXX over the years because the Apocryphal books can be used as proof-texts for promoting prayers for the dead, purgatory, prayers to deceased saints and/or angels, earning merits toward salvation through alms and indulgences, and other extra-biblical doctrines that conservative Protestants have traditionally rejected (Daniels, 2017).

However, many ecumenical evangelicals have been promoting the LXX in recent years, as well as a small and fairly recent contingent of young earth creationists (Sexton, 2015; Smith, 2018, replying to Cosner and Carter, 2018). In so doing, many of these individuals conveniently omit the embarrassing fact that the LXX contains the Apocryphal writings which are central to the Counter-Reformation agenda (Daniels, 2017).

Other LXX advocates, like S. Douglas Woodward (Woodward, 2018, 2019), assert a bolder agenda to “reboot the Bible,” promoting the Septuagint, claiming it is superior to the Protestant Bible’s preserved Hebrew text. This idea purports that the LXX is needed to back-translate and rehabilitatively “restore” portions of the Old Testament text, and to thus harmonize the Genesis chronology data with ancient Egyptian and Mesopotamian chronologies, as if doing that would somehow improve the credibility of Genesis and of the Bible itself. Woodward also advocates the Apocrypha books, as if they should be added to those belonging to the Protestant Bible.

Various legends that surround the original creation of the LXX, none of which completely agree with each

other, place it as being translated by Alexandrian Jews about 280 BC (Daniels, 2017). However, recent research has shown that none of these alleged ancient accounts and documents that purport a BC Septuagint exhibits any credibility when compared to the historical and logistical facts surrounding their provenance claims (Daniels, 2017).

In fact, a thorough historical analysis of ancient documents indicates that what we call the Septuagint was most likely first written during the first century AD (after some of the New Testament books were written, such that some LXX texts contain quotations from New Testament books—not vice versa) and then periodically modified in multiple versions thereafter (Daniels, 2017). This freehanded editing, generation after generation, is one of the reasons why the spurious Septuagint-based codices of Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, and Sinaiticus vary significantly from one another (Daniels, 2017).

Many assume that no Dead Sea scrolls contained any fragments of any New Testament books, yet that assumption is now upset by findings of New Testament fragments in caves that were closed prior to the Roman army’s destruction of Jerusalem and Judea in AD 68–70 (Cooper, 2017). In other words, if New Testament books were written and circulated *before* the time when our oldest LXX fragments originated, the LXX editors had the opportunity to insert New Testament quotes into their LXX copies, facilitating back-dated plagiarism to mask textual corruption—especially such efforts aimed at sabotaging Messianic prophecy. This problem is known in forensic science circles as the “recent fabrication” problem (Johnson, 2012).

At present, there are basically two different versions of the LXX available to modern readers. Lancelot Brenton compiled one version in 1851 primarily from Codex Vaticanus with supplemental text taken from Codex Alexandrinus

where Vaticanus was lacking sections (Brenton, 1851). Brenton’s LXX with English translation is readily available as a modern work by Hendrickson Publishers and also on a web site where it is conveniently compared to the KJV Bible, whose Old Testament writings are based on the Masoretic Hebrew text (Brenton, 1986; Marsh, 2012). The other key modern version is the Rahlfs-Hanhart Septuaginta from 2007 that is a slightly updated version of the original 1935 edition (Rahlfs, 2007). This LXX version is a blending of three different codices: Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, and Sinaiticus.

All of the codices that these two LXX versions are based on were developed no less than three centuries after the time of Christ, not before (Daniels, 2017). Forensically speaking, this is very important for evaluating the reliability (versus unreliability) of the LXX as a textual transmission source in contrast to the Masoretic scribe-transmitted Hebrew Bible (Johnson, 2012).

