

## Raising Cainan

Once again I am given occasion to 'raise Cainan', but the last word on the matter must rest with the apostle in his exhortations of 1 Timothy 1:4 and Titus 3:9.

In my letter of *CENTJ*11:(3):328, entitled 'Cainan of Luke 3:36', I am recorded as saying '*...from where, presumably, Luke recorded ...*' while the paper I submitted was punctuated differently, i.e. '*...from where, presumably Luke, recorded...*'

I would not have given this misplaced comma a second thought had not Jonathan Sarfati, seemingly on the basis of the mistaken punctuation, contentiously accused me of attempting to reconcile Luke 3:36 and Genesis 11:12 by theorizing that Luke used an inaccurate source to compile his genealogy (*CENTJ* 12(1):39-40). Had the comma been placed after '*... Luke ...*', as in the submitted paper, would he have so vehemently accused me of denying Luke's authorship of the entire Gospel?

Perhaps he did not read reference 2 after my initial article, where I suggested that 'Luke's' Cainan and the Kainam of Jubilees may have both referred to a common tradition, inspired but extrascriptural, cf. Jude 14, 15 and Enoch 1:9?

While that is an outside possibility it is so slight as to warrant being ignored; the name is missing from Luke 3:36 in the Papyrus Bodmer 14, 15 (of about AD 200) and its presence there was rejected by Irenaeus, Africanus, Eusebius and Jerome.

May I ask Dr Sarfati if the omission of even one, let alone an unspecified number of patriarchs in the scriptural genealogies as was suggested, using Cainan as a flimsy pretext, in *The Genesis Flood* and regurgitated by one 'evangelical' writer after another — a tradition that will doubtless be kept up by future contributors to this magazine — is logically possible for any writing

inspired by the Spirit of Truth? This is the point I was making in the initial letter.

In the early days of archaeology peoples and individuals referred to in excavations were frequently identified with biblical entities, merely on the ground of similar sounding names (e.g. Shoshenq with Shishak, although he lived a century later, mentioned in my following letter of *CENTJ* 11:3, *Archaeology and Chronology*, where, incidentally, you have me dating him at around 80 BC, while my actual letter said 800 BC). So we get the Amurru, westerners, of Akkadian inscriptions equated with the Amorites, although the kings mentioned in Genesis 14, identified with the Amurru, attacked the Amorites (Genesis 14:9); the Hurrians of Asia Minor and Syria with the Horites of Mount Seir, although archaeology reveals no Hurrian presence in Transjordan; and the Habiru of the Tell-el-Amarna letters with the Hebrews, although the Habiru attacked Byblos in Lebanon which was well away from the Hebrew area of attack.

In *CENTJ* 11:2, p.198, Sarfati offers the identification of the Hattusa civilization in Asia Minor with the Hittites as a vindication of Bible history. Such an identification is popular but unfounded; the Hattusa civilization was Indo-European, while the Hittites of Palestine were apparently Hebrew-speaking and racially Hamitic.

As I referred to this in reference 5 of *Archaeology and Chronology* I have obviously trod on his toes. Possibly this is behind his adverse and unwarranted criticisms of what I have written.

Derel Briarley  
Newcastle upon Tyne  
UNITED KINGDOM

Jonathan Sarfati replies:

The apostle Paul's exhortations in

1 Tim. 1:4 and Titus 3:9 couldn't have been referring to biblical genealogies, but were probably referring to extrabiblical legends inspiring Gnostic teachings.

Naturally, I had only the printed version of the letter to go by, and had no idea of the 'misplaced comma'. But the grammar of the original seems to be incorrect, so understandably the editor moved the comma. Did Derel Briarley mean 'the author, presumably Luke' ...? I can't see how it makes much difference.

Indeed, I would have been worried if DB had denied Luke's authorship (which he appears not to). But this is not explicitly stated in Scripture, even if it is a very reliable tradition and makes good sense internally. But it is even more worrying to see hints that a scriptural author might have used an inaccurate source — I'm not the only one who read DB's letter this way. I'm pleased that DB appears to repudiate this theory.

Jude's apparent citation of the Book of Enoch is different — the Holy Spirit is entitled to lead an author to cite an *accurate section* of an uninspired book, as opposed to incorporating an *inexact name*.

It is unwarranted to claim that Morris and Whitcomb and those who cite them are 'evangelical' in quotes because they assert gaps in the genealogy of Gen. 11. Their reasoning might be dubious, in particular since the ages of the patriarchs at the births of their key sons were given. But at least they tried to base their view on Scripture and not secular long-age ideas. And to be fair, Morris in his book *The Genesis Record*, written 15 years after *The Genesis Flood*, seemed to favour a gapless chronology. It must also be pointed out that neither the authors nor anyone else claimed that *The Genesis Flood* was inspired like Scripture.

