

## PART SEVENTEEN

### THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

(Gen. 4:1-15)

#### 1. *Preliminary Definitions*

It is doubtful that there is a more ambiguous word in our language today than the word "religion." It has literally come to mean "all things to all men."

The pagan etymology of the word is given us by Cicero, the Latin essayist. He derives it (*De Natura Deorum*, 2, 28, 72) from the Latin third-conjugation verb, *relego*, *relegere*, meaning "to go over again," "to consider carefully," that is, in thought, reading, and speech; and hence, as used by him, to mean "reverent observance" of duties to the gods. This etymology expresses fully the concept of "religion" that lay back of the idolatry and ritualism of pagan cults.

In our day the word is used to embrace everything from *per se* devotion to an object, on one hand, to sheer superstition, on the other. (In no area has this been more evident than in the innocuous wumgush expressed in the series of broadcasts some years ago, and later published in book form, under the title, *This I Believe*.) Considered subjectively, of course, as devotion to an object, it can take in almost any attitude or cult imaginable. From this "common denominator" point of view alone, to be religious is to be serious about something, to be serious enough to regard that something as of supreme value in life, and to take an attitude of commitment to the object that is so valued. Obviously, from this viewpoint, religion may have anything for its object, provided the anything is regarded as worthy of devotion. (Cf. John Dewey's definition of "God" as "the unity of all ideals arousing us to desire and actions"—this occurs in his little book, *A Common Faith*, p. 42.) Others have defined religion as "anything in which one believes." From this point of view devil-worship could be called a religion. From this viewpoint, the object of

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

religion may be a Party or a Cause (and indeed the Leninists do, in this sense, make a "religion" of atheism); it may be an idol or an icon, or a whole pantheon of anthropomorphic gods and goddesses; it may be a fetish or an amulet, or some impersonal magic force (known variously as *mana*, *manitu*, *orenda*, *wakan*, etc.); it may be the celestial bodies (sun, moon, star) or it may be "Mother Earth" (*Terra Mater*), as in the ancient Cult of Fertility; it may be an animal, a bird, or even an insect (cf. totemism); it may be the male generative organs (phallic worship); it may be man himself (hence, Comte's so-called "religion of humanity"); it may even be the Devil, as in some "spiritualistic" cults. Or, indeed it may be *the God of the Bible*, the living and true God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. 1:18-32, Exo. 3:13-15, Deut. 6:4-5, Acts 17:24-31, 1 Thess. 1:9-10; Eph. 1:17, 1:3, etc.). The use of the word "religion" in our day is so equivocal—and the word itself has taken on such vapidness—as to make it all but meaningless. We are reminded here of the Ohio College which referred to its "Religious Emphasis Week" as "Be Kind to God Week," and to the words of William Temple: "A lot of people are going to be surprised one day to find out that God is interested in a lot of things besides religion."

Faith, hope, and love are not criteria in themselves of their worth; rather, the criteria are the objects of one's faith, the goal of one's hope, and the recipient of one's love. So it is with religion: as just being serious about something, it is of very questionable value; the value lies in the object about which one is serious and to which one gives personal devotion. In short, the nobility of a religion (like that of faith, hope, or love) is to be determined, not by its subjective aspect, but by its objective realities. To define religion solely in subjective terms is only to denature it, or at least to vitiate its significance.

## GENESIS

2. *What True Religion Is Not.* (1) It is not just *respectability*. Mere respectability is a far cry from genuine righteousness. (2) It is not just a *status symbol*, although thousands of church members undoubtedly use it as such. (3) It is not *ritualism*. Pagan cults have always been built around solemn festivals and processions, and pagan temples have always reeked with the fumes of incense. (4) It is not a matter of *barter*, saying to God, "You scratch my back, and I'll scratch yours." Some persons can pray like a bishop in a thunderstorm who never think of God at any other time. (5) It is not an *escape device*. True religion is worshiping and serving God, not especially from fear of punishment or hope of reward, but out of sheer love for God. One of our oldtime preachers used to say that he was afraid of hell-scared Christians because one had to keep them scared all the time. As a matter of fact, irreligion is more liable than religion to be a device for escape from reality.

"God and the doctor we alike adore  
Just on the brink of danger, not before;  
The danger passed, both are unrequited,  
God is forgotten, and the doctor slighted."

(6) It is not just *wishful thinking*, "the projection of the father-image," etc. The chief concerns of genuine religion—self-abnegation, self-discipline, self-surrender, commitment (Rom. 12:1-2)—are at the opposite pole from any kind of fantasy. (7) Religion is not just a *convenience*, as the ultra-sophisticates would have it, something that needs to be maintained *to stabilize moral and social order*. Again, although it does serve these ends, they are not its primary concern. Its primary concern is the right relationship between the person and his God (John 3:1-6, 2 Cor. 5:17-20). (8) Religion is not primarily a *social institution*. Nor is it designed to be used as a support of social stability. Again, although it does serve to do this

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

as a secondary end, true religion is essentially personal: it is personal commitment to the living and true (personal) God (John 4:24): it is communion of the human spirit with the Divine Spirit (Rom. 5:5, 8:26-27, 14:17; Heb. 12:14; 2 Pet. 3:18). Cf. Whitehead's oft-quoted statement: "Religion is what the individual does with his own solitariness." (9) It is not just *morality* in the popular sense of that term by which it is equated largely with *mere respectability*. However, in the true sense of the word, in the sense that morality takes in one's duties to self, to society, *and to God*, religion is morality. At the same time, it goes beyond morality in the sense of including one's deepest personal attitudes toward, and devotion to, and communion with, the Heavenly Father. (10) It is not *nature-worship*. *The esthetic experience is not necessarily a religious experience*. True religion looks beyond the appreciation of nature itself to the worship of nature's God. Nature is the created; God is the Creator.

3. *What True Religion Is*. (1) I make no apology for using the term "true religion." Religion, to be religion in the full sense of the word, accepts (1) the fact of the existence and the awfulness of sin, (2) the fact that man has allowed sin to separate him from God, (3) the fact that because God is the offended One, He alone has the right to state the terms on which He grants forgiveness, pardon, remission, justification, etc., and so receive the offender back into covenant relationship with Himself, (4) the fact that if man is ever to attain that righteousness and sanctification "without which no man shall see the Lord" (Heb. 12:14; Rom. 8:10, 14:17; Matt. 5:8), he must have a *revealed* system of faith and practice designed to heal the schism caused by sin and to effect his reconciliation with the Father of spirits (Heb. 12:9), (5) that, furthermore, this Remedial System must provide an adequate Atonement (Covering) for sin—adequate in that it is sufficient to vindicate the Absolute Justice challenged

## GENESIS

by man's rebelliousness, and at the same time sufficient to overcome that rebelliousness by a demonstration of God's ineffable love for the one whom He created in His own image (John 3:16; Gen. 1:27, 2:7). That there is such a Remedial System, and that its details are revealed in the Bible, is our thesis here. The essence of true religion is *reconciliation* (2 Cor. 5:11-21, Eph. 2:11-22), and this is the grand objective of the Christian System as fully revealed in the New Testament. It has been rightly said that the test of a culture is the manner in which it treats that which was created in God's image. The French mystic Amiel has written: "The best measure of the profundity of any religious doctrine is given by its conception of sin and of the cure of sin." (6) The Bible has little to say about the meaning of the word "religion"; indeed in one instance it seems to equate "religion" and "superstition." Scripture makes it clear, however, *what true religion is per se*, and *how it manifests itself*. Essentially, as stated above, true religion is *reconciliation*. This is in complete harmony with man's spiritual needs as determined by his own experience, that is, if he is honest with himself and honest with God. (Atheism is sheer stupidity, the product of ignorance or of a perverted will: no man can logically *think* his way into it.)

(7) Hence, the etymology of the word, in its Biblical sense, is precisely what it is said to be by Lactantius (*Institutes*, 4, 28) and Augustine (*Retractions*, 1, 13,), and others of the Church Fathers. They derive the word from the first-conjugation Latin verb, *religo*, *religare*, meaning "to bind back" or "to bind anew." Harper's *Latin Dictionary* (LD, revised by Lewis and Short) has this to say (s.v.): "Modern etymologists mostly agree with this latter view, assuming as root, *lig*, to bind, whence also *licitor*, *lex* and *legare*; hence, *religio* sometimes means the same as *obligatio*." The close relationship of the family of words formed around the root *lig* (ligament, ligature,

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

oblige, etc.) to that formed around the root *leg* (*lex, legis*, "law," hence *legislate*, legal, etc.) is *too obvious to be* ignored. These two families of words both have the connotation of a binding force. Whatever the word "religion" may have meant to the pagan world, the fact remains that the essence of Biblical religion is a *binding of a person anew to God* (healing of the schism caused by sin: the God of the Bible is the covenant God) and is fully expressed in the word "reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5:17-21). Just as the essential principle of music is harmony; of art, beauty; of government, authority; of sin, selfishness; so the fundamental principle of true religion is *reconciliation* (Eph. 2:11-22; 2 Cor. 5:18-20, 6:14-18).

(8) In the Bible, and only in the Bible, do we find revealed the Remedial System by which is effected the healing of the wounds caused by sin. As a consequence of this healing through regeneration and continuous sanctification (2 Pet. 3:8, Heb. 12:14), the righteous person ultimately attains *holiness* (from *holon*, "whole"), which is wholeness or perfection (that is, completeness, from *per plus facere*, "to make thorough, complete"). For the true Christian, eternal life begins in the here and now, through union with Christ (Gal. 3:27, Rom. 8:1); the attainment of spiritual wholeness is consummated, of course, in the ultimate redemption of the body (Matt. 5:48; Col. 1:12; Rom. 8:18-24, 8:11; 1 Cor. 15:35-58; 2 Cor. 5:1-10; Phil. 3:20-21). (Cf. also Rom. 3:23 and 2 Cor. 5:20.)

### 4. *The Formula of True Religion*

True religion, as defined above, is that System of faith and practice revealed in Scripture that is designed to bind man anew to God in Covenant relationship. This system—the actualizing of God's Eternal Purpose, His Plan of Redemption, for man—necessarily includes two departments or agencies (the divine and the human), and three elements (irreducibles, essential institutions). The two departments are (1) the things that God has done, and

## GENESIS

will do, for us; and (2) the things we must do for ourselves in obedience to His revealed Will. That is to say, God overtures and states the conditions on which He will grant us forgiveness and remission of sins; and we, out of loving obedience, accept and comply with the terms; and so reconciliation is effected, and we are bound anew to our Father in covenant relationship. Two basic principles emerge at this point, from Biblical teaching, namely, (1) *That the root of true religion on the divine side is the grace of God* (Eph. 2:1-10, esp. 2:8). (a) As Campbell has written (CS, 36): "The whole proposition must of necessity in this case come from the offended party. Man could propose nothing, do nothing, to propitiate his Creator, after he had rebelled against Him. Heaven, therefore, overtures; and man accepts, surrenders and returns to God. The Messiah is a gift, sacrifice is a gift, justification is a gift, the Holy Spirit is a gift, eternal life is a gift, and even the means of our personal sanctification is a gift from God. Truly, we are saved by grace. Heaven, we say, does certain things for us, and also proposes to us what we should do to inherit eternal life. . . . We are only asked to accept a sacrifice which God has provided for our sins, and then the pardon of them, and to open the doors of our hearts, that the Spirit of God may come in and make His abode with us. God has provided all these blessings for us, and only requires us to accept of them freely, without any price or idea of merit on our part. But He asks us to receive them cordially, and to give up our hearts to Him." (b) All the principles, institutions, laws and blessings of true religion issue from the grace of God. "Grace," writes Cruden, "is taken for the free and eternal love and favor of God, which is the spring and source of all the benefits which we receive from Him." Grace is properly defined as "unmerited favor to sinners." (John 3:16-17; Tit. 3:5-7; Acts 15:11; Rom. 3:24; Eph. 1:3-6, 2:4-9, 3:9-11). The mother who sacrifices herself for her sick

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

child does it, not because she must, but because she loves the child. In like manner, to say that we are saved by grace is to say that we are saved without any necessity on God's part to save us. This means that God did not provide the Plan of Redemption for man, with its accompanying benefits and blessings, because He was under any kind of obligation to man, or to any other creature, to do so. It means, rather, that foreseeing man in a lost condition and in danger of perishing for ever, God out of His ineffable love for him, arranged, provided and offered the necessary Plan and means to reclaim and to regenerate him, to build him up in holiness, and to prepare him for citizenship in Heaven (Phil. 3:20-21, Rom. 8:28-30, Col. 1:12-15). Both Creation and Redemption have their source and root in God's amazing love, mercy, and compassion. Every blessing of the Gospel Plan, every privilege and blessing of Christian faith, worship and practice—all are manifestations of God's grace. In short, through God's grace, salvation has been brought within the reach of all mankind; however, man must accept and appropriate this salvation on the terms laid down under the New Covenant (Tit. 2:11, John 3:16-17, Eph. 2:8). *No gift, however precious, is of any value to the recipient, unless and until the latter accepts it and appropriates it to his own good.* (c) God's grace includes, necessarily, the *Atonement* provided by the Son through the offering of His body and the shedding of His blood (Rom. 3:25, 5:11; 1 Pet. 2:24; 1 John 1:7, 2:2, 4:10). (This Atonement made effectual the salvation of the elect of all Dispensations: see the ninth and tenth chapters of Hebrews.) The Son was under no necessity of providing this Covering for man's sin, but did so willingly, because of His overwhelming love for mankind (Heb. 10:10-13, John 15:13), and "for the joy that was set before him," the joy of making possible the redemption of lost sinners (Heb. 12:1-2). God's grace also includes the *revelation* by the Holy Spirit sent forth from



## GENESIS

Heaven (1 Pet. 1:12) of the conditions on which God proposes to receive men anew into covenant relationship with Himself. The Bible is the inspired and authoritative record of this divine revelation (1 Thess. 2:13; 2 Tim. 3:16-17; 1 Cor. 2:6-16; Eph. 3:4-5; 1 Pet. 1:10-12; 2 Pet. 1:21).

(2) *That the root of true religion on the human side is an obedient faith.* (a) Man's part in true religion is that of accepting and appropriating the benefits and blessings of "the gifts and the calling of God" (Rom. 11:29). This he does by faith in Christ (Heb. 11:6; John 1:10-13, 14:1, 20:30-31; Matt. 16:16; Acts 16:31; Rom. 5:1, 10:9-10; Gal. 3:26-27). This faith in Christ, however, is far more than mere intellectual assent to the Christian formula as embodied in the Good Confession (Matt. 10:32-33, 16:16; Rom. 10:9-10; 1 Tim. 6:13): it is full commitment, in spirit and soul and body, to the Mind and Will of Christ (Jas. 2:18-26, Rom. 12:1-2, 1 Cor. 2:16; Phil. 2:5, 4:13; Gal. 2:20, Col. 3:17). The faith in Christ that is faith unto the saving of the soul (Heb. 10:39) necessarily includes both *obedience to Christ* (John 14:15, 15:14; Heb. 5:8-9; 1 John 2:3, 5:2-3), and steadfast *abiding in Christ* (Matt. 7:24-27, 28:20; John 8:31-32, 15:4-7; 2 John 9; Rev. 2:7, 14:13). It should be noted that *abiding*, in Scriptural terms, signifies activity on man's part, consecration, worship, service—in a word, continuing steadfastly, "always abounding in the work of the Lord" (1 Cor. 15:58, Matt. 25:31-46). The *abundant* life is the *abounding* life (John 10:10). (b) *Every act of the truly Christian (Spiritual) Life is an act of faith* (Gal. 5:22-25). Repentance is faith turning the individual from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God (Acts 26:18, 2 Cor. 7:10, Rom. 2:4). The Good Confession is faith declaring itself in the presence of witnesses (Matt. 10:32-33, Rom. 10:9-10; 1 John 2:23, 4:2). Baptism is faith yielding to the authority of Christ (Matt. 28:18,

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

Acts 2:38; Gal. 3:27; cf. Matt. 3:15). The Lord's Supper is faith remembering the Atonement provided for man by the Christ of the Cross (1 Cor. 15:3, 11:23-26; Matt. 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:14-21; Heb. 10:25). Prayer is faith communing with the Father through Christ the Son and Mediator (Heb. 11:6, John 14:13, 1 Tim. 2:5). Liberality is faith acknowledging God's ownership and man's stewardship (Gen. 1:28; Psa. 24:1, 50:12; 1 Cor. 10:26; Acts 17:24-28; Mal. 3:8-10; Luke 16:2-4; 1 Cor. 16:1-2). Meditation is faith pondering, and praise is faith exalting our God and His Anointed. The true Christian walks in faith, lives by faith, and dies in the faith (Rev. 14:13). Faith so motivates the truly religious life, that it is said in Scripture that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 14:23). (c) True religion, in its practical aspects, that is, as lived day by day by God's saints, is *growth in holiness* (Rom. 14:17, Heb. 12:14, 2 Cor. 3:18, 2 Pet. 1:4), and love, mercy, compassion, and service toward all our fellows (Matt. 25:31-46, Luke 10:25-37, Jas. 1:27), especially toward "them that are of the household of the faith" (Gal. 6:10). True religion embraces all human activities that proceed from the actual *living* of the two Great Commandments (Deut. 6:5, Lev. 19:18, Matt. 22:34-40). The conclusive evidence of the practice of true religion in personal life is the manifestation of the fruit of the Spirit (Matt. 6:33, 7:15-23; Gal. 5:22-25). (d) The great tragedy of our time is the tendency to downgrade sin, even to scorn the fact of sin, Freudians would try to eliminate sin by "curing guilt." However, the facts are so obvious that only the spiritually blind refuse to see (Matt. 15:14, Luke 6:39); wilful ignorance of spiritual matters becomes more widespread as population growth gathers momentum. The fact is that the devil is not just a "sick angel," that sin is tragically more than a mental illness to be treated by psychotherapy and rehabilitation, as the "experts" would have us believe. Sin is open rebel-

## GENESIS

liousness—and rebellion—against God and His moral law. And there is but one remedy—the remedy provided by the agencies of true religion. The sad fact is that when the blind continue to lead the blind, and the blind continue to be willing to be led by the blind, *both* shall fall into the pit (Matt. 15:14). (e) The *formula* of true religion is the following: Amazing *grace* (on God's side) *plus* the obedience of *faith* (on man's side) *equals* true religion, *equals* eternal salvation (Heb. 5:9, 2 Pet. 1:11). Note, finally, Eph. 2:8—"by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that"—that is, that salvation—"not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." This is the formula, Scripturally stated, of true religion, which embraces salvation, reconciliation, pardon, remission, justification, regeneration, sanctification, and immortalization.

5. *The Dispensations of True Religion.* (1) It is often taken for granted that we have revealed in Scripture at least two, and probably three, different religions, namely, the Patriarchal, the Jewish, and the Christian. Strictly speaking this is not true. In the light of Bible teaching itself, we do not have three religious systems revealed therein; we have, rather, the record of the three successive Dispensations of the one *progressive* revelation of true religion (cf. Isa. 28:10, 13; Mark 4:28). Those who fail to recognize this fact, and those who deliberately refuse to recognize it, put themselves outside the possibility of any comprehensive understanding of the Scriptures. Only those who accept the Bible for what it is—one *Book*, the *Book of the Spirit*, with one *theme*, *redemption through Christ Jesus* (John 1:29), can hope to acquire any adequate knowledge of its content. (Cf. 2 Tim. 2:15, 1:13, 2:2.) Failure to distinguish what belonged to each of the Covenants, and to each of the Dispensations, of Biblical religion, has been, from the beginning, a prolific source of error and confusion throughout Christendom, and even more so throughout the non-Christian world. A vast per-

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

centage of professed church members in our day have no concept whatever of these distinctions, and the so-called "clergy" is not far behind them in maintaining this tragic lacuna in Scripture knowledge. (2) The word "dispensation" is a Bible word: it occurs four times in the New Testament, in 1 Cor. 9:17, Eph. 1:10, Eph. 3:2, and Col. 1:25. It designates the procedure by which God, in each successive period of revelation, has chosen to "dispense" both His requirements and His blessings on all who choose to enter into covenant relationship with Him (Jer. 31:31-34, 2 Cor. 3:1-11, Heb. 8:1-13, 1 John 1:1-4). The Greek original, *oikonomia*, means literally "household management," commonly designated the "economy" of a given system; hence it may be translated "administration," "provision," "dispensation," or even "stewardship" (even God is sometimes presented in Scripture as a steward). (3) Note the following matters of fact: (a) The three Dispensations of Biblical religion are the Patriarchal, which extended from Adam to Moses at Sinai; the Jewish, which extended from Sinai to Pentecost (it was abrogated by Christ's death on the Cross, Col. 2:13-15, but God graciously permitted it to continue as a social institution down to the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70); and the Christian, extending from Pentecost to the Second Coming of Christ. (b) Each Dispensation may properly be designated a *dispensation of divine grace*; however, this phrase is descriptive, in its full sense, only of the present or Christian Dispensation (which might also be designated the Dispensation of the Holy Spirit, who came on the Day of Pentecost to abide in, and to vitalize, the Church, the Body of Christ: Acts 2:38, Rom. 5:5, Eph. 2:22). It will be recalled that Alexander Campbell spoke of the Patriarchal Dispensation as the starlight age, the Jewish Dispensation as the moonlight age, the special ministry of John the Baptizer to the Jewish nation as the twilight age, and the Christian Dispensation as the sunlight age, of Divine

revelation. (c) *Dispensations changed as the type of priesthood was changed.* Throughout the Patriarchal Dispensation the patriarch or father of the family (which frequently took in several generations of offspring) acted as priest, that is, as mediator between God and the members of his household (Heb. 7:4, Acts 7:8). Throughout the Jewish (or Mosaic) Dispensation, the Levitical (Aaronic) priesthood served as mediators between God and the nation, the children of Israel (Exo. 6:16-20; Exo., ch. 28; Num. 17:8-11, Heb. 5:1-10, 7:11-28). Under the Christian Dispensation, the New Covenant, all Christians are priests unto God, and Christ Himself is their High Priest (1 Pet. 2:5; Heb. 7:16-17, 9:11-12, 9:24-28; 1 Tim. 2:5; Rev. 1:6, 5:10, 20:6, etc.). Thus it will be noted that Dispensations changed as the type of priesthood changed—from the family to the national to the universal (John 1:29).

6. *The Beginning of True Religion* (Gen. 4:1-5a).

*"1 And the man knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said: I have gotten a man with the help of Jehovah. 2 And again she bare his brother Abel. And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground. 3 And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto Jehovah. 4 And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And Jehovah had respect unto Abel and to his offering: 5 But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect."*

A. Campbell (LP, 131, 132): "There was no religion before the fall of man, either in Heaven or Paradise. That would be a startling proposition in the pulpit, yet it is irrefutably true. What is the meaning of the word *religio*, from which our word *religion* is derived? Is it not to bind again? Could there be a second binding, if there had not been an antecedent bond? There was no religion in

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:1-5

Paradise, while it was the home of Adam, for there was no bond broken. Accordingly, religion began after the fall of man. In like manner, there was no religion in heaven. There was superlative admiration and adoration, but no religion. This brief discussion of the word 'religion' will save you many blunders and much unprofitable thought; provided you understand how it radiates and ramifies throughout all the statutes of morality and piety. Now, while there was no *religion* in Paradise, and no necessity for it, until there was a bond broken and rights forfeited, *there was piety*. What is the meaning of the word *piety*? It is no more nor less than gratitude. An ungrateful being is a monster; hence Paul teaches us to hate ingratitude. Ingratitude is religious sin, and sin is no more nor less than ingratitude. Paul once said, let children learn to show piety, by gratitude to their parents. In consequence of sin, man is now in a preternatural state, not supernatural. The grace of God enables him to rise to the supernatural state. To this end Christianity is a scheme of reconciliation, and where there is no alienation, there can be no reconciliation." Campbell again (CS, 36 and 36, 11): "Religion, as the term imports, began after the Fall; for it indicates a previous apostasy. A remedial system is for a diseased subject. The primitive man could love, wonder and adore, as angels now do, without religion; but man, fallen and apostate, needs religion in order to his restoration to the love and worship and enjoyment of God. Religion, then, is a system of means of reconciliation—an institution for bringing man back to God—something to bind man anew to love and delight in God." "*Religio* with all its Latin family, imports a binding again, or tying fast that which was dissolved." Religion was made for man, for fallen man, and not man for religion. According to the Genesis record, true religion had its beginning in the account of the sacrifices offered to Yahweh by Cain and Abel (Gen. 4:1-15).