The relevance of this problematic provenance is critical to the preliminary analysis herein, because most creationists (e.g., Cosner and Carter, 2018; Smith, 2018; Sexton, 2015), who have written about the LXX, have uncritically assumed that what we today call the Septuagint is a Greek text that can be forensically traced to “before-Christ” documents—yet no such “before-Christ” documents exist (Daniels, 2017). There is no biblical promise that God would preserve the verbal text of any particular Scripture *translation*, as opposed to God having promised to preserve His original words as given (i.e., in the Old Testament, as to every “jot” and “tittle”), when God committed His prophetic “oracles” unto the Jews (Romans 3:2). The “let’s-get-back-to-the-Bible” Protestant Reformation champions (Wycliffe, Luther, Calvin, Knox, etc.) were peerless Bible scholars that trusted the Masoretic Text, not the LXX-Apocrypha codices given by Rome.




Figure 1. An image from Sinaiticus Isaiah Chapter 9.

The main sales pitch for the promotion of the LXX in the creation science community, is the idea that it gives a more accurate and lengthened (i.e., expanded) historical chronology in Genesis chapters 5 and 11 (Sexton, 2015; Smith, 2018). Although not formally published in recent creationist literature, personal communications with members of the creation science community suggest that some would favor an expanded LXX-based chronology. This would justify adding up to 1600 years of extra time for numerous hypothetical post-Flood local catastrophes and rapid animal diversification (beyond-breedability “speciations”).

These ideas are based on the assumption of a premature Cretaceous-Paleogene post-Flood boundary in the sedimentary rock record to explain the fossils and sediments of the Paleogene and Neogene of the Cenozoic.

For example, it is believed by some that terrestrial walking “proto-whales” left Noah’s Ark and then rapidly evolved (aka “hyper-evolution”) into marine whales, because whales are not found in the fossil-rock record before the Paleogene (Wise, 2009). And somehow, other animals (including many mammals), also making their first rock-record appearance in the Cenozoic, would also “benefit” from this “extra time,” as they

quickly diversified from Ark ancestors in some sort of rapid saltational hyper-evolution (Wise, 2017). The major problem with this overall idea is that whale fossils have been found across the entirety of Europe and the coastal margins of nearly every major continental land mass, negating their supposed burial in localized post-Flood catastrophes (Tomkins and Clarey, 2019).

In addition, many first appearances of plants and animals appear in Cenozoic sediments (Pimiento et al., 2017; Tomkins, 2018; Tomkins and Clarey, 2018a, 2019b). Besides the obvious paleontological data, Clarey’s extensive mapping of global megasequences clearly shows that Flood depositional processes were occurring on a massive scale through the entire Cenozoic system known as the Tejas megasequence (Clarey, 2017; Clarey and Werner, 2017). Thus, both geology and paleontology evidences debunk the notion of an early Flood boundary and hence the supposed necessity of both hyper-evolution and imaginary numerous and global post-Flood catastrophes.

Not only is the LXX being promoted among creationists for a lengthened chronology, but the spurious idea that Masoretic scribes tampered with the Old Testament chronologies to remove the possibility of Jesus Christ being the Messiah has also been put forth, as well, to justify the preferential use of the LXX (Smith, 2018). If any nefarious Jew or Gentile Bible corrupter was seeking to alter Scripture in order to push the Lord Jesus Christ out of the equation, would they not have tampered with Messianic prophecies, rather than supposedly shrinking complicated chronologies and genealogies? Indeed, Messianic prophecies are the chief means of apologetically authenticating the Messiah and His redemptive mission, and thus authenticating the Gospel of Christ. Notice that I Corinthians 15:3–4 twice qualifies the redemptive work of Christ as being “according to the [Old Testament] Scriptures.” And the Ethiopian eunuch

was evangelized by Isaiah 52:13–53:12, not some debatable chronology.

In this research and report, we show that rather than the MT being altered, it is the Greek translation of the LXX that provides a contrived corruption of at least five key Old Testament Scriptures wherein the alterations remove the prophetic connection to the New Testament mission and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. And we also show how basic flood-related chronology errors further disqualify the LXX as a reliable source for creationist research.

