



Endnotes for *Wild West Evangelical Hermeneutics, Part Three: The Patriarchal Life Spans*

Summer/Fall 2022 *Bible and Spade*

Notes

¹ Jeremy Sexton, “Evangelicalism’s Search for Chronological Gaps in Genesis 5 and 11: A Historical, Hermeneutical, and Linguistic Critique,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 61, no. 1 (March 2018): 25.

² Jeremy Sexton, “Who Was Born When Enosh Was 90? A Semantic Reevaluation of William Henry Green’s Chronological Gaps,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 77, no. 2 (Fall 2015): 195.

³ Sexton, 196.

⁴ Sexton, 195–96; Jeremy Sexton and Henry B. Smith Jr., “Primeval Chronology Restored: Revisiting the Genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11,” *Bible and Spade* 29, no. 2 (Spring/Summer 2016): 43.

⁵ Putnam notes that when a verb does not occur in the Qal stem, the Hiphil can function as a simple transitive verb. When a verb occurs in the Qal and Niphal stems, the Hiphil form of the same verb is most often causative. Such is the case here with *yālad*. See Frederic Clarke Putnam, *A New Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2010), 176.

⁶ Christo H. J. van der Merwe, Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 86.

⁷ Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 435.

⁸ Waltke and O’Connor, 435.

⁹ Jeremy Sexton, “Andrew E. Steinmann’s Search for Chronological Gaps in Genesis 5 and 11: A Rejoinder,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 61, no. 1 (March 2018): 39. Steinmann would assert that an unspecified triggering action of causation, instead of the actual birth of Enoch, occurred in the 162nd year of Jared’s life. Enoch was then born at some later, unknown time (perhaps centuries or even millennia later). This would allow for chronological gaps in Gen 5/11 (Andrew E. Steinmann, “Gaps in the Genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11?,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 174 [April–June 2017]: 145–48). Sexton explains:

Steinmann assumes that the semantic focus of יָלַד in the *hiphil* and *hophal* (i.e. in the H-stem) is on the progenitor’s causing action rather than the progeny’s birth. Consider the impossibility of reconciling this assumption with Gen 40:20; Ezek 16:4, 5. In each of these three verses, the H-stem of יָלַד focuses on “the day” of *birth*. Ezekiel 16:4, 5 refer to “the day on which *you were brought forth* [H-stem of יָלַד].” The temporal qualifier “the day on which” refers to the time of the progeny’s birth, not the time of the progenitor’s causing action. (“Steinmann’s Search,” 40 n. 2 [italics and brackets original])

The same critique applies to Gen 5/11, where two temporal qualifiers (begetting age and remaining years) limit the birth of the named descendant to one precise year in the life of the progenitor. For a decisive refutation of Steinmann’s eisegesis, see Sexton, “Evangelicalism’s Search,” 5–25; Sexton, “Steinmann’s Search,” 39–45; Sexton, “Who Was Born?,” 195–209. Steinmann’s case for chronological gaps in Gen 5/11 is ultimately driven by flawed hermeneutics. He openly admits that human interpretations of ANE evidence can exert magisterial control over the sacred text of Scripture. Gen 5/11 must contain gaps, because ANE archaeologists assign dates that conflict with the primeval chronology to archaeological remains (Steinmann, “Gaps in the Genealogies,” 141, 154).

¹⁰ Sexton, “Who Was Born?,” 197 n. 37.

¹¹ Sexton, 197–201; Sexton, “Evangelicalism’s Search”; Sexton, “Steinmann’s Search.”

¹² Ronald J. Williams, *Williams’ Hebrew Syntax*, revised and expanded by John C. Beckman, 3rd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 133, 179.

¹³ Genesis 5:7, 5:10, 5:13, 5:16, 5:19, 5:22, 5:26, 5:30; 11:11, 11:13, 11:15, 11:17, 11:19, 11:21, 11:23, 11:25.

¹⁴ J. Paul Tanner, “The Genealogies of Genesis 5 & 11: Reasons for Understanding These as Gapless Chronologies” (paper, Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, San Antonio, TX, November 17, 2016), 17.

¹⁵ Just a few examples include the following: Gleason L. Archer Jr., “The Chronology of the Old Testament,” in *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary: With the New International Version*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelien, vol. 1 of 12, *Introductory Articles* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979), 361; C. John Collins, “How Old Is the Earth? Anthropomorphic Days in Genesis 1:1-2:3,” *Presbyterion* 20, no. 2 (September 1994): 115–16; Frederic Gardiner, “The Chronological Value of the Genealogy in Genesis V,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 30, no. 118 (April 1873): 323–33; Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17*, *The New International Commentary on the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 254; Derek Kidner, *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary*, *Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries* 1 (Chicago: InterVarsity, 1967), 82–83; Kenneth A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and the Old Testament* (London: InterVarsity, 1966), 39; Kenneth A. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 440–41; Hugh Ross, *The Genesis Question: Scientific Advances and the Accuracy of Genesis*, 2nd ed. (Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress, 2001), 109; Francis A. Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1975), 37–38; Merrill F. Unger, *Introductory Guide to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1951), 194. Many more could be cited.

¹⁶ Gardiner, “Chronological Value,” 325 (italics added).

¹⁷ “How Old Is the Earth?,” 115–16 (italics original).

¹⁸ Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict*, 37 (italics added).