7. *The Elements of True Religion.* By "elements" we mean the irreducibles, the essentials (those factors without which true religion could not be true religion). These elements are, and have been from the beginning, the Altar, the Sacrifice, and the Priesthood. (1) The *Altar* in Patriarchal times was an artificial erection of earth, turf, and unhewn stones, on which the patriarch offered sacrifices for his household. It was to serve as a place of meeting for man with God, who was to be approached with a gift in the form of a sacrifice (Gen. 8:20, 12:7-8, 13-18, 22:9, 26:25, 33:20; Exo. 17:15, 20:24-26; Josh. 8:30, 22:10; Judg. 6:25-27, 21:4; 1 Sam. 7:17, 14:35; 2 Sam. 24:21, 24:25; 1 Ki. 18:30-32; 2 Chron. 4:1, etc.). In the Jewish Dispensation, the Altar was incorporated into the Tabernacle, and later into the Temple, and was known as the Altar of Burnt-Offering (Exo. 27:1-8, 2 Chron. 4:1). In the Christian Dispensation, Christ Himself is both Altar and Sacrifice. Some hold that at Calvary our Lord offered up His divine nature or the Altar of His perfect human nature (John 1:14; Matt. 1:18-24; cf. Heb. 4:15, 7:26; Exo. 20:25-26). (2) *Sacrifice* under the Patriarchal and Jewish Dispensations was usually that of a lamb, a male, the "firstling" of the flock, without blemish and without spot (Gen. 4:4, Exo. 12:5). These animal sacrifices were, of course, substitutionary and typical: they were designed to point to (prefigure) the Supreme Sacrifice, that of the Lamb of God, our Passover, the Perfect Atonement for "the sin of the world" (John 1:29, Isa. 53:7, 1 Pet. 1:19, 1 Cor. 5:7, Rev. 13:8). (3) The type of *Priesthood* changed, as noted above, with the change of Dispensations—from the Patriarchal Priesthood to the Aaronic or national Priesthood, both of which were abrogated with the ratification of the New Covenant, and were superseded by the universal Priesthood of all obedient believers in Christ, with Christ Himself acting as their great High

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:1-5

Priest (1 Pet. 2:5; Rom. 12; Rev. 1:6, 5:10, 20:6; Heb. 7:26-28, 9:11-12, 9:24-28).

7. *The Story of Cain and Abel.* (1) *Geography.* There is no indication in the Genesis record as to where the events occurred that are related here. It is to be taken for granted, however, that they took place somewhere outside, and perhaps in the vicinity of, the Garden of Eden, the gates of which had been closed forever to fallen man. (2) *Chronology.* It is impossible to formulate any accurate chronology of the events related in the early chapters of Genesis. Ussher's figures (now almost uniformly rejected), following in general the Hebrew text literally, cover a period from 4004 B.C. for the Creation, to 2348 B.C. for the Flood. Other authorities, following the chronology of the *Septuagint* and of the writings of Josephus, range from 5426 B.C. for the Creation, to 3171 B.C. for the Deluge. In terms of pottery chronology, the early archaeological periods of Palestinian culture are usually given as follows: the *Neolithic Age*, c. 6000-4500 B.C. (marking the development of plant and animal domestication, with pottery first appearing toward the close); the *Chalcolithic Age*, c. 4500-3000 B.C. (the period of irrigation culture, and of the widespread use of pottery, in Palestine); the *Bronze Age*, c. 3000-1200 B.C. (the period generally of Egyptian control in Palestine, terminating in the bondage of Israel in Egypt, the Exodus, and the Conquest of Canaan under Joshua); the *Iron Age*, c. 1200-333 B.C. (from the time of the Judges to that of Alexander of Macedon and the Hellenistic Period). Because of certain incalculable factors it is impossible to formulate any accurate chronology of the events related in Genesis prior to the Call of Abraham. The following tersely cogent statement will suffice here for the present: "The creation is sufficiently dated by that immortal phrase, 'in the beginning . . .,' so distant is it" (NBD, 213). (For elaboration



of the chronological problems of the events recorded in Genesis, see *infra*, Part XVIII.)

(3) V.1. "*And the man knew Eve his wife, and she conceived,*" etc. Note Whitelaw's comment (PCG, 77): "The Divine blessing (ch. 1:28), which in its operation had been suspended during the period of innocence, while yet it was undetermined whether the race should develop as a holy or fallen seed, now begins to take effect (cf. ch. 18:14, Ruth 4:13, Heb. 11:11)." (But—Does not Scripture teach that God's Eternal Purpose included His Scheme of Redemption, in view of His foreknowledge of man's lapse into sin? Does not the Cosmic Plan envision Redemption as the consummating phase of Creation?) (Cf. 1 Pet. 1:18-20, Matt. 25:34, Eph. 1:4; Rev. 13:8, 17:8.) "*And bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man with the help of Jehovah,*" etc. "The meaning of the name is 'metalworker' or 'smith'; here, however, it is represented as a derivation of a word meaning 'acquire,' 'get'" (IBG, 517); hence, a "possession." Cain seems to have been a progenitor of the Kenites (Gen. 15:19, Num. 24:21-22). Note Eve's statement, "I have gotten a man *along with* Yahweh," that is, *in cooperation with* Yahweh. Was this just the spontaneous outcry of joyful motherhood? Or was it essentially an utterance of faith, harking back to the oracle of Gen. 3:15; that is, Did Eve suppose that this fruit of her womb was the oracularly promised seed? Does her designation of this newborn babe as a *man* indicate that she had previously borne daughters only? Some commentators, including Murphy, think this possible. Certainly her statement was a manifestation of her faith in Yahweh, and in all likelihood she did recognize in Cain's birth "the earnest and guarantee of the promised seed." However, the impression conveyed by the narrative indicates that this was her first-born, and indeed the first-born of the human family. Whether either the Man or the Woman was aware of the Messianic implication in the

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:1-5

oracle of Gen. 3:15 we have no means of knowing. Scripture teaching seems to indicate, however, that this implication became a matter of progressive revelation, reaching its highest point in the testimonies of the Hebrew prophets and especially in the work of John the Baptizer, the last of this great prophetic line.

(4) V.2. Does this mean that the brothers were twins? Some have thought so, basing their view on the repeated phrases, "thy brother" and "my brother" throughout the narrative. It seems obvious, however, that this is conjecture: no such idea is necessarily conveyed in the text. Note that the name *Abel* means "breath," "vanity," etc. was this an unconscious "melancholy prophecy of his premature removal by the hand of fratricidal rage"? Certainly it was a proper designation of the short span of life and its tragic end that was experienced by this brother. (Cf. Jas. 4:14; Job 7:7, 14:1-2; Psa. 39:5, 102:3, 144:4; Eccl. 1:2; Isa. 40:6-8; 1 Pet. 1:24-25.) Note that whereas Abel became a "keeper of sheep" (a shepherd, sheep including goats, of course), Cain chose to be a "tiller of the ground" (a farmer). Both occupations had already been Divinely authorized by the terms of the penalty imposed on mankind (3:17-19) and the coats of skins provided for Adam and Eve (3:21). Is this "an attempt to explain why the brothers offered different kinds of sacrifice"? Did Cain's choice of occupation—the agricultural rather than the pastoral—serve to point up an innate rebelliousness, as if to assert himself and to his fellows his sheer independence, and his sovereignty over nature as well, by his toilsome wresting of a livelihood from the ground which was under a Divine anathema? On the other hand, in choosing the agricultural life was not Cain simply carrying out the terms of the penalty previously decreed on fallen man? We see no really justifiable grounds for necessarily relating differences of moral character in Cain and Abel to their respective choices of occupations.

8. *The Beginning of Sacrifice* (vv. 1-5a). (1) As noted heretofore, the beginning of sacrifice marked the beginning of true religion. Although the essential element of sacrifice—the shedding of blood—is intimated in God's provision of coats of skins for Adam and Eve, the first account of sacrifice as a Divine institution occurs here in connection with the story of Cain and Abel. Cain, we are told, brought an offering "of the fruit of the ground" unto Yahweh, but Abel brought of "the firstlings of his flock and the fat pieces thereof" ("the best of the best"). What was the consequence? God, we are told, *accepted* Abel and his offering (by what kind of *sign* we have no means of knowing, cf. Lev. 9:24, 1 Chron. 21:26, 2 Chron. 7:1, 1 Ki. 18:38), but He *rejected* Cain and his offering. We encounter here one of the most profound and most significant problems of Divine revelation, namely, *Why did God accept Abel's offering and reject Cain's?* The answer to this problem might well be said to be the key to the understanding of God's Eternal Purpose and His Plan of Redemption for mankind.

(2) Throughout this entire course it has been repeatedly emphasized that one cannot expect to get a correct and comprehensive understanding of Scripture unless he studies each text or passage, not only in the light of its immediate context, *but also in the light of Bible teaching as a whole*; and, it might well be added, unless he is willing to be open-hearted in accepting what he gets by this method. Perhaps in no Scripture narrative do we find examples of the confusion which results, and of the fantastic ideas which can be put forward by persons biased in some respect, than we find in the various "explanations" commonly offered as solutions of the problems which arise from the story of Cain and Abel, their respective offerings, and the Divine responses to them. *Why was Abel's offering accepted, and Cain's rejected, by Yahweh?* Obviously, the distinction is to be traced (a) to the dispositions of the two

# THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:1-5

brothers, or (b) to the materials of the respective offerings, or (c) perhaps to both of these factors. Cornfeld (AtD, 22) suggests the following: "Probably soil cultivation and cattle raising developed side by side; but God's preference for Abel's offering of the 'firstlings' of his flock and of their 'fat portions' reflects a Semitic standard of values which regards the austere nomadic life as the good life." (To be sure, Jewish commentators can hardly afford to accept the simple New Testament explanation of this problem as presented below.) Skinner also suggests the entirely *subjective* explanation (ICCG, 105, 106): "Why was the one sacrifice accepted and not the other? . . . Since the reason is not stated, it must be presumed to be one which the first hearers would understand for themselves; and they could hardly understand that Cain, apart from his occupation and sacrifice, was less acceptable to God than Abel. On the other hand they would readily perceive that the material of Cain's offering was not in accordance with primitive Semitic ideas of sacrifice. . . . The whole manner of the narration suggests that the incident is conceived as the initiation of sacrifice—the first spontaneous expression of religious feeling in cultus. If that impression be sound, it follows also that the narrative proceeds on a *theory* of sacrifice: the idea, viz., that animal sacrifice alone is acceptable to Yahve. . . . Behind this may lie (as Gunkel thinks) the idea that pastoral life as a whole is more pleasing to Yahve than husbandry." (IBG, 518): "It is possible that a reason was given" in an original document, "and that its omission by J was a piece of polemic against the peasant custom of bringing *the fruit of the ground* as an offering to the Lord, instead of the time-honored nomad offering of an animal." See also HBD, 2: "Whether the gift of Abel was more acceptable because it was blood, the essence of life, instead of grain, or because it was offered with greater sincerity, is not clear. In the story of Abel's death we read of the struggle

between pastoral and agricultural phases of society." Note that these comments presuppose only a *human theory* (or tradition) of sacrifice: the possibility of a Divine ordinance of sacrifice is not even taken into consideration. (JB, 19 n.): "The younger is preferred to the elder. This theme runs throughout the whole Bible and, in Genesis, its first appearance here is followed by others (Isaac preferred to Ishmael, Jacob to Esau, Rachel to Leah). Such preference demonstrates the freedom of God's choice, his contempt for earthly standards of greatness, and his regard for the lowly." (But in each of these cases mentioned, the Divine choice was not an arbitrary one, but in response to certain spiritual excellences (aspects of faith), or lack of them, on the part of the persons involved). Tos (ABOT, 63): "The Yahwist editor did not want to present absolute genealogies or objective descendancy. His purpose was to bring home the lesson: Once man rebels against God he becomes an enemy even to his fellow man. Therefore, he used a traditional story in which God favored a good shepherd over his wicked brother who was a farmer. This was a story that would be treasured and appreciated by the Hebrews who had been a pastoral people before they settled in Palestine." Elliott (MG, 54) presents a somewhat different view: "Entering into the acceptance and nonacceptance was the matter of attitude. Certainly there was some degree of sincerity on the part of both men. The key, however, is that Abel brought the very first and best. The word used for his offering was firstling or 'best of the flock.' It comes from a root which indicates something carefully chosen. Abel recognized himself as God's slave with God as the master to whom the first and the best should be given. Cain simply gave a token to show that he was grateful for services received; he felt it was the thing to do, much in the spirit of tipping the porter for carrying the bags. . . . Cain may have given a little grudgingly, as though he was forced to do so by his

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:1-5

superior, very much the way some folk give the tithe. The lesson underscored is that a gift, regardless of what, or how large or small, is a blessing to the giver only if his heart is right as he gives. Here, the essence of religion is implied—giving God the *very best*.” (Cf. 1 Sam. 12, 15:22; Isa. 1:11-13; Jer. 7:3-10, 7:21-26; Hos. 2:8-13; Amos 5:14-15; Mic. 6:8; Lev. 19:17.) This author goes on to say: “The correct answer to the acceptance of the offering is to be seen in what has been suggested above and not in any theory of the blood versus the nonblood offering, for the laws on sacrifice had not been given yet.” This last statement is a little short of amazing, to say the least. Does this writer, or anyone else, have any legitimate ground for asserting so dogmatically that the law of sacrifice had not as yet been given, or that the matter of blood versus nonblood offering had nothing to do with the human attitudes and the Divine responses in this tragic case? Especially does anyone have sufficient evidence to support such statements in view of the fact that they flatly contradict the plain teaching of the New Testament?

(3) It will be noted that in all the excerpts quoted above *the matter of faith and its source*, or the lack of it, on the part of the worshipers is completely ignored. One wonders just *why* this is so. Why did Yahweh accept Abel’s offering of the firstlings of his flock, but reject Cain’s offering of the fruit of the ground? Why any offering at all, if the laws of sacrifice had not been given? The only answer that can be cited which really answers the problems involved in the interpretation of this narrative is the *simplest* that can be given, the answer which is presented with such crystal clarity in the New Testament, viz., that Abel made his offering *by faith* and thus obeyed God’s Word, whereas Cain presumed to assert his will above the will of God and brought an offering of his own choice. Human presumption, assertion of human authority in ne-

glect of, or in disobedience to, the sovereignty of God, is indeed "the way of Cain" (Jude 11, 1 John 3:12).

(4) Heb. 11:4—"By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, through which he had witness borne to him that he was righteous, God bearing witness in respect of his gifts: and through it, he being dead yet speaketh." But how is faith acquired? In only one way, insofar as the Scriptures inform us: *Faith comes from hearing the Word of God* (Rom. 10:17, Gal. 3:2, 5; 1 Cor. 1:21). (This is a fact, proved to be such in human experience: the whole evangelistic (missionary) program of the church is based on the fact that where there is no preaching, no hearing, there is no faith, no conversion, no church.) If Abel was motivated by faith in presenting his offering to Yahweh, it necessarily follows that the offering was in harmony with the Divine Word, and hence that the law of sacrifice had been divinely ordained. This means, of course, that the essentials of the institution of sacrifice, the observance of which marked the beginning of true religion, had already been made clear to Adam and Eve and their offspring. This means, too, that it had already been decreed by God that the very essence of sacrifice (and animal sacrifice was the primary and essential form of sacrifice under the Old Covenant) was the shedding of precious blood because "the life is in the blood" (Lev. 17:11, Heb. 9:22). Therefore, it follows that God accepted Abel's offering because Abel obeyed the Divine law of sacrifice in presenting a blood offering; Cain, on the other hand, disobeyed this most fundamental aspect of true religion. Indeed the shedding of blood is intimated in Gen. 3:21: we are told here that God, as soon as Adam and Eve sinned, made "coats of skins, and clothed them": this necessitated the slaying of animals and hence the shedding of their blood. This reasoning is further authenticated by the language of Jesus in which He referred to "Abel the righteous" (Matt. 23:35; cf. Luke 11:51, Heb.

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:1-5

12:24). What is *righteousness*, and who is a *righteous* person? The righteousness which is of faith consists in obeying the Divine Word (Rom. 10:6-10; Gen. 6:19, Heb. 11:7, 8, etc.); hence the righteous person is one whose disposition is at all times to do the Father's Will to the full (Matt. 3:13). This was the disposition which Abel manifested in bringing his offering to Yahweh. This was the disposition which Cain *did not* manifest: on the contrary, he manifested the disposition to put his own will (his own way of doing things) above God's Will (God's way of doing things). What could a just God do but reject his offering? Thus it will be seen that God's acceptance of Abel's offering and His rejection of Cain's offering was not an arbitrary act on His part: indeed we are told repeatedly in Scripture that our God is no respecter of persons *as such* (Deut. 10:17, 2 Chron. 19:7, Acts 10:34, Rom. 2:11, Gal. 2:6, Eph. 6:9, 1 Pet. 1:17). In a word, both the inner attitudes of the two brothers, and their respective offerings as well, were the factors which elicited God's responses in this case: their offerings were simply proofs of the interior state of their hearts, respectively. These facts are all corroborated by the teaching of the Bible, from the first to the last, that every lamb that was ever offered on the Patriarchal and Jewish altars was divinely intended to typify (point forward to) the Lamb of God—Christ our Passover—whose Vicarious Sacrifice actualized the election (salvation) of all obedient believers of all generations of mankind, those of the Old Covenant as well as those of the New (John 1:29, 1:35; 1 Cor. 5:7; Isa. 53:7; Acts 8:32-33; 1 Pet. 1:19; Rev. 5:6, 8, 12; Rev. 6:1 ff.; Heb., chs. 7, 8, 9; Heb. 10:1-4, 8-14, etc.). Moreover, it should be noted here that Cain's rebelliousness is clearly indicated by the fact that he presented an offering from the ground, the very ground which had already been placed under a Divine anathema (Gen. 3:17, Rom. 8:20-22). To disregard these truths of Scripture is to disregard



the Word of God itself, and to flout the testimony of the Holy Spirit. (See especially Heb. 10:29.) It is to spread confusion in an area in which the truth is so simple and clear that wayfaring men, yea fools, need not err therein (Isa. 35:8). Finally, it follows that the other integral parts (elements) of true religion were present here, viz., the Altar and the Priesthood. Although no mention of the altar occurs in the text, it is necessary to infer its use: altar and offerings are inseparably linked in the institution of sacrifice. Moreover, this event occurred at the very fountainhead of the Patriarchal Dispensation with its patriarchal (or family) priesthood; hence Abel must have served in that capacity. The time element connecting man's sojourn in Eden with his history in the world outside is so indefinite (as a matter of fact it is completely ignored) in the Genesis record that we cannot rule out the possibility that many, many persons—even as descendants of Adam and Eve—were on earth by this time (cf. Gen. 5:3-5).

(Note here Scripture passages in which God is represented as manifesting "respect" for an object or the person associated with it (Gen. 4:4, 5; Exo. 2:25, Lev. 26:9, 2 Ki. 13:23, Psa. 138:6). Note other texts in which God is represented as *not* being a respecter of persons (Deut. 10:17, 2 Chron. 19:7, Acts 10:34, Rom. 2:11, Gal. 2:6, Eph. 6:9, 1 Pet. 1:17). Are these contradictory passages? Not at all. The two series simply have reference to very different kinds of "respect." The former signifies a righteous and benevolent "respect" based on "proper discrimination as to character"; the latter signifies God as acting *without partiality* (cf. Haley, ADB, p. 81).)

To summarize: *Why did God accept Abel's offering and reject Cain's?* The answer is, unequivocally: *Because Abel acted by faith, and Cain did not; because Abel did what God had told him to do, and Cain did not.* Lange (CDHCG, 256): "It is a fact that a difference in the

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:1-5

state of heart of the two brothers is indicated in the appearance of their offerings. . . . This difference appears to be indicated, in fact, as a difference in relation to the earliness, the joyfulness, and freshness of the offerings. After the course of some time, it means, Cain offered something from the fruits of the ground. But immediately afterward it is said expressly, Abel *had* offered (*preterite*); and farther it is made prominent that he brought of the firstlings, the fattest and best. These outward differences in regard to the time of the offerings, and the offerings themselves, have indeed no significance in themselves considered, but only as expressing the difference between a free and joyful faith in the offering, and a legal, reluctant state of heart. It has too the look as though Cain had brought his offering in a self-willed way, and for himself alone—that is, he brought it to his own altar, separated, in an unbrotherly spirit, from that of Abel.” Murphy (MG, 148, 149): “There was clearly an internal moral distinction in the intention or disposition of the offerers. Habel had faith—that confiding in God which is not bare and cold, but is accompanied with confession of sin, and a sense of gratitude for His mercy, and followed by obedience to His will. Cain had not this faith. He may have had a faith in the existence, power, and bounty of God; but it wanted that penitent returning to God, that humble acceptance of His mercy, and submission to His will, which constitute true faith. . . . But, in this case, there is a difference in the things offered. The one is a vegetable offering, the other an animal; the one a presentation of things without life, the other a sacrifice of life. Hence the latter is called *pleion thusia*; there is *more in it* than in the former. The two offerings are therefore expressive of the different kinds of faith in the offerers. They are the excogitation and exhibition in outward symbol of the faith of each.” M. Henry (CWB, 13): “That which is to be aimed at in all acts of religion is God’s acceptance:

we speed well if we attain this, but in vain do we worship if we miss it (2 Cor. 5:9). . . . The great difference was this, that Abel offered in faith, and Cain did not. There was a difference in the principle upon which they went. Abel offered with an eye to God's will as his rule, and God's glory as his end, but Cain did what he did only for company's sake, or to save his credit, not in faith, and so it turned into sin to him. Abel was penitent; Cain was unhumiliated; his confidence was within himself." (Let me suggest here that for homiletic purposes Matthew Henry's *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, edited by Church, published by Zondervan, is in a class by itself.)

9. *The Divine Origin of Sacrifice.* The first specific reference to the Plan of Redemption is found in the oracle that the Seed of the Woman should crush the Old Serpent's head (Gen. 3:15). The second is found in the institution of sacrifice, of which we have the earliest account in the story of Cain and Abel. The Divine origin of sacrifice is proved by the following facts: (1) *By the very character of the institution itself.* Although having moral significance in the sense that it involved the moral virtue of obedience to God, it is essentially a *positive* institution. W. T. Moore (in Campbell, LP, 111, n.): "The Moral is commanded, because it is *right*; the Positive is right, *because it is commanded.*" Again (*ibid.*, 110, n.): "The idea of Sacrifice lies at the foundation of all religion. And this is very conclusive proof that religion itself is of Divine origin, for no man could ever have *originated* the idea of sacrifice. That man would have come to the conclusion, *a priori*, that the life of an *innocent victim* would propitiate Deity is an absurdity which is equaled only by the insanity of infidelity itself. The first thought to a mind, unassisted by revelation, would be that the anger of Deity would be kindled at the idea of such a Sacrifice; and consequently, it would never have been used as a means of appeasing anger, unless done by the authority of some

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:1-5

Divine command. Hence, we conclude that God originated it." Whitelaw (PCG, 78): "The universal prevalence of sacrifice rather points to Divine prescription rather than to man's invention as its proper source. Had Divine worship been of purely human origin, it is almost certain that greater diversity would have prevailed in its forms. Besides, the fact that the mode of worship was not left to human ingenuity under the law, and that will-worship is specifically condemned under the Christian dispensation (Col. 2:23), favors the presumption that it was Divinely appointed from the first." Campbell (CS, 38): "Sacrifice, doubtless, is as old as the Fall. The institution of it is not recorded by Moses. But he informs us that God had respect for Abel's offering, and accepted from him a *slain lamb*. Now had it been a human institution, this could not have been the case; for a divine warrant has always been essential to any acceptable worship. The question, 'Who has required this at your hands?' must always be answered by a 'thus saith the Lord,' before an offering of mortal man can be acknowledged by the Lawgiver of the universe. 'In vain,' said the Great Teacher, 'do you worship God, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.' God accepted the sacrifices of Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc., and in the Jewish system gave many laws and enactments concerning it." Campbell (CS, 38, n.): "It is a curious and remarkable fact, that God covered Adam and Eve with the skins of the first victims of death, instead of their *fig-leaf* robes. This may have prefigured the fact that, while sin was atoned or expiated as respects God by the life of the victim, the effect as respects man was a covering for his nakedness and shame, or his sin, which divested him of his primitive innocence and beauty, and covered him with ignominy and reproach." We cannot imagine that Cain and Abel themselves originated the idea of bringing offerings to the Lord. Evidently, as Errett writes (EB, *in loco*): "God had made

known to our first parents some means and methods of approach to Him, and their children were trained in the observance of these."