## Methods

Key Messianic prophecies were selected from the list provided of “Prophecies Fulfilled at the First Coming of Christ” in the Henry Morris Study Bible (Morris II, 2012) on page 2123. A comparison of the LXX and MT was first done through the side-by-side English translation of Lancelot Brenton’s 1851 version (Brenton, 1986) versus the King James Version (aka Authorized Version of AD 1611), using a publicly available online resource (Marsh, 2012). For the original Hebrew text of the Old Testament books, we have used the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia BHS 5 (BHS), including its textual comparison apparatus. Regarding the Greek texts of the variant forms of what is today called the “Septuagint” or “LXX,” we have used Lancelot Brenton’s 1851 Greek text (Brenton, 1986) and Rahlfs-Hanhart Septuaginta (Rahlfs, 2007). Also, chronology data relevant to the life of Methuselah, as it correlates to the timeframe of the global Flood, was analyzed using passages within Genesis chapters six through nine.

## Genesis 3:15: Protoevangelium Corruption

### LXX

*And I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her*

*seed, he shall watch against thy head, and thou shalt watch against his heel.*

### MT

*And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.*

The obvious discrepancy between these two translations is the word “watch” versus “bruise.” In the LXX, “watch” corresponds to the Greek verb, “τηρέω” (tēreō) which is used to mean “keep, watch, or guard.” The inflected form of the first use of the verb in this passage is τηρήσει (future, active, indicative, 3rd person, singular) while the second instance is τηρήσεις (future, active, indicative, 2nd person, singular).

In Genesis 3:15, twice, the MT uses Qal imperfect forms of the verb **šûp**, translated “bruise” in our English Bible. The Hebrew word “bruise” (שׁוּפ) is used in two other places in the MT in a fashion that indicates severely inflicting injury or covering an individual with *darkness* (negative connotation). Job 9:17 says, “For He **breaketh** (שׁוּפ) me with a tempest, and multiplieth my wounds without cause” and Psalm 139:11 says, “If I say, Surely the darkness shall **cover** (שׁוּפ) me; even the night shall be light about me.”

Excluding the Apocrypha, the Greek verb τηρέω (tēreō) is used 14 times in the LXX. Eleven times it is translated as “keep,” “watch,” or “look” and its English gloss imparts the standard Greek meaning and usage of the term. In no instance is it ever used to give the impression of bruising or inflicting harm. Thus, the authors of the LXX translation in Genesis 3:15 were consistent with this same usage of tēreō throughout the rest of the LXX. The Greek translators could easily have chosen the verb συντρίβω (syntribō) or θραύω (thrauō), both of which have been translated as “bruise” in the New Testament and indicate the action of bruising, wounding, or destruction. The Greek verb that is translated “bruise” in Romans 16:20 is

συντρίψει, a form of the verb συντρίβω (syntribō). Moreover, it is noteworthy that Romans 16:20 (“And the God of peace shall **bruise** Satan under your feet shortly”) links to the content of Genesis 3:15 only if the MT text is relied upon, as opposed to the very different meaning given in the LXX version of Genesis 3:15.

There is a clear discrepancy and even an opposite meaning between tēreō in the LXX and šûp in the MT. The LXX usage means to “keep/keepeth,” “watch out for,” or “be on guard against” while the use of “bruise” means to “strongly injure or afflict.” Clearly, the enemies of God, and Satan himself, would be actively watching out for, keeping, and guarding against the fulfillment of this prophecy—but to no avail as we are told in I Corinthians 2:8, “for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.” We shall also briefly look at the importance of the phrases “bruise thy head” and “bruise His Heel” each in turn, thus showing their scriptural relevance and illustrating why their corruption in the LXX should not be lightly regarded.

In stating “bruise thy head,” we know that Satan inflicted a wound on the woman’s Seed (Jesus Christ) at Calvary, but Christ in turn inflicted a mortal wound upon the Serpent (crushing his head) in His atoning death, burial, and resurrection. The first part of this key biblical prophecy was realized at Calvary and the fulness of it will culminate when the triumphant Lord Jesus Christ casts Satan into the lake of fire (Revelation 20:10).