¹⁹ Daniel J. Dyke and Hugh Henry, “Genesis 5 and 11 Genealogies in the Context of the Biblical Mindset” (paper, Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, San Antonio, TX, November 17, 2016), 25, 31, 42, 34 (italics added).

²⁰ Using the abbreviation “PN” to designate unstated personal names inserted between the named patriarchs, Tanner explains further:

If indeed PN₂ really means “*the line that resulted in PN₂*,” it still must be true that “PN₁ lived X (number of years) *after* “*the line that resulted in PN₂*.” Using . . . the example of Mahalalel and Jared, if someone wants to argue that Gen 5:15 means “Mahalalel lived sixty-five years, and became the father of *the line that resulted in Jared*,” then he must also be consistent and say that Gen 5:16 means “Then Mahalalel lived eight hundred and thirty years after he became the father [infinitive of *yālad*] of *the line that resulted in Jared*.” One cannot limit Mahalalel’s 830 years to the first link in the chain; it is the whole chain including Jared. (“Gapless Chronologies,” 18 [italics original])

²¹ Ross, *Genesis Question*, 177.

²² John Millam, “The Genesis Genealogies: Are They Complete?,” Evidence for God from Science, September 3, 2010, http://www.godandscience.org/youngearth/genesis_genealogies.html, 21 n. 10.

²³ B. B. Warfield, “The Manner and Time of Man’s Origin,” in *Evolution, Science, and Scripture: Selected Writings*, ed. David N. Livingstone and Mark A. Noll (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2000), 222.

²⁴ Fazale Rana with Hugh Ross, *Who Was Adam? A Creation Model Approach to the Origin of Humanity*, second expanded ed. (Covina, CA: RTB, 2015), 376.

²⁵ James A. Borland and Duane L. Christensen, “Did People Live to Be Hundreds of Years Old before the Flood?,” in *The Genesis Debate: Persistent Questions about Creation and the Flood*, ed. Ronald Youngblood (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1999), 178, 182 n. 22.

²⁶ Borland and Christensen, 177.

²⁷ C. John Collins, *Genesis 1–4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2005), 204–206.

²⁸ “Genesis 5 and 11 Genealogies,” 26–29, 52–53. For more, see D. A. Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984).

²⁹ “Genesis Genealogies.”

³⁰ See endnote 15.

³¹ Bernard White, “Revisiting Genesis 5 and 11: A Closer Look at the Chronogenealogies,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 53, no. 2 (2015): 257 (emphasis added).

³² Jason S. DeRouchie, “The Blessing-Commission, the Promised Offspring, and the *Toledot* Structure of Genesis,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 56, no. 2 (June 2013): 219–47.

³³ This same form is also used in Genesis 4:1 (Eve bearing Cain), 4:17 (Cain's wife bearing Enoch), and 4:20 (Lamech's wife Adah bearing Jabal). It is also used in Genesis 16:15 in describing Hagar giving birth to Ishmael, as well as in Genesis 21:2, where Sarah gives birth to Isaac.

³⁴ Van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze, *Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, 315.

³⁵ "Zillah *also bore* Tubal-cain."

³⁶ "To Shem, the father of all the children of Eber, the brother of Japheth the elder, [children] *were also born*" (my translation).

³⁷ "The firstborn bore a son and called his name Moab. He is the father of the Moabites to this day. The younger *also bore a son* and called his name Ben-ammi. He is the father of the Ammonites to this day."

³⁸ "Milcah *also has borne children* to your brother Nahor....' Moreover, his concubine, whose name was Reumah, bore Tebah, Gaham, Tahash, and Maacah."

³⁹ Mathews observes that there is an "extended parallelism" between 2:4a and 5:2b and between 2:4b and 5:1a (Kenneth A. Mathews, *Genesis 1–11:26*, The New American Commentary, vol. 1A [Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996], 307 n. 36).

⁴⁰ I follow the LXX's numbers here over the MT's, based on the work published in the Genesis 5 and 11 Genealogy and Chronology Research Project.

⁴¹ "Son" (בֶּן) does not appear in any of the extant textual traditions preserving Genesis 5:3. However, it can be implied grammatically: "Both the Greek and the Hebrew can be read meaningfully by making 'Seth' at the end of the verse do double duty, i.e. modify both 'called his name' and 'begat,' although admittedly this is an unusual construction" (John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 35 [Atlanta: Scholars, 1993], 69). See also Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, trans. John J. Scullion, from German, Continental Commentary Series (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 346, note to 3a. It is also possible that "son" (בֶּן) dropped out due to scribal error. Wilson notes that it may have been omitted due to homoeoarchton (a scribal error caused by two words or phrases that begin similarly) (Robert R. Wilson, *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World*, Yale Near Eastern Researches 7 [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977], 161 n. 58). Similarly, Ronald S. Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1–11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 49–50, 130.

⁴² "Image" is in parallel with Gen 1:26 (K. Luke, "The Genealogies in Genesis 5," *Indian Theological Studies* 18, no. 3 [September 1981]: 232).

⁴³ The formula is then completed: "Thus all the days that Adam lived were 930 years, and he died" (Gn 5:5). The epitaph provides further evidence for the legitimacy of chronological computation, as the year of begetting Seth (230) can be added to the years lived after begetting Seth (700) to provide the reader with a chronological cross-check with Adam's life span (930).

⁴⁴ William Henry Green, for example, asserted that chronological computation does not or cannot extend across three generations of patriarchs in Gen 5 (and 11). See "Primeval Chronology," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 47 (April 1890): 297.

