

## Cainan: in or out?

From comparison of almost any modern Bible translation of Luke's genealogy (Luke 3:23–38) with the list of post-Flood patriarchs in Genesis 11:10–26 it is noticeable that an extra name appears in the genealogy of Luke. This name, 'Cainan', occurs in Luke 3:36, so that Arphaxad is the progenitor of Cainan, who is the progenitor of Shelah. The name is also present in the Septuagint of Genesis,<sup>1</sup> but is absent from the Masoretic Text and Samaritan Pentateuch. Possible categories of explanation for this phenomenon have been listed by Williams.<sup>2</sup> Two Greek manuscripts of Luke omit Cainan's name, and it is natural therefore that the possibility should be raised that a scribal error has occurred in the copying of Luke's Gospel, and that Cainan's name should be viewed as an addition and not part of the original composition.<sup>3</sup> The purpose of this letter is simply to consider the evidence of New Testament manuscripts for this proposal.

One of the manuscripts to make the omission is Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis, or Codex D, normally now dated to the fifth century AD and located in the University Library of Cambridge. This manuscript, which contains the Gospels and Acts in Greek and Latin, varies notoriously from other manuscripts, particularly in the book of Acts. In order to assess its relevance as a witness, the whole genealogy it gives in Luke's Gospel is given here in my translation of the Greek text (which is in essential agreement with the Latin):<sup>4</sup>

*'Jesus was about 30 years old, beginning, as it was thought, to be son of Joseph, son of Jacob, son of Matthan, son of Eleazar, son of Eliud, son of Jachein, son of Zadok, son of Azor, son of Eliakim, son of Abiud, son of Zorobabel, son of Salathiel, son of Jechoniou, son of Joakim, son of Eliakim, son of Josiah, son of Amos, son of Ma-*

*nasseh, son of Hezekiah, son of Ahaz, son of Jotham, son of Uzziah, son of Amaziah, son of Joash, son of Ahaziah, son of Joram, son of Jehoshaphat, son of Asaph, son of Abiud, son of Rehoboam, son of Solomon, son of David, son of Jesse, son of Obed [originally miswritten Obel],<sup>5</sup> son of Boaz, son of Salmon, son of Nahshon, son of Aminadab, son of Aram, son of Hezron, son of Perez, son of Judah, son of Jacob, son of Isaac, son of Abraham, son of Terah, son of Nahor, son of Serug, son of Ragau, son of Peleg, son of Eber, son of Sala, son of Arphaxad, son of Shem, son of Noah, son of Lamech, son of Methuselah, son of Enoch, son of Jared, son of Mahalalel, son of Cainan, son of Enosh, son of Seth, son of Adam, son of God.'*

A few things are immediately noticeable about this genealogy.

1. It agrees broadly with traditional readings for the names between Adam and Noah, and between Abraham and David.
2. Between Noah and Abraham it omits Cainan's name.
3. Between David and Jesus it is basically a copy of Matthew's genealogy, but, of course, in the reverse of Matthew's order. (The Greek of Codex D is not extant for Matthew's genealogy, though Matthew 1:12 onwards survives in the Latin text.)
4. Where Matthew omits three generations (Matthew 1:8) between Joram and Uzziah, Codex D supplies them.
5. Where Matthew records Josiah as progenitor of Jeconiah (Jehoiachin), Codex D adds two names between them, namely Eliakim and Jehoiakim. These were in fact the same person (2 Kings 23:34).

From this survey and observations 3 and 4 we see that the person(s) responsible for the text has/have clearly been creative rather than simply having tried to copy what they received. As part of this process they assimilated the text to other parts of the

NT (3), and also assimilated the part of the NT they used to texts from the OT (4). This is also done in the addition of the names Eliakim and Jehoiakim (5), though involving a mistake. It would therefore be no surprise if, as regards the omission of Cainan's name, they also produced their text by comparison with the OT. Given the demonstrated tendency to assimilate to parallel texts, it might well have been expected that the producers of the manuscript or its textual tradition would have omitted the name 'Cainan' in order to produce a harmony with manuscripts of the OT that they consulted. This manuscript therefore provides a very precarious basis for omitting Cainan's name.