In stating, “bruise his heel,” Henry Morris II, noted, “This primeval prophecy made such a profound impression on Adam’s descendants that it was incorporated, with varying degrees of distortion and embellishment, in all the legends, mythologies and astrologies of the ancients, filled as they are with tales of mighty heroes engaged in life-and-death struggles with dragons and other

monsters. Mankind, from the earliest ages, has recorded its hope that someday a Savior would come who would destroy the devil and reconcile man to God” (Morris, 2012).

### **Numbers 24:17 LXX Corruption of Christ’s Authority**

LXX

*I will point to him, but not now; I bless him, but he draws not near: a star shall rise out of Jacob, a man shall spring out of Israel; and shall crush the princes of Moab, and shall spoil all the sons of Seth.*

MT

*I shall see him, but not now: I shall behold him, but not nigh: there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth.*

Multiple key words in this prophecy are different between the LXX and the MT. First let us list them in the MT/KJV. They are “see” (ראה *râ’â*), “behold” (שר *šûr*), and “Sceptre” (שֵׁבֶט *šēbet*). These Hebrew words are all accurately rendered in the KJV’s English translation. In contrast, the Greek choice of words in the LXX clouds, lowers, and degrades the Messianic impact of the text. This is done by removing the kingship aspect of the prophecy, by virtue of omitting the mention of the “scepter” that belongs to this future champion of Israel. It is noteworthy that the same Hebrew noun “Sceptre” appears in a prior Messianic prophecy in Genesis 49:10, which indicates that the tribe of Judah would be the authoritative/royal tribe in Israel.

The obvious Greek verbs that should have been chosen for “see” (*râ’â*) should have been either ὁράω (*horaō*) or βλέπω (*blepō*). The Greek verb that was actually used was δείξω (*deixō*) followed by the personal pronoun αὐτῷ (*dative, singular, masculine/neuter*). The phrase

literally means “I will show him.” Not only is the Greek translation corrupted, but the English translation of the Greek is corrupted as well. The clear meaning of the Hebrew text is that the Messiah emphatically will be seen, not merely just pointed to or shown.

The corruption of the second phrase in the MT of “I shall behold him” is altered to “I bless him.” The Greek verb used is “μακαρίζω” (*makarizō*) which literally means to bless, not behold. The obvious potential choices for a Greek translation for “behold” are rather abundant, yet none were chosen by the LXX translators. Greek words for “behold” are θεάομαι (*theaomai*), and θεωρέω (*theōreō*). Alternatively, even ἡραῶ or βλέπω could have been used. The clear choice to avoid anything with the meaning of “behold,” despite the abundant options available, showing that the prophecy was beheld and fulfilled, is obvious and disturbing.

The third phrase, “a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel” clearly means that a noble rod/staff of correction, rule, and authority would arise out of Israel, not merely just “a man” as stated in the LXX. In fact, the Greek noun used in the LXX is ἄνθρωπος (*anthrōpos*); a generic noun typically used to describe a basic human or humankind. In fact, there was not even a modifying adjective to indicate that it was any special type of person other than just an ordinary human. In fact, an even more specific noun for a man/male, ἀνὴρ (*anēr*), was not used, much less any noun coming close to “sceptre” (*šēbet*) which literally means an authoritative rod for ruling and correction.

In this LXX verse, the first two phrases that were corrupted muddle the fact stressed in two affirming statements used for emphasis in the MT, that we will for a surety see the Messiah appear and behold Him. The last phrase in this LXX passage portrays the subject of the prophecy as some ambiguous human not as the Messiah, Ruler, and King.