⁴⁵ "The language of 4:25–26 is virtually identical to 5:2–3, and taken together they form a chiasmus" (Mathews, *Genesis 1–11:26*, 309).

⁴⁶ "The pattern that determines the whole genealogy begins in v. 3" (Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 356).

⁴⁷ Nahum M. Sarna, *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, The JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 41.

⁴⁸ The LXX's numbers for Lamech (188/565/753) place Methuselah's death six years before the Flood and 2,262 years from Adam. I have concluded that the MT preserves the original figures for Lamech (182/595/777). This places Methuselah's death in the year of the Flood and 2,256 years from the creation of Adam (instead of the MT's 1,656 years). For more, see Henry B. Smith Jr., "The Case for the Septuagint's Chronology in Genesis 5 and 11," in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Creationism, July 29–August 1, 2018*, ed. John H. Whitmore (Pittsburgh, PA: Creation Science Fellowship, 2018), 130.

⁴⁹ Sexton, "Who Was Born?," 204; Sexton and Smith Jr., "Primeval Chronology Restored," 44–45.

⁵⁰ It is compulsory for proponents of chronological gaps, operating on their own exegetical and hermeneutical premises, to explain the incredible phenomenon of Lamech naming Noah and attaching prophetic significance to his name when all the while it is not really Noah who is born in the 182nd year of Lamech's life, but an unnamed son whose ancestral line would eventually lead to Noah at some unknown future date (possibly thousands of years removed from Lamech). For the sake of consistency, the NCI advocate should also apply this exegetical logic to Adam–Seth–Enosh. When one does so, utter nonsense enters the fray. Adam explicitly caused a son to be born, and he called his name Seth (Gn 5:3). But if the object of the Hiphil of *yālad* in the case of Adam is an unnamed son and

not Seth, how can Adam give this unnamed son the name of Seth? The same exegetical logic applies to the scenario where Seth explicitly names Enosh. The need for a strained explanation(s) to circumvent the force of the “naming” passages as they are integrated into a formulaic chronological structure raises serious questions about the legitimacy of both the NCI position and its exegetical and hermeneutical method. See similar comments from White, “Revisiting Genesis 5 and 11,” 264 n. 32.

⁵¹ Robert J. V. Hiebert, trans., “Genesis,” in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title*, ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 9. The translator of the Greek Genesis from Hebrew added “three sons,” a phrase that is absent from the Masoretic Text.

⁵² McFall’s absurd exegesis serves as a good example: “When Noah was 500 years old he begat the common ancestor of these descendants. So that Noah carried in his loins Shem, Ham and Japheth, up until he was 500 years old and then they passed out of his physical body in that year” (Leslie McFall, “The Chronology of the Book of Jubilees” [unpublished manuscript, December 31, 2013], Microsoft Word file, 32, <https://lmf12.files.wordpress.com/2014/01/chronology-of-jubilees.pdf>).

⁵³ The Hebrew literally reads, “Noah was a son of 500 years.”

⁵⁴ “After the Flood Noah lived 350 years. All the days of Noah were 950 years, and he died” (Gn 9:28–29). The (re)appearance of the epitaph here conveys its structural and chronological significance in the broader context of the primeval history. The death notices for Adam and Noah also serve as another literary *inclusio* within the larger framework of Gen 1–11. Noah’s epitaph creates a precise and interlocking chronological peg between the end of his life and the year of the Flood.

⁵⁵ DeRouchie, “Blessing-Commission,” 237 n. 60. “Linear genealogies take the form: A gave birth to B, who gave birth to C, who gave birth to D. In contrast, segmented genealogies take the form: A gave birth to B, C, and D; B gave birth to E, F, and G; C gave birth to H, I, and J; D gave birth to K, L, and M” (DeRouchie, 238 n. 61).

⁵⁶ “And Noah caused three sons to be born: Shem, Ham, and Japheth” (my translation).

⁵⁷ “And” also appears in the 1599 Geneva Bible and the Darby translation. Also, Barry Bandstra, *Genesis 1–11: A Handbook on the Hebrew Text*, Baylor Handbook on the Hebrew Bible (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), 330.

⁵⁸ The CSB, CJB, EHV, HCSB, NASB 1995, and The Living Bible leave the *waw* untranslated. The NASB renders it “Now after Noah...”

⁵⁹ Frederic Clarke Putnam, *Hebrew Bible Insert: A Student’s Guide to the Syntax of Biblical Hebrew*, 2nd ed. (Ridley Park, PA: Stylus, 2002), 31.

⁶⁰ “When” is used by the CEB, The Message, and Wycliffe’s translation. Sarna uses “when” but provides no analysis (*Genesis*, 44). Similarly, Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 346.

⁶¹ This view is held by Robert Davidson, *Genesis 1–11*, The Cambridge Bible Commentary: New English Bible (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 60, 63; Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, Word Biblical Commentary 1 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1987), 250; Thomas D. Ice and James J. Scofield Johnson, “Using Scriptural Data to Calculate a Range-Qualified Chronology from Adam to Abraham, with Comments on Why the ‘Open’-or-‘Closed’ Genealogy Question Is Chronometrically Irrelevant” (paper, Southwest Regional Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Criswell College, Dallas, TX, March 1, 2002), 17–19. Davidson, for one, provides no rationale for choosing “when.”

⁶² The other scenario would involve twins being born at the very start of Noah’s 500th year, with the third son’s birth being just prior to Noah’s 501st birthday. This would be theoretically possible if “when” were an accurate translation.

