

3710	429	2	37
3711	430	3	38
3709	431	4	39
3708	432	5	40
3707	433	6	41
3706	434	7	42
3705	435	1	43
3704	436	2	44
3703	437	3	45
3702	438	4	46
3701	439	5	47
3700	440	6	48
3699	441	7	49
3698	442	1	1/50
3697	443	2	2
3696	444	3	3
3695	445	4	4
3694	446	5	5
3693	447	6	6
3692	448	7	7
3691	449	1	8
3690	450	2	9
3689	451	3	10
3688	452	4	11
3687	453	5	12
3686	454	6	13
3685	455	7	14
3684	456	1	15
3683	457	2	16
3682	458	3	17
3681	459	4	18
3680	460	5	19
3679	461	6	20
3678	462	7	21
3677	463	1	22
3676	464	2	23
3675	465	3	24
3674	466	4	25
3673	467	5	26
3672	468	6	27
3671	469	7	28
3670	470	1	29
3669	471	2	30
3668	472	3	31
3667	473	4	32
3666	474	5	33
3665	475	6	34
3664	476	7	35
3663	477	1	36

428	298	193	103	33
429	299	194	104	34
430	300	195	105	35
431	301	196	106	36
432	302	197	107	37
433	303	198	108	38
434	304	199	109	39
435	305	200	110	40
436	306	201	111	41
437	307	202	112	42
438	308	203	113	43
439	309	204	114	44
440	310	205	115	45
441	311	206	116	46
442	312	207	117	47
443	313	208	118	48
444	314	209	119	49
445	315	210	120	50
446	316	211	121	51
447	317	212	122	52
448	318	213	123	53
449	319	214	124	54
450	320	215	125	55
451	321	216	126	56
452	322	217	127	57
453	323	218	128	58
454	324	219	129	59
455	325	220	130	60
456	326	221	131	61
457	327	222	132	62
458	328	223	133	63
459	329	224	134	64
460	330	225	135	65
461	331	226	136	66
462	332	227	137	67
463	333	228	138	68
464	334	229	139	69
465	335	230	140	70
466	336	231	141	71
467	337	232	142	72
468	338	233	143	73
469	339	234	144	74
470	340	235	145	75
471	341	236	146	76
472	342	237	147	77
473	343	238	148	78
474	344	239	149	79
475	345	240	150	80

Iared

The slow rates assumed by archaeologists for social and technological developments in Egypt and Mesopotamia fail to factor in the new frontier of the post flood world and the great intelligence of man. They project assumptions of later ages backward. And they are based on accepting Darwinian classifications of the Stone Age and the assumption that the stone age generally came before the Bronze Age, when in fact, the Stone Age depended on the culture and mostly was parallel to farming, city building, and copper and bronze use. That is, while cities and farming were occurring in the plains, hunter gatherer stone age cultures were occurring on the periphery. While the plains people were making weapons of war from bronze, outlying tribes were making hunting weapons and utensils from stone. While some people were trying to stay together, other people were simply migrating after the game.

When it comes to key ciphers, the LXX is a substantial failure. It generally solves every difficulty by changing the Hebrew text rather than by showing an understanding of it.

Case points against the LXX. The LXX fails to get the 42 year cipher for Ahaziah in 2 Chron. 22:2 (אֶחָזְיָהוּ מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּנֵי יָמָיו שְׁנָיִם וָאַרְבָּעִים). It changes it to 20 (ὄν εἴκοσι ἔτων, Swete, Rahlff) years to harmonize it with 2 Kings 8:26, which has 22 years for his age (וּשְׁנָיִם וָאַרְבָּעִים וָשָׁנָה בְּנֵי יָמָיו). But the *Masoretic Text's* 42 year figure (אֶחָזְיָהוּ בְּנֵי יָמָיו שְׁנָיִם וָאַרְבָּעִים) refers to the duration of the dynasty of Omri till Ahaziah, and not the age of Ahaziah at his accession. The point of the text is to highlight that Ahaziah, although, a king of Judah, was descended from the dynasty of Omri and Ahab. One might say someone was a "son of a gun" to indicate a disreputable past. In the same way, "a son of 42 years" underlines an uncomfortable truth for the tribe of Judah. Your king is now a son of the northern kingdom, and that awful queen Jezebel through the awful Athaliah. Also, the reader should have noticed that the LXX's 20 year figure correcting the MT does not agree with its own number in 2 Kings 8:26, 22 years.

If this were the only instance of this kind of cipher, then someone might say *maybe*. But I have hope for you. The Hebrew scripture has a pattern of this sort of thing that makes it undeniable.

