

TOPICAL SERMON: IS LUKE WRONG ABOUT THE SON OF ARPHAXAD?

[2] The title of the sermon: "Is Luke Wrong About The Son Of Arphaxad?"

Is This An Error In The King James Bible?

- Today, I want to go over one so the so-called "ERRORS" in the King James Bible.
- Let's see what the supposed error is within the King James Bible.
- First, we'll go to Luke Chapter 3 which is giving us the genealogy of Jesus Christ.

[3] Luke 3:35-36 Which was the son of Saruch, which was the son of Ragau, which was the son of Phalec, which was the son of Heber, which was the son of Sala, 36 Which was the son of Cainan, which was the son of Arphaxad, which was the son of Sem, which was the son of Noe, which was the son of Lamech,

- Luke Chapter 3 tells us that the son of Arphaxad was Cainan. And Arphaxad is the son of Shem.
- Notice in Luke Chapter, that we see the Bible saying "THE SON OF" over and over.
- When we look at the genealogy of Jesus Christ in Matthew Chapter 1, we see the Bible using "THE SON OF" and "BEGAT."

[4] Matthew 1:1-2 The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. 2 Abraham begat Isaac; and Isaac begat Jacob; and Jacob begat Judas and his brethren;

- We see Jesus is "THE SON OF" David. He is "THE SON OF" Abraham.
- Jesus isn't the actual born SON OF either one of those: David or Abraham.
- Then, in Matthew Chapter 1, we see the genealogy of Jesus Christ change to "BEGAT."
- Abraham BEGAT Isaac. Isaac begat Jacob. Further down in Matthew Chapter 1, though, we see this.

[5] Matthew 1:8-9 And Asa begat Josaphat; and Josaphat begat Joram; and Joram begat Ozias; 9 And Ozias begat Joatham; and Joatham begat Achaz; and Achaz begat Ezekias;

- Ozias in this verse is not the immediate son of Joram. Ozias is called Uzziah in 2 Chronicles Chapter 26.
- And Ozias is called Azariah in 2 Kings Chapter 15. Keep in mind that Ozias begat Joatham.

[6] 2 Chronicles 26:1 Then all the people of Judah took Uzziah, who was sixteen years old, and made him king in the room of his father Amaziah.

[7] 2 Chronicles 26:23 So Uzziah slept with his fathers, and they buried him with his fathers in the field of the burial which belonged to the kings; for they said, He is a leper: and Jotham his son reigned in his stead.

- So Ozias from the Greek in Matthew Chapter 1 is Uzziah from the Hebrew in 2 Chronicles Chapter 26.

[8] 2 Kings 14:21 And all the people of Judah took Azariah, which was sixteen years old, and made him king instead of his father Amaziah.

- Ozias is called Uzziah and Azariah.

[9] 2 Kings 15:1-2 In the twenty and seventh year of Jeroboam king of Israel began Azariah son of Amaziah king of Judah to reign. 2 Sixteen years old was he when he began to reign, and he reigned two and fifty years in Jerusalem. And his mother's name was Jecholiah of Jerusalem.

- The father of Azariah or Uzziah or Ozias in Matthew Chapter 1 is AMAZIAH.
- Again, Amaziah is the actual birth father of Ozias in Matthew Chapter 1.
- But Matthew Chapter 1 says that Joram begat Ozias. But that isn't his actual birth father.
- But he's in the same line. So genealogies are not always father to son.
- Same thing with Abraham not being the birth father of Jesus Christ.
- Same thing with David not being the birth father of Jesus Christ.
- Jesus is the "SON OF ABRAHAM" and the "SON OF DAVID." They are in His physical line.

[10] Matthew 22:41-42 While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, 42 Saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The Son of David.

[11] Matthew 22:43-45 He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, 44 The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? 45 If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?

