

Extensive Messianic Prophecy Corruptions and Flood-Related Chronology Errors Disqualify the Septuagint (LXX): Revisited and Expanded*

J.P. Tomkins, D.W. Daniels, and J.J.S. Johnson**

Key Words: Alexandrinus, Apocrypha, Biblical chronologies, LXX, Masoretic Text, Messianic Prophecy, Septuagint, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus

* This manuscript is adapted from a previous paper: Tomkins, J.P., D.W. Daniels, and J.J.S. Johnson. 2019. Extensive Messianic Prophecy Corruptions and Flood-Related Chronology Errors Disqualify the Septuagint (LXX) as a Reliable Source for Creationist Research. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 56:40–47.

** Jeffrey P. Tomkins, jtomkins@icr.org;
David W. Daniels, dwdaniels@chick.com

Accepted for publication June 12, 2025

Abstract

There has been an increasing interest in the creation science community to promote what is today called the Septuagint (LXX), a controversial Greek translation of the Old Testament (OT) that also contains the noncanonical Apocrypha. Parties promoting this meme also falsely claim that the LXX closely follows the Masoretic Hebrew outside of a few minor word-choice and chronological differences. In reality, the modern version of the LXX often differs significantly from the providentially preserved Hebrew text of the OT. We reported previously that our analyses of key Messianic prophecies in the LXX, compared to the Hebrew text, reveal a disturbing trend of translational corruption in the Greek, which we now bolster with the addition of more key sabotaged OT passages. We also include the concurring analysis of highly respected post-Reformation Protestant theologians who arrived at the same conclusions that our study verifies. This present research, along with the witness of leading theologians of the past, shows that pivotal OT Messianic prophecies have been purposely altered in the LXX so as to remove their otherwise clear connection to the New Testament messianic mission and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Simple Summary

The article argues that the Septuagint (LXX), a Greek translation of the Old Testament, should not be considered a reliable source for Biblical study, especially within the creation science community, due to extensive errors. The authors claim that modern LXX versions differ significantly from the providentially preserved Hebrew Masoretic Text (MT). A major concern is the purposeful alteration of key Messianic prophecies in the LXX, which removes their clear connection to the New Testament mission and divinity of Jesus Christ. Examples of these changes include altering “bruise” to “watch” in Genesis 3:15, omitting the “Sceptre” in Numbers 24:17, changing “Kiss the Son” in Psalm 2:12, removing specific divine titles for Christ in Isaiah 9:6, and corrupting references to Christ’s blood atonement in Isaiah 52:15. The article also highlights Flood-related chronology errors in the LXX, such as Methuselah being shown to survive the Flood by over a decade, which contradicts the Genesis account. Furthermore, the LXX contains noncanonical, apocryphal writings that the Roman Catholic Church uses to support doctrines rejected by orthodox Protestants. The authors assert that the Septuagint versions available today were likely first written in the first century AD and periodically modified, with various codices like Vaticanus and Alexandrinus showing significant variations, and that the popular ancient account of its origin is a fable. Post-Reformation theologians, whose analyses the study verifies, also found the LXX to be corrupted and supported the Masoretic Text. Therefore, the authors strongly recommend that the LXX be abandoned as a reliable source of Biblical scripture, emphasizing that the carefully transmitted and providentially preserved Hebrew Masoretic Text should be used as the authoritative source for Old Testament research.

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 [MT]) 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 orthodox Protestants have traditionally rejected.

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 doing so, 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 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 exhibit any credibility when compared to the historical and logistical facts surrounding their provenance claims (Daniels, 2017). In fact, most contemporary LXX researchers consider the account of the origin of the LXX as described in the Letter of Aristeas to be a fable. Lanier and Ross, in a recent book on the LXX, say, “Scholars now regard the Letter of Aristeas as mostly, if not entirely fictitious” (2021, p. 48).

A 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).¹ 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).

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 (Brenton, 1986). Another key modern version is the Rahlfs-Hanhart Septuaginta from 2007, which 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).² 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 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

2 The actual oldest is Alexandrinus, with a date still accepted of about 450 AD. There is no evidence for Vaticanus before the 1400s (British Library, both Scot McKendrick and J. Neville Birdsall in *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*, edited by Scot McKendrick and Orlaith O’Sullivan (The British Library, London, UK, 2003), p. 34: “In short, we cannot be certain of the exact date nor the place of origin of Codex Vaticanus, nor, in spite of scholarly efforts, can its history before the fifteenth century be traced.” It showed up in the Vatican Library in the 1475 and 1481 catalogs. Sinaiticus, as in two books by David W. Daniels, *Is the ‘World’s Oldest Bible’ a Fake?* and *Who Faked the ‘World’s Oldest Bible’?*, was written between 1839 and 1843, with changes until 1859.

1 In the known Old Testaments in Greek, that of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, the Hebrew Old Testament was translated. But in Origen’s 3rd century version (200s AD), the New Testament words are copied into the Old Testament text marked “O” for Origen.

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, Tyndale, Luther, Calvin, etc.) were peerless Bible scholars that trusted the Masoretic Text, not the LXX-Apocrypha codices given by Rome.

