√*Evolution and Special Creation, page 126*

On these various grounds we conclude that the Scriptures furnish no data for a chronological computation prior to the life of Abraham; and that the Mosaic records do not fix and were not intended to fix the precise date either of the Flood or of the creation of the world.

-- William Henry Green, "Primeval Chronology," in *Bibliotheca Sacra* 147 (1890), pp. 285-303.

Oswald 1. Allis, in Appendix II ("The Antiquity of Man") of <u>The Five Books of</u> <u>Moses</u> treats the genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11. A few excerpts from this article follow.

With regard to the genealogies in Genesis v. and xi. there are a number of important points to be noted.

1. it is significant that neither chapter v. nor xi. ends with a total for the period covered and that the data supplied by these chapters are never used elsewhere in Scripture as the basis for chronological calculations. Several long dates are given (e.g., Gen. xv.13, Ex. xii.40, I Kgs. vi.1), cf. Acts vii.6, xiii.20); and a statement as to the length of time between the Creation and the Flood, and between the Flood and the Call of Abraham would be very interesting. But such statements occur nowhere in the Bible, though found for example in Josephus.

2. These genealogies have a symmetrical form which suggests that links may have been omitted. . . .

3. The statement in Gen. xi.26, 'and Terah lived seventy years and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran' does not accord with the theory that we are dealing with an exact chronology.

4. That many of the genealogies in the Old Testament are abridged is a well-known fact....

5. The only objection which can be raised against the view that, as in many other instances so in the genealogies of Gen. v. and xi., links may be omitted, is the fact that the age of each patriarch on attaining fatherhood is expressly stated. This is thought to Justify or require the conclusion that the total for the entire period can be ascertained (in round numbers) by adding up the total ages of these worthies when they became fathers. But this argument is not convincing . . . If the formula 'x begat y' can, in the statement 'Joram begat Ozias,' mean 'Joram begat (the ancestor of) Ozias,' there is no reason why adding the statement of age 'Joram lived _____ years and begat Ozias' could not mean exactly the same thing.

6. The view that these tables are not intended to give a strict chronology is favored by certain phenomena which appear in them. . .