⁶³ In an almost bizarre polemic, Johnson and Ice (“Using Scriptural Data,” 17–19) claim that Gen 9:24 is not referring to Ham at all since he is not referenced in verses 24 to 27. They ignore the explicit mention of his name in 9:22 (“And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father and told his two brothers outside”). They also insist that the order of the names in 5:32 (Shem, Ham, Japheth) must necessarily be the birth order. Thus, the youngest son cannot be Ham, but is Japheth instead. They also infer that anyone who believes otherwise does not believe what God has said. They should take up their argument with Moses, who, in the Table of Nations, first orders the sons “Shem, Ham, and Japheth” (10:1) and then delineates Japheth’s descendants first, then Ham’s, then Shem’s (10:2, 10:6, 10:21). The inspired author of 1 Chronicles also uses this second ordering.

⁶⁴ *Williams’ Hebrew Syntax*, 33–34. See also Frederick H. Cryer, “The Interrelationships of Gen 5,32; 11,10–11 and the Chronology of the Flood (Gen 6–9),” *Biblica* 66, no. 2 (1985): 247; Mathews, *Genesis 1–11:26*, 319. See also Genesis 42:13, 42:15, 42:20, 42:34.

⁶⁵ Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, trans. Israel Abrahams, from Hebrew, vol. 2 of 2, *Part Two: From Noah to Abraham; A Commentary on Genesis VI9–XI32* (Jerusalem: Varda Books, 2012), 163–65 (italics original).

⁶⁶ James C. VanderKam, *Jubilees: A Commentary on the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Sidnie White Crawford, vol. 1 of 2, *Chapters 1-21*, Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2018), 330, 338–39.

⁶⁷ Timothy Lim, “The Chronology of the Flood Story in a Qumran Text (4Q252),” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43, no. 2 (1992): 291. In agreement is Genesis Rabbah 36:7 (H. Freedman and Maurice Simon, eds., *Midrash Rabbah*, vols. 1–2 of 10, *Genesis: In Two Volumes*, trans. H. Freedman [London: Soncino, 1939], 1:292).

⁶⁸ The LXX uses the comparative, “younger” (νεώτερος). See Wevers, *Notes*, 124.

⁶⁹ Cf. John J. Davis, *Paradise to Prison: Studies in Genesis* (Salem, WI: Sheffield Publishing Company, 1998), 107; Sexton, “Who Was Born?,” 209 n. 90; Mathews, *Genesis 1–11:26*, 458; Genesis Rabbah 37:7 (Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 1:299).

⁷⁰ Cf. Cryer, “Interrelationships,” 247.

⁷¹ Wevers, *Notes*, 140 n. 40. The Hebrew (הִיְאָהֳלֵךְ) was rendered by Aquila in the dative case as τῷ μεγάλῳ (lit. “great”), likely modifying Shem. Symmachus rendered it as τοῦ πρεσβυτερου (lit. “elder”), likely modifying Japheth.

⁷² Merrill asserts that the LXX translators “altered” Gen 10:21 but provides no evidence for the claim (Eugene H. Merrill, “Chronology,” in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and David W. Baker [Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2003], 116).

⁷³ *Notes*, 140. Since Shem’s name in Greek appears in the dative case and not the genitive, “elder” is modifying Japheth.

⁷⁴ Cassuto, *Book of Genesis*, 2:218.

⁷⁵ C. G. Ozanne, *The First 7000 Years: A Study in Bible Chronology* (New York: Exposition, 1970), 16.

⁷⁶ “That [Shem] is not named first is a literary move in keeping with the theology of Genesis, wherein younger brothers (e.g., Seth, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, Joseph, Perez, and Ephraim) often replace, or are chosen over, their older brothers. It is therefore fitting that Shem and Abram, listed first because of their theological significance, are younger brothers” (“Who Was Born?,” 209). Also, Sexton, “Evangelicalism’s Search,” 6 n. 8.

⁷⁷ “After” also appears in the CEV, ERV, GNT, ISV, NLT, NRSV, and RSV. See also Donald E. Gowan, *From Eden to Babel: A Commentary on the Book of Genesis 1-11*, International Theological Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 81; John H. Sailhamer, *Genesis, in The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, ed. Tremper Longman III and David E. Garland, rev. ed., vol. 1 of 13, *Genesis–Leviticus* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 108–109.

⁷⁸ Cryer, “Interrelationships,” 247–48 (italics original). Wilson adds, “The temporal clause is formed by simple juxtaposition and so contains no explicit indication of the temporal sequence involved. The translation ‘after Noah was 500 years old’ would also be possible” (*Genealogy and History*, 160 n. 60).

⁷⁹ This progression is quite common with consecutive *wayyiqtol*. See Van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze, *Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, 165–66.

⁸⁰ Cf. Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, trans. Israel Abrahams, from Hebrew, vol. 1 of 2, *Part One: From Adam to Noah; A Commentary on Genesis I–VI 8* (Jerusalem: Varda Books, 2012), 290. Cassuto asserts that Japheth was born in Noah’s 500th year since he is the oldest son (1:290), but 5:32 does not require this interpretation. If one insists that a son be born in Noah’s 500th year, that son can only be Japheth. But in my thinking, Japheth could have been born when Noah was 501 years old. If one insists that Shem is the eldest son of Noah, then Japheth could have been born in Noah’s 503rd year, or thereafter. All these options remain reasonably faithful to the text and do not negate a chronological interpretation of Gen 5/11.