Not only is the LXX being heavily promoted among Christians, 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 to justify the preferential use of the LXX (Smith, 2018). Sanders (formerly Cosner) and Carter presented a variety of very cogent arguments against Smith and his unfounded MT conspiracy proposition by thoroughly debunking this claim, which we will not repeat here for brevity (Cosner and Carter, 2018; Sanders and Carter, 2019). In addition to these previously published counter-arguments, we would like to add another key point that is relevant to the research topic of this current paper. 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 1 Corinthians 15:3–4 twice qualifies the redemptive work of Christ as being “according to the [OT] 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 12 key Old Testament scriptures wherein the alterations remove the obvious prophetic connection to the New Testament mission and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. We also show that these LXX messianic prophecy corruptions and sources were well-known by a variety of highly respected scholars and theologians during the post-Reformation era.

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 and from the extensive book by Rydelink and Blum (2019). 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 (a/k/a Authorized Version of AD 1611) using the Accordance Bible software (version 14). For the original Hebrew text of the Old Testament books, the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia BHS 5 (BHS) was used, 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), Rahlfs-Hanhart Septuaginta (Rahlfs, 2007), and Henry Barclay Swete’s, *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint* (1909–1922) represented in Accordance Bible Software via the LXX Advanced Studies Add-On Bundle (also containing electronic versions of the Rahlfs-Hanhart and Brenton texts). In this paper, Brenton’s translation will be used along with the KJV, which, as noted, follows the Hebrew closely. If the Greek of the Vaticanus-based

Brenton translation differs significantly from that of the multi-text Rahlfs, that will be documented.

Results

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 verb *šûp* 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 (*šûp*) me with a tempest, and multiplieth my wounds without cause,” and Psalm 139:11 says, “If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover (*šûp*) 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.³ The Greek verb that is translated “bruise” in Romans 16:20 is συντριψει, a form of the verb συντρίβω. Moreover, it is noteworthy that Romans 16:20 (“And the God of peace shall bruise [*syntribō*] 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/keep-eth,” “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 1 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 fullness 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.*⁴

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” (*râ’â*), “behold” (*šûr*), and “Sceptre” (*šēḇet*). 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” (*šēḇet*) 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. In the New Testament we are told in Revelation 5:5, “Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof.”

Starting at the beginning of the verse’s corruptions, the obvious Greek verbs that should have been chosen for “see” (*râ’â*) should have been either ὁράω (*horaō*), βλέπω (*blepō*), ὀπτάνομαι (*optanomai*), or θεάομαι (*theaomai*).⁵ The Greek verb that was

⁴ This is Origen’s reading. Aquila translated the Hebrew.

⁵ Aquila (125 AD) actually wrote “ὀψομαι αὐτόν,” “I will see him,” indicative, future, middle, 1st person singular from ὁράω (*horaō*). Symmachus has ὀρω (*oro*), “I see,” like the Hebrew.

³ In Origen’s *Hexapla*, Aquila (about 125 AD) wrote προστρίψει (*prostripsei*), from προστρίβω (*prostribō*), “inflicted, worn down by rubbing.” Symmachus (about 175 AD) wrote θλίψει (*thlipsei*), “afflict, make to suffer.” Origen (writing 225–240 AD) was the one who wrote τηρήσει (*teresei*), “watch,” copied into the later Alexandrian Greek Old Testaments. See Origen’s *Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive Veterum interpretum Graecorum, in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*, Tomus I, *Prolegomena, Genesis-Esther*, edited by Fridericus Field (Oxonii, Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1875), p.16. [In English, *The Surviving Fragments of Origen’s Hexapla; or, The Fragments of the Ancient Greek Interpretations on the Entire Old Testament*, Volume I, *Prolegomena, Genesis-Esther*, edited by Fridericus Field (Clarendon Press, Oxford, UK, 1875), p. 16.]

actually used was δείξω (*deixō*)⁶ followed by the personal pronoun αὐτῷ (*autōi*, 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 somewhat muddled as well. The clear meaning of the Hebrew text is that the Messiah emphatically will be seen, not merely just pointed to or shown.⁷

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 ὁράω (*horaō*), βλέπω (*blépō*), or ὀπτάνομαι (*optanomai*) 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 in the MT, “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.⁸ And 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 Greek noun for a man/male, ἀνὴρ (*anér*), was not used, much less any noun coming close to the Hebrew for “sceptre” (*šēḇet*) which literally means an authoritative rod for ruling and correction. The Greek word for scepter that should have been used is ῥάβδος (*rhabdos*) and refers to a rod or staff. In the context of this Messianic prophecy, it provides a direct link and parallel to Hebrews 1:8 in the New Testament which says, “But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a **sceptre** of righteousness is the **sceptre** of thy kingdom” —a reference to Psalm 45:6 that uses *šēḇet* for scepter as does Numbers 24:17.

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.

Psalm 2:12 LXX Corruption of Christ the Son as Eschatological Messiah

LXX

Accept correction, lest at any time the Lord be angry and ye should perish from the righteous way; whensoever his wrath shall be suddenly kindled, blessed are all they that trust in him.

MT

Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.

While the doctrine of the trinity of the Godhead is not represented overtly in any OT texts, it is clearly supported in many places in the OT. The first place where God the Son as Messiah

is specifically mentioned is in Psalm 2:12, which is here also connected to the destruction of all those who do not place their faith in Him. The phrase “kiss the Son” (*Našqūw-bar*) is omitted and replaced with “Accept correction” (δράξασθε παιδείας) in the LXX.⁹ Even worse, the Hebrew verb “to kiss” (*našaq*) is in the Piel stem and in the imperative form, which denotes an exceedingly intensive and strong command. Thus, the LXX sabotage of this verse is painfully obvious, being completely altered to prevent people from placing their faith in the Messiah (Son of God) and not suffering eternal destruction.