(2) *By its universality.* (For an excellent example of sacrificial rites as practised by the Greeks under Agamemnon, during the Trojan War, see Homer's *Illiad*, Bk. I, ll. 428-487.) As Faber has written: "Throughout the whole world there is a notion prevalent that the gods can be appeased only by bloody sacrifices. There is no heathen people that can specify a time when they were without sacrifice. All have had it from a time which is not reached by their genuine records. Tradition alone can be brought forward to account for its origin." Again, Dummelow (CHB, Intro., 139): "The dependence on an unseen spiritual being, or beings; the consciousness of *broken communion*; the consequent need of some new, heaven-given means of access—these ideas, as well as the simpler and more childlike thought of tribute or of free-will offerings of homage and thankfulness, lie at the root of those sacrificial customs in which religion has always expressed itself even among pagans." Toy (IHR, 505, 506): "The various theories of the origin and efficacy of sacrifice (omitting the ambassadorial conception) are thus reducible to three types: it is regarded as a gift, as a substitution, or as an act of securing union (physical or spiritual) with the divine. These have all maintained themselves, in one form or another, up to the present day." As with respect to all universal traditions, *e.g.*, those of a Tree of Life, man's Golden Age of innocence, his Temptation and Fall, the role of Satan in these events, Noah's Flood, etc., so it is with that of the institution of Sacrifice. It points up two facts in bold relief: (a) the fact of diffusion from a common origin, and (b) the fact of corruptions, by diffusion, of an original purity. *Concepts that are so widespread as to be woven into the traditions of peoples everywhere, no matter how degenerate they may have become*

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:1-5

*as a result of popular diffusion, point back unmistakably to genuine originals. No counterfeit ever existed that did not presuppose a genuine.*

(3) *By the distinction between clean and unclean animals*, explicitly stated to have prevailed as early as the time of Noah (Gen. 7:2). It follows by necessary inference that this distinction must have been characteristic of the institution of sacrifice from the time of the Fall and the consequent ordination of the elements of true religion.

(4) *By the corroborative testimony of Scripture*: as evidenced (a) by the correlation of such passages as Heb. 11:4 and Rom. 10:17; (b) by the tenor of Bible teaching from beginning to end that animal sacrifice under the Old Covenant was substitutionary, hence typical of the great Antitype, the Lamb of God, whose Vicarious Sacrifice provides Atonement (covering) for the sin of mankind (John 3:16, 1:29; 1 Cor. 5:7, 1 Pet. 2:24, Heb. 9:26; cf. Isa. 53, 63:1). (It must be remembered that there was no remission of sin under the Old Covenant, but only a "passing over" of sin by Yahweh from year to year. Cf. Rom. 3:21-26; Acts 17:30, 14:16; Heb. 9:6-10, 9:23-28, 10:1-4, etc.)

10. *The Basic Design of Sacrifice*, that is, in God's Eternal Purpose, was twofold: (1) To give to the sinner a means of approaching God and to give to God a place of meeting with the sinner; and (2) as stated above, to point forward in type to the Supreme Sacrifice at Calvary: every Patriarchal and Jewish altar prefigured the death of God's Only Begotten, Christ our Passover (John 1:29, 2 Cor. 5:7). God's positive ordinances are divine appointments. When a man agrees, for instance, to meet a friend at a certain time and place, that is an appointment. So God's positive ordinances are Divine appointments where Divine grace and human faith meet in a holy tryst. In olden times, God and man met at the altar of sacrifice (Gen. 22:1-19, Exo. 20:24-26). Similarly, the Christian ordi-

nances are Divine appointments. In the ordinance of Christian baptism, God meets the penitent believer and there confers upon him, through the efficacy of the atoning blood of Christ, the full and free blessing of remission of sins. Hence, baptism is said in Scripture to be the institution in which sins are washed away (Acts 22:16); and is also said explicitly to be for salvation (Mark 16:16, 1 Pet. 3:21), for remission of sins (Acts 2:38), and for induction into Christ (Gal. 3:26-27). The Lord's Supper is likewise the divinely-appointed observance in which the elect of God under the New Covenant meet with their Savior, King, and Elder Brother, Jesus Christ, in solemn religious convocation and communion, on each first day of the week (Matt. 26:26-29, Luke 22:14-20, Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 10:16, 11:23-29, 16:1-2, etc.). On the human side, then, the ordinances are essentially manifestations and acts of faith. When the truth is once fully appreciated by Christian people that the Lord's ordinances are not rites, forms or meaningless ceremonies, but solemn, spiritual, heart acts, essentially acts of faith, and solemn meetings with our Heavenly Father and with our Great Redeemer, then indeed a great spiritual awakening will be engendered throughout the whole of Christendom. Then, but not until then, it may be possible for Christian unity to be achieved (John 17:20-21). The change most needed in our time is a proper evaluation of the Divine ordinances in the light of Scripture teaching (cf. Rom. 6:1-11, 6:17).

11. *The Fourfold Significance of Sacrifice.* (1) *It is a propitiation*, in the sense that it is designed to satisfy the demands of justice on the sinner (cf. Rom. 3:25; 1 John 2:2, 4:10). God's moral kingdom, like His physical world, is established upon a foundation of Divine law. Transgression of this Divine law is sin (1 John 3:4). Consequently, when the Divine law is disobeyed, justice requires that something be done about it, in order that the sanctity and majesty of the law may be properly sustained. Even

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:1-5

under human government, to allow infraction of the civil law to go unpunished or unpropitiated, is to encourage further violation and rebellion, and eventually, in effect at least, to completely nullify the law itself. A great many human teachers, in their eagerness to emphasize the love of God, completely ignore the fact of His unfailing justice (Psa. 89:14). In virtue of His justice, therefore, He cannot consistently allow transgression of His laws to go unpropitiated (unvindicated) and at the same time extend mercy to the transgressor. To do so would be to put a premium on sin and thus to undermine the foundations of His government. Campbell (CS, 39): "The indignity offered His person, authority and government, by the rebellion of man, as also the good of all His creatures, made it impossible for Him, according to justice, eternal right, and His own benevolence, to show mercy without sacrifice. . . . In this sense only, God could not be gracious to man in forgiving him without a propitiation, or something that could justify Him both to Himself and all His creatures." In short, God could not be wholly just and extend mercy to the sinner, without an offering from or for the latter, sufficient to satisfy the claims of perfect Justice with respect to the Divine law violated. (Cf. Rom. 3:24-26.) Propitiation is, in a sense, a legal term. (2) *It is a reconciliation*, in the sense that it is designed to bring the offended party and the offender together, and so to make peace between them. Insofar as it honors law and justice, then, sacrifice reconciles God to forgive; and insofar as it brings love and mercy to the offender, it overcomes the rebellion in his heart and reconciles him to his offended Sovereign. Campbell (CS, 40): "God's 'anger is turned away'; not a turbulent passion, not an implacable wrath, but '*that moral sentiment of justice*' which demands the punishment of violated law, is pacified or well pleased; and man's hatred and animosity against God is subdued, overcome and destroyed in and by the same sacrifice.



Thus, in fact, it is, in reference to both parties, a reconciliation." It is that factor which makes *covenant* relationship between God and man possible to both (Eph. 2: 15-16, 2 Cor. 5:18-20). (3) *It is an expiation*, in the sense that it is designed actually to cleanse and purify the heart of the guilt and pollution of sin. Campbell (CS, 40): "The terms purification or cleansing are in the common version preferred to *expiation*. . . . If any one prefer *purification* to expiation, or even *cleansing* to expiation, so long as we understand each other, it is indeed a matter of very easy forbearance. The main point is, that sacrifice cancels sin, atones for sin, and puts it away." "He put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Heb. 9:26): this is expiation. (4) *It is a redemption*, in the sense that it is designed to "buy back" the sinner from the bondage of sin into which he has sold himself and to consecrate him anew to the service of God. Rom. 3:24, 1 Cor. 6:19-20, Acts 20:28; Gal. 3:13, 4:4-5; Eph. 1:7, Col. 1:14, 1 Tim. 2:5-6, Tit. 2:14; Heb. 9:12, 2:14-15; 1 Pet. 1:18-19, Rev. 5:9, etc. (5) Finally, it should be noted here that *the doctrine of Atonement is inseparably linked with the institution of sacrifice. Atonement is equivalent to Propitiation*. Campbell again (CS, 38, n.): "The Hebrew term *copher*, translated in the Greek Old Testament by *ilasmos*, and in the common English version by *atonement* or propitiation, signifies a *covering*. The word *copher*, 'to cover,' or 'to make atonement,' denotes the object of sacrifice; and hence Jesus is called the *ilasmos*, the covering, propitiation, or atonement for our sins." (Cf. 1 John 2:2, 4:10.) To make atonement, therefore, is to satisfy the claims of justice with respect to the Divine law which has been violated, and hence to provide a covering for the guilt, and ultimately for the consequences, of the sins of all persons who accept the Gift and by so doing enter into covenant relationship with God. The Atonement, the

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:1-5

Propitiation, the Covering, the Gift, is God's Only Begotten (John 3:16). *There is no other.*

12. *Pagan Versus Biblical Sacrifice.* The distinguished Jewish author, Yehezkel Kaufmann, calls attention to the profound differences between the theories and practices of sacrificial rites in the pagan world and those characteristic of the Patriarchal and Jewish Dispensations of Biblical history. The pagan concepts he lists as follows (RI, 110-115): sacrifice (1) as providing nutriment for the gods, (2) as mystic union with God, and (3) as exerting influence on the Divine powers, "to heighten the powers of good over the demonic powers of evil." He writes as follows: "The mythological and magical framework that lent cosmic significance to sacrifice in paganism is wanting in the Bible. YHWH is not conceived of as dependent upon food, drink, or any external source of power. This precludes the idea that sacrifice is nutriment for the God. . . . For biblical religion, it is decisive that the mythological setting of this conception is entirely wanting. . . . The Biblical peace offering has been interpreted as a form of communion; part is consumed by the deity (the fat and the blood), the rest by the offerer in what is assumed to be a common meal with the deity. But this interpretation has no warrant beyond the pagan models upon which it is based. The Bible itself says nothing about communion. The peace offering is eaten 'before'—never 'with'—YHWH (cf. e.g., Deut. 12:7, 18; 14:23, 26; 15:20). The Priestly Code makes the flesh of the peace offering the property of YHWH. The human partaker of it is, as it were, a guest of YHWH; this is the nearness to God that is symbolized by eating the peace offering (Lev. 7:20 f.). Nothing supports the notion that man becomes an associate of the deity, is elevated for the moment to divine rank, or shares in the life of the God. Joy, not mystic union, is the basic emotional content of the Israelite cult; this joy too is 'before'—not 'with'—YHWH (Deut. 12:12, 18,

etc.). The difference is fundamental, and its linguistic expression, though subtle, is crucial. . . . Pagan purification rites aim to influence the divine powers, to heighten the powers of good over the demonic powers of evil. When we examine their biblical analogues we find no echo of a struggle between evil and good, no trace of either the mythological or the magical element which underlies the pagan idea." (It should be noted here that hangovers of these magical and mystical cults still persist in the theologies and rituals of institutional Christianity, although absent from the Christianity of the New Testament. The magical aspects persist in such dogmas as those of sacramentalism, transubstantiation, consubstantiation, impanation, baptismal regeneration, etc.; the mystical, in alleged special revelations, miraculous conversions, trances, indeed all psychical (or metapsychical) phenomena of the various forms of so-called ecstatic and orgiastic "religions.") (Note here especially the pertinent statement of W. Robertson Smith (RSFI, 62): "To reconcile the forgiving goodness of God with His absolute justice, is one of the highest problems of spiritual religion, which in Christianity is solved by the doctrine of the atonement.")

13. *The First Murder* (Gen. 4:5b-8).

"5 And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell. 6 And Jehovah said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? 7 If thou doest well, shall it not be lifted up? and if thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door: and unto thee shall be its desire, but do thou rule over it. 8 And Cain told Abel his brother. And it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him."

(1) What a "human interest" story this is! More profoundly realistic psychology is to be found in the Bible than in any other book known to man! The Bible pictures human beings *just as they are*—some good, some bad, some

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:5-8

mediocre; no doubt this is the reason why so many human rebels, puffed up in their own conceits, hate the Bible and will do anything in their power to discredit it. The apostle puts all such persons in the class to which they really belong: they are the wilfully ignorant, blinded by the god of this world (2 Cor. 4:4, 2 Pet. 3:5). There are other causes of moral evil than ignorance, and one of the most potent of these is a perverted will. (2) Cain was *very wroth*, literally *incensed* (inflamed): "the wrath was a fire in his soul" (Lange): cf. Jer. 15:14, 17:4. No sorrow for sin here, "no spirit of inquiry, self-examination, prayer to God for light or pardon, clearly showing that Cain was far from the right state of mind" (Murphy). Not a semblance of recognition of his own dereliction: nothing but fierce resentment against his brother and most certainly resentment toward God. "It is common for those who have rendered themselves unworthy of God's favor to have indignation against those who are dignified by it" (M. Henry). (Note how the Pharisees walked in the way of Cain, Luke 11:52.) Evil is always resentful in the presence of the good, because in the light of the good the evil is shown up in its true colors, and resents the expose. Think how prone professing Christians are to put the blame on God when overtaken by adversity ("God shouldn't have done this to me!"). The world, even the church, is filled with puny souls who can only whimper and whine in the hour of tribulation (cf. John 16:33). (3) "*His countenance fell.*" "Cain hung down his head, and looked upon the earth. This is the posture of one darkly brooding (Jer. 3:12, Job 29:24), and prevails to this day in the East as a sign of evil plottings" (Lange). What a picture of the impudent, rebellious, sullen posture and face of a spoiled brat! (3) *Vv.* 6, 7. Here we have another instance of those vivid anthropomorphic portrayals of our Heavenly Father dealing with the rebellious child created in His own image, seeking to arrest him from a

precipitous plunge into an act of violence that would ruin his whole life, as envy of the "true witness" welled up in his heart. To paraphrase Yahweh's words of warning and encouragement to do the right: "Why this consuming anger, Cain? Why this sullenness? If you are doing the good, your countenance will be radiant with joy. If you are not doing what is right and good, then sin is couching ("lieth") at your heart's door. Retrace your steps, amend your offering, and rule over this beast that threatens you." As we listen to those words of Fatherly admonition and encouragement to self-control and obedience, we recall the words of the Psalmist, "Like as a father pitieth his children, So Jehovah pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame, He remembereth that we are dust" (Psa. 103:13, 14). Alas! as is so often the case, the warning went unheeded! The same warning comes ringing down through the ages to all of God's saints, even those of our own time. If you are disgruntled at the minister or the congregation, critical of your brethren in Christ, and have a tendency in your heart to speak evil things of those who are trying to be Christians, just remember that sin is couching (lying, lurking) at the door of your heart; and, unless with our Lord's help, you assert your control of circumstances, sin will spring upon you like a wild beast and drag you down to the depths of infamy. Cf. Eph. 6:16—

"Life is one continued battle,  
Never ended, never o'er;  
And the Christian's path to glory  
Is a conflict evermore.

"Satan ever watches round him,  
Seeks to find the weakest part;  
And in moments most unheeded  
Quickly throws his fiery dart."

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:5-8<sup>b</sup>

(4) *The Murder*, V.8. "In the field"—this "means the open country, where Cain thought he would be safe from observation" (IBG, 519). Whitelaw (PCG, 80): "Beyond all question the historian designs to describe not an act of culpable homicide, but a deed of red-handed murder; yet the impression which his language conveys is that of a crime rather suddenly conceived and hurriedly performed than deliberately planned and treacherously executed." "Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him." Heavenly counsel failed to deter the rebel; the wild beast couching at his heart's door sprang, and the tragic deed was done. Not just a homicide, but a fratricide! Rage, born of consuming envy, becomes lust for blood. As it has been said of the crucifixion of Jesus: Hate is a passion never stilled, until it crucifies (1 John 3:15, John 8:44). Thus did the first Man become a prey of Satan, and his first-born a murderer and an outcast. Bowie (IBG, 518): "It was a strange contradiction that the first murder came with an act of worship. It was while he was approaching God that Cain knew how much he hated his brother. He felt frustrated because he felt somehow that God's truth ranked Abel higher than himself; and if he knew within himself that this was what he deserved, he struck out all the more blindly and bitterly against the superiority that shamed him. This is the explanation of the vindictive hostility that men may express toward those whose achievements they envy—the hostility of the citizen to a great political leader or the dislike which a minister may feel for a more honored brother minister."

### 14. *A Second Inquest* (Gen. 4:9-15).

"9 And Jehovah said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother? And he said, I know not: am I my brother's keeper? 10 And he said, What hast thou done? the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground. 11 And now cursed art thou from the ground, which hath opened its mouth to receive thy

*brother's blood from thy hand; 12 when thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee its strength; a fugitive and a wanderer shalt thou be in the earth. 13 And Cain said unto Jehovah, My punishment is greater than I can bear. 14 Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the ground; and from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a wanderer in the earth; and it shall come to pass, that whosoever findeth me will slay me. 15 And Jehovah said unto Cain, Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. And Jehovah appointed a sign for Cain, lest any finding him should smite him."*

(1) A *second* inquest: why so designated? Because this is essentially a repetition of the substance of Gen. 3:9-13. Again the loving Father seeks to bring His rebellious son to repentance and confession (catharsis), the only possible way to restoration and inner peace for the rebel. (2) V. 9. *The inquisition* no doubt took place at the customary place of sacrifice and at the time of the next offering. Did God speak through Adam, the father? or through Cain's own conscience? Or directly and vocally to Cain himself, in words "uttered from between the Cherubim" (3:24)? Note the question: "a question fitted to go straight to the murderer's conscience, and no less fitted to rouse his wrathful jealousy, as showing how truly Abel was the beloved one." Not that Yahweh's question was in any sense the *cause* of Cain's jealousy, but that it brought out the interior wrathful jealousy that was already consuming the rebel's heart. (It is often said that national prohibition of the nineteen-twenties brought about the spread of lawlessness. This we deny. It simply brought to the surface the lawlessness that was already there, in the hearts of the people.) (3) Note *Cain's answer*. What a combination of bravado, flippancy, sheer impudence—everything but the manifestation of an honest and good heart

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:9-15

(Luke 8:15)! Whitelaw, quoting Willet (PCG, 80): "He showeth himself a *liar* in saying, 'I know not'; *wicked and profane* in thinking he could hide his sin from God; *unjust* in denying himself to be his brother's keeper; *obstinate and desperate* in not confessing his sin." (Cf. Psa. 10.) How sin spreads: at first, murder; now, lying, deceit, effrontery and profanity (feeling himself tracked by avenging justice, Cain resorts to the use of every weapon in the arsenal of sin!). "Am I my brother's keeper?" *A question of universal significance: one that must be answered in some way by every son and daughter of Adam* (cf. Matt. 25:31-46). Murphy (MG, 153): "There is, as usual, an atom of truth mingled with the amazing falsehood of this surly response. No man is the absolute keeper of his brother, so as to be responsible for his safety when he is not present. This is what Cain means to insinuate. But every man is his brother's keeper so far that he is not himself to lay the hand of violence on him, nor suffer another to do so if he can hinder it. This sort of keeping, the Almighty has a right to demand of every one—the first part of it on the ground of mere justice, the second on that of love. But Cain's reply betrays a desperate resort to falsehood, a total estrangement of feeling, a quenching of brotherly love, a predominance of that selfishness which freezes affection and kindles hatred. This is the way of Cain (Jude 11)."

(4) *Vv. 10-12.* Yahweh sees that His attempt to arouse self-examination in the sinner has not elicited the slightest evidence of a favorable response. Cain's character has proved itself to be tragically corrupt, even to the extent of manifesting not even the slightest appreciation of God's love and mercy. Hence, thunders Yahweh: "What hast thou done?"—a question that puts in bold relief the sheer enormity of the course of sin that Cain had chosen to pursue! "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground." Note the repeated phrase, "thy brother": is not fratricide a truly heinous form of homi-



cide? Knowing that the guilty fratricide was not going to confess his sin, Yahweh charged him with it directly. The ground which had already been cursed so that it yielded thorns and thistles (3:18) was now cursed by the blood of the first martyr, Abel the righteous (Matt. 23:35, 1 John 3:12). This was the first curse pronounced upon a human being: only the serpent had been cursed in Eden; Adam and Eve had not (3:14). Murphy defines a curse thus (MG, 211): "A curse is any privation, inferiority, or other ill, expressed in the form of a doom, and bearing, not always upon the object directly expressed, but upon the party who is in the transgression." In the case before us, Abel's blood cried out to God for the punishment of the murderer, and that same cry has rung down through the ages proclaiming retribution upon the shedder of innocent blood. Anthropologists will testify uniformly that no people has ever been found without a customary or statutory law for the punishment of murder. (The "blood feud" or "blood revenge," the most common form of the *lex talionis*, (the infliction of death upon a murderer by the relatives of his victim), was the only device which men had, for the prevention of murder; later, of course, with the formation of nations, this right of vindication was taken from individuals and families and put under the authority of the state. Incidentally, *vindication* is the proper term to use here, as expressing the function of punishment, rather than "vengeance" or "revenge": true law never seeks revenge, but it must seek vindication when violated, that is, it must have a penalty for violation, and that penalty is designed to sustain the majesty of the law itself, that is, *to vindicate the justice of the law and of the will of the lawgiver as well*. Law is not law at all, lacking a penalty for its violation, the power to enforce the penalty, and the actual enforcement of it, if and when violated.) (It must be understood, of course, that murder is properly defined as the taking of the life of another

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:9-15

person on *one's own* authority and with malice aforethought: that is, it is an individual act, a *crime* under the civil law, a *sin* under the moral law. This definition of the act has its ethical basis in two sublime truths, namely, *that life is the gift of God, and hence man's greatest good* (Gen. 2:7, Acts 17:24-25). These have always been, and still are, the foundation stones of our Western cultural heritage.) (Note that in Abel's case, the blood seeks not retribution on its own, but cries out unto Yahweh for it. For instances of sin crying out to God, see Gen. 18:20-21, 19:13; Exo. 3:9; Heb. 12:24; Jas. 5:4.) Murphy (MG, 154): "The curse which now fell on Cain was in some sense retributive, as it sprang from the soil which received his brother's blood. The particulars of it are the withdrawal of the full strength or fruitfulness of the soil from him, and the degradation from the state of a settled dweller in the presence of God, to that of a vagabond in the earth." Again (MG, 155): "It is plain that no man has an inherent right to inflict the sanction of a broken law on the transgressor. This right belongs originally to the Creator, and derivatively only to those whom He has intrusted with the dispensation of civil government according to established laws" (cf. Rom. 13:1-7, Matt. 22:21).

(5) *Note well that this Divine anathema was to come upon Cain from the ground, and in two ways: (a) in refusing him its substance: a further look at Cain's progeny, as we shall see later, makes it clear that they did not make any success of agriculture; this refusal of the earth to yield its substance to them seems to have pushed them into the building of cities and the development of what we would today call the useful arts; and (b) in refusing him a home: he and his posterity became wanderers, an unsettled, restless people, prone to violence, without stability and without faith. The further study of Cain's descendants will surely disclose their basic irreligiousness, secularism (worldliness), proneness to pride in their own*

conceits, even wickedness and violence. Thus the earth did not become a participant in the curse pronounced on Cain, but God's minister of that curse. (There is a special significance, it seems to me, in these Divine anathemas having reference to the ground (earth) and to those creatures who were to be punished through the agency of the ground. Surely, they point up the Divine repudiation of, and warning against, the Cult of Fertility which prevailed throughout the entire ancient pagan world, and which had its roots in the worship of the Earth Mother (in Greek, *Ge-mater*, or Demeter; and in Latin, *Terra Mater*). This Cult, with its practices of ritual prostitution, sexual promiscuity, phallic worship, and like perversions—indeed the grossest forms of immorality—was the foremost obstacle to the spread of the knowledge of the living and true God throughout the world of Old Testament times and the ever-present temptation to that people whom God called out to preserve this knowledge, the fleshly seed of Abraham, to forsake their Divine calling and election for the idolatrous practices of their heathen neighbors and the satisfaction of their own carnal lusts.)

(6) V. 13. "My punishment is greater than I can bear." Utter insensitivity to personal guilt now leads to self-pity, the psychological refuge of a man who will not be honest with himself or with God by facing up to the facts. As if to say, "Jehovah, you are not treating me fairly! You are being unjust to me!" A repetition of Satan's rebellious charge that our God is a tyrant! The cry of every fanatical devotee of unlimited "personal liberty." The cry of a spoiled brat. (How anyone can question the fact that Cain's wickedness was real and that it stemmed from his interior profanity—disregard for divine things—and hence from his total lack of faith, is beyond our comprehension. Everything he said and did attests the truth of the explanation given in Hebrews 11:4. Rejection of this thoroughly trustworthy Biblical explanation is surely a mark of igno-

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:9-15

rance, or that of a perverted will directed by a closed mind (cf. 2 Pet. 3:5, Matt. 15:14, Isa. 6:8-10, Matt. 13:14-15, Acts 28:25-28, 2 Cor. 3:15, etc.). Even though some measure of remorse might be indicated by Cain's outcry here, still and all, it is remorse saturated with despair, the reaction that terminates in repentance unto spiritual death (2 Cor. 7:10), or, as in the case of Judas, unto physical death by suicide (Matt. 27:3-10, Acts 1:16-19). Cain's sorrow, if anything, was "the sorrow of the world," the sorrow that arises from complete lack of any understanding of God's ineffable grace.