⁸¹ The Flood narrative and other texts restrict Noah’s begetting ages for Japheth and Ham. Since Shem was born when Noah was 502 years old, Japheth must have been born sometime after Noah’s 500th birthday but at least nine months prior to Shem’s birth (assuming Japheth is the eldest). Ham was born after Shem, but he was old enough to have a wife on the day he entered the ark (Gn 7:13)—the 600th year, 2nd month, and 17th day of Noah’s life (Gn 7:11). While it is possible that Ham was several decades younger than his brothers (born, say, when Noah was 550 years old), the three sons likely were clustered closer together in age.

⁸² In the case of Gen 11:26, only Terah’s age at Abram’s birth (130) can be determined. Nahor or Haran was born when Terah was 70. Since Haran died in Ur (11:28) and Nahor married Haran’s daughter Milcah (11:29), Haran was most likely the oldest son of the three, probably born during Terah’s 70th year. This would follow the pattern in Gen 5:32 where the chosen son is listed first (Shem/Abram) and the oldest son is listed last (Japheth/Haran). For more, see my commentary in Henry B. Smith Jr., “From Adam to Abraham: The Latest on the Genesis 5 and 11 Project,”

Associates for Biblical Research, January 14, 2021, <https://biblearchaeology.org/research/topics/biblical-chronologies>.

⁸³ The Hebrew literally reads, “Shem [was] a son of 100 years.”

⁸⁴ The exact same phrase, “after the Flood” (אַחַר הַמַּבּוּל), also appears in Genesis 9:28, 10:1, and 10:32. The LXX reads μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν.

⁸⁵ “Noah was six hundred years old when the flood of waters came upon the earth.”

⁸⁶ Dyke and Henry establish the precision of the biblical texts placing Shem’s birth in Noah’s 502nd year and then in the same breath deny the validity of chronological computation. They claim that “the numerical data surrounding Noah and Shem do not refer to the time of the birth of Shem” (“Genesis 5 and 11 Genealogies,” 34). They further posit that Shem may not have been Noah’s son (34), contra Genesis 7:7, 7:13, 9:18, 10:1–2, 10:32; 2 Peter 2:5. Noah’s three sons and their three wives entered the ark with Noah and his wife. To my knowledge, no credible author in the history of the Church or ancient Judaism has ever doubted that Shem, Ham, and Japheth were the immediate sons of Noah. Dyke and Henry also elide Ham and Japheth when discussing Gen 5:32, then argue that since *yālad* is not pointing to Shem’s birth in Noah’s 500th year (this premise is correct), it may, when used in other instances in Gen 5/11, be referring to an unknown descendant rather than the direct object (30–31). But as we have shown, the 500-year referent in 5:32 is not pointing to anyone’s birth in that year, and 5:32 differs markedly from the rest of Gen 5/11.

⁸⁷ Many writers claim that 11:10 does not reconcile with the rest of Gen 5/11 and the Flood narrative. Mathews translates 5:32 as “After Noah was 500 years old...” but later, in his discussion on 11:10, contradicts his own interpretation of 5:32, stating that it better reads “When Noah...” or “Noah was 500 years old when he fathered...” By doing this, he unnecessarily puts the two passages in conflict with each other (*Genesis 1–11:26*, 319, 492–93, 493 n. 14). Jeremy Hughes argues that Genesis 11:10 is a “secondary addition” (*Secrets of the Times: Myth and History in Biblical Chronology*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 66 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, an imprint of Sheffield Academic Press, 1990], 18). Gerhard Larsson calls it a “puzzling inconsistency” (“The Chronology of the Pentateuch: A Comparison of the MT and LXX,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102, no. 3 [September 1983]: 405). Similarly, Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 561–62.

⁸⁸ Starting with Lamech’s birth when Methuselah is 187 years old, we then add 182 (Noah’s birth), 502 (Shem’s birth), and 100 (Arpachshad’s birth) to get 971 years.

⁸⁹ Henry B. Smith Jr., “Wild West Evangelical Hermeneutics, Part Two: Jesus Christ and the Supreme Authority of Scripture,” *Bible and Spade* 34, no. 3 (Fall 2021): 31–32.

⁹⁰ For example, Christensen claims, “It is probably not possible to recover the key to the theological meaning of the numbers and ages in Genesis 5 and 11, at least in detail” (Borland and Christensen, “Hundreds of Years Old?,” 180). One ought to weigh Christensen’s dubious statement against the witness about Scripture’s inherent clarity that we have from Jesus and from Scripture itself. See Henry B. Smith Jr., “Wild West Evangelical Hermeneutics, Part One: The Failure of the Comparative Archaeological Method,” *Bible and Spade* 34, no. 2 (Summer 2021): 25–27.

⁹¹ “Who Was Born?,” 209.

⁹² For both of these passages, I am largely following the translation of Lee A. Anderson Jr., “Sounding the Structural Depths: Theme Tracing and the Segmentation of the Narrative,” in *Grappling with the Chronology of the Genesis Flood: Navigating the Flow of Time in Biblical Narrative*, ed. Steven W. Boyd and Andrew A. Snelling (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2014), 684, 686, 693.

⁹³ For an exhaustive discussion and analysis, see Boyd and Snelling, *Grappling with the Chronology*.

⁹⁴ This expression is also employed in Leviticus 8:34, 16:30; Joshua 7:25; and 1 Samuel 11:13.