I can assure DB that I had no objection to his letter 'Archaeology and Chronology'. To be honest, I didn't even notice that the two letters

in *CENTJ* 11(3):328-9 had the same author. More importantly, I thought it was *useful* of him to point out the problems in secular chronology and recommend books like *Centuries of Darkness*. DB's point about the Hittites is reasonable, and if I had strongly objected to that I would have said so, not attacked something unrelated.

However, his evidence is not conclusive, even though it could well be right. The Hattusan Empire might have had outposts in Palestine, in which case they might have learnt the Hebraic language of the area and intermarried with the Canaanites. We know that the Hattusans under Muwatallis did have the better of a draw against the Pharaoh Ramesses II in the famous Battle of Kadesh in Syria. For comparison, I am a Jew, but I live far from my ancestral homeland, speak an Indo-European tongue and have a lot of Japhetic blood.

Jonathan Sarfati  
Brisbane  
AUSTRALIA

## Logic and creation: but what sort of logic?

Dr Sarfati's overview of logic<sup>1</sup> is timely and useful, as many Creationists and Evolutionists do not know when their arguments are valid. Much material produced by both sides convinces only those already convinced.

But caution is needed. However self-evident the application of logic to Scripture may appear to those who think logically, we should avoid believing that the Bible is consistent with, or can be analysed using, Aristotelian logic.

Western reasoning, including Aristotelian logic, is due to Plato and Aristotle, whose approach displaced

a more informal, rhetorical epistemology. These Greeks practised, and approved of,<sup>2</sup> homosexual paedophilia. Such depravity was the end result of their refusal to acknowledge God and give Him thanks (Romans 1:18-32). Since *'The fear of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge'* (Proverbs 1:7), these men did not even **begin** to find knowledge. They stumbled in darkness (contrast Isaiah 45:19). Yet their way of reasoning, the foundation of modern epistemology, by denying validity to other ways, arrogantly stands to judge whether God's way is valid. No wonder God destroys Greek 'wisdom' (1 Corinthians 1:19—22). So how can Greek methods be the right way to seek Truth (Romans 12:2)?

Nor is Aristotle's the only system of formal logic. Mathematician Cantor, working on infinite subsets of the natural numbers, showed that Aristotelian logic was applicable only to finite sets; later, self-consistent non-Aristotelian logics were developed.<sup>3</sup> Although Aristotelian logic helps solve practical problems, it is neither God-given nor unassailable.

Aristotelian logic assumes that problems can be subdivided, and each sub-problem determined to be either 'true' or 'false'. For real-life problems, the process usually results in some loss of integrity in the problem studied (i.e. the problem is more than the sum of its analysed parts). The rigid true/false dichotomy also makes the solution appear more clear-cut than it actually is.

Spurious confidence in the validity of the analysis also stems from a more fundamental problem: although inconsistent solutions are rejected, the best solution cannot be determined. The method does not make clear that the solution obtained may be suboptimal. Hence, people are sometimes trapped into logically unassailable, but intuitively bad, solutions. In principle, any non-trivial problem can be analysed in many ways, depending upon what aspects

of the problem are regarded as 'important'. Each approach gives a different, logically impeccable solution. Hence any particular solution is only one of many, and unlikely to be the best. Aristotle's method cannot help to decide how to divide up the problem in order to find the best. The most important stage in the analysis must be done subjectively, with no way of knowing whether a different division might be better. This subjectivity is the method's greatest weakness.

Nevertheless, by using analysis, modern science is very successful where irregularity and uncertainty are least apparent, and feedback from its results is strong (e.g. does the technology work?). It is less widely appreciated that exclusive emphasis on this way of thinking results in cultural and metaphysical loss. Many people believe logical scientific method is the *only* valid epistemology. Clearly not — this methodology with its ruthless logic fails when consistently applied to human relationships. Those who try are soon friendless!

In everyday life, people use a less rigorous, less 'black and white', logic, that copes with vagueness and uncertainty, and suits the way people reason, which is associatively rather than by deduction.<sup>4</sup> If people commonly draw conclusions that conflict with Aristotle's logic, we should consider whether they are using another logic, rather than simply conclude that their thinking is fallacious. Their thinking may be rational, reflecting either a different set of 'important factors to allow for', or be a correct conclusion in a different logic. Such a logic may well, like real life, be incapable of being made formally consistent!

Someone else's logic may appear incomprehensible! Anyone who studies philosophy discovers philosophers, presumably intelligent and thinking men, whose conclusions appear nonsensical. Whatever our opinion, their conclusions made sense to them. We should not assume that