(7) *Vv. 14-15.* (a) Cain's language here is clearly a reference to that punitive device of early familial and tribal life known as the "blood feud," "blood revenge," the device which early man found necessary to prevent wholesale murder and thus to maintain social order (see *supra*). In the course of time, as population increased, this device began to create a serious problem. The great Greek writer of tragedy, Aeschylus, known as "the poet of great ideas," deals with the problem in what is known as his Oresteian trilogy, consisting of the three plays, the *Agamemnon*, the *Choephori*, and the *Eumenides*. In the *Agamemnon*, the Greek chieftain is pictured as returning from the conquest of Troy, only to face the smoldering wrath of his wife Clytemnestra, who hated him because of his sacrifice of their daughter Iphigenia at Aulis (supposedly to quell the fury of the goddess Artemis which had been aroused by Agamemnon's killing of a deer in one of her sacred groves: at any rate this was Agamemnon's version of the incident). Soon after reaching Argos, Agamemnon was murdered by Clytemnestra and her paramour, Aegisthus. Orestes, the son, was saved from the same fate by his sister Electra who had spirited him away secretly to the court of the Phoenician king, Strophius, whose wife was Agamemnon's sister. There Orestes formed a close friendship with the king's son, Pylades. On attaining maturity

Orestes went secretly with Pylades to Argos, where, on the authority of Apollo, at the tomb of Agamemnon he executed strict justice (*Dike*) by killing both Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. This part of the drama is presented in the *Choephoroi* ("The Libation Bearers"). But Orestes now was not just an ordinary executioner in the ordinary sense of "blood revenge"; his crime was *matricide*, a particularly heinous kind of killing. Hence, who was now to execute the demands of justice on Orestes? And who should kill the man who would kill Orestes, all, of course, in the name of rigid legal justice? How long was this vicious circle to continue? Was there any way of putting an end to it? If so, how was this to be done without violating justice in some way? Orestes is now beset by the Furies: he goes crazy and begins to wander from land to land, until finally, again by the advice of Apollo, he takes refuge in the temple of Athena at Athens. How does Aeschylus resolve the issue, essentially a problem of finding a way of tempering justice with the more humane "quality of mercy"? The dramatist uses the device of the *deus ex machina*. He brings Athena, the goddess of wisdom, into the picture; she convenes the Court of the Areopagus to hear his plea. Orestes is acquitted by this Court, becomes sane again, and the Furies are transformed into the *Eumenides* ("The Benignant Ones"). The profound moral problem thus elaborated by Aeschylus was twofold: the deeply felt doctrine of strict legal justice, but also the existence in Heaven of an Understanding and a Will that is supreme even over the Law. (The same profound doctrine is to be found also in the *Antigone* of Sophocles, LCL edition, p. 349, ll 450 ff.). Thus it will be seen that the dramatist resolved this problem in precisely the same way in which man resolved it, that is, by taking the execution of the penalty away from the jurisdiction of the family and putting it under the authority of the state ("the People vs. John Doe"). (b) "Whosoever findeth me," cried Cain,

# THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:9-15

"shall slay me." This raises the question: *Just what and how many other persons were on earth at the time to execute blood revenge?* Or, as often stated by the caviler: *Where did Cain get his wife?* (cf. v. 17). (A carping old reprobate once said to an old-time evangelist: "If you will show me how and where Cain got his wife, I'll 'jine' the church." The evangelist was equal to the challenge. He answered: "Old man, until you can quit worrying about other men's wives, you're not fit to 'jine' the church or anything else that is decent.") Cornfeld writes (AtD, 23): "Where did Cain get his wife, if Abel and Cain were Adam and Eve's only children? It is clear that the Cain and Abel story belonged to a different tradition which assumed the presence of other people in the world besides the family of Adam. The kind of rational and critical interest which characterizes our age was remote from the ancient narrators, particularly when it came to tracing ancestral genealogies." T. Lewis (Lange, CDHCG, 259) suggests that neither Adam nor Cain may have had any reason to know that the earth was not populated with their kind. This view, however, seems a bit far-fetched. *The most reasonable explanation is that Cain married into the Adamic family into which he was born.* We are told that after 130 years Adam begat Seth, and that throughout his long life he begat sons and daughters (Gen. 5:3-5); in proportion to his longevity he must have sired progeny of some dimensions (cf. Exo. 12:37-42). Hence in the first 130 years of the conjugal union of Adam and Eve, undoubtedly other, many other, children were born to them. The matter of the identity of Cain's wife is no problem. He might even have married one of his own sisters: this would not have been regarded as incest during the infancy of the race. (Cf. Acts 17:30, also Gen. 20:12—here we are told that Abraham married his half-sister). Certainly Adam's offspring were not limited to just the two brothers and their wives (provided that Abel

also was a married man) at the time of Abel's murder. *The reason for the Biblical story of Cain, Abel, and Seth exclusively, again is one that will not be apprehended by the person who fails to take into consideration the teaching of the Bible as a whole. The reason is a very simple one, namely, that the Bible is not intended to be a history of the race, but the history only of the Messianic Line or Genealogy, the Line that began with Adam and culminated in Jesus Christ.* (Luke apparently gives the real genealogy through Mary, Luke 3:23—Joseph was the son-in-law of Heli; Matthew, writing specifically to the Jews, gives the legal genealogy, Matt. 1:16.) *There is but one grand design in the content of the Bible from beginning to end, namely, to provide the evidence in oracle, prophecy, and historical fulfilment to authenticate the Messiahship of Jesus.* (Cf. Matt. 16:16, John 20:30-31, Rom. 10:9-10.) *Only when approached and studied from this point of view, does the Bible have the significance that its Author, the Holy Spirit, designed it to have, that is, the fulness of the truth to liberate man from the guilt and from the consequences of sin* (John 8:31-32, 1 Thess. 5:23). (Cf. 1 Pet. 1:10-12, 2 Pet. 1:21, John 16:7-15, 1 Cor. 2:6-16.)

(c) Cain's contemplation of his miserable doom filled his guilty heart with apprehension that some of his own kind in the flesh might take his life in retaliation (as required by the *lex talionis*) on hearing of his wanton slaughter of his brother Abel. But, again, as in his cry, "from thy face shall I be hid," he manifests his utter insensitivity to the fact of God's ineffable grace. Yahweh's face was not turned away from him completely. On the contrary, he received from God a twofold response: first, the promise that anyone who might slay him would incur vengeance *sevenfold* (that is, Cain's violent death, should it occur, would be *fully avenged*); second, Yahweh "appointed a sign for Cain, lest any finding him should slay him." Commentators disagree as to whether

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION 4:9-15

this sign was a visible one for the purpose of warning away would-be avengers, or an inward assurance to Cain himself that he should not suffer "blood revenge" at the hands of a kinsman. "In the case of Cain's murderer there was to be no mitigation of the penalty as in the case of Cain himself; on the contrary, he would be visited more severely than Cain, as being guilty not only of homicide, but of transgressing the Divine commandment which said that Cain was to live" (Whitelaw, PCG, 82). What was this "mark of Cain?" No one knows. The essential facts about it are that it was not a sign of God's forgiveness, but only a pledge of His protection; that it was not a brand of shame, but a "covering" of Divine grace; that it served to establish the principle, at the very outset of man's life on earth, that vindication belongs to God (Rom. 12:19, 2 Thess. 1:8). Murphy (MG, 156): "The whole dealing of the Almighty was calculated to have a softening, conscience-awakening, and hope-inspiring effect on the murderer's heart." Whether this desired reformation (regeneration) of Cain ever occurred, we do not know; however, judging from the general irreligiousness of his posterity as indicated in the remaining part of chapter 4, the evidence is wholly to the contrary. *After all, even though subhuman nature is powerless to resist the decrees of God, there is one power in the universe which can resist His Will and, sorry to say, His love—that power is the human will* (John 5:40, Matt. 23:37-39, Acts 7:51-53).

\* \* \* \* \*

## FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

*"Am I My Brother's Keeper?"*

Cain's profane reply to God's first query reveals the spirit of a social outcast. But his antisocial attitude was only part and parcel of his murderous act. Practically all anarchists become such through their own crimes against society. If we are not willing to help those about



us, we are bound to be willing to harm them and to drag them down. The entire human race is bound up in one bundle of interdependence, and every human being must choose between social altruism and social animosity.

If it is impossible for anyone to keep from radiating moral or immoral influence, as the case may be, how much more so for God's saints. The one who professes to be a Christian takes upon himself the obligations inherent in spiritual brotherhood, whose fundamental laws are love for God and love for his fellows, and especially for those who are of the household of the Faith (Matt. 22:34-40, 25:31-46; Luke 10:25-37; Jas. 1:27; Rom. 14:21; Gal. 6:2, etc.). Conversion is *the passing from the kingdom of this world*, in which the ruling principle of life, individual and social, is selfishness, the choice of self's way of doing things above God's way of doing things, *into the Kingdom of Christ, the Reign of Messiah*, in which the ruling principle of life, both individually and collectively, is sacrifice, the choice of God's way of doing things above man's way of doing things (Acts 26:17, Matt. 6:31-34, Rom. 12:1-2, Gal. 5:16-25). Love is the fulfilment of the law (Rom. 13:10); in the very nature of the case, love is the motive which prompts Christians, members of the Body, to bear one another's burdens and so to fulfil the law of Christ (Gal. 6:2; 1 John 4:7-11; 1 Cor. 9:21; Rom. 8:2; Jas. 1:25, 2:8, 2:12).

### *The Voice That Cries From the Ground*

"The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground," said Yahweh to Cain. God speaks in the same words today to the unbeliever, the murderer, the fornicator, the adulterer, the abuser of himself with men, the sorcerer, the idolater, the drunkard, the coveter, the seducer, the liar—indeed all who live and die outside of Christ. In this universal sense (Rom. 3:23), it is the blood of Christ—the blood "that speaketh better than that

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

of Abel" (Heb. 12:24)—the blood that was shed for an Atonement for the sin of the world (John 1:29), that cries out from the ground for the execution of justice upon all who refuse to shelter themselves by faith under this Heavenly Covering (2 Cor. 5:21, Heb. 10:26-31). And so will God speak to you in Judgment, fellow Christians, if you allow your loved ones to live and die without Christ, without your speaking a word to them about their soul's salvation. So will He speak to you, if you permit the multitudes to go past your door, down the broad way that leads to destruction (Matt. 7:13-14), without ever a warning word, a feeling of concern, or a manifestation of interest on your part. Are you going through life without ever a thought of the millions who are dying without Christ and the Redemption which He has freely provided? The business of the Church is to snatch precious souls from the burning. The Church of our time can never regain its power until it undergoes a rebirth of the evangelistic passion that characterized the saints of the apostolic age (Acts 8:4, 1 Tim. 3:15, Matt. 24:14). Unfortunately for man, his sins of omission seem to be far more numerous than those of commission (Jas. 4:17, 1:22). And this brand of sin is most flagrantly obvious today in the lackadaisical attitude of institutionalized Christianity with respect to the Church's mission to the unsaved: in all too many instances the Great Commission seems to be "the lost word" (Matt. 28:18-20).

"Christ has no hands but our hands  
To do His work today;  
He has no feet but our feet  
To lead men in His way;  
He has no tongue but our tongues  
To tell men how He died;  
He has no help but our help  
To bring them to His side."

## GENESIS

### *The Cry of the Lost Soul*

"My punishment is greater than I can bear," was Cain's cry, not of confession, but of sheer desperation. "Through ignorance of the divine character, he pronounced his sin too great to be pardoned. It was not that he really knew his sin, but that he knew not God. He fully exhibited the terrible fruit of the fall in the very thought of God to which he gave utterance. He did not want pardon, because he did not want God. He had no true sense of his own condition, no aspirations after God, no intelligence as to the ground of a sinner's approach to God. He was radically corrupt—fundamentally wrong, and all he wanted was to get out of the presence of God, and lose himself in the world and its pursuits" (C.H.M., NBG, 75).

"From thy face I shall be hid." To the foregoing it should be added that Cain did not want God because he did not, in any sense of the term, know God. Like Judas who went out and hanged himself when he might have enjoyed salvation on the terms of the Gospel, Cain, thinking himself beyond the pale of Divine compassion and mercy, resigned himself to an earthbound existence. "He thought he could live well without God, and he therefore set about decorating the world as well as he could, for the purpose of making it a respectable place, and himself a respectable man therein, though in God's view it was under the curse, and he was a fugitive and a vagabond" (C.H.M., NBG, 75).

Cain's cry of desperation might well be said to have been an archetype of the cry of lost souls in the Judgment. Fully realizing at last the awfulness of their complete loss of God, they shall call on the mountains and the rocks to fall upon them and hide them "from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb" (Rev. 6:15-17). Truly it will be "a fearful thing to fall

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

into the hands of the living God" (Heb. 10:31), unrepentant, disobedient, and hence utterly rejected (Heb. 6:4-8, 10:26-30; Rom. 2:4-11; Matt. 25:41-46). In this world the wheat and the tares must grow together until the harvest (Matt. 13:24-30). But let no son of man question the fact *that there will be a harvest* in which the wheat shall be gathered into the garner (granary, Matt. 3:12) and the tares shall be burned with unquenchable fire (cf. Matt. 13:36-43). Whatever other sanctions may overtake the neglectful and the impenitent at the Last Judgment (Acts 17:30-31), we can be sure that, again as a consequence of their full realization of what eternal loss of God and all good really means, the raging fires of conscience will issue truly in "the weeping and the gnashing of teeth." Indeed it may well turn out that memory is the worm that never dies, and conscience the fire that is never quenched (cf. Luke 16:19-31, Mark 9:48, Isa. 66:24).

### *The Marks of Real Faith*

Genuine faith always (1) does what God commands, and (2) does it in the way God commands it to be done. Errett (EB, 36): "We sometimes listen to sneers at the conscientious observance of ordinances, and often hear it suggested that if *morals* had more attention, there need be small concern about ritualistic observances. True, there may be enslavement to a ritual, and especially to rituals of human contrivance, which partake more of the nature of Cain's offering than of Abel's; and when precision in such observances is exalted above a pure morality, it is a sad day alike for the church and the world. But let it also be remembered that when God has appointed a ritual observance, the same spirit of evil that rejects it, or corrupts it, will also, when occasion serves, reject also all that is good in morals. Hence, the same evil spirit that led Cain to despise God's law of sacrifice, led him also to cast

## GENESIS

aside all moral restraints and to murder his brother. The spirit of rebellion is the same, whether it strikes at a divine ordinance or at the life of a brother."

We hear a great deal in our day about what is called *vital* Christianity (faith, religion, etc.) as distinguished from what is called *formal* Christianity, etc. The Bible makes no such distinctions. God's ordinances are His ordinances, regardless of their essential character, and not one of them is to be trifled with. Everything in Christianity is *vital* or it is not of Christian *faith*.

"The Moral is commanded, *because it is right*; the Positive is right, *because it is commanded*." In all Dispensations God has required of His elect *both internal and external worship*. The external, although embodying the moral virtue of obedience, is designed to serve as a testimony to the outside world. Baptism, for example, is the positive institution in which the obedient believer *witnesses* to the facts of the Gospel—the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ (1 Cor. 15:1-8); hence, any act short of a burial and resurrection (an immersion in water and an emersion therefrom) vitiates the testimonial character of the ordinance, and *simply cannot be Scriptural baptism*. Again, how often do we hear baptism spoken of as a "mere outward act," "mere external performance," etc. This kind of terminology is blasphemy: it is an evidence of the *profanity* which characterized Cain's attitude toward the ordinance of sacrifice. When, in the name of both reason and faith, did our Lord go into the business of ordaining "mere outward acts" or "mere external performances"? There is design in everything that God commands us to do: that design embraces *both man's good and God's glory* (Col. 3:17, 1 Cor. 10:31, Eph. 3:21, Rev. 7:12).

It is notoriously true that modifications, by human authority, of God's positive ordinances, have generally been to serve the ends of *convenience*. In all likelihood Cain

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

was the first "substituter." He brought the kind of offering which was the more convenient for him (by occupation he was a tiller of the ground) to bring to Yahweh. It may well be said that he substituted, for the kind of offering God had ordained, an offering which he—Cain, proud Cain—considered to be "just as good." How many millions in our day, as in all ages past, are trying to substitute civic "morality," respectability, social service, fraternalism, intellectualism, tradition, etc., for the obedience of faith! How many, how very many, substitute lodge, cult, ethical society, service club, etc., for the Church of the living God! "Sprinkling is just as good as immersion." "I am willing to take my chances without immersion." "I am willing to take my chances without attending church every Lord's Day." "I am a moral man—that's good enough for me!" But are these substitutes "good enough" *for God*? God says that all such things are "vain"—that is, utterly futile! "In vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men" (Matt. 15: 8-9, Isa. 29:13, Col. 2:8, 1 Tim. 6:20, 2 Tim. 2:16, Jas. 1:26). All such "substituters" are walking in the "way of Cain" (Jude 11).

Note what the righteousness which is of faith has to say: "the word is nigh thee . . . the word of faith, which we preach" (Rom. 10:8). Faith does what God commands, and does it in the way He has commanded it to be done. Faith without the works of faith is dead (Jas. 2:26).

### *God's Covering of Grace*

There is nothing that the earth has to offer that can provide atonement (covering) for the transgression of a law of God, or that can open up the way to God. Abel recognized this truth and brought an offering of blood. Blood is life (Lev. 17:11), and life—every kind of life—is the gift of God (Gen. 2:7, Acts 17:25). Cain refused to witness to these truths of true religion and brought an offering of the ground, the ground which had already

## GENESIS

been placed under the Divine anathema (Gen. 3:17). Cain represents the man who tries to approach God on the basis of something of merit within himself—commonly defined morality, good citizenship, fraternalism, social service, intellectualism, etc. He represents the class described by the Lord Jesus in Matt. 7:15-23.

C.H.M. (NBG, 63, 64): "An unpardoned sinner coming into the presence of Jehovah, to present an 'unbloody sacrifice,' could only be regarded as guilty of the highest degree of presumption. True, he had toiled to produce this offering: but what of that? Could a sinner's toil remove the curse and stain of sin? Could it satisfy the claims of an infinitely holy God? Could it furnish a proper ground of acceptance for a sinner? Could it set aside the penalty which was due to sin? Could it rob death of its sting, or the grave of its victory?—could it do any or all of these things? Impossible! 'Without shedding of blood there is no remission.' Cain's 'unbloody sacrifice,' like every other unbloody sacrifice, was not only worthless, but actually abominable, in the divine estimation. It not only demonstrated his entire ignorance of his own condition, but also of the divine character. 'God is not worshiped with men's hands, as though He needed anything'; and yet Cain thought He could be thus approached—and every mere religionist thinks the same. Cain has had many millions of followers, from age to age. Cain-worship has abounded all over the world. It is the worship of every unconverted soul, and is maintained by every false system of religion under the sun."

Dean (OBH, 13): "Cain's offering was only such as Adam and Eve in the innocence of Eden might have offered. It expressed no sense of sin, no prayer for pardon. Moreover, Cain lacked the faith of his brother Abel (Heb. 11:4). His spirit, as contrasted with Abel's, was one of unbelief, self-righteousness, self-will. It was a case of Pharisee and Publican at the gate of Eden."

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

We cannot expect to approach God on the basis of anything within ourselves. The so-called "moralist" is the modern Pharisee, who stands off, with a great show of piety, and prays, "Lord, I thank Thee I am not like other men" (Luke 18:11), or, in modern terms, "I thank Thee, Lord, that I am not like all those poor hypocrites in the church," etc. The "moralist" puts all confidence in himself, rather than in Christ, His only hope of glory (Col. 1:27); and, in the end, his house will crumble because it is built on sand (Matt. 7:24-27).

There is but one way back to God—that Way is Christ (John 14:6, 1 Tim. 2:5-6). There is but one remedy for sin—that remedy is the blood of Christ (1 John 1:7, Heb. 9:14, 1 Pet. 1:18-19, Mark 14:24, Acts 20:28, Rom. 3:25, 5:9; Eph. 1:7, Col. 1:14; Heb. 9:22, 13:20; John 1:29). There is but one method of presenting and applying this remedy, namely, the preaching of the Gospel for the obedience of faith (1 Cor. 1:21; Rom. 1:16, 10:12-17; John 14:1, 20:30-31; Acts 16:31, 2:38, 8:12; Matt. 28:18-20; Luke 15:18-19; 2 Cor. 7:10; Rom. 10:9-10; Rom. 6:1-11; Acts 22:16, Gal. 3:27, etc.).

### *The Way of Cain*

To summarize: What are the attitudes (motives) which characterize those who walk in "the way of Cain" (Jude 11). Obviously, the following:

1. *Spiritual insensibility.* As shown above, Cain's outcries manifested his lack of any real knowledge of God, hence of any appreciation of the Divine love and mercy (cf. John 3:16; Rom. 8:38-39, 11:33-36; Eph. 3:14-19). His reaction to God's rejection of his offering was one of sheer spiritual obtuseness (cf. 1 Cor. 2:14), apparently lacking even the slightest notion that, if he should correct his offering (as the LXX reads, "if thou offer correctly, shalt thou not be accepted?"), he would receive God's full and free pardon. He simply did not know God in the sense of having any appreciation of Him or of His love.



Hence, not one of God's questions which were calculated to induce reformation, ever "got through" to him. (Of course, in our day, even we Christians find it difficult to understand that God's love is such that when He forgives, He forgets: Psa. 103:10-18, Jer. 31:31-34, Heb. 8:12.)

2. *Unbelief.* Faith does what God commands in the way He has commanded it to be done. Abel brought an offering of faith in that it met the requirements of the positive institution of sacrifice. It was a blood-offering, as it had to be to foreshadow the blood-offering of God's Only Begotten, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (John 17:24, Eph. 1:4, 1 Pet. 1:18-20, Rev. 13:8, 1 Cor. 5:7). This fact was, of course, an integral part of God's Eternal Purpose (Heb. 9:11-28, 10:1-25). The Old Testament saints may not have known, indeed could hardly have known, the reason for this fundamental requirement (Heb. 9:22)—but God knew. This was sufficient for Abel, as it is for every man of faith. To Cain, however, who walked by sight and not by faith (2 Cor. 5:7), the details of God's law of sacrifice meant little or nothing (Heb. 11:4); hence in all justice there was only one response that Yahweh could make, and that was to reject his offering. "Blind unbelief is sure to err"—of course, it errs *because it is blind*.

3. *Self-will, self-assertiveness.* Cain elevated his own "righteousness" ("way of doing things") above the righteousness of God (God's way of doing things), the righteousness which is of faith (Rom. 10:6-10). On his own authority he came before Yahweh with *his own* kind of offering. As suggested above, this obviously was the *convenient* thing for him to do. He was the first of that long line of "substituters" (*ersatz* "Christians") who choose *what they esteem* to be "just as good" as that which God has ordained. "Such was 'the way of Cain,' in which way millions are, at this moment, rushing on. Such persons are not, by any means, divested of the religious element in

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

their character. They would like to offer something to God—to do something for Him. They deem it right to present to Him the results of their own toil. They are ignorant of themselves, ignorant of God; but with all this there is the diligent effort to improve the world, to make life agreeable in various ways, to deck the scene with the fairest colors. God's remedy to *cleanse* is rejected, and man's effort to *improve* is put in its place. This is 'the way of Cain,' Jude 11" (C.H.M., N.B.G. 75, 76). Again (*ibid.*, p. 77): "There is abundance of religion, so called; but alas! charity itself is compelled to harbor the apprehension that very much of what passes for religion is but a screw in the vast machine which has been constructed for man's convenience and man's exaltation. Man would not be without religion: it would not be respectable; and therefore he is content to devote one-seventh of his time to religion, or, as he thinks and professes, to his eternal interests, and then he has six-sevenths to devote to his temporal interests; but whether he works for time or eternity, it is for *himself*, in reality. Such is 'the way of Cain.' Let my reader ponder it well. Let him see where this way begins, whither it tends, and where it terminates."