### **Isaiah 9:6 LXX Corruption of Christ’s Deity**

LXX

*For a child is born to us, and a son is given to us, whose government is upon his shoulder: and his name is called the Messenger of great counsel: for I will bring peace upon the princes, and health to him.*

MT (numbered as 9:5)

*For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.*

As truly human, Jesus was “born” on Earth; as truly God, Christ was “given” to the world. The phrase “mighty God” corresponds to the MT’s אֵל גִּבּוֹר (*Ēl gibbôr*), an obvious indication of the Messiah’s deity, yet this indication of incarnate deity is deleted in the LXX’s Greek rendering of this verse. Likewise, the phrase “everlasting father” or “father of eternity” (*abi-’ad*) has no Greek counterpart in the LXX version of this verse.

The corruption and completely absurd altering of the prophetic text in this LXX passage involves a blatant demeaning of the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ who is not merely just a “Messenger of great counsel” as stated in LXX. The Lord Jesus Christ is “The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.” These descriptive words for the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ have been blatantly omitted in the LXX. Since all of the words for these omitted phrases in the LXX are clearly present in the Hebrew text, there is no need for any detailed exegesis regarding this corruption.

### **Hosea 11:1 LXX Corruption of Matthew 2:15’s Fulfillment**

LXX

*Early in the morning were they cast off, the king of Israel has been cast off: for*

*Israel is a child, and I loved him, and out of Egypt have I called his children.*  
**MT**

*When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt.*

The beginning of 11:1 in the LXX contains words taken from 10:15 and moved over to the next chapter. Of the printed editions we had access to, only in Septuaginta it is in 10:15. In Brenton and the Orthodox text, it is moved to 11:1.

However, the main point is that there is a clear corruption of the prophecy in the difference between “out of Egypt have I called *his children*” in the LXX compared to “called *my son* out of Egypt” in the MT. An exegesis of both the Greek and Hebrew validate the corruption readily apparent in the English. There is no genuine dispute, however, that the New Testament confirms and verifies the MT on this Messianic prophecy, because Matthew 2:15 explicitly recognizes the MT wording as a Messianic prophecy fulfilled in Jesu Christ’s migration to Egypt: “And was there until the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, ‘Out of Egypt have I called my Son.’”

The Hebrew word for “son” (which is singular, not plural) in this verse in the MT is בֶּן (bēn). This prophecy was literally fulfilled by Jesus Christ, as indicated in Matthew 2:13–21, in which Joseph was warned in a dream to flee to Egypt to avoid Herod’s plot to kill the Lord and then when Herod had died, Joseph was again informed in a dream to bring his family back to Israel such that this prophecy in Hosea might be fulfilled as stated, “Out of Egypt have I called my Son” (Matthew 2:15).

The key phrase in Greek from this passage in the LXX is, “ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ” which is correctly represented in Brenton’s English translation. The definite article and neuter noun “τὰ τέκνα” (accusative, plural) followed by the personal

pronoun form “αὐτοῦ” (genitive, masculine, singular) clearly mean “his children” not “my son.” Had it been accurately translated into Greek from the Hebrew, it would have read, “τὸν υἱὸν μου” with “son” (υἱόν) being in the accusative, singular and “my” (μου) being in the first person, genitive, singular. Given the high specificity of Koinê Greek in conveying this type of information, this corruption is a clear perversion of the Hebrew text and completely corrupts this important and highly precise prophecy.

In regard to the history of how this LXX corruption came about, only Origen could have altered or approved of the change in the text to *ta tekna autou*. Aquila (125 AD), Symmachus and Theodotion (both ca. 175 AD) all had it right, saying some form of *huios mou* (my son). So the one who changed it, or the only one not to change it back, if it had said “his children” from the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD, was Origen’s column of the Hexapla. Aquila reads “τὸν υἱὸν μου.” Symmachus put “υἱός μου” and Theodotion wrote “υἱόν μου,” without the definite article. None of these Alexandrian Jewish translators chose words that violated the Hebrew as Origen’s words startlingly did. Both the Alexandrinus and the Vaticanus followed Origen (Hosea was removed from Sinaiticus), not the Hebrew. An examination of the source texts puts the blame for passing on this error squarely on Origen’s shoulders.