Proverbs 30:4 LXX Corruption of Christ the Son of God

LXX

Who has gone up to heaven, and come down? who has gathered the winds in his bosom? who has wrapped up the waters in a garment? who has dominion of all the ends of the earth? what is his name? or what is the name of his children?

MT

Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended? who hath gathered the wind in his fists? who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is his name, and what is his son's name, if thou canst tell?

As noted above, the doctrine of the Trinity is clearly supported in the OT, including several overt witnesses to God the Son—the first being as noted above in the LXX corruption of Psalm 2:12. And here in Proverbs 30:4, the second overt OT witness to God the Son is also sabotaged. The Hebrew for

6 By Origen (writing 220–250 AD).

7 Even the Latin reads, “Video eum, sed non nunc; intueor eum, sed non propinquum.” “I see him, but not now; I behold him, but not near” (Field, 1875, p. 256). [See footnote #3 for full citation of this source.]

8 Used by Origen in the LXX. Symmachus has σκηπτρον (*skeptron*), scepter, like the Hebrew.

9 Replaced by Origen. Aquila has καταφιλησατε (*kataphilesate*), “kiss,” and Symmachus put προσκυνησατε “worship, prostrate before.”

“and what is his son’s name” (*ῥῆμα ὅτι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τέκνου αὐτοῦ*). The Greek noun used here (*τέκνον teknon*), is for “child/children” and in the New Testament is used as a term of kindly address by teachers towards their disciples.¹⁰ Furthermore, the noun and the article is clearly given in the dative plural (*τοῖς τέκνοις*) in the LXX not singular as in the MT. Not only is this an obviously absurd corruption, but the Greek word for son (*υἱός huíos*) denoting kinship, closely corresponding to the Hebrew, is intentionally avoided in the LXX.

Isaiah 4:2 LXX Christ as “the Branch of the Lord” Purged

LXX

And in that day God shall shine gloriously in counsel on the earth, to exalt and glorify the remnant of Israel.

MT

In that day shall *the branch of the LORD* be beautiful and glorious, and the fruit of the earth shall be excellent and comely for them that are escaped of Israel.

The corruption here is a simple removal of this title for the Messiah “the branch of the Lord” (*šemah Yəhōwā*). The noun for “branch” (*šemah*) is used as common title for Christ in messianic prophecy phrases in other places in the OT; Jeremiah 23:5 (“righteous Branch”), Jeremiah 33:15 (“Branch of righteousness”), Zechariah 3:8 (“my servant the Branch”), and Zechariah 6:12 (“the man whose name is The Branch”). In Jeremiah 23:5 a more subtle LXX corruption is employed in which the standard Greek noun for

branch (*κλάδος klados*), used eleven times in the NT to denote “branch,” is swapped out for a noun describing “a rising/proceeding” or “East” (*ἀνατολή anatolē*) which in the NT does not describe a branch but a directional rising, coming forth, or simply “East”; e.g., Matthew 8:11 (“And I say to you that many will come from east [*ἀνατολή*] and west [*δυσεως*]”). For Jeremiah 33:15 in the LXX, the entire verse is missing as part of the complete missing section of Jeremiah 33:14–26. The two instances in Zechariah appear to be intact in the LXX.

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.*¹¹

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.

In the incarnation, Christ, as God the Son, took on humanity as truly

¹¹ Aquila wrote θαυμαστος συμβουλος, ισχυρος δυνατος, πατερ ετι, αρχων ειρηνης (“wonderful counselor, mighty strong one, everlasting father, prince of peace”). Symmachus has παραδοξασμος, βουλευτικος, ισχυρος, δυνατος, πατερ αιωνος, αρχων ειρηνης (“marvelous, counselor, mighty, powerful, everlasting father, prince of peace”). Theodotion wrote θαυμαστος βουλευων, ισχυρος, δυναστης, πατηρ, αρχων ειρηνης (“Wonderfully counseling, mighty, powerful leader, father, prince of peace”).

human (Christ the God-Man). The phrase “mighty God” corresponds to the MT’s *Ēl gibbôr*, which is 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” represented by the compound word *abi-‘ad*, has no Greek counterpart in the LXX version of this verse. Finally, the Prince of Peace (*šar-šālôm*)—the “ruler” or “prince” of shalom-peace is sabotaged.

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 the 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 Greek of the LXX are clearly present in the Hebrew text, there is no need for any detailed exegesis regarding this corruption.

Isaiah 52:15 LXX Corruption of Christ’s Blood Atonement

LXX

Thus shall many nations wonder at him; and kings shall keep their mouths shut: for they to whom no report was brought concerning him, shall see; and they who have not heard shall consider.

MT

So shall he sprinkle many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths at him: for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider.

The clear corruption is the glaring discrepancy of “Thus shall many na-

¹⁰ Origen in the LXX states this. Both Aquila and Symmachus say υἱο (huio), “son.”

tions wonder at him" in the LXX vs. "So shall he sprinkle many nations" in the MT.¹² In Greek, the phrase "οὕτως θαυμάσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπ' αὐτῷ" has as its subject, the many nations (ἔθνη πολλὰ) that are doing the action of the verb θαυμάσονται (future, middle, indicative, 3rd plural, θαυμάζω), which is wondering at some nebulous "him" (the Messiah). The verb θαυμάζω (*thaumazō*) means to wonder or to marvel and is not even remotely close to representing the Hebrew word for "sprinkle."