4. *Profanity* (worldliness, secularism, irreligion). Cain, like Esau, was profane (Heb. 12:16); that is to say, he lived his life "outside the temple": he not only lived in the world, he was also of the world. It seems, moreover, that he bequeathed this worldliness, this secularism, this restlessness, to his posterity (cf. Exo. 20:5-6). Not the slightest semblance of humility is to be found in anything he said or did, or in anything that is reported about the particular line which he sired. Again C.H.M. (*ibid.*, pp. 74, 77): "It is well to see that Cain's act of murder was the true consequence—the proper fruit—of his false worship. His foundation was bad and the superstructure erected thereon was also bad. Nor did he stop at the act of murder; but having heard the judgment of God thereon, despairing of

## GENESIS

forgiveness through ignorance of God, he went forth from His blessed presence and built a city, and had in his family the cultivators of the useful and ornamental sciences—agriculturists, musicians, and workers in metals. . . . How different the way of the man of faith! Abel felt and owned the curse; he saw the stain of sin, and, in the holy energy of faith, offered that which met it, and met it thoroughly—met it divinely. He sought and found a refuge in God Himself; and instead of building a city on the earth, he found but a grave in its bosom.”

“The way of Cain” is indeed the broad way over which the multitudes travel, not to eternal fellowship with God, but to Godless, Christless eternity.

### *Abel and Christ: Analogies*

The Scriptures do not expressly state that Abel was intended to be typical of Christ: nevertheless, the analogies are striking, as follows:

1. *In the similarity of their occupations.* Abel chose the occupation of a shepherd. Christ is the Good Shepherd (John 10:16, Heb. 13:20, 1 Pet. 5:4) of human souls.

2. *In the similarity of their offerings.* Abel brought the best of his flock, and the fat thereof, to the Lord. This was an offering of blood and fat, the richest offering that could be made under the Old Testament plan of worship. So our Christ offered Himself freely for the sin of the world (John 1:29; Heb. 12:2, 9:14; Eph. 5:1; Matt. 20:28; 1 Tim. 2:5-6). The blood of Abel’s offering prefigured the blood of Christ which was shed for the remission of sins (Heb. 9:29, Matt. 26:28, Eph. 5:25). The fat of Abel’s offering prefigured the inherent excellency of Christ’s body (a consequence of His begetting by the Holy Spirit, Luke 1:35, Acts 2:24) which was offered up on the Cross for the sin of mankind (John 1:29, 1 Cor. 11:24, 1 Pet. 2:24; Heb. 10:5, 10, 20). All this adds up to the fact that our Lord’s vicarious sacrifice of Himself was the

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

richest (because the costliest) offering that Heaven could provide for the redemption of fallen man (John 3:16, Rom. 3:24).

3. *In the similarity of their deaths.* Abel was murdered by his own brother. The Lord's Anointed was put to death at the importunities of His own people, and especially of their ecclesiastical leaders. Cain exclaimed, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Yahweh replied: "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground." When the Jewish leaders, supported by the mob which they had assembled to enforce their demands, besought Pilate to turn Jesus over to them that He might be put to death, their raucous cry was, "His blood be on us, and on our children" (Matt. 27:25). By their wanton act, the ground has been stained by a blood "that speaketh better than that of Abel" (Heb. 12:24). God took them at their word, as all subsequent history shows. In A.D. 70, the Roman armies entered Jerusalem, after a horrible two years' siege, sacked the city, destroyed the Temple, and carried the Jews into captivity.

4. *In the similarity of the penal sanctions which overtook their murderers.* Cain was branded and sent out into the land of "wandering"; he became an outcast and a vagabond, and his restlessness was transmitted to his posterity. From the day of Messiah's Crucifixion, the Jewish nation has never had a flag it could call its own: even today, despite the establishment of the state of Israeli, the Jewish people remain scattered among all nations, and their Zionistic state faces a precarious future. (Cf. Matt. 8:11-12, 21:42-44, 23:29-39, 24:1-2; Mark 12:10-11, 13:1-2; Luke 11:45-52, 13:34-35, 19:41-44, 20:9-18, 21:20-24, 23:27-31; cf. also Deut. 28:37; Mark 11:12-14; Acts 3:13-15, 7:51-53.) The story is told of Frederick "the Great" of Prussia, who was inclined toward skepticism, once asked one of the ministers of his realm: "Reverend

## GENESIS

Sir, what is the most convincing proof you can give me of the divinity of Christ and the divine inspiration of the Scriptures?" The clergyman hesitated not a moment. "Sire," said he, "the most convincing proof of the divinity of Christ and the inspiration of Scripture that I, or any other person, could give you, *is the history of the Jewish people.*" But, let us not overlook the fact that the blood of Christ is upon the Gentiles as well as the Jews. According to tradition, Pilate, who presumed to cleanse himself of this blood by ceremonially washing his hands in front of the mob (Matt. 27:24-26), later died a suicide in Gaul. Moreover, the death of Christ signaled also the setting in of the dry rot which culminated in the downfall of the Roman Empire itself. The simple fact is that our sins, your sins and mine, crucified the Lord of glory. He bore them all upon His body on the Tree! We have all, Jews and Gentiles alike, been concluded under sin that we might all return to God in the same way and on the same terms (Rom. 3:23, Eph. 3:11-22).

C.H.M. (NBG, 77, 78): "The earth, which on its surface displayed the genius and energy of Cain and his family, was stained underneath with the blood of a righteous man. Let the man of the world remember this; let the man of God remember it; let the worldly-minded Christian remember it. The earth which we tread upon is stained by the blood of the Son of God. The very blood which justifies the Church condemns the world. The dark shadow of the cross of Jesus may be seen by the eye of faith, looming over all the glitter and glare of this evanescent world. 'The fashion of this world passeth away.' It will soon all be over, so far as the present scene is concerned. 'The way of Cain' will be followed by 'the error of Balaam,' in its consummated form; and then will come 'the gainsaying of Core'; and what then? 'The pit' will open its mouth to receive the wicked, and close it again to shut them up in 'blackness of darkness forever.' (Jude

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

11-13).” (Cf. Num., chs. 22, 23, 24; esp. Num. 24:3-9 with Num. 31:8, 31:15 ff, 2 Pet. 2:15, Rev. 2:14; Num., ch. 16, 26:9-10, 27:1-5, with Jude 11.)

\* \* \* \* \*

## REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART SEVENTEEN

1. State the pagan etymology of the word “religion” as given by Cicero.
2. Considered subjectively, what generally is the word “religion” used to signify?
3. Name some of the practices which are commonly associated with the term.
4. State John Dewey’s definition of the term.
5. What significance has the *object* of religious devotion to the theory and practice in any particular system?
6. Name those matters which true religion *is not*.
7. What are the basic premises of true religion?
8. What is the essence of true religion?
9. What does the term signify in Biblical religion?
10. Explain what is meant by the phrase, the Remedial System.
11. What does the Remedial System include?
12. What is the mainspring of true religion on the Divine side? What is it on the human side?
13. What does God’s grace include?
14. What are the various manifestations of faith which characterize the Spiritual Life?
15. State the *formula* of true religion.
16. What does the word “Dispensation” signify? Name the Dispensations of true religion, and state the extent of each.
17. What kind of change marked changes in Dispensations?

## GENESIS

18. In what Genesis narrative do we find the account of the beginning of true religion?
19. State A. Campbell's explanation of the beginning of true religion.
20. In what interior condition of man did the necessity for true religion arise?
21. By what specific measures did God meet this human need?
22. Was religion provided for man before or after the Fall?
23. What are the elements of true religion?
24. What was the altar in the Patriarchal Dispensation? In the Jewish Dispensation? What is it in our Dispensation?
25. What was the type of priesthood in the Patriarchal and Jewish Dispensations respectively? What is it in our Dispensation?
26. What type of sacrifice was characteristic of the Old Testament Dispensations?
27. What did these offerings point forward to (typify)?
28. State the approximate dates of the Neolithic, Chalcolithic, and Bronze Ages. When did the Iron Age begin?
29. Who were the first sons of Adam and Eve? What different occupations did they choose?
30. Give the details of the first account of sacrifice.
31. In this connection, explain the probable significance of Gen. 3:21.
32. Whose offering was rejected, and whose accepted, by Yahweh?
33. What is the prevailing naturalistic explanation of God's acceptance of the one offering and His rejection of the other?
34. What is the Biblical explanation?

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

35. Show how these examples illustrate a basic principle of Biblical interpretation.
36. What is meant by "the righteousness which is of faith"?
37. What is the significance of the blood in the institution of sacrifice?
38. Who is our Passover? Cite the Scripture text which states this fact explicitly.
39. State the proofs of the Divine origin of sacrifice.
40. Distinguish between moral law and positive law.
41. What was the twofold basic design of the institution of sacrifice?
42. Why have men in all ages tended to ignore, neglect, modify, even scoff at God's positive ordinances?
43. What is the Scriptural significance of a positive divine ordinance?
44. What is the testimonial significance of the Christian ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper?
45. Explain what is meant by sacrifice as a propitiation, as a reconciliation, as an expiation, and as a redemption.
46. What does the word "atonement" mean? State clearly the Biblical doctrine of the Atonement.
47. What were the chief characteristics of pagan sacrifices?
48. Why do we say that pagan sacrifices were probably corruptions of the original law of sacrifice as revealed in Scripture?
49. Name some of the remnants of the magical and mystical pagan cults of sacrifice that were carried over into institutionalized Christianity.
50. Who committed the first murder, and why?
51. How did God proceed in dealing with the murderer? What did He first try to do?
52. What was Cain's reaction?
53. In what sense did Cain's offering lack efficacy?



## GENESIS

54. What did Cain try to do after killing Abel?
55. What did he say when God bluntly charged him with the crime?
56. What was his attitude?
57. In what sense, would you say, is every man his brother's keeper?
58. What was the "blood feud" or "blood revenge"?
59. In what way did man finally, by law, resolve this problem of blood revenge?
60. Distinguish between *vengeance* and *vindication*.
61. Trace the development of sinful feelings into actual crime, as exemplified in "the way of Cain."
62. What was the first curse ever pronounced on a human being?
63. What is indicated in Cain's cry, "My punishment is greater than I can bear"?
64. In what way or ways did the ground serve as the instrument of punishment to Cain and his posterity?
65. What is the answer to the question, Where did Cain get his wife?
66. Why are Cain, Abel, and Seth the only three children of Adam and Eve mentioned in Scripture?
67. What relation has this fact to the grand design of the Bible as a whole?
68. What was the "mark of Cain"?
69. What purpose was served by this "mark"? Was it a mark of punishment or a mark of Divine grace? Explain your answer.
70. What special obligations does the Christian have toward his brothers in the flesh?
71. What special obligations does the Christian have especially toward those of the household of the faith?

## THE BEGINNING OF TRUE RELIGION

72. What proofs do we have from Cain's outcries that he had no real understanding of God?
73. How does Cain's cry of desperation point to the cry of lost souls at the Judgment?
74. What are the marks of genuine faith? How are these related to the Christian ordinances, especially that of Christian baptism?
75. Explain what is meant by the phrase, "God's covering of grace."
76. What are the devices to which men resort as substitutes for this Divine "covering"?
77. What folly is involved in man's presumption that civic morality, fraternalism, respectability, intellectualism, tradition, and the like, will have the efficacy to save him from sin?
78. What is the folly of trying to substitute something "just as good" for implicit obedience to God's laws?
79. How does genuine faith respond to the Divine ordinances?
80. What are the chief characteristics of those who walk in "the way of Cain"?
81. Explain Jude 11.
82. What does the word "profanity" especially imply in Scripture?
83. What are the analogies between the lives of Abel and Christ?
84. In what sense did the punishment which descended on Cain point forward to that which descended on the Jews and Gentiles who crucified Christ?
85. What is the blood "that speaketh better than that of Abel"?
86. In what sense does this blood cry out against all mankind? What, then, is man's only remedy?

## THE BEGINNINGS OF HUMAN CULTURE

(Gen. 4:16-24)

1. *The Patriarchal Age*

The story of Cain and Abel introduces the Patriarchal form of government and worship. Family government is the oldest form of social organization known to history; family worship is the oldest form of worship described in the Bible. The patriarch was the head of his family; as such, he acted as prophet, priest and king. As *prophet*, he communicated the will of God, which he received by direct revelation, to his household; as *priest*, he offered sacrifice and acted as mediator between Yahweh and his family; and as *king*, his will was absolute law. The institution of worship during this Dispensation was the altar. This may have been a mound of earth, or a huge stone, or several stones placed one on top of the other, or a heap of unhewn stones and native earth (Exo. 20:24-26, Deut. 27:5-6). The patriarchs were nomadic, of course, and the altar was usually a heap of unhewn stones and native earth thrown together wherever the patriarch pitched his tents and on which he offered sacrifices to Jehovah. The first period of the Patriarchal Dispensation was the Antediluvian Period in the story of which, in the Biblical account, we have the history of the Messianic Genealogy from Adam to Noah.

2. *The Line of Cain*

*"16 And Cain went out from the presence of Jehovah, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden. 17 And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived, and bare Enoch: and he builded a city, and called the name of the city, after the name of his son, Enoch. 18 And unto Enoch was born Irad: and Irad begat Mebujael; and Mebujael begat Methusael; and Methusael begat Lamech. 19 And Lamech took unto him two wives: the name of the one was Adah, and*

## THE BEGINNINGS OF HUMAN CULTURE 4:16-24

*the name of the other Zillah. 20 And Adah bare Jabal: he was the father of such as dwell in tents and have cattle. 21 And his brother's name was Jubal: he was the father of all such as handle the harp and pipe. 22 And Zillah, she also bare Tubal-cain, the forger of every cutting instrument of brass and iron: and the sister of Tubal-cain was Naamah. 23 And Lamech said unto his wives:*

*Adah and Zillah, hear my voice;*

*Ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech:*

*For I have slain a man for wounding me,*

*And a young man for bruising me:*

*24 If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold,*

*Truly Lamech seventy and seven fold."*

(1) V. 16. In view of the repeated affirmations in Scripture of God's omnipresence (everywhereness: cf. Psa. 139:7-10, Isa. 66:1, Jer. 23:23-24, Amos 9:2-3, Acts 17:27-28), how can it be said that any human being went "out from" His presence? (Cf. Gen. 3:8, 11:5, 18:20-21; 1 Ki. 19:11-12, Jonah 1:3.) Obviously, the "presence of Jehovah" (Yahweh) in these latter passages had reference either (a) to special and visible manifestations of Deity at the times indicated, or (b) to the place of those manifestations (probably at the entrance of the Garden where the Cherubim were stationed), or (c) to both. All such passages are anthropomorphic in character. It will be noted that Cain became a dweller "in the land of Nod," that is, the land of Wandering, "on the east of Eden." "The name of this unidentified land recalls the description of Cain as a 'wanderer,' *nad*, in the land of Nod" (JB, 19, n.). It may carry a connotation of the man's obvious *restlessness*: was the Biblical Cain a counterpart of the Greek Prometheus? Does this mean, as Josephus conjectures, that Cain was not in any sense reformed by his punishment, "but waxed worse and worse, giving himself to rapine, robbery, oppression, deceit" (Whitelaw, PCG, 82)?

(2) V. 17. (a) *Cain's wife*. "Starting from a single pair in Eden, in the course of seven generations the human family must have attained to very considerable dimensions. At the birth of Seth, Adam was 130 years old, and in all probability had other sons and daughters besides Cain and his wife. If Lamech, the seventh from Adam in the line of Cain, was contemporaneous with Enoch, the seventh from Adam in the line of Seth, at least 600 years had passed away since the race began to multiply; and if Abraham's stock in less than 400 years amounted to 600,000 [men alone, "a mixed multitude," Exo. 12:37-42], Cain's posterity in the like time might arise to the like multitude. If to these the descendants of Seth be added, it will appear that the earth's population in the time of Lamech was considerably over 1,000,000 inhabitants" (PCG, 90). Murphy (MG, 158): "The wife of Cain was of necessity his sister, though this was forbidden in after times, for wise and holy reasons, when the necessity no longer existed." (b) *The first city*. Cain built the city and named it *Enoch* after the name of his son. A city in that day was a stronghold, a fort, built on high ground, and walled.

(3) V. 18. A series of three nondescript characters, progenitors of three successive generations: Irad ("townsman," "wild ass"?), Mehujael ("smitten by God"), Methushael ("strong man of God"?). "And Methushael begat Lamech" ("strong youth"). In this genealogy Lamech stands out in bold relief as a man of authority, aggressiveness, even violence.

(4) *Lamech's Family*, vv. 19-24. (a) V. 19. The first record and evidently the first instance of polygamy. (b) Note the names of the two wives: Adah ("the adorned," "ornament," "beauty"), and Zillah ("shadow," "tinkling," "musical player"). These seem to indicate the charms which attracted Lamech and caused him to turn marriage from a moral into a sensual institution. (c) Vv. 20, 21—Adah's sons were named Jabal (*yabal*, "to lead" flocks),

THE BEGINNINGS OF HUMAN CULTURE 4:16-24 and Jubal (*yobel*, "trumpet"). (d) V. 25—Zillah's son was Tubal-cain ("hammer blow of the smith"). "Tubal (name of a northern race, Gen. 10:2, famous for its deposits of metal). Cain means 'smith' in other Semitic languages" (JB, 66n.). Murphy (MG, 159): "The three names Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal are formed from a root signifying to *flow, run, go forth*, perhaps *blow*, from which comes the *blast* or trumpet-note of joy or release. Accordingly, all sorts of going forth, that were suitable to the life of a nomad, seem to have distinguished this family." We have here an account of the beginnings of stockbreeding, of the invention and use of musical instruments, and of various forms of metal-working. Some say that we have described here "the three classes of nomads: shepherds, traveling musicians, and tinkers" (JB, 66, n.). (e) Note the name of Tubal-cain's sister, Naamah, meaning "lovely." Does not this indicate that the Cainites selected their wives for their sensual (voluptuous) forms and lovely faces rather than for their pious hearts? Thus we find in comparing the name of Tubal-cain's sister ("the lovely") with that of Adam's wife ("the living") a growing symptom of the degeneracy which was gradually coming upon man, and especially on—and through—the line of Cain.

(5) *The Song of Lamech* (vv. 23-24). "This ferocious song, composed in honour of a desert paladin named Lamech, is recorded here as evidence of the increasing ferocity of Cain's descendants" (JB, 21, n.). Whitelaw (PCG, 89): "In protestations and assurances in which the mind of the speaker views the action as already accomplished, being as good as done . . . then the father of Tubal-cain is depicted as exulting in the weapons which his son's genius had invented, and with boastful arrogance threatening death to the first man that should injure him, impiously asserting that by means of these same weapons he would exact upon his adversary a vengeance ten times greater than that which had been threatened against the

murderer of Cain. Considering the character of the speaker and the spirit of the times, it is probable that this is the correct interpretation." "Lamech's song in Gen. 4: 23f. is frequently thought to be a 'sword-lay' glorifying the weapons of war invented by his son. He boasts to his wives that he has killed men, and, because of his superior strength due to his weapons, he has no need of God's protection, but is well able to defend himself. He appears as 'a cruel man, destitute of all humanity' (Calvin)" (NBD, 706). Murphy (MG, 159, 160): "In this fragment of an ancient song, we have Lamek, under the strong excitement of having slain a man in self-defence, reciting to his wives the deed, and at the same time comforting them and himself with the assurance that if Cain the murderer would be avenged sevenfold, he the manslayer in self-defence would be avenged seventy and seven fold. This short ode has all the characteristics of the most perfect Hebrew poetry. Every pair of lines is a specimen of the Hebrew parallelism or rhythm of sentiment and style. They all belong to the synthetic, synonymous, or cognate parallel, the second member reiterating with emphasis the first. Here we observe that Lamek was a poet; one of his wives was possibly a songstress, and the other had a taste for ornament. One daughter was the lovely, and three sons were the inventors of most of the arts which sustain and embellish life. This completes the picture of this remarkable family." Remarkable, yes, but unfortunately proud, self-assertive, and irreligious. Cornfeld (AtD, 23, 24): "The Song of Lamech or in fact a fragment of the original, is one of the oldest examples of epic style in the Old Testament. Other very ancient epic fragments, artistically moulded, will be found elsewhere and may easily be distinguished by their style and spirit as different from the literary material in which they are embedded." Lange (CDHCG, 261): "The song of Lamech is the first decidedly poetic form in the Scriptures, more distinct than ch.

## THE BEGINNINGS OF HUMAN CULTURE 4:16-24

1:27 and ch. 2:23, as is shown by the marked parallelism of the members. It is the consecration of poetry to the glorification of a Titanic insolence, and, sung as it was in the ears of both his wives, stands as a proof that lust and murder are near akin to each other. Rightly may we suppose . . . that the invention of his son, Tubal Cain, that is, the invention of weapons, made him so excessively haughty, whilst the invention of his son Jubal put him in a position to sing to his wives his song of hate and vengeance. This indicates, at the same time, an immeasurable pride in his talented sons. He promises himself the taking of blood-vengeance, vastly enhanced in degree, but shows, at the same time, by the citation of the case of his ancestor Cain, that the dark history of that bad man had become transformed into a proud remembrance for his race." (Could the Battle of the Gods and Giants (Titans) in Greek tradition rightly be regarded as an echo of this Song of Lamech? See Plato's *Sophist*.)

### 3. *The Degeneracy of the Cainites*

The brief account of Cain's posterity which is given us in this section of the fourth chapter of Genesis (vv. 16-24) shows clearly the kind of people they were. It is evident that they inherited the corrupt, restless character of their common ancestor. Thus, in a few striking statements the inspired writer pictures the retrogression of the human race into wickedness and violence, beginning with the Cainites, and the subsequent intermingling of the two lines of Cain and Seth. It was this intermingling, moreover, that resulted in the universal wickedness which precipitated Divine Judgment in the form of the Flood. The degeneracy of the Cainites is evidenced: (1) *By their names*. Enoch ("the initiated and his city"), Irad, Mehujael, and Lamech, are all names that suggest this-worldliness: even Methushael is a name which indicates this tendency, although there is some confusion as to what this name really



did mean. Adah, Zillah, and Naamah, are names that indicate sensual attraction rather than true nobility of womanhood. (2) *By their works*. The building of a city was unnecessary and productive of sin. Urbanization has always multiplied sin, crime, disease, insanity, intoxication, prostitution, strife, violence, indeed every kind of wickedness (cf. Gen. 1:28, 11:4). There is no evidence that God ever looks with favor on the concentration of population. "And though it certainly cannot be sinful to handle a harp, or to cultivate poetry, yet when we put all of these things together—beautiful wives, iron weapons, musical instruments, warlike ballads, if not bacchanalian songs—it is not difficult to perceive a deepening devotion to the things of life which invariably proclaims a departure from the things of God." Of course this does not mean necessarily that the facets of human culture which take in what we ordinarily speak of as the useful arts and the fine arts are evil *in themselves*: they become evil, however, when they are prostituted to profane, licentious and violent ends, when they become the means used by man to glorify, even to deify, himself and his kind. History certainly testifies that so many persons who devote their lives to the production of the fine arts especially (music, poetry and other forms of literature, painting, sculpture, etc.) are notoriously lacking in religious (spiritual) sensitivity or practice. *Why is this so?* (3) *By their immoral lives*. We see, in the profane careers of the Cainites a growing disregard for divine things, and this profanity seems to gather momentum with each succeeding generation. Lamech prostituted the institution of marriage into a sensual and polygamous relationship. We see the growth of a turbulent and lawless spirit, in the warlike weapons of Tubal-cain's invention and in the boastful ballad which Lamech "sang" to his wives. These two things—licentiousness and lawlessness—are always indicative of moral and spiritual degeneracy.

## THE BEGINNINGS OF HUMAN CULTURE 4:16-24

### 4. *The Antiquity of Human Culture*

In sociological jargon, culture is usually defined as the sum total of "behavior patterns" handed down from generation to generation. It includes the various facets of what are commonly called the *fine arts* and the *useful arts*. In the section of chapter 4 now before us we find brief references to the progenitors of certain cultural pursuits, namely, those of herdsmen, musicians, and smiths (metalworkers). Some interesting comments on this development are to be found in works by modern writers. For example, Skinner writes (ICCG, 123): "The three sons of Lamech represent not the highest stages of social evolution, but three picturesque modes of life, which strike the peasant as interesting and ornamental, but by no means essential to the framework of society." But—by what authority do we assume that the author of this account was writing for peasants in particular? Simpson (IB, 524): "It may be noted here that the implication of vss. 20-22a is that Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal (-cain) were the fathers of the nomads, musicians, and metalworkers existing at the time of writing, i.e., that the author of this account of the origins of civilization knew nothing of the Flood." This is a purely arbitrary assumption, and is completely out of harmony with the obvious design of the text which surely is to point up the growing worldliness of the Cainites and so to lead to an explanation of the universal wickedness which brought Divine judgment on the antediluvian world. Again, it has been supposed by the analytical critics that these cultural developments as depicted in Gen. 4:16-24, not the least of which by any means was the building of a city, occurred much later than in antediluvian times, and hence that the narrative presents an anachronism which can be resolved only by assuming that it was composed at a much later date, probably after the beginning of the Iron Age about 1500 B.C. To this argument we reply that the inspired writer—whom we believe to have been Moses,

although he might well have been making use of ancient traditions—is not picturing contemporary events, that is, events occurring in his own lifetime, but is simply referring back to the particular age in which these cultural developments occurred, and to those individuals who originated the phases of culture which are specifically mentioned. Moreover, the fundamental purpose of the writer is obvious (as stated above), namely, *to chronicle the growing degeneracy of the Cainites, their sheer worldliness and irreligiousness*, rather than to emphasize the historical or sociological content of what he is putting in the record. It is not surprising, therefore, that he makes no attempt to trace the Line of Cain beyond seven generations. Since he is interested only in accounting for the universal wickedness which later overtook the human race, in the intermingling of the more pious Sethites with the worldly Cainites, his purpose is accomplished fully in his description of the profane character of Lamech and his wives and offspring.