Again, the LXX fails at 1 Sam. 13:1 (γεσσαράκοντα ἔτων Ἰεβοσθε υἱὸς Σαουλ), by omitting the verse, due to difficulty of understanding the Hebrew. But the two years, is King Saul's reign to the Jubilee, and not his whole reign, or his age.

Also, the LXX fails at 1 Kings 6:1, because the 440 (τῷ τεσσαρακοστῷ καὶ τετρακοσιοστῷ) years throws the Jubilee off of the actual cycle. No one really knows exactly why it has 440 years. And even those who favor the LXX reject it. But really, do they have a good excuse for such cherry picking, accepting the LXX where it agrees with their inflated post flood archaeological scheme, and then rejecting it where the odd number does not help any of their theories?

I should mention that the LXX also fails at Genesis 1:1 and also by saying God ceased from his work on the sixth day. The SP does the same with the sixth day business. In both cases, the LXX misunderstands the Hebrew text. Saying "space-time" began in Genesis 1:1 is a philosophical imposition on the text. But first, the speculators need it to read "In the beginning God created...", then they can claim "space-time" was created "In the beginning." Einstien would certainly love this. And so would Greek Philosophers. In this respect the LXX Genesis 1:1 is the oldest mistranslation in the world. Put it in the Guinness Book of World records. But both Jewish and Christain Hebrew experts have pointed out that "In the beginning of God's creation..." reflects the Hebrew better. In this respect is no different than "In the beginning of Nebucadnezzar's reign, ...."

Einstein will be happy to know that "space-time" began in 605 BC. Nabopolassar will be happy know that he succeeded in erasing "space-time" in 747 BC, so that it could begin again with Neb.

In Exodus 12:40, the LXX adds "and in the land of Canaan" to the text. Swete's LXX Edition also makes the time period 435 years (τετρακόσια τριάκοντα πέντε). And one could argue that that figure was in the original LXX, and even in the Hebrew from which it was translated. Rahlff's edition has 430 years. In any case, 430 years in Canaan and Egypt leaves out the time that Jacob spent in Paddan Aram, and also the time that Abraham spent in Haran. We have to understand the 400 year figure in Genesis 15 in conjunction with this. The time from Isaac's birth to the Exodus was 400 years. And there were 25 years from when Abraham left Haran at age 75 before he fathered Isaac at age 100. Unless 5 years are included for time between Ur and Haran, and in Haran, then the total of 430 cannot be reached. The "sons of Israel" is a tribal name. It includes Abraham, just as some of the names in Genesis 10 were tribal names acquired later than the progenitor of their respective tribes, and then were anachronistically used, so also the sojourn of Israel is an anachronistic use of a tribal name that extends back to Abraham's exit from Ur. For this reason, expansion of the LXX "and in the land of Canaan" was unnecessary to explain the sense. It does not improve matters, but rather makes the text harder to understand by implying that the sojourn was limited to Egypt and the land of Canaan.

Yes, it appears that the LXX has fallen into every trap and tripped on every Cipher contained in the MT to protect itself from just such tampering as the LXX translators imposed on it. There is actually some good assurance here in the Hebrew text. God laid a trap for those who would alter the text by which we could catch them in the act later.

In 2 Sam. 2:10, the LXX omits the word "son of" in front of "forty years," and interprets the Hebrew idiom as Ishbosheth's age. But it isn't his age. He is a son of his father's kingdom, which lasted 40 years. The word "son" is used twice in the Hebrew. The LXX uses it only once (τεσσαράκοντα ἔτων Ἰεβοσθε υἱὸς Σαουλ, ). The MT has it twice (בְּנֵי יָמָיו שְׁנָיִם וָאַרְבָּעִים וָשָׁנָה וּבְנֵי יָמָיו אַרְבָּעִים וָשָׁנָה). This is how the Paul knew Saul had reigned 40 years in Acts 13:21. One may ask why God, through Scripture, set out to provide us with a complete chronology through all the periods of time where the human race wasn't keeping good records. Ok, others were keeping records. But they were pretty crappy records because they could not keep them from being broken into fragments and then buried into ruined cities. So back to God. Why did he provide all the numbers, and then in a few key places it seems he omitted the numbers leading to all the controversy over what the chronology actually is? Well, the solutions are there. You just have to break the ciphers. The difficulties are there to defeat those who would alter the text because the chronology does not agree with their theories of what God should have said, when he didn't.

The LXX has what scholars call a harmonizing tendency. Edits were made to solve perceived logical problems, and to smooth things out.