- It was a mystery to the Pharisees. They couldn't answer Jesus because they had no idea.
- Jesus Christ is God, but He came to the earth in the flesh to be our Savior.
- He was before all because He didn't have a beginning or an ending. He is God.
- But He was made a little lower than the angels so He could become flesh and be our Savior.
- So, obviously, the genealogies of Jesus Christ teach us many, many things.
- When we go to Matthew Chapter 1 and Luke Chapter 3, we see that these genealogies are not the exact father to son relationship as they are listed out.
- Again, the Book of Luke says this:

[12] Luke 3:35-36 Which was the son of Saruch, which was the son of Ragau, which was the son of Phalec, which was the son of Heber, which was the son of Sala, 36 Which was the son of Cainan, which was the son of Arphaxad, which was the son of Sem, which was the son of Noe, which was the son of Lamech,

- "Which was the son of Cainan, which was the son of Arphaxad."
- "BIBLE SCHOLARS" will tell us that this is a lie. They will say that the King James Bible has a mistake.
- They will go back to the Old Testament with proof that this is a contradiction in the Bible.
- Let's go back to the Old Testament and see who is the actual son of Arphaxad.
- Is it Cainan as Luke Chapter 3 says?
- Keep in mind that the actual father of Arphaxad is Shem and Arphaxad's grandfather is Noah.

[13] Genesis 10:21-24 Unto Shem also, the father of all the children of Eber, the brother of Japheth the elder, even to him were children born. 22 The children of Shem; Elam, and Asshur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram.

23 And the children of Aram; Uz, and Hul, and Gether, and Mash. 24 And Arphaxad begat Salah; and Salah begat Eber.

- Arphaxad begat Salah. There is no mention of Cainan in this Scripture as it says in Luke Chapter 3.
- This doesn't mean there is a contradiction between Genesis Chapter 10 and Luke Chapter 3.

[14] Genesis 11:10-13 These are the generations of Shem: Shem was an hundred years old, and begat Arphaxad two years after the flood: 11 And Shem lived after he begat Arphaxad five hundred years, and begat sons and daughters. 12 And Arphaxad lived five and thirty years, and begat Salah: 13 And Arphaxad lived after he begat Salah four hundred and three years, and begat sons and daughters.

- Again, Arphaxad begat Salah. There is no mention of Cainan in Genesis Chapter 11.
- Again, Luke Chapter 3 says that Cainan is "THE SON OF" Arphaxad.
- And Luke Chapter 3 tells us that Sala is the son of Cainan.
- But Genesis tells us that Arphaxad begat Salah.
- So, Luke Chapter 3 has Cainan mixed in between Arphaxad and Salah.

[15] 1 Chronicles 1:17-18 The sons of Shem; Elam, and Asshur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram, and Uz, and Hul, and Gether, and Meshech. 18 And Arphaxad begat Shelah, and Shelah begat Eber.

- 1 Chronicles Chapter 1 tells us that Arphaxad is a son of Shem.
- And we see Arphaxad begat Shelah.

Cainan Is Not Mentioned In The Old Testament

- Again, there is no mention of Cainan being a son of Arphaxad in the Old Testament.
- Let's draw this out so you aren't confused by all of these names.

[16]



- Is it Noah, Shem, Arphaxad, Salah as we see in Genesis Chapter 10, Genesis Chapter 11, and 1 Chronicles Chapter 1?
- Or, is it Noah, Shem, Arphaxad, Cainan, and Salah as we see in Luke Chapter 3? Which one is it?

The name Arphaxad is mentioned 10 times in the entire Bible.

- We've went though all of those Scriptures so far. Twice in Genesis Chapter 10.
- Four times in Genesis Chapter 11. Three times in 1 Chronicles Chapter 1.
- That's nine times in the Old Testament. And then once in Luke Chapter 3 for ten occurrences.
- That's all the information God gives us on Arphaxad. 10 occurrences of his name.
- Now, what about Cainan? Well, there's 2 different Cainan's in the Bible.
- But, the name Cainan appears 7 times in the King James Bible.

[17] Genesis 5:6-8 And Seth lived an hundred and five years, and begat Enos: 7 And Seth lived after he begat Enos eight hundred and seven years, and begat sons and daughters: 8 And all the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years: and he died.

- So, we're going all the way back to Seth who was the third son of Adam and Eve.