In the Hebrew of this verse, the subject is the Messiah who "shall sprinkle many nations." The Hebrew verb for sprinkle is, *nâzâ*. It is used 24 times in the Hebrew and is always translated "sprinkle" in the KJV. In prophetic relation to its presence in Isaiah 52:15, the use of *nâzâ* refers to the priest sprinkling the blood of the sacrifice for the iniquity of the people (Israel). It is used repeatedly in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers in this manner. For example, Leviticus 4:6 says, "And the priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and *sprinkle* of the blood seven times before the Lord, before the veil of the sanctuary" and Leviticus 17:19 says, "And he shall *sprinkle* of the blood upon it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel."

There is no excuse for this corruption in the LXX as the verb for sprinkle in the Greek, ῥαίνω (*rhainō*) is employed 13 times in the LXX where 11 times it is used appropriately to refer to the sprinkling of sacrificial blood in Exodus 29:21, Leviticus 4:17, 5:9, 8:11, 14:16, 14:27, 16:14, 15, 19, and Numbers

19:4.¹³ The noun cognate of the verb ῥαίνω is ῥαντισμός (*rhantismos*) and is directly linked to the scriptural acknowledgment of the fulfillment of Isaiah 52:15 in the New Testament as noted in 1 Peter 1:2 that says, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and *sprinkling* of the blood of Jesus Christ" and Hebrews 12:24 that says, "And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of *sprinkling*, that speaketh better things than that of Abel."

Why is this prophetic description of the Lord Jesus Christ so important, and why should we take this LXX corruption so seriously? The simple matter is that our eternal salvation is through the blood of Christ. In the fulfillment of this prophecy we are told in the New Testament, "Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him (Romans 5:9), "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins (Ephesians 1:7), and "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin (1 John 1:7)—just to list a few of the many verses on this subject. Furthermore, these scriptures were notably written concerning Gentile believers representing the ἔθνος (*ethnos*) or nations of Isaiah 52:15.

Isaiah 53:2 LXX Corruption of Incarnate Christ Growing Up on Earth

LXX

*We brought a report as of a child before him; as a root in a thirsty land: he has no form nor comeliness; and we saw him, but he had no form nor beauty.*¹⁴

13 And we see this in the fact that both Aquila (125 AD) and Theodotion (175 AD) used ῥαντισει in their translations.

14 Origen in the Greek. Aquila wrote και αναβησεται ως τιθνηζομενον εις προσωπον αυτου ("And he shall rise as one

MT

For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.

In the first part of this LXX verse, the Greek states, "ἀνηγγείλαμεν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὡς παιδίον" which is literally rendered in English as, "we reported before him as [a] child." Brenton's English gloss is deceptive because παιδίον (neuter, singular, nominative) is not in the genitive and does not translate as "of a child" but "[a] child" (anarthrous—having no article). The genitive αὐτοῦ (him) is a genitive of reference linked to ἐναντίον (before), giving the phrase "before him." But the main point to be made is that the verb ἀναγγέλλω does not even come close to representing the usage of the Hebrew verb "to grow up" *âlâ*. The Greek verb used¹⁵ is ἀναγγέλλω (*anaggellō*), which means to proclaim, report, or announce. And its verbal form is ἀνηγγείλαμεν (aorist, active indicative, first person plural), which means "we reported" with the subject of "we" built in.

In contrast to the errant Greek translation of this verse, the Hebrew *âlâ* meaning to grow/rise, which is defined within the analogy of a growing tender plant (*yônêq*). This idea in the Hebrew could easily have been richly expressed in a variety of Greek verbs for plant-specific growth, such as θάλλω (*thallō*), αὐξάνω (*auxanō*), βλαστάνω (*blastanō*), or φύω (*phūō*). Furthermore, the Hebrew noun for *yônêq*, describing a "tender plant," is entirely missing in

being nurtured before his face"). Symmachus put (και) ανεβη ως κλαδος ενωπιον αυτου ("(And) he rose as a branch before him"). Theodotion put και αναβησεται ως θηλαζον ενωπιον αυτου ("And he shall rise as a suckling before him").

15 By Origen.

12 By Origen in the LXX. Aquila and Theodotion wrote ραντισει (*rhantisei*), "sprinkle." Symmachus strangely put αποβαλει (*apobalei*), "throw off, throw away."

the LXX. An appropriate noun describing a “tender plant” could have been used, such as φυτόν (*fyton*), meaning “plant,” or βλαστός (*blastos*), meaning “shoot or bud.” The clarifying adjective ἀπαλός (*hapalos*) for “tender” could also have been connected to the noun.

One of the great miracles of God incarnate as the Lord Jesus Christ was that he was not only born of a virgin through the power of the Holy Spirit, but that he grew up and matured as an earthly human in the midst of a wicked world and lived a sinless life (Luke 2:40–52). One of the outcomes of this important point is given in Hebrews 4:15, “For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.” In this respect, this LXX corruption destroys the miraculous prophecy that Christ, the God-Man, as deity-incarnate human would grow up as a man, living a completely sinless life on a sinful, cursed Earth before the Lord, using the analogy of a tender plant growing up in a hostile and dry desert.