⁹⁵ The same exact phrase is also found in Genesis 17:23, 17:26; Exodus 12:17, 12:41, 12:51; Leviticus 23:21, 23:28–30; Deuteronomy 32:48; Joshua 5:11; and Ezekiel 24:2.

⁹⁶ The Hebrew uses the standard adverb and pronoun (אַחַר־זֶּה) for this expression (“after this”). “This” refers to everything that had happened previously in the narrative of Job.

⁹⁷ The Greek translation reads, “Now Job lived after his calamity one hundred and seventy years, and all the years he lived were two hundred and forty-eight years” (Claude E. Cox, trans., “Job,” in Pietersma and Wright, *New English Translation of the Septuagint*, 696). This reading is likely secondary.

⁹⁸ Nahor’s original life span is based on readings preserved in the LXX (79 plus 129). See Smith Jr., “Case for the Septuagint’s Chronology,” 127–28, 131.

⁹⁹ “Tall el-Hammam Is Still Sodom: Critical Data-Sets Cast Serious Doubt on E.H. Merrill’s Chronological Analysis,” *Biblical Research Bulletin* 13, no. 1 (2013): 23.

¹⁰⁰ Space limitations prohibit a fuller chronological exposition. For more, see Andrew E. Steinmann, *From Abraham to Paul: A Biblical Chronology* (Saint Louis: Concordia, 2011), 72–80; Eugene H. Merrill, “Fixed Dates in Patriarchal Chronology,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 137, no. 547 (July 1980): 241–51.

¹⁰¹ Wayne Grudem, “The Perspicuity of Scripture,” *Themelios* 34, no. 3 (2009): 307.

¹⁰² James K. Hoffmeier, response to “The Fifteenth-Century (Early-Date) Exodus View,” by Scott Stripling, in *Five Views on the Exodus: Historicity, Chronology, and Theological Implications*, ed. Mark D. Janzen, Counterpoints (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2021), 54–56.

¹⁰³ See also Paul’s speech in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch (Acts 13:18).

¹⁰⁴ The Hebrew literally reads, “a son of 80 years,” and, “a son of 3 and 80 years.”

¹⁰⁵ Steinmann, *From Abraham to Paul*, 81–86.

¹⁰⁶ See my commentary in “Wild West Evangelical Hermeneutics, Part One,” 23–25.

¹⁰⁷ A glance at Joshua’s words about the chronology of his own life also cannot cohere with symbolic interpretations: “I was **forty years old** when Moses the servant of the LORD sent me from Kadesh-barnea to spy out the land... And now, behold, the LORD has kept me alive, just as he said, **these forty-five years** since the time that the LORD spoke this word to Moses, while Israel walked in the wilderness. And now, behold, **I am this day eighty-five years old**” (Jos 14:7a, 14:10). Note that the chronological referent of 45 years does not apply to Joshua’s age, but to the time elapsed since the spies went into Canaan. And it coheres with the chronology of Moses’s life. Again, a nonliteral interpretation would turn Joshua’s words into gibberish.

¹⁰⁸ Collins asserts,

If Tall el-Hammam is biblical Sodom—based on the volume of evidence I see no way around this implication—then the date of its terminal Bronze Age destruction provides us with a *chronological peg* by which an archaeologically and historically reasonable date for the career of Abr(ah)am can be fixed. Such an anchor-point may also provide *hermeneutical grounds* for either accepting or rejecting the traditional notion that the patriarchal lifespan numbers are to be understood as base-10, arithmetic values, or something else altogether. (“Tall el-Hammam Is *Still* Sodom,” 4 [italics added])

If one concedes for the sake of argument that Tall el-Hammam does fit the geographical requirements for Sodom (a hotly disputed but still-open question), Collins and his archaeological team should be looking for a significant destruction from around 2100 BC (or ca. 1900 BC if one follows the short sojourn). The reported Middle Bronze destruction at Hammam (ca. 1600–1550 BC) has nothing whatsoever to do with the account in Genesis 18–19. Of this we can be certain because the biblical text’s absolute authority as the Word of the infinite, eternal, living God decisively testifies against Collins’s dating scheme. It would indeed be tragic if it turned out that Hammam really was Sodom, but that the correct time period for its destruction was overlooked/ignored because of an indefatigable and dogmatic adherence to an erroneous, incoherent, and ultimately subversive interpretation of the patriarchal life spans.

¹⁰⁹ Smith Jr., “Wild West Evangelical Hermeneutics, Part One,” 22–28; Smith Jr., “Wild West Evangelical Hermeneutics, Part Two,” 25–32.

¹¹⁰ R. C. Sproul, “What Inerrancy Is All About: The Truth of Scripture Demolishes Speculation,” *Moody Monthly* 80, no. 5 (January 1980), 13, quoted in Stephen J. Nichols, *R. C. Sproul: A Life* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2021), 134.

¹¹¹ See this series’ unofficial preface: Henry B. Smith Jr., “By Whose Authority?,” *Bible and Spade* 33, no. 4 (Fall 2020): 11.

¹¹² Ewald M. Plass, comp., *What Luther Says: An Anthology*, vol. 3, *Prayers to Zeal* (Saint Louis: Concordia, 1959), 1523.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Lee A., Jr. 2014. Sounding the Structural Depths: Theme Tracing and the Segmentation of the Narrative. Pp. 639–704 in Boyd and Snelling, *Grappling with the Chronology*.
- Archer, Gleason L., Jr. 1979. The Chronology of the Old Testament. In *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary: With the New International Version*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein. Vol. 1 of 12, *Introductory Articles*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Bandstra, Barry. 2008. *Genesis 1–11: A Handbook on the Hebrew Text*. Baylor Handbook on the Hebrew Bible. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.