[18] Genesis 5:9-11 And Enos lived ninety years, and begat Cainan: 10 And Enos lived after he begat Cainan eight hundred and fifteen years, and begat sons and daughters: 11 And all the days of Enos were nine hundred and five years: and he died.

- Here's where we see the first Cainan in the Bible.
- Enos is the father of this first Cainan. This Cainan is not the subject of the sermon.
- But I'm going to show you all the 7 instances of the name Cainan in the Bible. There's 2 so far.

[19] Genesis 5:12-14 And Cainan lived seventy years, and begat Mahalaleel: 13 And Cainan lived after he begat Mahalaleel eight hundred and forty years, and begat sons and daughters: 14 And all the days of Cainan were nine hundred and ten years: and he died.

- There's 3 more instances of the name Cainan. Again, this is not the Cainan we are interested in.
- Here's the last 2 instances of the name Cainan which come in Luke Chapter 3.

[20] Luke 3:36-37 Which was the son of Cainan, which was the son of Arphaxad, which was the son of Sem, which was the son of Noe, which was the son of Lamech, 37 Which was the son of Mathusala, which was the son of Enoch, which was the son of Jared, which was the son of Maleleel, which was the son of Cainan,

- This is the Cainan we are interested in. This is the son of Arphaxad.
- The Cainan in Genesis Chapter 5 is the son of Enos. This would be Seth's grandson, Cainan.
- And Adam's great grandson named Cainan. The Cainan in Luke Chapter 3 is much later on.
- So, that's it for Cainan in the Bible. That's all the information we get on Cainan.
- The one in Luke Chapter 3 is not mentioned anywhere else in the entire King James Bible.

I triple checked to see if I was missing a different spelling of the name Cainan.

- We'll call the Cainan from Enos the first Cainan.
- We'll call the Cainan from Arphaxad the second Cainan.
- So, the subject of this sermon, is talking about the second Cainan.
- Well, the first Cainan is also referred to as Kenan or "K-E-N-A-N" and not "C-A-I-N-A-N."
- There's only one verse in the Bible with the name "K-E-N-A-N" and this is talking about the first Cainan.

[21] 1 Chronicles 1:1-3 Adam, Sheth, Enosh, 2 Kenan, Mahalaleel, Jared, 3 Henoch, Methuselah, Lamech,

- All the way back to Adam, Seth, Enos, and then Cainan. So this isn't the one we're interested in.
- In other words, the Bible doesn't give us any further information on Cainan in Luke Chapter 3.
- The Old Testament excludes Cainan but the New Testament includes Cainan in this genealogy.
- Well, some people just can't take this. They'll think that they MUST figure this out.
- So, what do they do? They start making things up and people believe what they say.
- And that's why we're going over this sermon today.

People will tell you that the King James Bible has mistakes because of this Scripture about the son of Arphaxad in Luke Chapter 3.

- I want you all to be aware of things like this because they are very convincing.
- They will say that there are mistakes in the Bible and this is just one of the examples.
- So, let's start with the so-called great "SCHOLAR" named John Gill. Let's see what he says about Luke 3:36.

[22] "This Cainan is not mentioned by Moses in Ge 11:12 nor has he ever appeared in any Hebrew copy of the Old Testament, nor in the Samaritan version, nor in the Targum; nor is he mentioned by Josephus, nor in 1Ch 1:24 where the genealogy is repeated; nor is it in Beza's most ancient Greek copy of Luke: it indeed stands in the present copies of the Septuagint, but was not originally there;"

[23] "And therefore could not be taken by Luke from thence, but seems to be owing to some early negligent transcriber of Luke's Gospel, and since put into the Septuagint to give it authority: I say "early", because it is in many Greek copies, and in the Vulgate Latin, and all the Oriental versions, even in the Syriac, the oldest of them;"

- Just for your information, the Septuagint is abbreviated LXX and is a Greek translation of the Old Testament from the original Hebrew.
- In other words, the original Hebrew doesn't have this second Cainan but a translation from Hebrew to Greek in the Septuagint does have this second Cainan.
- This means the Septuagint is wrong. The King James Bible doesn't follow the Septuagint in the Old Testament because it's very clear that the original Hebrew doesn't have this second Cainan.
- Some so-called scholars will even say that Luke copied from the Septuagint.
- They will say, "Luke didn't get it from the Holy Spirit. He used the Septuagint, obviously."