### **Zechariah 12:10 LXX Corruption of John 19:37’s Fulfillment**

**LXX**

*And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and compassion: and they shall look upon me, because they have mocked me, and they shall make lamentation for him, as for a beloved friend, and they shall grieve intensely, as for a firstborn son.*

**MT**

*And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn.*

The fulfillment of this MT Scripture in the New Testament is recorded in John 19:37 that states, “And again another scripture saith, ‘They shall look on him whom they pierced.’” This verse is widely regarded as a prophecy in which the Jews will look upon the returning Lord Jesus, the Messiah as the one whom their ancestors had rejected and pierced (Hebrew: פָּקַד) during his crucifixion. The obvious corruption of this prophecy is clearly evident by the complete omission of the phrase, “whom they have pierced” (with the LXX replacing that phrase with “because they have mocked me”). The LXX’s verb “mock” (κατωρχήσαντο) is nothing close to the Greek New Testament’s verb “pierced” (εξεκεντησαν). The literal piercing of the Lord Jesus at Calvary was originally prophesied in Psalm 22:16, which states, “they pierced my hands and my feet.” It was fulfilled at the cross and prophetically affirmed in John’s (19:37) gospel account of the crucifixion, which states, “And again another scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they pierced” (εξεκεντησαν).

In Revelation 1:7, we have a similar Messianic prophetic verse to Zechariah 12:10, “Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him.” The usage of the verb to pierce, “ἐκκεντέω” (ekkenteō) that was used in Revelation 1:7 and John 19:37, is entirely missing in the LXX.

Once again, the blame for either writing or passing this error on, can be placed squarely upon Origen’s shoulders.

Only he has *κατωργήσαντο*. Aquila and Theodotion both put *ἐξεκεντησαν*, and Symmachus used *επεξεκεντησαν*. Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, and Sinaiticus all have Origen's corrupt reading.

## Flood-Related Chronology Corruption

An amazing problem with the LXX, skipping the partial years regarding birthdays and gestations, is that its math requires Methuselah to survive the Flood by more than a dozen years (Johnson, 2008). Genesis 5:25–26, in the Hebrew MT, tells that Methuselah fathered Lamech when Methuselah was 187 years old, and that Methuselah lived 782 years thereafter (i.e., till Methuselah died).

Lamech was 182 years old when he fathered Noah (Genesis 5:28–29). Since Methuselah lived 782 years after Lamech was born, Methuselah lived 600 years after Noah was born (because  $782 - 182 = 600$ ). Noah was in his 600<sup>th</sup> year of age when the Flood commenced (Genesis 7:11). Therefore, the Hebrew MT reports Methuselah dying the year when the Flood hit (Johnson, 2008).

Genesis 5:25–26, in the Greek LXX, tells that Methuselah fathered Lamech when Methuselah was 167 [*ἑκατὸν καὶ ἑξήκοντα ἑπτὰ*] years old, and that Methuselah lived years 802 [*ὀκτακόσια δύο*] thereafter (i.e., till Methuselah died). Genesis 5:27 then says that Methuselah's total lifespan was 969 years ( $167 + 802 = 969$ ).

LXX says that Lamech is 188 [*ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα ὀκτῶ*] years old when Noah is fathered (Genesis 5:28–29). Since LXX says Methuselah lived 802 [*ὀκτακόσια δύο*] years after Lamech was born, so Methuselah would have lived 614 years after Noah was born (because  $802 - 188 = 614$ ). LXX says that Noah was in his 600<sup>th</sup> year of age when the Flood hit (Genesis 7:11); therefore, such that Methuselah would have died 14 years after the Flood started. The obvious and embarrassing problem for the

LXX translation is that Methuselah cannot have survived the Flood, according to Genesis 6–9 and 1 Peter 3:20 (“eight souls were saved by water”).