The other manuscript to omit Cainan's name is P<sup>75</sup> (Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV). It contains parts of Luke and John and is very early, usually dated to the third century. It is fragmentary, and the genealogy is not extant before Judah's name in Luke 3:34. The text that the manuscript displays is less wild than that of Codex D.<sup>6</sup> Its omission of Cainan's name is inferred by the editors on grounds of lack of space in a fragmentary line.<sup>7</sup> By my judgment of space requirements from the printed page, the editors seem to be correct in this, but since the relevant section of the manuscript was one of the few ones for which they did not produce a photograph to accompany the printed text, it has not been possible for me to verify this.

Larry Pierce suggests that *'it is most likely that this reading [including Cainan] in Luke 3:36 is not original but a post-AD 220 interpolation'*.<sup>8</sup> Again caution is called for. The name, or at least three or four visible letters of it and the requisite space for the name, is present in P<sup>49</sup>, a fragmentary papyrus normally dated to the third century, but which Carsten Peter Thiede has recently assessed as coming from a date *'not much later than that of P<sup>64</sup>/P<sup>67</sup>'*,<sup>10</sup> which he famously and controversially claimed could be the earliest manuscript of the NT dating from the first century AD.<sup>11</sup> Thiede's datings, however, have not generally

been accepted.

To conclude, there are two manuscripts bearing witness to the omission of Cainan's name in Luke's Gospel. One of these shows obvious signs of textual alteration. The other is certainly very early. However, these manuscripts provide an inadequate basis to confirm the supposition that a scribal error has been introduced into Luke. English Bible translations in the relevant points in Genesis 11 and Luke 3 seem to be made from the most reliable manuscript bases, even if this leaves us with an issue of how we should understand the relationship between the two passages. The purpose of the letter is to discourage those seeking a quick fix to a problem from latching onto a textual solution which in fact raises additional problems. Perhaps future textual discoveries will alter the balance of the situation, but at present the evidence discourages us from too confident a claim that error has occurred in the scribal transmission of Luke's Gospel.

Pete Williams  
Cambridge  
UNITED KINGDOM

## References

1. Williams, P.J., Some remarks preliminary to a biblical chronology, *CEN Tech. J.* **12**(1):98–106, esp. note 9, 1998. It should be noted that the Septuagint differs from the Masoretic Text not just in Genesis 11:12–13, but also in Genesis 10. Its contrasting readings are as follows: *'The sons of Shem: Elam and Asshur and Arphaxad and Lud and Aram and Kainan' (Genesis 10:22); 'And Arphaxad begot Kainan and Kainan begot Shelah ...'* (Genesis 10:24). That variant readings occur in more than one place, clearly and painfully indicates to us that differences between the Masoretic Text and Septuagint result, at least at some level, from deliberate changes having been introduced in one of them or their forbears.
2. Williams, Ref. 1, p. 103.
3. Pierce, L., Cainan in Luke 3:36: insight from Josephus, *CEN Tech. J.* **13**(2):75–76, 1999. Pierce claims support from Josephus for positing that the Septuagint originally did not have the name. However, caution is necessary here since Josephus had access to texts in both Hebrew and Greek, which he may have used eclectically so that in the case of the genealogy of Genesis 11, *'The dates*

*given by Jos ... consistently follow neither the MT nor the LXX'*; in: Franxman, T.W., *Genesis and the 'Jewish Antiquities' of Flavius Josephus*, Biblical Institute Press, Rome, p. 16, 1979. The standard view of those who study Josephus, as far as I can tell, is that Josephus was not averse to emending the biblical text to remove chronological difficulties he perceived or to improve his chronological scheme. For this see Feldman, L.H., *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*, E.J. Brill, Leiden, Boston, Köln, p. 561, 1998, and Bosse, A., *Die chronologischen Systeme im Alten Testament und bei Josephus*, Wolf Peiser Verlag, Berlin, p. 36, 1908. A possible example of this may be where he claims that Shem begot Arphaxad twelve years after the flood (Antiquities 1.150) in contrast to the Masoretic Text and Septuagint, which state that this occurred two years after the flood (Genesis 11:10). This gives an indication of how careful we must be in using Josephus' information.