John Gill Admits That Many Greek Manuscripts Contain Cainan

So, John Gill admits that MANY of the copies of the original Greek of the New Testament includes Cainan in Luke Chapter 3.

- And it's very clear that the original Old Testament Hebrew doesn't have this Cainan.
- But John Gill is saying it doesn't make sense so watch his conclusion next.

[24] "But ought not to stand neither in the text, nor in any version: for certain it is, there never was such a Cainan, the son of Arphaxad, for Salah was his son; and with him the next words should be connected, which was the son of Arphaxad; which was the son of Sem, or Shem, which was the son of Noe, or Noah, which was the son of Lamech,"

- In other words, the great Baptist theologian, John Gill, says that Cainan doesn't belong in the Scriptures.
- But, he admits that Cainan is in MANY of the copies of the original autographs.
- The original autographs would be the INSPIRED and PERFECT word of God that God wrote.
- But John Gill says, "Oh no God, you're wrong. Cainan wasn't the son of Arphaxad."

John Gill says, "There never was such a Cainan, the son of Arphaxad." Do you see that?

- Was John Gill alive to verify that? That was about 4,400 years ago. John Gill lived in the 1700's.
- So over 4,000 years from the time that John Gill lived here on earth.
- But he's going to tell us that no such Cainan lived? Do you think he knew for sure? Of course he didn't.
- But I know of ONE who does know, and that's God. Was God alive when Arphaxad and Cainan was alive?

Again, the so-called Bible experts decrease the faith of believers who are reading their commentaries.

- But not mine John Gill. That trash doesn't work on me. I believe the King James Bible is perfect.
- I believe we have the perfect word of God without error in English with the King James Bible.
- Let's see what some other Bible scholars say about Luke 3:36. John Gill was bold.
- He flat out said that God was wrong. He doesn't believe we have a perfect set of Scriptures.
- Here's what Adam Clarke says about Luke 3:36.

[25] Of Cainan - This Cainan, the son of Arphaxad, and father of Sala, is not found in any other Scripture genealogy. See Ge 10:24; 11:12; 1Ch 1:18, 1Ch 1:24, where Arphaxad is made the father of Sala, and no mention at all made of Cainan.

[26] Some suppose that Cainan was a surname of Sala, and that the names should be read together thus, The son of Heber, the son of Salacainan, the son of Arphaxad, etc. If this does not untie the knot, it certainly cuts it; and the reader may pass on without any great scruple or embarrassment. There are many sensible observations on this genealogy in the notes at the end of Bishop Newcome's Harmony.

- This man believes I am going to be embarrassed about the supposed contradiction in the Bible between Genesis, 1 Chronicles, and Luke.
- "We can avoid such an embarrassment." We should use another book to figure it out.
- Now, let's take a look at Matthew Henry's commentary.

[27] One difficulty occurs between Abraham and Noah, which gives us some perplexity, Lu 3:35-36. Sala is said to be the son of Cainan, and he the son of Arphaxad, whereas Sala was the son of Arphaxad (Ge 10:24; 11:12), and there is no such man as Cainan found there.

[28] But, as to that, it is sufficient to say that the Seventy Interpreters, who, before our Saviour's time, translated the Old Testament into Greek, for reasons best known to themselves inserted that Cainan; and St. Luke, writing among the Hellenist Jews, was obliged to make use of that translation, and therefore to take it as he found it.

- The Seventy Interpreters he is mentioning there is talking about the Septuagint.
- The Septuagint was written 200 to 300 years before Jesus Christ came to earth, supposedly.
- So these great Bible scholars tell us that Luke must have used the Septuagint for the genealogies in Luke Chapter 3.

Do you see what they're doing? They are saying that there's no way Luke got this from God.