The notion of anachronism in these verses before us has been thoroughly debunked by archaeology. It is clearly understood in our day, as proved by archaeological discoveries, that many aspects of human culture are very ancient. In the Neolithic Age, which extended roughly from about 8000 B.C. to 5000 B.C., plant and animal domestication was fully developed and even pottery began to appear about the latter date. (Indeed we must take account even of the polychrome paintings on the cave walls, of the hand-carved artifacts (such as batons especially, probably used for magical purposes), many specimens of which have been brought to light by archaeological excavations, and which must have been in existence about the beginning of the Neolithic Period.) The Chalcolithic Age (c. 5000-3000 B.C.) was marked by many cultural advances. For example, Albright tells us (FSAC, 173, 174) that the decorative art of the Chalcolithic Age is "very instructive" as

## THE BEGINNINGS OF HUMAN CULTURE 4:16-24

compared with that which preceded it. He writes: "In the chalcolithic cultures of Halaf, Susa, and Ghassul after 4000 B.C. we find an extraordinary development of the imaginative-aesthetic powers of man, resulting in astonishingly complex geometrical figures of dragons which carry us into the realm of phantasmagoria. It is very doubtful whether man's artistic capabilities are actually any higher today than they were in late prehistoric times, though the number of motifs, techniques, and media available to him now is, of course, immeasurably greater." Nelson Glueck (RD, 42-50) tells us that advanced copper industry was developed in some areas of Palestine as early as the beginning of the Chalcolithic Age. "It is written that the cousins of the Kenites, called the Kennizites, lived in the Valley of the Smiths (the Wadi Arabah), and, furthermore, that Tubal-cain, the latter part of whose name is just a different English spelling for Kenite, was the first forger of copper and iron instruments (1 Chronicles 4:12-14, Gen. 4:22). . . . I am inclined to think that there is a link of hereditary and industrial union, which binds the Kenite and Judaeen miners and craftsmen of the Wadi Arabah with their very distant Chalcolithic predecessors at Tell Abu Matar, even as its primitive copper crucibles, unchanged in style throughout the centuries, may have served as models for those in Solomon's intricate smelter at Ezion-geber" (p. 45, cf. Num. 21:8-9). Again (*ibid.*, 58): "The Chalcolithic farming communities in the Northern Negev belonged to an advanced agricultural civilization, which extended throughout the Fertile Crescent." Again (p. 48): "Tell Abu Matar was not a mean village lacking in comfort and culture. Among its residents were farmers, shepherds, potters, weavers, smiths and other artisans of high attainments. They stored their grain in pits made moistureproof with plaster linings. The furniture of their households and the tools of their trades were fashioned out of flint, basalt, limestone, ivory and bone. Distinctive

pottery was shaped by hand with partial or occasional use of the tournette, and fired so well in kilns that some of it has survived the passage of six millenia. Men and women adorned themselves with stone and ivory bracelets, copper rings, pendants of mother of pearl and amulets sometimes of striking beauty," etc. He concludes: "In many respects, the Chalcolithic civilization of Tell Abu Matar was indistinguishable from that of sites of the same period elsewhere. It obviously did not exist in a vacuum." Remember that these statements describe cultures that flourished at the very beginning of the Chalcolithic Age, about 4000 B.C., and probably earlier. ("Chalcolithic" means literally "copperstone." Bronze (brass), which came in later, was an alloy of copper and tin.) Finally, in this connection, Cornfeld (AtD, 23): "Whether the Cainite civilization referred to in Genesis 4 originated in Anatolia, in Kurdistan, or farther east of Eden, or how it spread, is uncertain. The Biblical representation of the progress of the arts and crafts is well borne out by archaeology. The potter's wheel, the use of donkeys, primitive wheeled vehicles, bricks and cylinder seals are among man's discoveries in these earliest prehistoric sites." There can be no doubt that the phases of human culture described in Genesis 4: 16-24 flourished not too long after the very beginnings of the history of *homo sapiens*. Indeed archaeology has, in recent years, confirmed the historicity of practically every event recorded in Scripture.

\* \* \* \* \*

### REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART EIGHTEEN

1. With what events did the Patriarchal Dispensation begin and end?
2. What was the earliest form of government? Of worship?
3. What was the duty of the patriarch as prophet, as priest, and as king?

## THE BEGINNINGS OF HUMAN CULTURE 4:16-24

4. What is the correlation between this threefold function and the meaning of the titles, Messiah, Christos, and Christ?
5. Of what did the patriarch's household consist?
6. What was the altar throughout the Patriarchal Dispensation? Of what was it constructed?
7. What was the nature of the sacrifice offered in the Patriarchal Dispensation?
8. What is the first period of the Patriarchal Dispensation called, and why?
9. What genealogical line is given us in Genesis 4:16-24?
10. In what sense did Cain go "out from the presence of Jehovah"?
11. What is probably indicated by the phrase, "the land of Nod"?
12. Summarize the suggestions offered in regard to Cain's wife.
13. Who built the first city and what was it named?
14. What was the moral significance of this act?
15. What evils usually result from concentration of population?
16. What was God's original injunction to man *in re* the occupancy of the earth? Instead of obeying this command, what did man do?
17. Is there any evidence in Scripture that God looks with favor on concentration of population?
18. List the descendants in the Line of Cain terminating with Lamech.
19. What is suggested by the meaning of the names given these men?
20. Who is represented as introducing polygamy?
21. Who were Lamech's wives, and what is the meaning of their names?

22. What facets of human culture were introduced by Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal-cain, respectively?
23. What was the name of Tubalcain's sister and what did it mean?
24. What is meant by the Song of Lamech?
25. What was the character of this song from the *literary* and from the *moral* points of view?
26. What does it reveal about the person who composed and sang it?
27. On what grounds can we say that Cain's evil propensities were handed down to his offspring?
28. What were the phases of human culture originated by the sons of Lamech?
29. What is meant by the term "culture," and of what does culture consist?
30. What are the evidences of the growing degeneracy of the Cainites?
31. Show how this presentation of the development of culture harmonizes with the actual cultural developments in the Neolithic and Chalcolithic Ages.
32. What, obviously, was the author's purpose in inserting this brief account in the Scripture record of the origins of these facets of culture?
33. Why, probably, did he stop tracing the Line of Cain after seven generations?
34. What is the obvious relation of Gen. 4:16-24 to the material that is presented in succeeding chapters?
35. Explain what is meant by the Chalcolithic Age and the Bronze Age. What is bronze (in Scripture, brass)?

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE MESSIANIC LINE

(Gen. 4:25-5:32)

1. *The Birth of Seth*

*"25 And Adam knew his wife again; and she bare a son, and called his name Seth: For, said she, God hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel; for Cain slew him. 26 And to Seth, to him also there was born a son, and he called his name Enosh. Then began men to call upon the name of Jehovah."*

2. *The Two Genealogies*

(1) The inspired author first traces the Line of Cain through seven generations, and at that point he terminates the genealogy of the Cainites. Why did he trace the Line no further? Apparently because this was far enough to accomplish his purpose, namely, the explanation of the universal wickedness which spread over the whole earth as a result of the intermingling of the pious Sethites with the irreligious Cainites. By the time we conclude reading his few terse statements about the Line of Cain, especially those descriptive of Lamech and his offspring, we are bound to see that Cain's descendants were restless, proud, lustful, inclined to violence, and generally profane. Hence, in Gen. 4:25 the writer turns our attention to his basic purpose in giving us these early genealogical tables, that of recording the beginnings of the Messianic Line.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the fundamental design of the Holy Spirit in giving us the sacred Scriptures is that of providing the evidence to authenticate the Messiahship of Jesus (cf. John 20:30-31, 16:13-14; Acts 3:13-18, 10:39-43, 26:22-23; 1 Pet. 1:10-12). We sometimes wonder why all the genealogical tables scattered throughout the Bible, especially those in Genesis, in Chronicles, and in Matthew and Luke. They are there for a specific purpose: to give us the history of the



Messianic Line, the Line of Promise, the Line destined to culminate, and to be fulfilled, in the Seed of the Woman (Gen. 3:15). The method of the author of Genesis is followed by practically all Bible writers, namely, that of taking up first the relevant *collateral* matter and then returning to the *main theme*. He first disposes of the Line of Cain, for the purposes as stated above, and then traces the line of Seth ("substitute" for Abel) through whom the Messianic Line is carried forward, concluding with Noah, "a preacher of righteousness" (2 Pet. 2:5. Murphy [MG, 161]): "This passage completes the account of Adam's family. Henceforth we generally meet with two parallel lines of narrative, as the human family is divided into two great branches, with opposing interests and tendencies. The main line refers to the remnant of the race that are on terms of open reconciliation with God; while a collateral line notes as far as necessary those who have departed from the knowledge and love of the true God." Green (UBG, 49): "The whole arrangement bears evidence of adaptation and careful thought, and is suggestive of one author, not the combination of separate compositions prepared with no reference to each other. A further indication of the same sort, implying the original unity of these chapters, is their correspondence with the general plan of Genesis in respect to genealogies. Uniformly the divergent lines are first traced before proceeding with the principal line of descent leading to the chosen people. In ch. 10 the various nations of mankind sprung from the three sons of Noah; then (11:10 sqq.) the line from Shem to Abram. Nahor's descendants (22:20 sqq.), those of Keturah (25:1 sqq.), and of Ishmael (vs. 13 sqq.), before those of Isaac (vs. 19 sqq.). Those of Esau (36:1 sqq.) before those of Jacob (37:2 sqq.). In like manner the degenerate and God-forsaken race of Cain is traced (iv. 17 sqq.) before proceeding with that of Seth (ch. 5)."

(2) On account of the similarities of certain names in both genealogical tables, some of the critics have "supposed a mingling of both genealogies, or one common primitive legend in two forms." Lange (CDHCG, 261): "Keil contends against this by laying emphasis on the difference of the names that appear to be similar, and the different position of those that are alike. For the sake of comparison we let the line of Seth immediately follow: 1. Adam (earth-man). 2. Seth (compensation or the established). 3. Enoch (weak man). 4. Cainan (profit, a mere like-sounding of Cain). 5. Mahalalel (praise of God [only an echo of Mahujael]). 6. Jared, descending, the descender (only a resemblance in sound to Irad). 7. Enoch, or Henoch, the consecrated. Here the devoted, or *consecrated*, follows the *descending*; in the Cainitish line he follows Cain. The one was the occupier of a city in the world, the other was translated to God; both consecrations, or devotions, stand, therefore, in full contrast. 8. Methuselah. According to the usual interpretation: man of the arrow, of the weapons of war. As he forms a chronological parallel with the Cainitic Lamech, so may we regard this name as indicating that he introduced these newly invented weapons of the Cainites into the line of Seth, in order to be a defence against the hostile insolence of the Cainites. It consists with this interpretation, that with him there came into the line of Seth a tendency toward the worldly, after which it goes down with it, and with the age. Even the imposing upon his son the name Lamech, the strong youth, may be regarded as a warlike demonstration against the Cainitic Lamech. Therefore, 9. Lamech or Lamech. 10. Noah, the *rest*, the *quieter*, or *peacemaker*. With Lamech who greeted in his son the future pacificator, there appears to be indicated in the line of Seth, a direction, peaceful, yet troubled with toil and strife. It was just such an age, however, as might have for its consequence the alliances and minglings with

the Cainites that are now introduced, and which have so often followed the exigencies of war. This Sethian Lamech, however, forms a significant contrast with the Cainitic. The one consoled himself with the newly invented weapons of his son Tubal Cain, as his security against the fearful blood-vengeance. The other comforts himself with the hope that with his son there shall come a season of holy rest from the labor and pains that are burdened with the curse of God. In regard to both lines in common, the following is to be remarked: 1. The names in the Cainitic line are, for the most part, expressive of pride, those of the Sethic, of humility. 2. The Cainitic line is carried no farther than to the point of its open corruption in polygamy, quarrelsomeness, and the consecration of art to the service of sin. The Sethic line forms in its tenth period the full running out of a temporal world-development, in which Enoch, the seventh, properly appears at the highest point. 3. Against the mention of the Cainitic wives, their charms and their arts, appears in the Sethic line only the mention of sons and daughters. It serves for an introduction to the sixth chapter."

(3) *Vv. 25-26.* (a) Adam is now bequeathing his own image to his offspring, not the image of God that he had been originally by creation, but that image which has now become marred by sin. Of course, we have no means of knowing how greatly the descendants of Adam may have multiplied by the time he attained the age of 130 years (5:3). In view of the penalty pronounced on Eve, however, his progeny must have been numerous (note 3:16—"unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy pain and thy conception"). The Bible is not concerned with any of these numerous sons and daughters (5:4), but only with the three who figure in the Messianic Development, namely, Cain, Abel and Seth. (b) Said Eve, "God hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel," hence the name Seth ("the appointed," "substitute," "compensa-

tion"). Murphy (MG, 162): "For God hath given me another seed instead of Habel. He is to be instead of Habel, and God-fearing like Habel. Far above this consideration, God hath given him. This son is from God. She regards him as God's son. She receives this gift from God, and in faith expects him to be the seed of God, the parent of a godly race. Her faith was not disappointed. His descendants earn the name of the sons of God. As the ungodly are called the seed of the serpent, because they are of his spirit, so the godly are designated the seed of God, because they are of God's Spirit. The Spirit of God strives and rules in them, and so they are, in the graphic language of Scripture, the sons of God (Gen. 6:1)." Note that God here, in the words attributed to Eve, is Elohim. (Was Mother Eve in any sense aware of the implications of the Divine oracle of Gen. 3:15, concerning the seed of the woman?) (c) To Seth was born a son, and he called his name Enosh (A.V., Enos), *i.e.*, "weakness," "frailty,"—"probably a sorrowful remembrance of Abel (Psa. 8:5, 90:3)."

(4) *Note especially v. 26b.* This closing sentence points up a remarkable event which took place in connection with the birth of Enosh: "Then began men to call upon the name of Jehovah." The LXX gives it: "He was the man who began to call upon the name of the Lord." This is a difficult passage. Lange (262) holds that what is narrated here must be "the beginning of a formal divine worship." Murphy writes (162-164): "The gist of the sentence does not lie in the name Jehovah. For this term was not then new in itself, as it was used by Eve at the birth of Cain; nor was it new in this connection, as the phrase now appears for the first time, and Jehovah is the ordinary term employed in it ever afterwards to denote the true God. As a proper name, Jehovah is the fit and customary word to enter into a solemn invocation. It is, as we have seen, highly significant. It speaks of the Self-

existent, the Author of all existing things, and in particular of man; the Self-manifest, who has shown himself merciful and gracious to the returning penitent, and with him keeps promise and covenant. Hence it is the custom of calling on the name of Jehovah, of addressing God by his proper name, which is here said to have been commenced." Murphy goes on to point up the fact that *whereas we read of God speaking to man in Paradise, we do not read of man speaking to God*. He writes: "In the examination that preceded the sentence passed upon the transgressors, we hear Adam and Eve replying to the questions of God, but not venturing to open a conversation with the Most High." He proceeds to call attention to Adam's belief of the indications of mercy, whether in word or deed which God gave him. "The bringing of an offering to God was a step in advance," he says, of the "humble, submissive, self-accusing faith" of our first parents, yet the institution of sacrifice was essentially a symbolic act, "a mute sign" of the obedient faith being manifested by the worshiper, unaccompanied by invocation or address of any kind. "At length, however, Sheth was given to Eve, and accepted by her as a substitute for Habel. Enosh, the child of sorrow, was born to him. Collateral with this line of descent, and all the anxieties and wants which it involved, was the growth of a class of men who were of the spirit of Cain, and receded further and further from God. In these circumstances of growing iniquity on the one hand, and growing faith on the other, believing reason comes to conceive the full import of the mercy of God, freely and fully accepts of pardon, and realizes the peace and privilege which it bestows. Growing man now comprehends all that is implied in the proper name of God, *Jehovah*, the author of being, of promise, and of performance. He finds a tongue, and ventures to express the desires and feelings that have long been pent up in his breast, and are now bursting for utterance. These

## BEGINNINGS OF THE MESSIANIC LINE 4:25, 26

petitions and confessions are now made in an audible voice, and with a holy urgency and courage rising above the sense of self-abasement to the confidence of peace and gratitude. These adorations are also presented in a social capacity, and thereby acquire a public notoriety. The father, the elder of the house, is the master of words, and he becomes the spokesman of the brotherhood in this new relationship into which they have spontaneously entered with their Father in heaven. The spirit of adoption has prompted the confiding and endearing terms, *Abba*, *Father*, and now the winged words ascend to heaven, carrying the adorations and aspirations of the assembled saints. The new form of worship attracts the attention of the early world, and the record is made, 'Then began they to call upon the name of the Lord,' that keepeth covenant and mercy."

Of course, the analytical critics speculate that this was an insertion from the J document or Yeh, the author of which, they say, was interested especially in origins, and hence is the source of our information about the beginnings of nomadism, music, and metalworking (vv. 20-22), the origin of the Nephilim (giants, 6:2), the origin of viticulture (9:20), the first of the Gibborim (despots, or in terms of early Greek thought, tyrants, 10:8), and the origin of diversity of languages (11:1-9). (See, for example, IBG, 526). Hence it is J who, according to this theory, reports in 4:26 the origin of what is called "the cult of Yahweh." Skinner writes in similar vein (ICCG, 127): "What historic reminiscence (if any) lies behind this remarkable statement we cannot conjecture; but its significance is not correctly expressed when it is limited to the institution of formal public worship on the part of a religious community (Delitzsch); and the idea that it is connected with a growing sense of the distinction between the human and the divine (Ewald et al) is a baseless fancy. It means that Enos was the first to invoke

the Deity under this name; and it is interesting chiefly as a reflection, emanating from the school of J, on the origin of the specifically Israelite name of God. The conception is more ingenuous than that of E (Exo. 3:13-15) or P (Exo. 6:3), who base the name on express revelation, and connect it with the foundation of Hebrew nationality." Skinner goes on to say, however, that the expression (literally, "call by [means of] the name of Y"), denotes the essential act in worship, the invocation (or rather *evocation*) of the Deity by the solemn utterance of His name. It rests on the widespread primitive idea that a real bond exists between the person and his name, such that the pronunciation of the latter exerts a mystic influence on the former." (For the significance of names, see Plato's *Cratylus*). It should be remarked here that these critics tear even separate Scripture verses into shreds in their useless speculation about which belongs to what (J, E, D, P), without benefit of external evidence of any kind whatsoever, a form of "seminary nit-picking" that is paralleled in no other branch of human study. They ignore the obvious fact of the repeated interlacing of the Divine Names, not only in various sections, but even in particular verses, throughout the Pentateuch. Perhaps the most significant fact of all is, that the critics are hopelessly at variance even among themselves as to the credibility of their conflicting suppositions. Even the few arguments that could be acceptable as legitimately supporting the Documentary Hypothesis are vitiated by this Babel of academic tongues. (For a critical examination—and refutation—of these theories, the student is advised to study, along with the present textbook, the great work by William Henry Green, published in 1895, entitled *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*. The author was, at that time, Professor of Oriental and Old Testament Literature in Princeton Theological Seminary. Unfortunately for the spread of the truth, students in present-day "standardized"

## BEGINNINGS OF THE MESSIANIC LINE 4:25, 26

"theological" seminaries are never given any opportunity to become acquainted with this book or with any other of like content. The would-be pundits of our time seem to assume that no learning ever existed prior to the beginning of the present century.)

Concerning Gen. 5:26b, M. Henry writes (CWB, 15): "The worshipers of God began to distinguish themselves. The margin reads it, *Then began men to be called by the name of the Lord*, or to call themselves by it." Whitelaw summarizes (PCG, 90): "Either (1) to invoke by prayer the name of Jehovah, i.e., Jehovah himself as he had been pleased to discover his attributes and character to men, referring to the formal institution of public worship. 'The expression is elsewhere used to denote all the appropriate acts and exercises of the stated worship of God—ch. 12:8, 13:4, 21:33; 1 Chron. 16:8; Ps. 105:1 (Bush).' Or (2) to call themselves by the name of Jehovah—cf. Num. 32:42, Judg. 18:29, Ps. 49:12, Isa. 44:5." Rotherham (EB, 37 n.): "Or, 'to invoke with the name Y.'" We suggest here Lange's terse simple statement (CDHCG, 262): "The language undoubtedly refers to a general honoring of the name Jehovah among the pious Sethites." (For a further treatment of this problem, see my *Genesis*, Vol. III, with respect to the correlation of Exo. 3:14-15 and 6:2-3 with Gen. 22:14).

3. "*The Generations of Adam*" from Seth to Enoch (Gen. 5:1-20).

"1 *This is the book of the generations of Adam.* 2 *In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created.* 3 *And Adam lived a hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth;* 4 *and the days of Adam after he begat Seth were eight hundred years: and he begat sons and daughters.* 5 *And*



*all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died.*

*"6 And Seth lived a hundred and five years, and begat Enosh: 7 and Seth lived after he begat Enosh 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.*

*"9 And Enosh lived ninety years, and begat Kenan: 10 and Enosh lived after he begat Kenan eight hundred and fifteen years, and begat sons and daughters: 11 and all the days of Enosh were nine hundred and five years, and he died.*

*"12 And Kenan lived seventy years, and begat Mahalalel: 13 and Kenan lived after he begat Mahalalel eight hundred and forty years, and begat sons and daughters: 14 and all the days of Kenan were nine hundred and ten years: and he died.*

*"15 And Mahalalel lived sixty and five years, and begat Jared: 16 and Mahalalel lived after he begat Jared eight hundred and thirty years, and begat sons and daughters: 17 and all the days of Mahalalel were eight hundred ninety and five years: and he died.*

*"18 And Jared lived a hundred sixty and two years, and begat Enoch: 19 and Jared lived after he begat Enoch eight hundred years, and begat sons and daughters: 20 and all the days of Jared were nine hundred sixty and two years: and he died."*

(1) Note the *format* in which this genealogy is presented, consisting of three parts: "(a) the age of each patriarch at the birth of his first-born, (b) the length of his remaining life (with the statement that he begat other children), and (c) his age at death" (Skinner, ICCG, 128). (The exceptions, for obvious reasons, are in the cases of Adam (v. 3) and Enoch (22, 24). The section on Noah is, of course, incomplete). But—is it necessary to assume that the son first mentioned in each

case was the first-born? Certainly Seth was not Adam's first-born. Moreover, each patriarch is said to have "begat sons and daughters": might not some of these have been born (and even been deceased) prior to the birth of the son who is mentioned specifically? We must remember that the Author is giving us the Messianic Genealogy, and nothing more or less (cf. Luke 3:36-38). (2) V. 3—Note again that Adam is said to have begotten a son in his own likeness, after his image, not strictly the Divine image in which he had been created, but the image of God now modified and corrupted by sin—*though not totally depraved*—transmissible by ordinary generation. (Traducianism is the view that both the interior and exterior man [in soul and body, or, as we prefer, spirit and body] are passed on by natural generation: obviously, every human being is begotten and born a psychosomatic unity. Creationism is the theory that each human soul is immediately created by God and joined to the body, either at conception or at birth or at some time between these two events. The theory of the Preexistence of the human soul was held by Plato, Philo Judaeus, and Origen. [See A. H. Strong, ST, 488-497]. Obviously, Traducianism is the only view that is in accord with both human experience and scientific thought.) Probably in most instances the son named in Gen. 5 *was* the first-born: this raises the problem of *the lateness of paternity* in such cases. Was this due to some physical cause handed down by heredity and in proportion to the growing degeneracy of the race? Or was paternity delayed in order that the father might acquire maturity of faith before producing a son to be the one who should carry on the Messianic Line? It may be that the one named in the record was chosen because his piety was foreknown by God, as in the case of Jacob (it will be recalled that Esau was rejected because of his profanity: cf. Heb. 12:16). It must be remembered that these genealogies are pointed toward the

identification of those persons who figured in the Messianic Development. Other genealogical tables are interspersed only to indicate what relationships these other lines may have had, favorable or hostile, with the main Lineage of which the Bible is the historical record. (3) Note that God "called their name Adam," that is, Man. Here we have, obviously, the *generic* name, which includes both male and female. "God, as the maker, names the race, and thereby marks its character and purpose" (Murphy, MG, 170).