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 the LXX 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.¹⁶ 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 Jesus 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 *hén*. 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 υἱόν μου” with “son” (υἱόν *huion*) being in the accusative, singular, and “my” (μου *mou*) being in the first person, genitive, singular. Given the high

specificity of Koinê (common) 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 τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ. Aquila (125 AD), Symmachus, and Theodotion (both ca. 175 AD) all had it right, saying some form of υἱόν μου (*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 1st century AD, was Origen’s column of the *Hexapla*. Aquila reads “τὸν υἱόν μου,” Symmachus put “υἱός μου,” and Theodotion wrote “υἱόν μου,” all 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,

16 By Origen in the LXX. Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion all read “my 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 also 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: *daqar*) 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 κατορχέομαι (κατωρχήσαντο, aorist, third person plural, “they mocked”) is nothing close to the Greek New Testament’s verb “pierced” (ἐξεκέντησαν). 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” (ἐξεκέντησαν, aorist, third person plural, “they pierced”).

In Revelation 1:7, we have a similar messianic prophetic verse to Zechariah 2:10, “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 this LXX passage.

Once again, the blame for either writing or passing this error on can be placed squarely upon Origen’s shoulders. Only he has κατωρχήσαντο. Aquila and Theodotion both put

ἐξεκέντησαν, and Symmachus used ἐπεξεκέντησαν. Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, and Sinaiticus all have Origen’s corrupt reading.

Zechariah 13:7 LXX Corruption of Matthew 26:31’s Fulfillment

LXX

Awake, O sword, against my shepherds, and against the man who is my citizen, saith the Lord Almighty; smite the shepherds, and draw out the sheep: and I will bring mine hand upon the little ones.

MT

Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the LORD of hosts: smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered: and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones.

At the Mount of Olives, right after the Passover supper with his disciples, Jesus himself declared that this prophecy of Zechariah would be immediately fulfilled saying, “All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, *I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad.*” This LXX corruption in Zechariah 13:7 employs a previously noted sabotaging strategy, which is to simply make a key noun in the messianic passage to become plural, thus sabotaging the otherwise clear meaning of the prophecy. In Hebrew, the noun for shepherd (*harō’eh*) is clearly in the singular form. The Greek noun for shepherd, along with its article is clearly plural (τοὺς ποιμένας). Another corruptive oddity is the fact that the Greek verb to “draw out” (ἐκσπάω *ekspaō*) is not the same verb as given in Matthew 26:31, which means “to strike” or “to smite” (πατάσσω *patassō*), used 10 times in the NT and 404 times in the LXX. The verb ἐκσπάω is not used at all in the NT, but appears about 20 times in the LXX.

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 14 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 600th 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 ἐξήκοντα 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). The LXX says that Lamech is 188 [ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα ὀκτώ] years old when Noah is fathered (Genesis 5:28–29). Since LXX says Methuselah lived 802 [ὀκτακόσια δύο] years after Lamech was born, Methuselah would have lived 614 years after Noah was born (because 802 – 188 = 614). LXX says that Noah was in his 600th 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”).

In regard to the Genesis chronology errors of the LXX which we and the

post-Reformation scholars have also taken note of as will be shown below, we would like to acknowledge the recent work of creation scientists Carter and Cosner who have also shown this same flaw in the LXX—proving the superiority of the MT (Cosner and Carter, 2015, 2018; Sanders [formerly Cosner] and Carter, 2019).

Theological Witnesses Against the Septuagint in the Post-Reformation Era

William Whitaker (1548–1595) was a prominent Protestant Anglican churchman, academic, and theologian. He was Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, and a leading divine in the university in the latter half of the sixteenth century. Few English divines were held in higher esteem than Whitaker, who was known as “the pride and ornament of Cambridge” (Beeke and Pederson, 2006, pp. 614–615). He was especially well known for his monumental, 718-page treatise on the Bible entitled *A Disputation on Holy Scripture*, first published in Latin (1588) and then later translated into English and published (Whitaker, 1848). In this work, he made a number of comments on problems with the LXX. First, he notes the discrepancies it had with the MT, saying, “Learned men question whether the Greek version of the scriptures now extant be or be not the version of the seventy elders. The sounder opinion seems to be that of those who determine that the true Septuagint is wholly lost, and that the Greek text, as we have it, is a mixed and miserably corrupted document” and “But this of ours differs amazingly from the Hebrew copies, as well in other places and books, as specially in the Psalms of David” (p. 121).

Whitaker also tackles the issues with the Genesis chronologies, stating, “There is the greatest difference between the Hebrew and Greek books

in the account of times and years. The Greek books reckon 2242 years from Adam and the beginning of the world to the flood, as we read in Augustine, Eusebius, and Nicephorus' Chronology. But in the Hebrew books, we see that there were no more than 1656. Thus, the Greek calculation exceeds the Hebrew by 586 years. Again, from the deluge to Abraham, there is, according to the LXX, an interval of 1082 years. But if you consult the Hebrew Verity, you will not find more than 292” (p. 121). And engaging with the issue of Noah's Flood he says, “It is even a laughable mistake in the Greek by which Methusalem is made to survive the flood fourteen years. Where did he remain during the deluge? or how was he preserved? Certainly he was not in the ark; in which the scripture testifies that there were no more than eight persons. This, therefore, is a manifest falsity in the Greek edition” (p. 122).