- They are saying that it's obviously an error and Luke must have put this error in from the Septuagint.
- So, what they are actually saying here? That we don't have a perfect Bible. There are mistakes.
- Do you see who was leading the way in all of these new Bible versions?
- Yes, it was the men of this world who acted like they had great faith in God.
- When, in reality, what they were doing was sick. Totally depraved and sick.

Did Luke Make A Mistake When He Lists Cainan As The Son Of Arphaxad?

"Luke made a mistake when he wrote that Cainan was the son of Arphaxad." That's what they say.

- So what do you think most of the pastors and preachers in this world today will side with?
- Will they side with the perfectly written Book of Luke in the King James Bible?
- Or, will they side with the great "Bible scholars" from this world?
- Will they side with the Holy Spirit of God or with man? Of course they all choose to side with man.
- Hey, listen, not here. We will not side with man on this matter. We will side with the Book of Luke.
- We will side with the perfect word of God in the King James Bible. We will choose God's word.
- We won't make up excuses. We won't make up fairy tales like John Gill and Matthew Henry.

[29] Proverbs 30:5-6 Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. 6 Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.

- When John Gill, Matthew Henry, and the great theologians change and add to God's word, what do you think happens?
- What happens is exactly what that Scripture says right there. "They will be found liars."
- Luke isn't the liar. The Holy Spirit isn't the liar. God isn't the liar. God knows all.
- God knows if Cainan belongs there in Luke Chapter 3. And He put it there.
- John Gill doesn't know ANYTHING. Matthew Henry doesn't know ANYTHING.
- They're going to go up against the word of God. REALLY??? What does that tell you about them?
- NO FAITH. LITTLE FAITH. They don't believe what God's word says. They correct God's words.

The pastors and preachers in today's world will tell you that we don't have the perfect word of God.

- Where do you think this came from? SATAN who convinced these other so-called scholars.
- "Did God really say that? Did God really say that Cainan is the son of Arphaxad? Did He say that?"
- They will say that only the original autographs were inspired.
- Well, guess what? Those don't exist. We don't have the original autographs from Moses.
- We don't have the original autographs from Ezra or whoever wrote 1 Chronicles.
- We don't have the original autographs from Luke.
- These so-called scholars of today will flat out tell you that the perfect word of God doesn't exist.

[30] 2 Timothy 3:14-15 But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; 15 And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

- Timothy sure didn't have the original autographs from Moses or Ezra.

- But the perfect word of God tells us that Timothy, from a child, has known the HOLY SCRIPTURES.
- Timothy had the HOLY SCRIPTURES. But the experts today would say, "Oh no he didn't have them."
- "Because only the original autographs are the inspired word of God."
- The Bible tells us that Timothy had the Holy Scriptures and the Bible proves the liars wrong.
- And those liars who say only the originals are inspired are WRONG.
- God put Cainan in Luke Chapter 3 for a reason, and I guarantee you that one of the many reasons is to test out faith in His words.
- Watch what the very next verses in 2 Timothy say:

[31] 2 Timothy 3:16-17 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: 17 That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

- Luke Chapter 3 in the King James Bible is THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. There are no errors there.
- And once we know that we have the perfect word of God in the King James Bible, what can we do?
- We can correct these so-called Bible scholars because God's word gives us the truth.
- We use His words for REPROOF and for correction. We need to stand up for God's word.

I hope you're seeing what the so-called "Bible" scholars are actually doing?

- They are decreasing God's word. They are working against God. They decrease faith in God's word.
- "Did God really say that???" They answer directly. They say, "No, God didn't say that. It's a mistake."
- But it's not a mistake. It's the word of God, which is without error, and it is perfect.
- I want you to know that the subject of this sermon has caused many issues over hundreds and most likely a couple thousand years.
- I want to show you what the McClintock and Strong Cyclopedia says about this second Cainan.

[32] "Some have suggested that the Jews purposely excluded the second Cainan from their copies, with the design of rendering the Septuagint and Luke suspected;"

- There's another made up reason. "The Jews purposely excluded the second Cainan from their copies."
- Why? So they could render the Septuagint and Luke as suspect.
- Again, they're bringing doubt on the Old Testament Scriptures that don't have Cainan there.