(4) Murphy again: "The writer, according to custom, completes the life of one patriarch before he commences that of the next; and so the first event of the following biography is long antecedent to the last event of the preceding one. This simply and clearly illustrates the law of Hebrew narrative" (p. 170). (5) There is some difference of opinion about the interpretation (meaning) of the various names which appear in this table. The following interpretations seem to be fairly accurate: Seth ("substitute," "compensation"), Enosh ("weak man," "mortal"), Kenan, or Cainan ("possession," "artificer"), Mahalalel ("praise of God"), Jared ("descent"), Enoch ("dedicated"), Methuselah ("man of a dart"), Lamech ("strong man," "man of prayer"?), Noah ("comfort," "rest"). (6) Someone has cynically described the personages named in the lines of Cain and Seth as "religious nobodies." This, however, is begging the question: it is assuming that because nothing especially startling is said about those in the Line of Seth (excepting, of course, Enoch and Noah) that they were "splendidly nil." But this notion is not supported by the interpretation of the names of the Sethites. Nor is it supported by the moral contrast between those in the Line of Cain and those in the Line of Seth. It is too obvious to be questioned that the Sethites were not characterized by the self-pride, restlessness, lust, and violence

that is depicted in the story of the Cainites. It is significant too that the Sethites include two great men, two men who were remarkable for their faith and piety—Enoch and Noah. And it is even more significant (as we shall see later) that Enoch and Noah played certain definite roles in the unfolding of God's Cosmic Plan. There seems to have been no occasion, therefore, for the inspired author to have gone into irrelevant details about the other Sethites who are named. *The law of parsimony is a prime characteristic of Divine revelation.*

4. "And he died." The fifth chapter of Genesis reveals the tragic record of man's subjection to the rule of physical death. No matter that "there were giants in the earth in those days"; no matter that there were "mighty men, men of renown" on the earth; no matter that they built cities, wrote poetry, invented instruments of music and war; no matter that they lived to be nearly a thousand years old and "begat sons and daughters"; still and all it is recorded of each of them, "and he died." Rom. 5:14—"Death reigned from Adam until Moses. Rom. 5:12—"through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin." Man cannot escape death. Neither by invention, culture, science, philosophy, or anything within the range of his genius, can he disarm death of its awesome sting. Heb. 9:27—"it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh judgment" (cf. Acts 17:30-31). "And he died"—"the solemn toll of the funeral bell" (Bonar); "a standing demonstration of the effect of disobedience" (Murphy). "Eight times in this chapter the words *and he died* occur. . . . There is a double element in human nature which makes the fact of death so tragic. Man is akin to all animal existence in that every individual dies. He is different from the animal in that he is conscious of dying, foresees it, and feels its contradiction of his insatiable hunger for life. Nor does the universality of

death dull its poignancy" (IBG, 528). Think how men have tried to deal with death in their desperate efforts to overcome it, and how, realizing their failure to do so, they have resorted to wishful thinking in various cults of agnosticism, atheism, humanism, positivism, skepticism, etc., all of which are but varieties of "whistling in the dark." But—does not the other side of the coin present an equally forbidding face? An eminent scientist, writing in *Saturday Review* some months ago, declared it to be within the realm of possibility that human science could prolong the average life-span of the human being to five hundred years or more. Then he concluded, But who would want to live that long in the kind of society in which man lives today on this earth? Yes, death is inevitable because it is a Divine appointment, but, let it never be forgotten, a *benevolent* appointment.

5. *"The Generations of Adam" from Enoch to Noah and His Sons* (Gen. 5:21-32).

*"21 And Enoch lived sixty and five years, and begat Methuselah: 22 and Enoch walked with God after he begat Methuselah three hundred years, and begat sons and daughters: 23 and all the days of Enoch were three hundred sixty and five years: 24 and Enoch walked with God: and he was not: for God took him.*

*"And Methuselah lived a hundred eighty and seven years, and begat Lamech: 26 and Methuselah lived after he begat Lamech seven hundred eighty and two years, and begat sons and daughters: 27 and all the days of Methuselah were nine hundred sixty and nine years, and he died.*

*"28 And Lamech lived a hundred eighty and two years, and begat a son: 29 and he called his name Noah, saying, This same shall comfort us in our work and in the toil of our hands, which cometh because of the ground which Jehovah hath cursed. 30 And Lamech lived after he begat Noah five hundred ninety*

*and five years, and begat sons and daughters. 31 And all the days of Lamech were seven hundred seventy and seven years: and he died.*

*"32 And Noah was five hundred years old: and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth."*

6. *The Translation of Enoch*

(1) Lange (CDHCG, 272): "The unceasing refrain, *and he died*, denotes here also the limit of the long and elevated line of life that seems to be ever mounting towards heaven, but ever breaks off in the end—with the exception of Enoch." "Still, on this dark background of a conquering death shows still more clearly the power of life. . . . And so we get a clear view of the battle of life with death."

(2) Cf. Jude 14—"Enoch, the seventh from Adam"; and Heb. 11:5—"By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death," etc. Literally, "he was not, for God took him." Or, according to the LXX, "he was not found, for God translated him." Murphy (MG, 172): "This passage is important for the interpretation of the phrase, *and he was not (found)*. It means, we perceive, not absolutely, he was not, but relatively, he was not extant in the sphere of sense. If this phrase does not denote annihilation, much less does the phrase, 'and he died.' The one denotes absence from the world of sense, and the other indicates the ordinary way in which the soul departs from this world. Here, then, we have another hint that points plainly to the immortality of the soul. . . . If we omit the violent end of Habel, the only death on record that precedes the translation of Henok is that of Adam. It would have been incongruous that he who brought sin and death into the world should not have died. But a little more than half a century after his death, Henok is wafted to heaven without leaving the body. This translation took place in the presence of a sufficient number of witnesses, and furnished a manifest proof of the presence and reality of the invisible powers. Thus were life and immortality

as fully brought to light as was necessary or possible at that early stage of the world's history. Thus was it demonstrated that the grace of God was triumphant in accomplishing the final and full salvation of all who returned to God. The process might be slow and gradual, but the end was now shown to be sure and satisfactory." "Enoch is distinguished from the other patriarchs in several ways: his life is shorter but his years number those of the days in a solar year, he therefore attains a perfect age; he 'walks with God' as Noah did, 6:9; like Elijah, he vanishes mysteriously, taken by God. Enoch has a prominent place in subsequent Jewish tradition: he is held up as a model of piety, Si. 44:16, 49:14, and certain apocryphal books (one of which is cited in Jude 14-15) bear his name" (JB, 21, n.). (3) In the pagan classical writings there are accounts of such translations to heaven, as, *e.g.*, those of Hercules, Ganymede, and Romulus." (The tradition is reported even among primitive peoples of the Americas.) But translation was awarded to these "for their valor or for their physical beauty, and not, as in the translation of Enoch, for 'a pious and religious life.'" (PCG, 96). (4) Heb. 9:27—"It is appointed unto men once to die"—true! But Divine appointments (*cf.* Gen. 3:19) are always subject to exceptions, ordered by the Divine Will for His own specific ends: hence, miracles (Acts 2:22). Obviously, the translation of Enoch (in the Patriarchal Dispensation) and that of Elijah (in the Jewish Dispensation) were both designed to be prototypic of the Translation of the Church (or at least of the living saints) at our Lord's Second Coming. The first universal judgment was executed by means of water; the second and last, we are told, will take the form of fire (2 Thess. 1:7-10, Rev. 20:11-15). Enoch was not left to see the rise of the world's corruption to its height; in like manner, we are told, the Bride of Christ, the Church, will not be permitted to

BEGINNINGS OF THE MESSIANIC LINE 5:21-32  
suffer the Great Tribulation (Matt. 24:21, Rev. 7:14); "the dead in Christ shall rise first, then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord" (1 Thess. 4:13-18). Enoch became the prototype of all those "who shall not sleep, but shall be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump" (1 Cor. 15:50-58). Enoch and Elijah are the only Biblical personages who never "tasted of" (experienced) death (John 8:51-52, 11:24-27): each was translated directly to the Throne of God and thus became an heir of immortality by translation (transfiguration, cf. Matt. 17:1-8). Note the following interesting comment by Kaufmann (RI, 77): "That a mortal should become God is inconceivable; but that he should join the company of celestial creatures is possible, as in the cases of Enoch and Elijah. This is the limit of Biblical apotheosis."

(5) Concerning the Translation of Enoch, Lange writes (CDHCG, 273): "According to Knobel the motive for the translation was probably to rescue Enoch from the age in which he lived—with relation to ch. 4:10. Beyond a doubt, however, the main reason was the fact that he had become personally ripe for transformation, and that through his faith there might be introduced into this world faith in a new life in the world beyond (Heb. 11:5, 6). If we would seek farther, we must compare the translations that follow in sacred history. Elijah is translated because his consistent legalism must become a judgment of fire, and a last Day for the apostate Israel: Christ is translated, because His staying longer in this world must have come to a sudden conflict of life and death with the old world, that is, must have had for its consequence the Last Day; the believers at the end of the world are translated, because now the Last Day has actually appeared. Judging from these analogies, we may conjecture that the



translation of Enoch denoted a decided turning-point in the life of the old world. At all events, he had not in vain announced the day of judgment before his departure. At this time, it is probable, there was the beginning of corrupt alliances between the Sethites and the Cainites. It is the probable middle time between Adam and the Flood." (Cf. Jude 14-15; cf. Deut. 33:2, Matt. 16:27, Dan. 7:10, Heb. 12:22). (6) It should be noted especially that Enoch "walked with God." "Originally," writes Skinner (ICCG, 131), "this included the idea of initiation into divine mysteries." He adds: "In the OT such an expression (used also of Noah, 6:9), signifies intimate companionship (1 Sam. 25:15), and here denotes a fellowship with God morally and religiously perfect (Mic. 6:8, Mal. 2:6)." (How different the motivation to translation here from that of the translation of Ganymede by the supreme god of the Greek pantheon, Zeus, with its overtones of homosexuality!) (7) "What a haunting phrase it is: *He was not; for God took him!* There is no effort to elaborate upon the mystery of death or to presume in human terms to define what lies beyond it. Only the one great conception: when the good man dies God takes him and he goes to be with God. He goes to be with God because he has learned to be with God already. See what limitless suggestions there are in the brief and simple words, he *walked with God.*" Herbert L. Simpson (*Altars of Earth*, p. 136) has a lovely paragraph concerning Enoch: "One day Enoch's place on earth was empty, and the people who had known him drew their own conclusions. He had been known as the intimate of God; and what more natural than that, when night fell, he should have gone home with his Friend? A little girl was telling the story of Enoch in her own way. 'Enoch and God,' she said, 'used to take long walks together. And one day they walked farther than usual; and God said, 'Enoch, you must be tired; come into My house and rest''" (quoted, IB, 531). (However, there

needs be a sequel here to complete the Biblical story. It probably should go something like this: "Enoch was so happy in God's house, and God was so glad to have him there, that they kept on living together for ever.") In Scripture, to walk with God is to walk by faith, to do God's will to the full (Matt. 24:37-42, Luke 17:28-35; Heb. 11:5-6; Matt. 3:15, 7:24-27; Gal. 5:25).

7. *Methuselah, Lamech, and Noah*

(1) It has been said that Methuselah's only claim to distinction is the fact that of all the antediluvian patriarchs, he lived the longest, 969 years; that is, his life lacked only thirty-one years of extending through a millenium (provided, of course, that the years numbered in this chapter of Genesis were years as we know them today). This would mean, of course, that he died in the year of the Flood. (It is worthy of note also, that the shortest life in this line of descent, that of Enoch, was followed by the longest, that of Methuselah.) (2) In the few verses about Lamech, it should be noted that not only is his son's name given (Noah), but the reason for this name is assigned ("comfort"). Murphy (MG, 173): "The parents were cumbered with the toil of cultivating the ground. They looked forward with hope to the aid or relief which their son would give them in bearing the burden of life, and they express this hope in his name. . . . This is only another recorded instance of the habit of giving names indicative of the thoughts of the parents at the time of the child's birth. All names were originally significant, and have still to this day an import. Some were given at birth, others at later periods, from some remarkable circumstance in the individual's life. Hence many characters of ancient times were distinguished by several names conferred at different times for different reasons. The reason for the present name is put on record simply on account of the extraordinary destiny which awaited the bearer of it." (3) Note the names of the three sons of Noah in the

order given in v. 32—Shem, Ham, and Japheth. The language of 9:18-19 forbids our assuming that Noah sired any other sons, even after he came forth from the ark: nor is there any statement made that Noah begat sons *and daughters* as is made in the case of each of the patriarchs who preceded him. Moreover, there is controversy among various authorities as to the import of the *sequence* of these names. There is reason to believe that Japheth was the eldest and Ham the youngest of the three sons: this seems to be corroborated by the language of Gen. 10:21. Those who hold this view explain that Shem is placed first in the narrative as being spiritually, rather than physically, the firstborn. (See PCG, 97). (4) It should be noted too that the name of Noah's wife is not given, despite her very great importance to the continuance of the race. It is significant, is it not, that the inspired writer goes out of his way, so to speak, to give us the *names* of Lamech's wives, in the Line of Cain, names indicating sheer worldliness, but does not find it necessary to name the women in the Line of Seth, contenting himself with the terse statement in the case of each Sethite patriarch (Noah alone excepted) that he "begat sons and daughters"? There can be but one reasonable explanation of this fact, namely, that he directs his narrative to the one point he seeks to emphasize above all others, namely, that it was through the intermingling of the pious Sethites and the profane Cainites that universal wickedness became widespread by the time of Noah.

#### 8. *The Longevity of the Antediluvian Patriarchs*

This has ever been a problem of some concern to Bible students; indeed, the time element throughout the entire Biblical story is hedged about with questions, some of which apparently defy solution. This is bound to occur because, as we have stated heretofore, the realm of God's activity is one of timelessness, and this norm is reflected in the inspired writer's apparent lack of concern for chronological

preciseness, especially in his dealing with that phase of religious history which had to do with the beginnings of the Messianic Development.

Several theories have been put forward by different authorities for the unusual length of life attributed in Genesis to the antediluvian patriarchs. Josephus, for example, accounts for it on the basis of the superior piety of the early fathers of the race (*Antiquities* I, 3, 9). By some it has been attributed to the immunity to mortality which early man was privileged to enjoy by virtue of Adam's original access to the fruit of the Tree of Life. Still others have explained it on the basis of a distinct manifestation of Divine grace to man, to the end that religious instincts might be awakened and transmitted to posterity by ordinary generation (cf. Gen. 4:26). White-law writes (PCG, 94): "We prefer to ascribe the longevity of these antediluvian men to a distinct exercise of grace on the part of God who designed it to be (1) a proof of the Divine clemency in suspending the penalty of sin; (2) a symbol of that immortality which had been recovered for men by the promise of the woman's seed; and (3) a medium of transmission for the faith, for the benefit of both the Church and the world. It seems to this writer, however, that the unusual longevity of the antediluvians, granting the accuracy of the chronology that is recorded about them, is most simply explained by the fact that they were near the fountainhead of the race and hence their physical constitutions had not been weakened by sin and its consequences, as occurred in the later history of mankind. Surely it is significant that subsequent to the Flood, Abraham lived to be only 175 years old, Moses only 120 years (Gen. 25:7, Deut. 34:5), David only some 70 years, and that the average human life-span had dwindled to some thirty-five or forty years by the beginning of the Christian era. One might well wonder if the old candle will not finally flicker out! However, this trend has been

reversed in recent decades; the human life-span has been raised to an average of some 70 years as a result of current advancements in preventive medicine, the control of epidemics, and the amazing reduction in infant mortality.

Dr. Jauncey states the two most reasonable explanations of the longevity of the antediluvian patriarchs as follows (SRG, 73, 74): "The first is that their concept of a year was radically different from ours. That there was some confusion on this point is seen from the ancient records other than the Bible which also emphasized this longevity. A list of ancient Babylonian kings gives spans of life extending in some cases to 1200 years. The Berossos list of antediluvian kings indicates length of reign for a single person to be 100 times as much, extending in one case to 64,800 years! Apparently their year unit was not only different from ours but also varied among themselves. If we could find out exactly what the Genesis antediluvian year was, the problem would be simplified enormously. Another point of view is that it isn't their longevity which was abnormal but our brevity! In those early days sin would not have brought about the ravages that came later. The human body is built and designed for much longer life than we enjoy. It becomes prematurely aged by adverse conditions that God never intended. There is a lot of truth in this." (See George A. Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible*, ch. V).

It can hardly be doubted that primeval chronology was not characterized by any notable degree of preciseness. Cornfeld (AtD, 25) writes: "The genealogy [in ch. 5] is noted for the phenomenally long life-spans of its characters. . . . But all are much younger than their Babylonian colleagues, the ten antediluvian kings who are listed on a Mesopotamian clay prism: Babylonian tradition ascribes to them life-spans of thousands of years. In comparison Biblical longevity appears quite brief. This suggests that the recorded life-spans of Genesis cannot be con-

sidered in isolation, but are related to the Mesopotamian traditions. One of these has been handed down in a later version by Berossus, a Babylonian historian of the Hellenic period, who names ten kings who ruled before the Flood, whose aggregate life-spans total 432,000 years!" Archer (SOTI, 187) discusses the problem as follows: "The *Westminster Dictionary of the Bible* (1944) lists three possibilities for the genealogies of Genesis 5 and 10. (1) If they represent literal generations without any gaps, the total from Adam to the Flood comes out to 1656 years, and the total from the Flood to the birth of Abraham about 290 years. This makes up a grand total of 1946 years from Adam to Abraham. This interpretation is dubious, however, since no such grand total (or 'long date') is given in the text itself, and since the grouping into ten pre-Deluge and ten post-Deluge generations is suspiciously similar to the schematized 14, 14, 14 of Matthew 1 (where demonstrably there are six or seven links missing). Moreover, Luke 3:36 indicates that a Cainan, son of Arphaxad, is missing in Genesis 10:24 (which states that Arphaxad was the 'father' of Shelach, the son of Cainan according to Luke 3). (2) The genealogies record only the most prominent members of the ancestry of Abraham, omitting an undetermined number of links (although presumably not as many links as actually are named in the lists concerned). A variation of this view would construe the formula 'A begat B' as meaning either B himself or some unnamed ancestor of B (perfectly allowable in Hebrew parlance, since grandfathers are occasionally said to have begotten their grandsons; at least Billah's grandsons are spoken of as her sons in 1 Chron. 7:13). The ages of the patriarchs who lived several centuries (even 900 years or more) would be understood as the actual lifetime of the individuals named. This view would allow for a time span of possibly five or six thousand years between Adam and Abraham—depending upon how many links are omitted.

. . . (3) Or else the names listed in Genesis 5 represent an individual and his direct line by primogeniture—an interpretation which makes possible adding the entire lifetime figure almost end to end, thus coming out to a grand total of 8,227 years between the birth of Adam and the Flood. For example, when Adam is said to have lived 930 years, this really means that Adam and his direct line were at the head of affairs for 930 years. At the end of this time they were superseded by the family of Seth, which remained in control through Seth's main line for 912 years (Gen. 5:8). Thus it would not have been until 1842 years after Adam's birth that the family of Enosh took over the leadership—and so on. One difficulty with this theory, however, is that Seth is the oldest surviving son of Adam to be mentioned, apart from the exiled Cain, and it is difficult to imagine by what other son Adam's direct line would have descended before the allegedly collateral line of Seth took over. On the whole, then, the second interpretation seems the most to be preferred of the three. The first interpretation, of course, leaves insufficient room to account even for the attested history of Egypt, which doubtless goes back to at least 3500 years B.C., and that, too, necessarily after the Flood." (It should be noted, in this connection, that whereas the text of Genesis 5 in our versions represents man as having been in existence at the time of the Deluge exactly 1656 years, the Septuagint (which Josephus follows with but three minor differences) represents the age of man at the date of that catastrophe as 2262 years. Other tables such as the Samaritan Pentateuch vary even from these figures. See PCG, 97.)

Green (UBG, 49, 50): "It should be remarked here that no computation of time is ever built in the Bible upon this or any other genealogy. There is no summation of the years from Adam to Noah, or from Noah to Abraham, as there is of the abode in Egypt (Exo. 12:40), or of the period from the exodus to the building of the temple (1

Ki. 6:1). And as the received chronologies and the generally accepted date of the flood and of the creation of the world are derived from computations based on these genealogies, it ought to be remembered that this is a very precarious mode of reckoning. This genealogy could only afford a safe estimate of time on the assumption that no links are missing and that every name in the line of descent has been recorded. But this we have no right to take for granted. The analogy of other biblical genealogies is decidedly against it. Very commonly unimportant names are omitted; sometimes several consecutive names are dropped together. No one has a right, therefore, to denominate a primeval chronology so constructed the biblical chronology and set it in opposition to the deductions of science, and thence conclude that there is a conflict between the Bible and science." (The student is urged to read, in this connection, Part I of John W. Haley's great book, *Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible*. As far as we have been able to determine the book is now out of print, but probably it can be purchased from a book store dealing in secondhand and out-of-print books.)

Let us always keep in mind that with God it is always *now*: the space-time continuum in which man has his being is but a single Divine thought. God does not fore-know—rather, He *knows*. Hence the time element has not too much to do with the fulfilment of the Eternal Purpose. It is the Messianic Line that is emphasized throughout Scripture, not the precise chronology of events and records used to authenticate the Messianic Development. In the words of one of the great hymns of the faith, with reference to Eternity, Life Everlasting:

"When we've been there ten thousand years  
Bright shining as the sun,  
We've no less days to sing Thy praise  
Than when we've first begun!"

\* \* \* \* \*



## FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

*The Messianic Ministry*

2 Cor. 5:21—"Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him." The word *Atonement* means *Covering*. God's Covering of Grace is the Vicarious Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross (John 1:29).

1. *Christ made sin for us*: (1) made a divine-human person, yet possessing fully our human nature (John 1:14; Matt. 1:23; Luke 1:35; Phil. 2:5-8; Heb. 2:14-18, 4:14-16); (2) made a condemned person (Heb. 12:1-3, 2:9); (3) put under guilt, or obligation to suffer (John 3:16; Luke 24:7, 46; Acts 3:18; 1 Pet. 3:18, 2:21-25; Isa. 53:1-12); (4) by *natural* union with the race (Heb. 2:14-15, Matt. 1:23).

2. The saints are made righteous (justified) in Him: (1) made righteous persons (Rom. 10:1-10; 1 John 3:7; 2 Cor. 5:21); (2) made justified persons (Rom. 3:21-26, 5:1-2; Tit. 3:4-7); (3) freed from the guilt of sin (Acts 2:38, 10:43; Rom. 6:17-18; 1 Cor. 12:13; Gal. 5:1; 2 Cor. 3:17); (4) by *spiritual* union with Christ (Gal. 3:27-28; Rom. 6:1-7, 8:1-2; Eph. 2:11-18; 2 Pet. 1:4, 3:18).

John 17:20, 21—"that they may all be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us," etc.

\* \* \* \* \*

## REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART NINETEEN

1. According to ch. 5, how many generations were there from Adam to Noah?
2. What is the over-all design of these two genealogies?
3. What is the basic theme of the entire Bible?
4. Why is the Line of Cain carried forward only through Lamech and his family?

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE MESSIANIC LINE

5. Why does the Bible mention only three sons of Adam and Eve?
6. What are the objections to the view that we have here "a mingling of two genealogies" or "one common primitive legend in two forms"?
7. What kind of "image" did Adam hand down to *his* offspring?
8. Explain what the last statement in 4:26 means.
9. What does the name "Seth" mean, and what does this signify?
10. Summarize the interpretations of this passage as given by each of the following: Skinner, Murphy, M. Henry, Whitelaw, Lange.
11. What was the special significance of names among ancient peoples?
12. Define traducianism, creationism, and pre-existence as theories of the "origin" of the soul.
13. How explain the apparent "lateness of paternity" in the Line of Seth?
14. Why was it necessary to bring Seth into the story?
15. Explain what is meant by the generic name given in 5:1. What does "generic" mean?
16. What is made clear in these genealogies about the relative piety of those in the two Lines?
17. What is the significance of the phrase, "and he died," as repeated eight times in ch. 5?
18. Explain what is meant by the law of parsimony as related to Divine revelation.
19. Explain what is meant by the statement, "he was not," in the story of Enoch.
20. What is the great difference between the mythological translations in classic pagan literature and the translation of Enoch?