Regarding the source of messianic prophecy corruptions, Whitaker gives a synopsis of three Greek translations of the OT that were done by Aquila of Sinope (~130 AD), Symmachus (late second century AD), and Theodotion of Pontus (~150 AD). For the first instance, Whitaker recounts, “Aquila, having originally been a Greek, received baptism and was admitted into the Christian society; but, on account of his assiduous devotion to astrology, was first censured by the Christians, and finally, when he disregarded their censures and admonitions, ejected from the Church; that, stung by such a disgrace, this impious man revolted from the Christians to the Jews, had himself circumcised, learned the Hebrew language and literature, and translated the scriptures of the Old Testament into Greek, but not with faithfulness or sincerity, but with a depraved and perverse intention (καμπύλω καὶ διεστραμμένω, as Theodoret says,) of obscuring the tes-

timonies which confirm the doctrine of Christ” (p. 123). Of Theodotion, Whitaker notes that he was originally of the heretical Christian sect of Marcion, and who “utterly abjured Christianity, went over to the Jews; and, having learned their language, translated the scriptures into the Greek tongue, ‘for the confutation,’ as Theodoret says, ‘of his own sect’” (p. 124). Concerning all three of these men Whitaker notes, “these three interpreters were enemies of the Christian faith, and did not translate the scriptures honestly” (p. 124).

Edward Leigh (1602–1671) was an Oxford-educated Protestant theologian and politician who sat in the House of Commons (1645–1648). After Oxford, Leigh entered the Middle Temple and became a painstaking student of divinity, law, and history. Leigh also served as a colonel in the Parliamentary Army and had a seat in the Westminster Assembly. Leigh wrote a three-volume *Treatise of Divinity*, which, in the first volume, he made enlightening comments on the state of the Septuagint in his day (Leigh 1646). On page 120 (vol. 1) in his section on the LXX Leigh immediately notes, “That Ancient and true translation of the Septuagint, is corrupted and violated, which (as Jerome saith) was agreeable to the Hebrew, but so is not the Greek Copy now extant, which is full of corruptions, and seemeth to be a mixt and confused translation of many.” And he follows this statement with, “If the Seventy, as well as the Hebrew, had been authentical, the Lord would have been careful to have kept it pure and uncorrupt unto our days, as well as he hath done the Hebrew. There is indeed a Greek Edition extant, which goeth under the name of the 70. But Whitaker saith that the true seventy is lost and that this which we now have is mixt and miserably corrupted.” Leigh also notes the Genesis chronology errors as well.

John Owen (1616–1683) was an English Puritan Nonconformist church leader, theologian, and vice-chancellor of the University of Oxford. Owen was one of the most prominent theologians in England during his lifetime and a prolific author. His published works are still widely read, studied, and revered today. Owen's writings today have been reprinted by Banner of Truth Trust in a 16-volume set on a variety of theological topics (Owen, 1853a), as well as a massive 7-volume commentary on the NT epistle to the Hebrews (Owen, 1853b). In various places in his writings, Owen pointed out many of the problematic issues with the LXX. In fact, even in Owen's day, there were proponents claiming that the MT needed "to be corrected by translations, especially that of the LXX; with sundry other such imaginations, which they countenance with uncertain conjectures and fabulous stories" and "I cannot but wonder how some seem to take shelter unto their opinions, especially that of preferring the translation of the LXX" (Owen, 1853a, p. 4:233). In commenting on errors made by John Chrysostom (AD 347–407) and Jerome of Stridon (AD ~342–420) in using the LXX in the Psalms (Jerome would later assert primacy of the MT; Currid, 2019), Owen said, "It cannot be denied but that they were led into these mistakes by the translation of the LXX" (Owen, 1853a, p. 6:608). Regarding the corruption of Isaiah 52:15 discussed previously, Owen acknowledges, "The LXX have very badly rendered the words, 'Many nations shall wonder at him,' both as to words and sense" (Owen 1853a, p. 12:462).

And regarding the fictional and historically inaccurate letter of Aristaeus and its tale of a ~300 BC translation of the OT, Owen says, "let the authors of this insinuation prove the assertion, namely, that there was ever in the world any other copy of the Bible, dif-

fering in any one word from those that we now enjoy; let them produce one testimony, one author of credit, Jew or Christian, that can, or doth, or ever did, speak one word to this purpose" (16:409). And of the fruit of the post-BC LXX translators that did contribute to the text, Owen speaks in terms of them "altering and varying many things from the original, with the innumerable corruptions and interpolations that have befallen that translation" (Owen, 1853a, p. 16:409).

Owen, in his massive 7-volume commentary on the NT epistle to the Hebrews, which has some OT quotes similar to the LXX, says what we also have proposed: back corrections of the errant LXX. In this regard in Volume 4, Owen says, "as many such differences occur, where some have tampered to make the apostle's words and the translation of the LXX in all things to agree" (Owen, 1853b, p. 4:4) and in Volume 5 he again affirms "That sundry passages have been unquestioningly taken out of the New Testament, and inserted into that translation [LXX]; which I have elsewhere proved by undeniable instances" (Owen, 1853b, p. 5:458).

Francis Turretin (1623–1687) studied theology at Geneva, Leiden, Utrecht, Paris, Saumur, Montauban, and Nîmes. He eventually returned to his native city of Geneva, where he pastored and served as professor of theology at the University of Geneva. Turretin's highly impactful *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (IET) was published in three volumes between 1679 and 1685 in Latin and then used as the chief theological textbook at Princeton Seminary until the middle of the 19th century, when Charles Hodge produced a systematic theology in English. Turretin's IET was recently translated into English and published in the late 20th century. And for the purpose of this paper, Turretin's scholarly writings on the LXX are very insightful.