[33] "Others that Moses omitted Cainan, being desirous of reckoning ten generations only from Adam to Noah, and from Noah to, Abraham."

- Others say that Moses took out Cainan purposely so that there are exactly ten generations from Adam to Noah and ten generations from Noah to Abraham.
- Again, this is just a guess like so many people make when interpreting Scriptures.
- God didn't say that within the Scriptures.

[34] "Some suppose that Arphaxad was father of Cainan and Salah - of Salah naturally, and of Cainan legally;"

- There's another possible reason they've listed there but the Scriptures don't tell us this.

[35] "While others allege that Cainan and Salah were the same person under two names."

- This one can't be true because Luke Chapter 3 calls them out as totally different people.
- God isn't trying to deceive us by putting 2 different names next to each other but they're actually the same person.

[36] "It is believed by many, however, that the name of this second Cainan was not originally in the text even of Luke, but is an addition of inadvertent transcribers, who, remarking it in scmi copies of the Septuagint, added it."

- Again, many believe that this second Cainan is a mistake in the Bible.
- They will say it wasn't in the original text of Luke. And people just believe what they say.
- They don't have the original autographs from Luke so they just make something up.
- They don't say that we aren't sure. They don't say that we shouldn't be saying something we aren't sure about.

Some "Scholars" Act Like They 100% For Sure That Luke Made A Mistake

They act like they know 100% for sure that Luke made a mistake.

- Or, that someone added it that wasn't Luke. They act as if they know it's a mistake for sure.
- The truth is THEY KNOW NOTHING. God will prove them to be liars since they add doubt to God's word.
- Look, this goes for ANY similar situation in the King James Bible. Find anything you can.
- People constantly look for errors in the King James Bible. Keep looking. You won't find them.
- Waste your whole life trying to prove God's word has errors. You can't do it.

[37] 2 Peter 1:19 We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts:

[38] 2 Peter 1:20-21 Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. 21 For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

- You don't get to make up your own private interpretation that doesn't match with the Bible.
- Such as: "Luke Chapter 3 obviously has errors." Hey, that's a lie. That's your own opinion that is idiotic.
- Don't act like you believe in God's word and then attack His words as lies and mistakes.
- The Holy Scriptures didn't come by the will of man. They didn't come by Luke the man.
- He didn't copy the Septuagint. The words didn't come from Luke himself.
- "But holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."
- Who gave Luke the words? Was it Luke himself? No, the Holy Ghost gave Luke those words.

You can either believe what THESE SCRIPTURES right here say or not.

- If you don't, then you have to go through every word in the Bible and tell me which one is actually God's word and which one isn't.
- You'll have to create your own new Bible through your own private interpretation.
- And yes, that's what so many people are doing today. And they're ignorant that we already have a perfect word of God in existence.

- And it never went away.

Yes, the word of God existed perfectly before the King James Bible.

- But English came along and I speak English. And God gave me a perfect Bible in English.
- Is the King James Bible the only word of God in existence? No, it isn't.
- But false religions and false denominations are constantly creating their own so-called Bible.
- The Book of Mormon with the King James Bible for the Mormons.
- When the King James Bible shows that they're wrong, they side with the Book of Mormon.
- The New World Translation for the Jehovah False Witnesses.
- The oneness Pentecostals will use the King James Bible but it's obviously wrong in many places they say.

[39] 1 John 5:7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

- The oneness Pentecostals will tell you that is not Scripture. "We don't listen to that one."
- Well, what else do you want to get rid of within the Bible? That's what they do.
- These men and women will tell God what needs to be corrected. "We know better than God."
- Hey, listen, that's exactly what is happening. Why is everyone falling for this?

[40] John 10:35-36 If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; 36 Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?