## Discussion

A recent movement within the creation science community to push a highly-questionable Greek translation of the Old Testament that contains the non-canonical apocryphal writings favorable to the Counter-Reformation agenda is examined by textual analysis of five key Messianic prophecies. In comparing these five prophecies between the LXX and the MT, we find that they have been completely corrupted in the LXX, effectively removing their prophetic connection to the New Testament mission and divinity (and Gospel) of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Our findings are completely contradictory to the unsupported claim of the LXX promoters that post-AD Jews seeking to quench the spread of Christianity altered the chronologies in Genesis in the Hebrew Bible to de-authenticate Jesus as the Messiah. Rather than altering complicated chronologies of interest to an isolated Jewish audience in the Hebrew text, which very few Greek-speaking Christian Gentiles could even understand, would it not make more sense for unbelieving Jews and/or Gentile apostates, conspiring against Christ, to produce a corrupt and deceptive Greek text like the LXX for a much wider audience? The impact on the early church and thereafter would be considerably greater given that Koinê Greek was the international language of the era. In such a case, not only would foundational Messianic prophecies have been corrupted as they are in the LXX, but heretical folk tales such as the writings of the Apocrypha were also added throughout the text, masquerading as “additional” scripture, further polluting the text of the Old Testament and allowing for unbiblical doctrines.

It is also noteworthy that the case for the LXX is also largely based on an assumed BC text which has now been shown to be a highly unreliable assumption, fraught with provenance problems that fail forensic science standards of scrutiny (Daniels, 2017). At this point, it appears the LXX is nothing more than a compilation and synthesis of post-AD corrupt Greek OT translations, in many places sloppily translated (like a paraphrase), and in some theologically sensitive places, mistranslated on purpose. We propose that the Messianic prophecy corruptions were done by either ill-meaning Jews seeking to de-authenticate Jesus as Messiah or gnostic pseudo-Christians seeking to downplay Christ's divinity (e.g. Origen of Alexandria).

It is possible that the different versions of the LXX can serve as important aids in learning and studying the vocabulary and grammar of the Koinê Greek language of the New Testament era. However, given the blatant textual error of the LXX, along with its non-canonical and unbiblical apocryphal writings, we strongly recommend that it be abandoned as a reliable source of chronological information for the creation science community. At the very least, it is inferior to the preserved Hebrew Scriptures that we know as the Masoretic Text. It is the carefully transmitted and providentially preserved Hebrew text (MT) that should be used as the authoritative text for creationist research and for Old Testament Bible study in general.

Furthermore, creationists should also consider how the LXX demonstrates a clashing with the biblical account of the global Flood, by virtue of the texts suggesting that Methuselah survived the Flood! This glaring problem has been noted by some LXX advocates, but none have offered a forensically reliable remedy to this error. Meanwhile, as complicated and distracting chronological/genealogical arguments have waged

back and forth between proponents and opponents, the “elephant in the room” is the pervasive textual corruption that clearly exists in what is today called the LXX, such as has been demonstrated in key Messianic prophecies in the present paper.

### **What's at Stake?—Not Just an Academic Controversy**

Besides the importance of Scripture in creation science research related to origins, created kinds, flood geology, etc., biblical data is particularly relevant to creationists for two more reasons: (1) it affects the biblical doctrine of Scripture's preservation (which involves both miraculous inspiration and providential transmission) and (2) it reflects or hinders the biblical doctrine of Scripture's inerrancy which involves respecting the authority of Scriptural content, as well as its accuracy in all historical and scientific facts, as well as Messianic prophecies—especially those the New Testament verifies.