In a section of his IET on *The Holy Scriptures*, where he addresses the LXX, Turretin immediately turns his attention to the issue of messianic prophecy corruptions, noting that "The second [following the alleged BC version] is that of Aquila of Pontus, under the emperor Hadrian, about AD 137. Being first a Greek in religion, afterwards a Christian, then being excommunicated from the church for his attachment to the study of astrology, he went over to the Jews and (actuated by hatred of the Christians) translated the Old Testament in order to corrupt the prophecies concerning Christ" (Turretin, 1992, p. 124). After noting this issue, the topic of this paper, Turretin also addresses subsequent versions up to Origen and Jerome, saying,

"Third, that of Theodotion, who lived under Commodus (AD 184), born in Pontus, a Marcionite in religion, and afterwards turning Jew, made a new version in which he followed the Septuagint for the most part. Fourth, that of Symmachus, under Antoninus and Aurelius (about AD 197), who, from a Samaritan turned Jew, translated the Old Testament in order to confute the Samaritans. There were also two others of uncertain authors: from Jericho, found in a cask in that city, under Caracalla (AD 220); the other, the Nicopolitan, found near Nicopolis in the reign of Alexander Severus (AD 230). Out of all these versions, Origen made up his Tetrapla, his Hexapla, and his Octapla. The Tetrapla contained in distinct columns the four Greek versions of the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion. In the Hexapla, he added two Hebrew editions: one in Hebrew, the other in Greek letters. In the Octapla were inserted the two other anonymous Greek versions, those of Jericho and Nicopolis, which some call the seventh edition. The eighth was that of

Lucian the Martyr, who emended the preceding ones and was favored highly by the Constantinopolitans. The ninth was that of Hesychius, which the Egyptians and Alexandrians embraced. "

And regarding Jerome, Turretin says, "The tenth was one which the ancients said was translated from the Latin of Jerome into Greek," and regarding the early use of the LXX for translations, Turretin notes, "Various ancient Latin versions were also made principally from the Greek versions. The most common was the Italian, according to Augustine (CI 2.15 [FC 2:79; PL 34.46]). Two others were made by Jerome: one from the Septuagint; the other (which he carefully corrected from the Hebrew and Greek text) is supposed to be the present Vulgate, but in process of time became greatly corrupted" (p. 124).

Turretin also added important notes regarding The Letter of Aristeeus saying, "However, if we were called upon to express an opinion, we would give our cordial assent to that of those learned men who consider all these things as worthy of little credit. Even in his time, Jerome began to exhibit and attack the genuineness of the narratives, and this has been done more clearly and strongly by more modern writers (Vives, Saint Augustine, of the City of God...with...comments of Lodovicus Vives 18.42 [1620], pp. 687–88; Scaliger in Thesaurus temporum Eusebii [1606]; Drusius, Casaubon, Wouverus, Ussher, Rivet, Heinsius and others)" (p. 127).

And as an interesting side note to the importance of the LXX to the Roman Catholic Church, he says, "Although the papists do not all speak alike, yet most of them agree that this version [LXX] was divinely inspired and therefore properly obtains divine authority; and that the translators are to be considered not as interpreters but as prophets, who, that they might not

err, had the help of the Holy Spirit in a special way, as Bellarmine says [Jesuit Cardinal and a key figure in the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation] (VD 2.6, pp. 68–71)" (p. 127).

Turretin also addressed the state of the LXX in his day noting, "It is not considered pure now, but greatly corrupted and interpolated. We have only its ruins and wreck (*leipsana*), so that it can hardly be called the version of the Septuagint (like the ship Argo, which was so often repaired as to be neither the same nor yet another). Jerome frequently alludes to this (Letter 112 [89], "Ad Augustinum" [PL 22.928–29]; 'Praefatio...in librum Paralipomenon Praefatio,' from "Hieronymi Prologus Galeatus" in Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis Sixti V...et Clementis VIII [1865], p. xlix and '...in Esdras et Nehemiam Praefatio,' from *ibid.*, p. 1)" (p. 128).

And finally, Turretin also gives us one of the most concise summaries of the absurd Genesis chronology errors of the LXX; "The great discrepancies in chronology between the Hebrew text and the version of the Septuagint (the Hebrew manuscripts making only 1656 years from the creation to the deluge, while the Septuagint makes 2242) does not prove that the version is authentic, but rather that it is corrupt...also the manifest error of the Greek version in extending the life of Methuselah at least fourteen years beyond the flood (if not twenty) and yet does not say that he was in the ark. For if Methuselah begat Lamech in the 165th year of his age (as the admirable notes in Walton's edition of the Greek version say, Biblia sacra polyglotta [1657], 1:20 on Gen. 5:25), Methuselah ought to have lived so many years after the flood. [pg. 129]" and "The anachronism (*anachronismos*) in the Septuagint in the calculation of the life of the postdiluvian patriarchs (where they extend the number of years above 1700 to the birth of Abraham—the Hebrew making only 292 years—because they add at least one

hundred years to the life of each of the patriarchs who lived between the flood and the time of Abraham) cannot favor the authenticity of that version. It demonstrates a glaring error from whatever source it may have arisen" (p. 130).