- At the end of verse 35, Jesus Christ says THE SCRIPTURE CANNOT BE BROKEN.
- All of these people can keep trying all they want. His words will not pass away.
- His words will not be broken. Oneness Pentecostals, Jesus says: "I AM THE SON OF GOD."
- But you say the Son of God doesn't exist on His own as His own person. But Jesus says He does.
- But you know more about Jesus than Jesus does.
- John Gill knows more about Cainan than God does. Matthew Henry knows more than God.
- The Book of Mormon knows more than God. The Jehovah False Witness know better than God.
- The Church of Christ knows the way to heaven better than Jesus Christ.

Here's the truth about Luke Chapter 3 and Cainan referred to as the son of Arphaxad.

- Let me state this again. No one has the original autographs of the Book of Luke.
- But we do have about 5,800 Greek manuscripts of the New Testament.
- These are copies of copies of copies of the originals. Some are complete and some are fragments.
- Do you know how many of these manuscripts don't have the name Cainan in Luke Chapter 3?
- THREE. Out of thousands of copies. But yet, they still like to say that it is a copyist error.
- So thousands upon thousands of copies have the error but three don't? Seriously? No. Nice try.
- This would mean we're in big trouble when it comes to thousands of manuscripts being wrong.

Cainan as the son of Arphaxad is seen in the huge majority of Greek manuscripts.

- Cainan is also seen in other ancient New Testament versions that are not in Greek.
- He is seen as the son of Arphaxad in the Latin Vulgate and many other early English versions prior to King James Bible.
- Wycliffe in 1395, Tyndale in 1525, Coverdale in 1535, Geneva Bible in 1560.

- You'll also even find Cainan within the modern Bible perversions like the New King James, NIV, NASB.
- And all of the English versions. Cainan isn't missing in Luke Chapter 3 within any of the Bibles.
- There's not even an omission of Cainan within Luke Chapter 3 in any Bible language available.

For the few manuscripts out of 5800, approximately, that do take out the name of Cainan out:

- These manuscripts are not very reliable at all. They don't even contain full verses within the Book of Luke.
- Many sections of the Book of Luke are missing from those manuscripts.
- Entire sections and verses are missing. So it's not unusual that Cainan would be found in those either.
- When 3 out of 5800 omit Cainan from Luke Chapter 3, do you think they might have the errors?
- But not to the so-called Bible scholars. They would go with the 3 out of 5800.

Is Cainan Truly The Son Of Arphaxad?

So, what's the answer to Cainan being the Son of Arphaxad in the Book of Luke but not shown anywhere else?

- What's the correct answer? Is Luke correct? Of course it is. Is Genesis correct? Of course it is.
- Is 1 Chronicles correct when it doesn't mention Cainan? Of course it's correct.
- There is no contradiction in the King James Bible. Well then how do you explain it?
- We go back to the beginning of the sermon.
- The words "THE SON OF" and "BEGAT" do not always imply a father to son relationship.
- And we know this is especially true in the genealogy of Jesus Christ in Matthew Chapter 1 and Luke Chapter 3.
- It's true that Jesus Christ is not the actual son of Abraham. He is not the actual son of David.

[41] 1 Samuel 24:16 *And it came to pass, when David had made an end of speaking these words unto Saul, that Saul said, Is this thy voice, my son David? And Saul lifted up his voice, and wept.*

- David was definitely not the son of Saul. Saul was from the tribe of Benjamin.
- David was from the tribe of Judah.

[42] 1 Samuel 26:17 *And Saul knew David's voice, and said, Is this thy voice, my son David? And David said, It is my voice, my lord, O king.*

- We see Saul refer to David as his son multiple times. "MY SON DAVID." But he isn't his actual son.
- But David was the son in law to Saul. And Saul called him "son."

[43] Ruth 4:17 *And the women her neighbours gave it a name, saying, There is a son born to Naomi; and they called his name Obed: he is the father of Jesse, the father of David.*

- Obed was not Naomi's son. Ruth was actually a daughter in law to Naomi and Ruth had Obed.
- Ruth's prior husband who died was Naomi's son. Now Ruth marries Boaz and has Obed.
- But the Bible says right there that "There is a SON born to Naomi." But it sure wasn't her actual son.
- There are tons and tons of examples in the Bible showing the same things.
- Naomi calls Ruth her daughter many times, but she isn't her actual daughter.
- I am a son of Abraham because I have faith. But Abraham isn't my actual father.