### **References**

- Bardtke, H., W. Baumgartner, P. A. de Boer, O. Eibfeldt, et al. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia BHS 5th*. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, Germany.
- Brenton, L. C. 1851. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. Samuel Bagster and Sons, Ltd., London, UK.
- Brenton, L. C. 1986. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., Peabody, MA.
- Clarey, T. L. 2017. Local Catastrophes or Receding Floodwater? Global Geologic Data that Refute a K-Pg (K-T) Flood/post-Flood Boundary. *CRSQ* 54:100–120.
- Clarey, T. L., and D. J. Werner. 2017. The Sedimentary Record Demonstrates Minimal Flooding of the Continents During Sauk Deposition. *Answers Research Journal* 10:271–283.
- Cooper, William R. 2017. New Testament Fragments Amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls. Creation Science Movement, Portsmouth, UK.
- Cooper, William R. 2016. The Forging of Codex Sinaiticus. Creation Science Movement, Portsmouth, UK.
- Cosner, L., and R. Carter. 2018. Is the Septuagint a Superior Text for the Genesis Genealogies? (posted on creation.com at <https://creation.com/lxx-mt-response>. Accessed October 11, 2019. Daniels, D. W. 2017. *Did Jesus Use the Septuagint*. Chick Publications, Ontario, CA.
- Daniels, D. 2017. Did Jesus Use the Septuagint? Chick Publications, Ontario CA.
- Johnson, J. J. S. 2008. How Young Is the Earth? Applying Simple Math to Data in Genesis. *Acts & Facts*. 37 (10): 4.
- Johnson, J. J. S. 2012. Tonsils, Forensic Science, and the Recent Fabrication Rule, *Acts & Facts*, 41(6):8–9, at <https://www.icr.org/article/tonsils-forensic-science-recent-fabrication> (Accessed October 11, 2019).
- Marsh, E. C. 2012. The Septuagint versus the Masoretic. <http://ecmarsh.com/lxx-kjv/index.html> (Accessed September 25, 2019).
- Morris II, H. M. 2012. *The Henry Morris Study Bible*. Green Forest, AZ: Master Books.
- Pimiento, C., J. N. Griffin, C. F. Clements, D. Silvestro, et al. 2017. The Pliocene marine megafauna extinction and its impact on functional diversity. *Nat Ecol Evol* 1 (8):1100–1106. doi: 10.1038/s41559-017-0223-6.
- Rahlf, A. 2007. *Septuaginta (Greek Edition)*. Edited by R. Hanhart. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, Germany.
- Sexton, J. 2015. Who Was Born When Enosh Was 90? A Semantic Reevaluation of William Henry Green's Chronological Gaps. *Westminster Theological Journal* 77:193–218.
- Smith, H. B. 2018. The case for the Septuagint's chronology in Genesis 5 and 11. Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Creationism, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Thiede, C. P. 2001. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Jewish Origins of Christianity*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, UK.
- Thiede, C. P., and M. d'Ancona. 1996. Eyewitness to Jesus: Amazing New Manuscript Evidence about the Origin of the Gospels. Doubleday, London, UK.
- Tomkins, J. P. 2018. Evolutionists Can't Fill the Hexapod Gap. *Acts & Facts* 47 (8).
- Tomkins, J. P., and T. L. Clarey. 2018a. Darwin's Abominable Mystery and the Genesis Flood. *Acts & Facts* 47(6).
- Tomkins, J. P., and T. L. Clarey. 2018b. Building a Biblical Paleo-Biogeography Model. *Acts & Facts* 47(9).
- Tomkins, J. P., and T. L. Clarey. 2019. Global Whale Fossil Distribution Reveals Post-Flood Boundary. *Acts & Facts* 48(9).
- Wise, K. 2017. Step-Down Saltational Intra-baraminic Diversification. *Journal of Creation Theology and Science Series B: Life Sciences* 7:1–9.
- Wise, K. P. 2009. Mammal Kinds: How Many Were on the Ark? In *Genesis Kinds: Creationism and the Origin of Species*, edited by T. C. Wood and P. A. Garner. Wipf and Stock, Eugene, OR.
- Woodward, S. D. 2018. Rebooting the Bible, Part 1.
- Woodward, S. D. 2019. *A Biography of the Christian Bible*. Faith Happens Books, Oklahoma City, OK.