Discussion

In comparing these twelve high-profile Messianic prophecies between the LXX and the MT, we find that they have been completely corrupted and sabotaged in the Greek of the LXX, effectively removing their prophetic connection to the New Testament mission and divinity (and Gospel) of the Lord Jesus Christ. And while we are the first to systematically document how they were sabotaged, we are not the first to acknowledge this sad state of affairs as we proved by the writings of leading post-Reformation scholars.

These 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 and His Deity, 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. It is therefore proposed 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).

We do not downplay the fact 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 errors of the LXX, along with its non-canonical and unbiblical apocryphal writings, it is strongly recommended that it be abandoned as a reliable source of Biblical Scripture, being inferior to the preserved Hebrew Scriptures that we know as the Masoretic Text. It is the carefully transmitted and providentially preserved Hebrew text that should be used as the authoritative text for Old Testament research.

Finally, we would like to acknowledge that following the first version of this paper that we published five years ago (Tomkins, Daniels, and Johnson, 2019) there was quite a heated backlash from several individuals in the creationist community. Their concerns and objections were subsequently

answered by authors James Johnson (Th.D. and Hebraist) and David Daniels (M.Div. and Wycliffe and SIL Global-trained Bible translator), and we request that before any letters to the editor be sent in response to this current paper, that these citations be read and considered (Daniels, 2020; Johnson and Daniels, 2020a, 2020b).

References

- Bardtke, H., W. Baumgartner, P.A. de Boer, O. Eibfeldt, et al. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia BHS 5th*. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, Germany.
- Beeke, J.R., and R.J. Pederson. 2006. *Meet the Puritans*. Reformation Heritage Books, Grand Rapids, MI.
- 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.
- Cooper, William R. 2017. *New Testament Fragments Amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Creation Science Movement, Portsmouth, UK.
- Cosner, L., and R. Carter. 2015. Textual Traditions and Biblical Chronology. *Journal of Creation* 29(2):99–105.
- 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 February 11, 2025.
- Currid, J. 2019. The Hermit Who Saved the Hebrew Truth. *Reformed Faith & Practice* 4(3). Accessed February 18, 2025, at <https://journal.rts.edu/article/the-hermit-who-saved-the-hebrew-truth>.
- Daniels, D. 2020. Reply to Doug Ell’s Letter to the Editor. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 56:261–264.
- Daniels, D.W. 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., and D. Daniels. 2020a. Septuagint Reply. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 56(2):188–191.
- Johnson, J.J.S., and D. Daniels. 2020b. Johnson and Daniels’ Response to Carter and Cosner’s Letter. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 57(1):65–68.
- Lanier, G.R., and W.A. Ross. 2021. *The Septuagint: What It Is and Why It Matters*. Crossway, Wheaton, IL.
- Leigh, E. 1646. A Treatise of Divinity Consisting of Three Bookes: The First of Which Handling the Scripture or Word of God, Treateth of Its Divine Authority, the Canonically Bookes, the Authentically Edition, and Severall Versions, the End, Properties, and Interpretation of Scripture. E. Griffin, London, UK. Accessed on February 14, 2025. <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A47629.0001.001/1:7.6?rgn=div2;view=fulltext>.
- Morris II, H.M. 2012. *The Henry Morris Study Bible*. Master Books, Green Forest, AR.
- Owen, J. 1853a. *The Works of John Owen*, edited by W. Goold. Johnstone and Hunter, Edinburgh-London, UK. 24 volumes; volumes 1–16, reprint editions, 1987. Banner of Truth, London, England.
- Owen, J. 1853b. *An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, edited by W. Goold. Johnstone and Hunter, Edinburgh-London, UK. 24 volumes; volumes 17–23 (vol. 1–7) reprint editions, 1991. Banner of Truth, London, England.
- Rahlfs, A. 2007. *Septuaginta (Greek Edition)*. Edited by R. Hanhart. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, Germany.
- Rydelink, M., and E. Blum. 2019. *The Moody Handbook of Messianic Prophecy: Studies and Expositions of the Messiah in the Old Testament*. Moody Publishers, Chicago, IL.
- Sanders, L., and R. Carter. 2019. The Masoretic Text of Genesis 5 and 11 is still the most reliable. Posted on creation.com at <https://creation.com/smith-response>. Accessed February 11, 2025.
- 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*. Edited by J.H. Whitmore, pp. 117–132. Creation Science Fellowship, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Thiede, C.P. 2001. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Jewish Origins of Christianity*. Palgrave Macmillan, Camden, London, UK.
- Thiede, C.P., and M. d'Ancona. 1996. *Eye-witness to Jesus: Amazing New Manuscript Evidence about the Origin of the Gospels*. Doubleday, London, UK.
- Tomkins, J.P., D.W. Daniels, and J.J.S. Johnson. 2019. Extensive Messianic Prophecy Corruptions and Flood-Related Chronology Errors Disqualify the Septuagint (LXX) as a Reliable Source for Creationist Research. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 56(1):40–47.
- Turretin, F. 1992. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, Volume 1. Edited by James T. Dennison, Jr.; translated by George Musgrave Giger. P&R Publishing, Phillipsburg, NJ.
- Whitaker, W. 1849. *A Disputation on Holy Scripture*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. First published in Latin as *Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura* in 1588.
- Woodward, S.D. 2018. *Rebooting the Bible, Part 1*. Faith Happens Books, Oklahoma City, OK.
- Woodward, S.D. 2019. *A Biography of the Christian Bible*. Faith Happens Books, Oklahoma City, OK.