Old Testament Source documents (2)

The Septuagint:-

The name Septuagint (Sept- is the root word for seven in Latin) derives from the fact that 72 Jewish scholars in Alexandria, Egypt, seem to have attempted a translation of some Old Testament books into Greek. Modern scholars claim that the Septuagint is a valid Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament, a translation which occurred around 200 BC. The claim is that the Septuagint was directly translated from the Hebrew, two centuries before Christ. These modern day scholars claim that the apostles quoted from the Septuagint, and because the quotes are the same, that is how we know the Septuagint is the Word of God. In reality, this is not true whatsoever. All that exists are scraps of evidence that the first five books of the Old Testament were translated into Greek at around 200 BC. There's no shred of evidence that the remainder of the Old Testament was translated into Greek at around 200 BC.

What it comes down to is that the Septuagint, the book as we know it today, has nothing to do with what was translated in 200 BC. What was produced in 200 BC didn't survive (except the scraps). All historical evidence only points to the fact the 72 only translated the first five books, Genesis through Deuteronomy. That is all the BC evidence there is, that's all there is to show.

Subsequently, some two hundred years after Christ, an Alexandrian called Origin somehow extrapolates a version from these incomplete little scraps and produces a complete Old Testament Greek translation. In the process, we will show that he doctored, altered and changed the Hebrew Old Testament when he translated it into Greek. Origin was a strange person, who castrated himself and considered it spiritual. This is the man who produced the earliest 'Septuagint', in a book called, "The Hexapla," which is like a parallel Bible showing different versions. One of the columns he labelled, "Septuagint".

The Septuagint and the Dead Sea scrolls.

Many claims have been made about the Scrolls. For one, we will see that the findings at Qumran overwhelming support the Masoretic Text to an astounding degree. However, we will do well to remember that the Essenes, living in the desert at Qumran, were a strange sect. One would expect that amongst their writings one would most likely find some corrupt manuscripts, amongst the majority of Masoretic texts. Fortunately, not so far off, further south, are the findings at Wadi Murabbaat and Masada, which exclusively support the Masoretic Text. This weight of evidence shows that the established text, accepted by those placed in charge of the oracles of God (Romans 3:1-2), was the Traditional Hebrew Text. The fact that we have such exact copies one thousand years older than the ones used to produce the Authorized Version (KJV) reveal to us the providential hand of the Almighty God in preserving His words. Secondly, it seems rather foolish to accept the variant findings in Dead Sea Cave IV as final and authoritative without knowing for certain who placed them there and why, no matter how old they are dated.

There is a reason why the Masoretic Text not only won out so faithfully over the centuries. There is also a reason why the findings among the variant scrolls , which differ from the Masoretic, are so few in number. But modern scholars prefer not to see it in this way.

It is now common for modern scholars to state: "People who take the Bible literally now have a real big problem, now that the Dead Sea Scrolls have validated the Septuagint". "This proves that the apostles quoted the Septuagint," and then they try show you that the apostles quoted from **Jeremiah and Psalms**. However, what exactly did they find at the Dead Sea matching the Septuagint? Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. Just scraps, little scraps of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. What does that prove about Jeremiah? What does that prove about Psalms? It proves nothing.

In reality, to put it bluntly, the main reason why some of the quotes in the New Testament match up with the corrupt Septuagint is because the Septuagint was written hundreds of years after the New Testament. Here's what a man called Origen did. He reconstructed the Septuagint to match the New Testament, to give this credibility so that people would look at this and say, "Wow, this reads just like the New Testament. This must be what the New Testament was quoting from." That's getting the cart before the horse, my friend.

Origin, the Alexandrian False Teacher, False Prophet, his heresies would be a whole chapter. He twisted scripture in places, and the in other places he made it conform to the New Testament to give it credibility, to make it seem legit. However, you will never find a Greek Septuagint manuscript that the apostles were quoting from before the time of Christ. It's hundreds of years later that this thing comes into existence, and again, we're not denying that the first five books of the Bible were translated into Greek, but here's the thing, that's not what this book is. This Septuagint comes into existence hundreds of years later.