- Borland, James A., and Christensen, Duane L. 1999. Did People Live to Be Hundreds of Years Old before the Flood? Pp. 166–83 in *The Genesis Debate: Persistent Questions about Creation and the Flood*, ed. Ronald Youngblood. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock.
- Boyd, Steven W., and Snelling, Andrew A., eds. 2014. *Grappling with the Chronology of the Genesis Flood: Navigating the Flow of Time in Biblical Narrative*. Green Forest, AR: Master Books.
- Carson, D. A. 1984. *Exegetical Fallacies*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Cassuto, Umberto. 2012a. *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*. Trans. Israel Abrahams, from Hebrew. Vol. 1 of 2, *Part One: From Adam to Noah; A Commentary on Genesis I–VI 8*. Jerusalem: Varda Books.
- . 2012b. *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*. Trans. Israel Abrahams, from Hebrew. Vol. 2 of 2, *Part Two: From Noah to Abraham; A Commentary on Genesis VI9–XI32*. Jerusalem: Varda Books.
- Collins, C. John. 1994. How Old Is the Earth? Anthropomorphic Days in Genesis 1:1-2:3. *Presbyterion* 20, no. 2 (September): 109–30.
- . 2005. *Genesis 1–4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R.
- Collins, Steven. 2013. Tall el-Hammam Is Still Sodom: Critical Data-Sets Cast Serious Doubt on E.H. Merrill’s Chronological Analysis. *Biblical Research Bulletin* 13, no. 1: 1–28.
- Cox, Claude E., trans. 2007. Iob. Pp. 667–96 in Pietersma and Wright, *New English Translation of the Septuagint*.
- Cryer, Frederick H. 1985. The Interrelationships of Gen 5,32; 11,10-11 and the Chronology of the Flood (Gen 6–9). *Biblica* 66, no. 2: 241–61.
- Davidson, Robert. 1973. *Genesis 1–11*. The Cambridge Bible Commentary: New English Bible. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davis, John J. 1998. *Paradise to Prison: Studies in Genesis*. Salem, WI: Sheffield Publishing Company.
- DeRouchie, Jason S. 2013. The Blessing-Commission, the Promised Offspring, and the *Toledot* Structure of Genesis. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 56, no. 2 (June): 219–47.
- Dyke, Daniel J., and Henry, Hugh. 2016. “Genesis 5 and 11 Genealogies in the Context of the Biblical Mindset.” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, San Antonio, TX, November 17.
- Freedman, H., and Simon, Maurice, eds. 1939. *Midrash Rabbah*. Vols. 1–2 of 10, *Genesis: In Two Volumes*, trans. H. Freedman. Vol. 1. London: Soncino.
- Gardiner, Frederic. 1873. The Chronological Value of the Genealogy in Genesis V. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 30, no. 118 (April): 323–33.
- Gowan, Donald E. 1988. *From Eden to Babel: A Commentary on the Book of Genesis 1-11*. International Theological Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Green, William Henry. 1890. Primeval Chronology. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 47 (April): 285–303.
- Grudem, Wayne. 2009. The Perspicuity of Scripture. *Themelios* 34, no. 3: 288–308.
- Hamilton, Victor P. 1990. *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hendel, Ronald S. 1998. *The Text of Genesis 1–11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hiebert, Robert J. V., trans. 2007. Genesis. Pp. 1–42 in Pietersma and Wright, *New English Translation of the Septuagint*.
- Hoffmeier, James K. 2021. Response to “The Fifteenth-Century (Early-Date) Exodus View,” by Scott Stripling. Pp. 53–59 in *Five Views on the Exodus: Historicity, Chronology, and Theological Implications*, ed. Mark D. Janzen. Counterpoints. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic.
- Hughes, Jeremy. 1990. *Secrets of the Times: Myth and History in Biblical Chronology*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 66. Sheffield: JSOT Press, an imprint of Sheffield Academic Press.
- Ice, Thomas D., and Johnson, James J. Scofield. 2002. “Using Scriptural Data to Calculate a Range-Qualified Chronology from Adam to Abraham, with Comments on Why the ‘Open’-or-‘Closed’ Genealogy Question Is Chronometrically Irrelevant.” Paper presented at the Southwest Regional Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Criswell College, Dallas, TX, March 1.
- Kidner, Derek. 1967. *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 1. Chicago: InterVarsity.
- Kitchen, Kenneth A. 1966. *Ancient Orient and the Old Testament*. London: InterVarsity.
- . 2003. *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Larsson, Gerhard. 1983. The Chronology of the Pentateuch: A Comparison of the MT and LXX. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102, no. 3 (September): 401–409.
- Lim, Timothy. 1992. The Chronology of the Flood Story in a Qumran Text (4Q252). *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43, no. 2: 288–98.