4. I have examined the manuscript in: *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis: Quattor Evangelia et Actus Apostolorum Complectens Graece et Latine, Sumptibus Academiae Phototypice Repraesentatus, Tomus Posterior*, Sumptibus Academiae, Cambridge, 1899. I have adopted many conventional English spellings of names, but in a few cases the names have been transliterated precisely.
5. Scrivener, F.H., *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis, Being an Exact Copy, in Ordinary Type, of the Celebrated Uncial Graeco-Latin Manuscript of the Four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles ...*, Deighton, Bell, and Co., Cambridge, p. 435, 1864.
6. It omits John 7:53–8:12 and shows some affinity to Codex Vaticanus (B), which it may precede by over a century.
7. Martin, V., and Kasser, R., *Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Evangile de Luc chap. 3–24*, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, Cologny-Genève, p. 33, 1961.
8. Pierce, L., Letters to the Editor, *CEN Tech. J.* **14**(1):51, 2000.
9. Merell, J., Nouveaux fragments du Papyrus 4, *Revue Biblique* **47**:5–22, 1938.
10. Thiede, C.P., Notes on P<sup>4</sup> = Bibliothèque Nationale Paris, Supplementum Graece 1120/5, *Tyndale Bulletin* **46**:55–57, esp. p. 57, 1995.
11. Thiede, C.P., Papyrus Magdalen Greek 17 (Gregory-Aland P<sup>64</sup>): a reappraisal, *Tyndale Bulletin* **46**:29–42, 1995.



Photo by David Jaeger

## Larry Pierce replies

Pete Williams' letter has produced nothing to disprove the contention that Cainan in Luke 3:36 is a spurious addition,<sup>1</sup> and instead leaves us with an unresolved biblical discrepancy.

To summarise the reasons I stand by my claim:

- 1) 100% certainty that Cainan was never in the Masoretic Hebrew text.
  - Dr Williams himself has provided excellent documentation why Masoretic readings should be preferred over the LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch.<sup>2</sup>
  - Parallel passage in Chronicles would have to be corrupted.
  - The Samaritan Pentateuch, written at the time of the LXX, does not have it
- 2) 99% certain that Cainan was never in the original LXX.
  - The Samaritan Pentateuch, written at the time of the LXX, does not have it.
  - Josephus, who obviously used the LXX for his genealogy (because of the numbers), never mentioned it (AD 93). Even William's theory in his footnote 2, that Josephus used the MT and LXX eclectically, is not proof that the LXX at the time had the extra Cainan, and even if it did, Josephus evidently didn't believe it was genuine.
  - Julius Africanus did not mention Cainan and he used the LXX (AD 220).
- 3) 90% certain that Cainan was not in the original manuscript of Luke.
  - Omitted by church fathers before AD 220.
  - Earliest copy of Luke omits it.

Therefore, we should not use Luke 3:36 to prove gaps in genealogies — and certainly biblioseptics, if they had any integrity, would cease using this as 'evidence' for biblical errancy. I would be much more convinced if all the citations from the LXX by early writers included Cainan, the Samaritan Pentateuch had it and all extant Greek manuscript copies of Luke had it. There is more than reasonable doubt

that Cainan in Luke 3:36 ever existed except as a scribal error.

Larry Pierce  
Winterbourne, Ontario  
CANADA

### References

1. The information supporting this has been collated from *CEN Tech. J.* letters by Jonathan Sarfati and me, and posted on the AiG Website at <<http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/3748.asp>>.
2. Williams, P.J., Some remarks preliminary to a biblical chronology, *CEN Tech. J.* **12**(1):98–106, 1998.

## Integrating Flood models?

This contribution by A.C. McIntosh, T. Edmonston and S.T. Taylor<sup>1</sup> has an aura of spreading oil on the troubled waters of the Noachian Flood. Even today however, oil on the water is a bane to the ecologist, and leaves an undesirable mess to clean up. There is a need to sound out the ground we build on, for fear that we have chosen the unconsolidated site of an abandoned municipal dump! A lasting monument to the foregoing, I imagine, is the leaning tower of Pisa.