The NIV and ESV have been changing scriptures in the Old Testament to follow the Septuagint, a fraud, for which there's no substantial evidence of being in existence before Christ. Oh, there's evidence that there was a Greek translation of five books before Christ and maybe more books, maybe there were Greek translations of lots of books. It wouldn't surprise me if there were other Greek translations of all the books of the Old Testament, but you know what? Not in this format. Not in this corruption that is being put upon us today as the so called Septuagint.

The ESV, NAS are taking changes from the Septuagint and then put a little footnote, "Here's what the Hebrew says." Let's rather put a big footnote on the whole King James Old Testament, "This is what the **Hebrew** says." Look, "Continue thou in the things that you've learned and what you've been assured of," and that's what I'm doing today, is just assuring you today that the King James Bible is the Word of God. It is the same as what it was thousands of years ago. It's in English, but it says the same thing.

We don't need to go dig up some messed up Septuagint or messed up Dead Sea Scrolls and go to the Hebrew that was buried in the Earth. No, we need to go with that which was passed down. That which has been preserved to every generation, and the King James Bible is the Word of God in English. You don't need to learn Hebrew

to understand this. You don't need to learn Greek. You don't need to travel over the sea. You don't need to dig down into the Earth. You don't need to climb up into heaven. It's near you. It's near us. It's in our mouth. It's in our heart. It's what we preach. It is the Word of God. It is the mind of Christ.

Isn't it great to have it at our fingertips? Isn't it good to know that it's accurate? That it's reliable?

Origen (Extracted from the Guardian"https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/belief/2010/jun/10/origen-christianity-philosophy"

Origen learnt Hebrew in order to read the Hebrew Bible. Like Philo, Origen read scripture allegorically. The Bible was divinely inspired, he held, **but** since so many of the stories in the Bible were clearly false and even ridiculous, God's intention must have been that they not be taken literally. "What intelligent person", Origen asked, "can imagine that there was a first "day", then a second and a third "day" – evening and morning – without the sun, the moon, and the stars ... Who is foolish enough to believe that, like a human gardener, God planted a garden in Eden ... I cannot imagine that anyone will doubt that these details point symbolically to spiritual meanings, by using an historical narrative which did not literally happen."

Origen was declared a heretic and anathematised by the second council of Constantinople in 553, some three centuries after his death. "It was Origen's Platonism that did him in. Following Plato, he subscribed to the doctrine of pre-existent soul. God's first creation, before time, was a collectivity of souls. Of these, all but one, the human soul of Christ, fell away. In the end, however, all humans and every spirit, even the devil, would be saved, returning to a state of "pure mind".

"Alexandria, Origen's birthplace, was the intellectual center of the Hellenistic world and a hotbed of speculative Platonic philosophy. In the first century Philo of Alexandria had, through his biblical exegesis, attempted to fuse Platonism and Judaism. Origen, with greater success, sought to merge Christianity with Greek philosophy." Success ,in this case, clearly meaning 'successful deception'. Adherents of false religions and worldly philosophy do love Origen.

Furthermore, from https://www.christianitytoday.com/history/issues/issue-51/origen-model-or-heretic.html, we extract the following: "Origen and many other Christians (like Augustine) believed the Scriptures had a double meaning; the spiritual significance, while escaping the notice of most people, could be contemplated by the perfected Christian. " But Origen's interpretations crossed the boundaries of orthodoxy. He extended this general truth to physical objects. From Origen now arises the heresy of religious artefacts: " At the root of these controversies is Origen's (unacceptable) use of the Bible. Neo-Platonism taught that physical objects acted as symbols of spiritual reality and so contained a double meaning."

Later in life, the historian Eusebius reported, he castrated himself in literal obedience to Matthew 19:12. And in 250, during the violent persecution of Decius, he was imprisoned and tortured so severely that he never recovered.

Corrupt or not?