Matthew Chapter 1 is the genealogy of Jesus Christ from Joseph's side.

- But Jesus isn't in the biological line of Jesus Christ. Joseph was the adopted father of Jesus.
- Joseph didn't get Mary pregnant and they had Jesus. Joseph has no biological connection.
- But watch this.

[44] Matthew 1:15-16 And Eliud begat Eleazar; and Eleazar begat Matthan; and Matthan begat Jacob; 16 And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

- The true father of Joseph is JACOB in verse 16 right there. Now watch Luke Chapter 3.

[45] Luke 3:23 And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli,

- Notice the Bible says Jesus being the "SON OF JOSEPH" but we know that means adopted son.
- Now we see that the Bible says that Joseph was the son of Heli. So, is Jacob or Heli the father of Joseph?
- Matthew Chapter 1 is the genealogy through Joseph and Luke Chapter 3 is the genealogy through Mary.
- Mary's actual father would be named Heli, but Joseph is also known as Heli's son because he is the son-in-law to Heli.

Do you see how the Bible works? There's not a contradiction with Joseph's dad.

- What could have happened then with Cainan? We don't know for sure.
- But I do know that the King James Bible is correct in all SCRIPTURE.
- Let's see what might make sense as we close this out today.
- Maybe Cainan is an adopted son of Arphaxad who ended up raising Sala.

[46] Luke 3:35-36 Which was the son of Saruch, which was the son of Ragau, which was the son of Phalec, which was the son of Heber, which was the son of Sala, 36 Which was the son of Cainan, which was the son of Arphaxad, which was the son of Sem, which was the son of Noe, which was the son of Lamech,

- Again, Arphaxad, Cainan, Sala in that order. Cainan is in there for a reason. He was there. He is real.
- Maybe he wasn't the biological father of Salah but maybe he raised him for some reason.
- Why was he left out of the Old Testament? Maybe he wasn't the biological son of Arphaxad.
- I guarantee you that God has a perfectly good reason for Cainan not being listed in Genesis and 1 Chronicles.

There Are Many Different Explanations That Make Perfect Sense

Or, maybe Cainan is the biological son of Arphaxad and he dies early for some reason.

- Then Arphaxad raises Sala as his own son and becomes the adopted father of Sala.
- Or, Cainan was the actual son of Arphaxad and the actual son of Cainan is Sala.
- Maybe the Old Testament leaves him out for some other reason.
- Maybe he worshipped false gods. Maybe God cursed him and left him out in the Old Testament.
- Or, maybe the Bible skips over that generation in the Old Testament for another reason.
- The genealogies we see in the Bible skip over generations.
- The sons that are listed are not always in the order that they are born.

[47] Genesis 6:10 And Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth.

- We see Shem listed first. He isn't the oldest. The order is Japheth, Shem, and Ham.
- But the Bible doesn't always put them in their birth order.
- Again, the King James Bible is perfect so don't let pastors, preachers, scholars, theologians, or anyone else tell you that there is an error.
- Luke Chapter 3 is an example of something they like to use to "PROVE" that the Bible is not perfect.

[48] Psalm 12:6-7 The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. 7 Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

- God did not lie to us right there. HE SAYS, "I WILL PRESERVE MY WORDS FOREVER."
- It doesn't matter what John Gill thinks. It doesn't matter what Matthew Henry thinks.

[49] Psalm 100:5 For the LORD is good; his mercy is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations.

- His truth and His words will endure to all generations. That's you and me right now.
- We have the perfect word of God with the King James Bible. It's amazing.

[50] 1 Peter 1:24-25 For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: 25 But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.

- John Gill faded away. He's not here anymore. His glory fell away a long time ago.
- But do you know whose still here? God is still here. He isn't going away.
- "But the word of the Lord endureth FOREVER." Do we have the perfect word of God today?
- Of course we do. Why? Because God says so. I don't care what any man says about the Bible.
- Simply know that you have the perfect word of God with the King James Bible and believe it.

Let's pray.