- Luke, K. 1981. The Genealogies in Genesis 5. *Indian Theological Studies* 18, no. 3 (September): 219–44.
- Mathews, Kenneth A. 1996. *Genesis 1–11:26*. The New American Commentary, vol. 1A. Nashville: Broadman & Holman.
- McFall, Leslie. 2013. “The Chronology of the Book of Jubilees.” Unpublished manuscript, December 31. Microsoft Word file. <https://lmf12.files.wordpress.com/2014/01/chronology-of-jubilees.pdf>.
- Merrill, Eugene H. 1980. Fixed Dates in Patriarchal Chronology. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 137, no. 547 (July): 241–51.
- . 2003. Chronology. Pp. 113–22 in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and David W. Baker. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic.
- Millam, John. 2010. “The Genesis Genealogies: Are They Complete?” Evidence for God from Science. September 3. http://www.godandscience.org/youngearth/genesis_genealogies.html.
- Nichols, Stephen J. 2021. *R. C. Sproul: A Life*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway.
- Ozanne, C. G. 1970. *The First 7000 Years: A Study in Bible Chronology*. New York: Exposition.
- Pietersma, Albert, and Wright, Benjamin G., eds. 2007. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Plass, Ewald M., comp. 1959. *What Luther Says: An Anthology*. Vol. 3, *Prayers to Zeal*. Saint Louis: Concordia.
- Putnam, Frederic Clarke. 2002. *Hebrew Bible Insert: A Student’s Guide to the Syntax of Biblical Hebrew*. 2nd ed. Ridley Park, PA: Stylus.
- . 2010. *A New Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix.
- Rana, Fazale, with Ross, Hugh. 2015. *Who Was Adam? A Creation Model Approach to the Origin of Humanity*. Second expanded ed. Covina, CA: RTB.
- Ross, Hugh. 2001. *The Genesis Question: Scientific Advances and the Accuracy of Genesis*. 2nd ed. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.
- Sailhamer, John H. 2008. *Genesis*. In *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, ed. Tremper Longman III and David E. Garland. Rev. ed. Vol. 1 of 13, *Genesis–Leviticus*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Sarna, Nahum M. 1989. *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- Schaeffer, Francis A. 1975. *No Final Conflict*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Sexton, Jeremy. 2015. Who Was Born When Enosh Was 90? A Semantic Reevaluation of William Henry Green’s Chronological Gaps. *Westminster Theological Journal* 77, no. 2 (Fall): 193–218.
- . 2018a. Evangelicalism’s Search for Chronological Gaps in Genesis 5 and 11: A Historical, Hermeneutical, and Linguistic Critique. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 61, no. 1 (March): 5–25.
- . 2018b. Andrew E. Steinmann’s Search for Chronological Gaps in Genesis 5 and 11: A Rejoinder. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 61, no. 1 (March): 39–45.
- Sexton, Jeremy, and Smith, Henry B., Jr. 2016. Primeval Chronology Restored: Revisiting the Genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11. *Bible and Spade* 29, no. 2 (Spring/Summer): 42–49.
- Smith, Henry B., Jr. 2018. The Case for the Septuagint’s Chronology in Genesis 5 and 11. Pp. 117–32 in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Creationism, July 29–August 1, 2018*, ed. John H. Whitmore. Pittsburgh, PA: Creation Science Fellowship.
- . 2020. By Whose Authority? *Bible and Spade* 33, no. 4 (Fall): 10–11.
- . 2021a. “From Adam to Abraham: The Latest on the Genesis 5 and 11 Project.” Associates for Biblical Research, <https://biblearchaeology.org/research/topics/biblical-chronologies> (January 14).
- . 2021b. Wild West Evangelical Hermeneutics, Part One: The Failure of the Comparative Archaeological Method. *Bible and Spade* 34, no. 2 (Summer): 22–28.
- . 2021c. Wild West Evangelical Hermeneutics, Part Two: Jesus Christ and the Supreme Authority of Scripture. *Bible and Spade* 34, no. 3 (Fall): 25–32.
- Sproul, R. C. 1980. What Inerrancy Is All About: The Truth of Scripture Demolishes Speculation. *Moody Monthly* 80, no. 5 (January).
- Steinmann, Andrew E. 2011. *From Abraham to Paul: A Biblical Chronology*. Saint Louis: Concordia.
- . 2017. Gaps in the Genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11? *Bibliotheca Sacra* 174 (April–June): 141–58.
- Tanner, J. Paul. 2016. “The Genealogies of Genesis 5 & 11: Reasons for Understanding These as Gapless Chronologies.” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, San Antonio, TX, November 17.
- Unger, Merrill F. 1951. *Introductory Guide to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- VanderKam, James C. 2018. *Jubilees: A Commentary on the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Sidnie White Crawford. Vol. 1 of 2, *Chapters 1–21*. Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress.

- van der Merwe, Christo H. J.; Naudé, Jackie A.; and Kroeze, Jan H. 1999. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and O'Connor, M. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Warfield, B. B. 2000. The Manner and Time of Man's Origin. Pp. 211–29 in *Evolution, Science, and Scripture: Selected Writings*, ed. David N. Livingstone and Mark A. Noll. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- Wenham, Gordon J. 1987. *Genesis 1-15*. Word Biblical Commentary 1. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.
- Westermann, Claus. 1994. *Genesis 1-11*. Trans. John J. Scullion, from German. Continental Commentary Series. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Wevers, John William. 1993. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 35. Atlanta: Scholars.
- White, Bernard. 2015. Revisiting Genesis 5 and 11: A Closer Look at the Chronogenealogies. *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 53, no. 2: 253–77.
- Williams, Ronald J. 2007. *Williams' Hebrew Syntax*. Revised and expanded by John C. Beckman. 3rd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Wilson, Robert R. 1977. *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World*. Yale Near Eastern Researches 7. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.