The authors display a temperature profile (attributed to Rush and Vardiman<sup>2</sup>) with the express purpose of down-playing the feasibility of the vapour canopy model, the gist of which suggests that, if the volume of ‘waters which were above the firmament’ had initially stemmed from water that exceeded the height of hip rubber boots, the biological community below would have been poached. So when Scripture says, ‘a firmament in the **midst** [Hebrew **middle**] of the waters’, we are obliged to consider it synonymous to saying, ‘a ship in the **middle** of the ocean’. That in reality would equate the ‘windows of heaven’ (from which **the Bible says**, the 40 days and 40 nights of rain fell), as just subducting sea floors, and erupting fountains of the great deep!

The fact that according to Baumgardner ‘there is presently **no ocean floor on earth that predates** [isotopically dated I suppose?<sup>3</sup>] the fossiliferous strata’ (emphasis and parenthesis mine), implies that the **entire** ocean floor subducted! As to floodwater temperatures and subduction, the present ocean floors cover 5,440,200 square miles of mantle with a sub-crustal surface temperature exceeding 2,000 °F.<sup>5</sup> What exposing the waters below the firmament to such a gigantic crucible would do as to temperature, is more than I can imagine. The very existence of the waters which were above the firmament (their elevation and vapour consistency) I would suggest, is accounted for as having been necessary for the absorption and removal of earth’s primordial heat. Hence the vapour canopy (‘**the waters which were above the firmament**’)!  
‘Evidence for rapid reversals has been discovered in thin lava flows.’<sup>4</sup>

Are we to understand from that, that each lava flow indicates an historical geomagnetic reversal? Maybe we need to get back to basic magnetism! Is it not obvious, that the magnetic direction of each succeeding flow, being thin, was in direct response to its predecessor, and not the effect of the **global** geomagnetic field? Set one magnet in any direction and overlay it with another magnet, and it matters not what direction the global field may be, those basic rudimentary laws (**like poles repel, unlike poles attract**) will apply. A sequential description then, would suggest that the magnetic elements in the initial flow of the lava (on solidifying), were set directionally. The next flow being in a fluid state, and overlaying its predecessor, before solidifying adjusted magnetically (**like poles repel, unlike poles attract**) in a reverse direction, and so on up through the subsequent flows. I have never heard of one geomagnetic reversal proposition that I felt bore the weight of the paper it was written on. The Bible says that along with the founding of the world, God created the north and the south (Psalm 89:11–12). From the foregoing it appears that it was neither well founded nor created.

Every cartographer and navigator from antiquity, can be thankful that such is not the case.

It is my hope that anyone reading reference 48 will realize that ‘the waters of Noah’ (Isaiah 54:9) certainly **did not** issue from the oceans. The flood narrative clearly gives ‘the windows of heaven’ and ‘the fountains of the great deep’ as their source. Consequently, they bear no association whatsoever with the bounds referred to in Psalm 104:9. Likewise, Jeremiah 5:22 refers to the placing of the sand for a perpetual boundary for the waters of the sea. These bounds were placed there at the gathering together on the third day of Creation and those waters have never covered the earth again!

**I will reiterate ‘the waters of Noah’ (Isaiah 54:9) certainly did not issue from the oceans.** The flood narrative clearly gives ‘the windows of heaven’ and ‘the fountains of the great deep’ as their source. Consequently they bear no association whatsoever with the bounds referred to in Psalm 104:9. If those sea waters, bounded on day three (Psalm 104:9), constituted ‘the waters of Noah’, the Scripture need only have said, ‘Let the waters be gathered together and let the dry land **disappear**’, and because no substantial amount of water would be added from ‘above the firmament’, the oceans would lack sea mounts, and submerged shore lines bordering continental shelves. Fully 15 % of the ocean surface covers continental shelves!<sup>5</sup>

William L Tompkins  
Toronto, Ontario  
CANADA

### References

1. McIntosh, C., Edmonston T. and Taylor, S.T., Flood models: the need for an integrated approach, *CEN Tech. J.* **14**(1):52–59, 2000.
2. McIntosh *et al.*, Ref. 1, p. 53.
3. In this context see Walker, T., Radioactive decay rate depends on chemical environment, *CEN Tech. J.* **14**(1):4, 2000.
4. McIntosh *et al.*, Ref. 1, p. 55.
5. *Comptons New Century Encyclopedia*, Version 2.00.