The Septuagint can be proven corrupt in a few moments. The 72 Jews, or Origen, made a mistake with their maths in Genesis. They have Methuselah live an additional 14 years after the flood. In the Bible Methuselah was the oldest man who ever lived. He lived to be 969 years old. If one does the math, one notices that Methuselah dies the exact year of the flood, the very same year. Reading the Genesis 5 genealogies and doing the math, one can add up how long it was from the creation to the flood: it was one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years.

That is pretty easy math. Many have done it. But when reading the Septuagint and doing the same math, one finds that it's 2,256 years to the flood. It seems that the 72 Jews, or Origen, padded the numbers to make it 600 more years to the flood. As to why we can only guess. This could be because they lived in Egypt and the Egyptians had their own mythology. Hence they may have tried to match the Egyptian calendar to make theirs a more acceptable number. Now here's the amazing thing. If one does the rest of the math using the Septuagint, one finds that Methuselah dies 14 years after the flood…he survived the flood outside the ark! This 900 year old man must have treaded water for a whole year!

Maths doesn't lie, is not subject to interpretation, The figures are not contestable. It clearly shows the Septuagint as suspect and corrupt. The Hebrew Bible, on the other hand, is once again validated by it's beautifully and elegantly meshing numbers. The 72 Jews messed with the Septuagint numbers, obviously on purpose, but they got the numbers wrong. That's not translating. When you're translating, you don't change numbers. But this translation has Methuselah live an additional 14 years after the flood. That clearly shows that the Septuagint is corrupt, after only digging a few pages into it.

Translation error can also not explain first Samuel 17, the famous story about David and Goliath, where verses 12 through 31 are gone. Apparently the Book of Job also has around 400 verses removed in the Septuagint. There are a vast number of Hebrew manuscripts backing up the handed down traditional text, while the Septuagint stands on its own. Given this, which one will you trust? Can anyone take the lone Septuagint seriously? "But it's older, so it's better", the modern scholars argue. Only for those gullible enough to place a 'learned' opinion higher than the laws of mathematics, and willing to swallow the 'older is better' line, to them it might it appear so.

Septuagint 'backed up' by the Vaticanus?

When Paul quotes the Old Testament, the NIV and ESV footnotes say: In the Hebrew it says this…". The NIV and ESV have used the Septuagint for these quotes, especially quotes from the Psalms and Jeremiah. **Guess when we have the earliest Septuagint manuscripts of Psalms and Jeremiah?** Three or four hundred years after Christ! Let's investigate the names of these manuscripts. Let's see if these names sound familiar. These are the names that the NIV and ESV refer to. Here's the name of one of them, Sinaiticus. Here's the name of another one, Vaticanus. Vatican? Hmm. Vaticanus? Here's another one, Alexandrinus. Those are the three big manuscripts of the Septuagint dating back to three or four hundred years after

Christ. That's supposedly telling us what the Greek translation said 200 years before Christ, that Jesus supposedly quoted from.

Here's what academic opinion has said for years: “We reject the Septuagint as being corrupt”. That's why the King James translators didn't use it. They used the Hebrew scriptures.

But then the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered, and as a result academic opinion changed, all for the wrong reasons. Academics will lie to you and say, "Well, the Dead Sea Scrolls prove that the Septuagint goes back before the time of Christ because the Septuagint matches the Dead Sea Scrolls," and as a result Origin couldn’t have originated the Septuagint. However, here's what they found at the Dead Sea, only scraps of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. How does that prove, based on these scraps, that the rest of what Origin put out (included the Apocrypha and all the rest of the Old Testament books, Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah), ... how does that prove anything?

We have evidence historically that the first five books were translated into Greek a few hundred years before Christ, and have evidence that even scholars who look at the Septuagint will tell you that this was not all translated by one person or one group. It's translated different in different parts. It's clearly from different time periods, but no. We're supposed to believe that this book, the Septuagint, this whole book, was translated 200 years before Christ and that the disciples quoted from it.