## GENESIS

21. Define translation, transfiguration.
22. What is the prototypic import of the translation of Enoch and Elijah? What is the explanation of Jude 14?
23. How harmonize these instances of translation with Heb. 9:27?
24. Explain what is meant in Scripture by the phrase, "walking with God."
25. For what is Methuselah particularly noted?
26. What did Lamech name his son and what is the significance of the name?
27. For what reason, obviously, are Lamech's wives named in the Line of Cain, and their names interpreted, whereas no women are named in the Line of Seth?
28. What do we know about Noah's wife?
29. What, according to Jauncey, are the two most reasonable explanations of the longevity of the men in the Line of Seth?
30. Summarize Whitelaw's explanation of this problem.
31. Summarize Archer's conclusions regarding the problem.
32. State the facts about primeval chronology as given by Green.
33. How is the problem related (1) to that of time in general, (2) to the record of the Messianic Line?
34. How does the chronology of the Septuagint differ from that of the Hebrew Scriptures?
35. What, generally, was the religious condition of the race in the antediluvian period?

## THE WORLD BEFORE THE FLOOD

(Gen. 6:1-22)

1. *Universal Degeneracy* (Gen. 6:1-8).

*"And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the ground, and daughters were born unto them, 2 that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they chose. 3 And Jehovah said, My Spirit shall not strive with man for ever, for that he also is flesh: yet shall his days be a hundred and twenty years. 4 The Nephilim were in the earth in those days, and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them: the same were the mighty men that were of old, the men of renown.*

*"5 And Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. 6 And it repented Jehovah that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. 7 And Jehovah said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the ground; both man, and beast, and creeping things, and birds of the heavens; for it repenteth me that I have made them. 8 But Noah found favor in the eyes of Jehovah."*

(1) V. 1. The word *adamah* is used here, translated "ground": it occurs also in vv. 7 and 20, and in ch. 7, vv. 4, 8. It is thus distinguished from *erets*, which occurs repeatedly throughout Genesis and in the story of the Flood in particular, and may be rendered either "earth" or "land." (Incidentally space is lacking here for any elaborate discussion of the problems of the documentary (critical) analysis of the Genesis account of the Flood or those of the actual extent of the Flood as a historical event. For an exhaustive refutation of the former, the

student is again advised to study Green (UBG) and Allis (FBM); and for equally thoroughgoing treatments of the latter, the various works recently published by Rehwinkel, Morris and Whitcomb, Archer, Unger, Ramm, et al: for a listing of these books, see Bibliographical material on the introductory pages of this textbook. C.C.C.).

(2) V. 2. The "sons of God" and the "daughters of men." One theory is that marriage alliances were formed by supernatural beings with mortal women, and that from these unnatural unions there arose "a race of heroes or demigods who must have figured largely in Hebrew folklore. It is implied, though not expressly said, that the existence of such beings, intermediate between the divine and the human, introduced an element of disorder into the Creation which had to be checked by the special interposition of Yahweh" (Skinner, ICCG, 139). (See Hesiod's account, in his *Works and Days*, of the ages of man: first, the golden race; then in the order named, the silver, the brazen, the *demigods*, and finally the iron race. Cf. also the myth of the Titans, that of the Cyclopes, and the accounts of the quasi-divine personages of the Heroic Age, etc.). Green (UBG, 53): "The sons of God are not angels nor demigods, whose intermarriage with the daughters of men brought forth a race of monsters or superhuman beings. This purely mythological conceit was foisted upon the passage in certain apocryphal books like the book of Enoch; also by Philo and Josephus, who were misled by the analogy of ancient heathen fables. But it was repelled by the great body of Jewish and Christian interpreters from the earliest periods, though it has been taken up again by a number of modern scholars. It is assumed by them that a transgression of angels is here spoken of, though the existence of angels has not been before mentioned nor in any way referred to in the previous part of Genesis. This view has no sanction whatever in Scripture. Jude, vs. 6, 7, and 2 Pet. 2:4 have been tortured into sustaining it;

## THE WORLD BEFORE THE FLOOD 6:1-8

but they contain no reference to this passage whatever. And there is no analogy anywhere in the Bible for the adoption by the sacred writers of mythological notions in general, or for the idea in particular of the intermarriage of angels and men." The JB (21,n) summarizes: "The author uses a popular story of a race of giants, in Hebr. *Nephilim*, the Titans of Eastern legend, born of the union between gods and mortals. The author does not present this episode as a myth nor, on the other hand, does he deliver judgment on its actual occurrence; he records the anecdote of a race of supermen simply to serve as an example of the increasing human malice that is to provoke the Deluge. Later Judaism and almost all the earliest ecclesiastical writers identify the 'sons of God' with the fallen angels; but from the 4th century onward, as the ideas of angelic natures become less material, the Fathers commonly take the 'sons of God' to be Seth's descendants and the 'daughters of men' those of Cain." That these phrases have reference to intermarriage of either demigods or angels with mortal women is absurd. As Green puts it (p. 54): "Sexual relations are nowhere in Scripture attributed to superior beings. There is no suggestion that angels are married or are given in marriage; indeed the contrary is expressly declared (Matt. 22:30). Male and female deities have no place in the Bible, except as a heathen notion which is uniformly reprobated. The Hebrew language does not even possess a word for 'goddess.' The whole conception of sexual life, as connected with God or angels, is absolutely foreign to Hebrew thought, and for that reason cannot be supposed to be countenanced here." The JB comment that from the 4th century on, the ideas of angelic nature became less material in the writings of the Fathers, seems to ignore completely these facts of the Scriptures themselves. There are, of course, poetic references to angels as "sons of God" in Job (1:6, 2:1, 38:7) and in Psalms (29:1, 89:6). The phrase occurs also in

Dan. 3:25; here, however, the term has nothing to do with the use of it in Genesis, as it is the language of Nebuchadnezzar and hence represents a genuine heathen conception (or it could be an identification on the king's part, unwittingly of course, or a pre-incarnate manifestation of the Eternal Logos: cf. Mic. 5:2). On the contrary, the phrase, "sons of God," is a common designation of the chosen people, the worshipers of the living and true God, throughout the Old Testament (cf. Exo. 4:22; Deut. 14:1, 32:5, 6, 18, 19; Hos. 1:10, 11:1; Isa. 43:6, 45:11; Jer. 31:20, cf. 2 Cor. 6:18), whereas worshipers of false gods are spoken of as sons and daughters of those gods (e.g., Num. 21:29, Mal. 2:11). "It is in entire accord with this Biblical usage that the pious race, who adhered to the true worship of God, are called the sons of God in contrast with the descendants of Cain, who had gone out from the presence of Jehovah, and abandoned the seat of his worship entirely" (Green, 55). Note also the correspondence between this interpretation and the numerous passages throughout the Pentateuch in which intermarriage of Israelites with Canaanites is viewed with deep concern, if not actually forbidden, lest the former should be seduced into idolatry, or into the gross moral corruptions of the Cult of Fertility, as a consequence. (E.g., in Genesis 24:3-4, 27:46, 28:1-2, 26:34, 35; 28:6-8, ch. 34). Obviously any kind of warning against intermarriage with angels does not occur in Scripture, because it would have been meaningless.

Green's conclusions are irrefutable (UBG, 56): "This explanation of how it came to pass that the pious portion of the race were infected with the universal degeneracy is not only appropriate in the connection, but is necessary to account for the universality of the following judgment, which is repeatedly and largely insisted upon. This is an integral and essential part of the narrative, the omission of which would leave an unfilled chasm. The primal

## THE WORLD BEFORE THE FLOOD 6:1-8

source of human corruption had been germinally shown in the fall (ch. 3); the degeneracy of the Cainites had been traced (ch. 4). Nothing but good, however, had thus far been said of the race of Seth (4:26, 5:22, 24, 29). That this pious race were themselves involved in the degeneracy which had overtaken the rest of mankind, is here stated for the first time. But this is necessary to explain why the whole race of man, with the exception of a single family, should be doomed to destruction." Again (56, 57): "The explanation now given is further confirmed by v. 3, where sentence is passed for the offence described in the preceding verse. In what the offence consisted, if the sons of God were angels, is not very obvious. It is not illicit intercourse which is described: the terms used denote lawful marriage. But if it was wrong for the angels to marry women, the angels surely were the chief offenders; and yet no penalty is denounced upon angels. The divine sentence falls exclusively upon man. There is such an obvious incongruity in this that Budde insists that ver. 3 is an interpolation and does not belong in this connection, but has been transferred from the account of the fall of our first parents. The incongruity that is alleged, however, does not show the verse to be an interpolation, but simply that the mythological sense which has been given to the passage is false." Finally, "it is objected that 'the daughters of men' must have the same universal sense in ver. 2 as in ver. 1; and that the contrast of 'the sons of God' with 'the daughters of men' shows that different orders of being are here referred to. But this contrast works precisely the other way. It has already been shown that in Scripture language the sons of God are his chosen people—the Godfearing race. In contrast with them 'the daughters of men' are necessarily limited to the rest of mankind, the ungodly mass" (*ibid.*, p. 58). *We conclude, therefore, without fear of successful contradiction, that what is pictured here is the intermingling of the*



*pious Sethites with the profane Cainites; moreover, that the phrase, "the sons of God," has special reference in this passage to the Messianic Line, which in the fifth chapter has been traced from Adam, through Seth, to Noah.*

(3) V. 3. (a) "My Spirit shall not strive with man for ever" (cf. John 16:7-8). "My Spirit," that is, Ruach Elohim, the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit. "Shall not strive with man," *i.e.*, He will put no coercion on the volitions of men, and, after giving ample warning, instruction, and invitation, "He will, as a just judgment, on the unbelieving and impenitent, withdraw his Spirit and let them alone" (Murphy, MG, 197). Even Divine grace has its limits. God bore long and patiently with the iniquity of the antediluvian world, but the time came, as it always does in such cases, when longsuffering love had to give way to strict justice (Gal. 6:7-8). In our Dispensation, God's love will follow man to his grave, but in all justice it cannot follow him farther (cf. Psa. 89:14; Rev. 20:13; Luke 13:3, 16:19-31; Ezek. 18:23; Isa. 55:7; 1 Tim. 2:3-4; 2 Pet. 3:9). God is not just a glorified bellhop who will be satisfied with our puny tips, nor is He a cosmic plumber whom we can call in for repairs and then dismiss nonchalantly. Not even Divine Love can go so far as to put a premium on sin! (b) "For that he also is flesh," *i.e.*, in view of the fact that the natural man is corporeal as well as spiritual (Gen. 2:7) and that now, since the fall, "the flesh has gained the upper hand, and the spirit is in the bondage of corruption." (c) "Yet shall his days be a hundred and twenty years." This statement "if spoken of the generation then living, would mean that they should not survive that limit; if of successive generations of men, that this should henceforth be the term of human life. The former is demanded by the context. The latter is preferred by critics whose uniform usage is to interpret at variance with the context if possible. It is here absolutely without support. There is no suggestion

## THE WORLD BEFORE THE FLOOD 6:1-8

anywhere that the duration of human life was ever fixed at one hundred and twenty years. It is contradicted by all that is recorded of the ages of subsequent patriarchs from Noah to Jacob. This verse, then, explicitly points to a catastrophe, in which that whole generation should be involved, and which should take place in one hundred and twenty years" (Green, p. 60). God's Spirit has always striven with man, even from the beginning when He tried to bring the first sinners to the point of repentance and confession. *But even Divine grace has its limits*, and, when the wickedness of man became so great that the earth was literally *filled* with violence, God of necessity said, "I will destroy" (cf. Ezek. 21:27, Acts 17:26). But even then He sent Noah to warn the antediluvians of "things not seen as yet" (Heb. 11:7), and granted a reprieve of one hundred and twenty years to give them opportunity for repentance and reformation and so to demonstrate to future generations that the judgment to come upon them was just. This is a demonstration of the limits to which the love of God will go, to pardon and to restore one of His rebellious creatures. If a human soul is bound to go to perdition, he must do so in the very face of the ineffable manifestations of His longsuffering grace (John 3:16-17, 1:17; Rom. 3:24, 5:20; Eph. 2:8; Tit. 2:11; 1 Pet. 5:12; 2 Pet. 3:18).

(d) T. Lewis summarizes (CDHCG, 285): One "has no right to say that 'the contrast of spirit and flesh in the moral understanding, as in the Epistles of Paul, does not occur in the Old Testament,' unless it can be shown that this is not a clear case of it." Again, *in re* v. 3: "When *ruach* is thus regarded as the spiritual, or rational, in man, in distinction from the carnal, the sentence becomes a *prediction*, instead of a declaration of judgment—a sorrowful prediction, we may say, if we keep in view the predominant aspect or feeling of the passage. The spirit, the reason, that which is most divine in man, *will* not always

rule in him. It has, as yet, maintained a feeble power, and interposed a feeble resistance, but it is in danger of being wholly overpowered. It will not hold out forever; it will not always maintain its supremacy. And then the reason given suits exactly with such a prediction: he is becoming flesh, wholly carnal or animal. If allowed to continue he will become utterly dehumanized, or that worst of all creatures, *an animal with a reason*, but wholly fleshly in its ends and exercises, or with a reason which is but the servant of the flesh, making him worse than the most ferocious wild beast—a very demon—a brutal nature with a fiend's subtlety only employed to gratify such brutality. Man has the supernatural, and this makes the awful peril of his state. By losing it, or rather by its becoming degraded to be a servant instead of a lord, he falls wholly into nature, where he cannot remain stationary, like the animal who does not 'leave the habitation to which God first appointed him.' The higher being, thus utterly fallen, must sink into the demonic, where evil becomes his god, if not, as Milton says, his good. . . . The whole aspect of the passage gives the impression of something like an apprehension that a great change was coming over the race—something so awful, so irreparable, if not speedily remedied, that it would be better that it should be blotted out of earthly existence, all but a remnant in whom the spiritual, or the divine in man might yet be preserved." Again: "On these deeper aspects of humanity, consult that most profound psychologist, John Bunyan, in his *Holy War*, or his *History of the Town of Mansoul*, its revolt from King Shaddai, its surrender to Diabolus, and its recovery by Prince Immanuel. Bunyan was Bible-taught in these matters, and that is the reason why his knowledge of man goes so far beyond that of Locke, or Kant, or Cousin." Cf. also Aristotle (*Politics*, I, 3, 30): "For man, when perfected, is the best of animals, but, when separated from law and justice, he is the worst of all; since armed

## THE WORLD BEFORE THE FLOOD 6:1-8

injustice is the more dangerous, and he is equipped at birth with arms, meant to be used by intelligence and virtue, which he may use for the worst ends. Wherefore, if he have not virtue, he is the most unholy and the most savage of animals, and the most full of lust and gluttony." Are not the foregoing descriptions of man's lurking bestiality supported today by the front page stories in every newspaper throughout the entire world? (Cf. Matt. 24:37-39, Luke 7:26-27).

(4) V. 4. (a) The Nephilim—who were they? The LXX translates it "giants"; other old Greek versions, "violent men." The word occurs again only once—in Num. 13:33. The notion that the Nephilim of this passage in Numbers were lineal descendants of those of Genesis 6 is simply an unproved assumption of the destructive critics, obviously for the purpose of casting doubt on the authenticity of the text and perhaps of the entire narrative of the Flood. The "giants" of Numbers were Canaanites, evidently men "of great stature and powerful frame," whose size so excited the imagination of the "spies" sent out by Moses (Caleb and Joshua excepted) that their report was a gross exaggeration of the facts. (Cf. also 1 Sam. 17:4-10, 21:9, 22:10). How could the Nephilim reported by the spies have been descendants of those of antediluvian times if there had occurred in the meantime a catastrophe which had swept away all mankind except Noah and his family? Green (UBG, 57-58) holds that v. 4 indicates that the Nephilim did not spring from the union of the sons of God and the daughters of men, because, "the statement is that 'the Nephilim were in the earth' prior to these intermarriages, and also after these intermarriages had taken place." Again: "The idea that the Nephilim were a superhuman race sprung from the union of angels with the daughters of men is completely nullified by the explicit declaration that the Nephilim existed before such marriages took place as well as after.

No new species of creatures can be intended, therefore, whose origin is traced to the intermarriage of different orders of beings." With this last statement we can agree. But we see no particular reason from the reading of the Scripture text, for arguing that the Nephilim existed *before and after* the intermingling of the sons of God with the daughters of men.

(b) A question of some import arises at this point, namely, Were the Nephilim of a pre-Adamic breed? Certainly this is not to be regarded as an impossibility. Cf. Archer (SOTI, 188-189): "To revert to the problem of the Pithecanthropus, the Swanscombe man, the Neanderthal and all the rest (possibly even the Cro-Magnon man, who is apparently to be classed as *Homo sapiens*, but whose remains seem to date back at least to 20,000 B.C.), it seems best to regard these races as all prior to Adam's time, and not involved in the Adamic covenant. We must leave the question open, in view of the cultural remains, whether these pre-Adamite creatures had souls (or, to use the trichotomic terminology, spirits). But the implication of Genesis 1:26 is that God was creating a qualitatively different being when He made Adam (for note that the word rendered 'man' in Gen. 1:26, 27 is the Hebrew '*Adam*'), a being who was uniquely fashioned in the image of God. Only Adam and his descendants were infused with the breath of God and a spiritual nature corresponding to God Himself. Romans 5:12-21 demands that all mankind subsequent to Adam's time, at least, must have been literally descended from him, since he entered into covenant relationship with God as the representative of the entire race of man. This indicates that there could have been no true genetic relationship between Adam (the first man created in the image of God) and the pre-Adamic races. However close the skeletal structure of the Cro-Magnon man (for example) may have been to *Homo sapiens*, this factor is scarcely relevant to the principal

question of whether these cave men possessed a truly human soul or personality. They may have been exterminated by God for reasons unknown prior to the creation of the original parent of the present human race. Adam, then, was the first man created in the spiritual image of God, according to Genesis 1:26, 27, and there is no evidence from science to disprove it." As Archer points out, the French scientist, Lecomte du Nouy, in his remarkable volume, *Human Destiny*, explains evolution as a response to the Divine Will. Man arises, he insists, from within the evolutionary process; and at a certain moment, perhaps in connection with the Cro-Magnon age, man became truly man by a mutation—a mutation in which God breathed into him "free will," and a capacity to choose between good and evil, i.e. a conscience. (Cf. Archer, *ibid.*, 188, n.).

(c) However, it seems to me that Lange comes nearer to the solution of this problem (CDHCG, 286). In discussing the phrases, "mighty men that were of old, men of renown," he writes: "A designation, not merely of offspring from the mismarriages, but referring also to the Nephilim who are earlier introduced, as it appears from the appended clause. The author reports things from his own standpoint, and so the expression, 'they were *of old*, men of renown,' affirms their previous existence down to that time. Cain was the first. But now there are added to the Cainites and the Cainitic degenerate offspring of these sensual mesalliances. It was true, then, as it has been in all other periods of the world's history, the men of violent deeds were the men of renown, very much the same whether *famous* or *infamous*." Cornfeld contributes to the clarification of the problem as follows (AtD, 25): "We may perhaps link the Nephilim of Genesis with the 'mighty men that were of old,' these semi-legendary heroes of prehistory whose memory and deeds are recorded in the ancient annals of Mesopotamia, Egypt, and other lands of

antiquity. These were the founders of the first dynasties, lawgivers and the like. The word Nephilim (in Arabic—nabil) means princes. So the Nephilim need not be interpreted as a race of 'giants,' but 'great men.' In this Hebrew tradition the crisis described here was held as proof that these semi-divine and arrogant Nephilim were more bent on evil than good. . . . In the opinion of G. Ernest Wright the tradition of early 'giants on the earth' may coincide with the beginning of the Dynastic Ages from 3000 B.C.E. (the Early Bronze Age) and the succession of kings who established the first great empires. Great personalities who stood head and shoulders above their fellows began to emerge. Illustrations of the time may be held to explain the fame of such 'giants.'"

(d) *How did God's Spirit strive with the antediluvians?* How, according to Scripture does God's Spirit, the Holy Spirit, uniformly strive with rebellious man? How, or by what means, does the Spirit convict men of sin, righteousness and judgment (John 16:8)? Through the instrumentality of the Word, of course, spoken or written: faith comes from reading or hearing the Divine Word (Rom. 10:14-17). Experience thus confirms Scripture: where there is no preaching, no hearing, no reading of the Word, no contact with the Word, there is no faith, no conversion, no Church. The entire evangelistic and missionary enterprise of the Church of Christ is predicated on this fact (Acts 28:23-28). The Spirit and the Word "go together" (Isa. 59:21). The Spirit and the Word (Logos) acted together in the Creation (Gen. 1:2, 3, etc.). The Spirit sustains and preserves the whole Creation by the power of the Word (Heb. 1:1-4, 2 Pet. 3:5-7). The Spirit has, in all ages, wrought miracles by the instrumentality of the Word (Num. 20:7-13; Josh. 10:12-13; John 1:1-14; Matt. 14:19-20, 8:3, 8; John 4:50; Matt. 8:32, Mark. 1:25, 1:22, 27; Luke 7:14; John 11:43; Acts 3:6, 9:34,

## THE WORLD BEFORE THE FLOOD 6:1-8

9:40; Heb. 4:12; Luke 16:29-31; Rom. 10:6-8). The Spirit strove with men through the Word proclaimed by holy men of old (2 Pet. 1:21, 1 Pet. 1:10-12, Heb. 1:1, Neh. 9:30); through the teaching of Christ who possessed the Holy Spirit without measure (John 3:34, 6:63, 8:31-32, 17:17; Matt. 7:24-27; Heb. 1:2; Matt. 12:28, cf. Exo. 8:19, Luke 11:20—the “finger of God” is, in Scripture a metaphor of power exercised by the Spirit of God); through the Word proclaimed and recorded by the Spirit-guided Apostles (John 14:26, 15:26-27, 16:7-15; Acts 1:8, 10:36-43; 1 Cor. 2:6-16; 1 Thess. 2:13; 1 Cor. 14:37, etc.). The Seed of the Kingdom is the Word of God (Luke 8:11); it is the incorruptible seed, because spiritual life is in it and is generated through it (1 Pet. 1:23); hence, the Gospel is—not just *a* power, nor *one* of the powers—but *the* power of God unto salvation to every one that believes (Rom. 1:16-17). *How, then, did the Spirit strive with men in antediluvian times?* Through Noah, of course, who was God’s preacher of righteousness to the people of his day (2 Pet. 2:5). How did Noah come to know of the doom about to descend on mankind? He knew it by faith, that is, God forewarned him of the impending catastrophe and he believed God (Heb. 11:7). For one hundred and twenty years Noah proclaimed the inevitability of Divine judgment; for one hundred and twenty years, Christ, through Noah, warned the masses of the antediluvian world who by this time had, by their own wicked works, incarcerated themselves in the prison-house of sin (Isa. 42:6-8, 61:1-3; Luke 4:17-19; 1 Pet. 3:18-22), that unless they repented, they should all likewise perish (cf. Luke 13:3). But all in vain! The only thanks he got was scorn, ridicule, and perhaps even violence. (I am reminded of the oldtime preacher’s sermon subject, “What Happened to the Carpenters who Helped Noah Build the Ark?” What *did* happen to them? The pit of



the abyss, of course!) The Spirit of God is still striving with ungodly men, calling them to repentance and redemption. But He will not always do so: the time will come when the line between Divine mercy and justice will surely be drawn. The Spirit has ceased striving with His Old Covenant people and they are today suffering the consequences of their rejection of the Messiahship of Jesus (Matt. 23:37-39, 27:25; Luke 21:20-24). The time will come, and indeed may not be too far off (cf. Matt. 24:35-39, 24:29-31), when God's Spirit will quit striving with all humanity (Matt. 25:31-46); then cometh judgment (Heb. 9:27, Acts 17:30-31, Matt. 12:41-42, Rom. 2:1-11), in which all mankind shall be judged, each according to his own works (Rom. 14:10-12; 2 Cor. 5:10, 11:15; Gal. 6-7; Heb. 10:26-27; Rev. 20:11-14, 22:10-15).

(5) *Vv. 5-8.* (a) *God's "repentance."* Note the JB rendering (67-69): "Yahweh saw the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and that the thoughts in his heart fashioned nothing but wickedness all day long. Yahweh regretted having made man on the earth, and his heart grieved. 'I will rid the earth's face of man, my own creation,' Yahweh said, 'and of animals also, reptiles too, and the birds of heaven; for I regret having made them.' But Noah found favour with Yahweh." The JB annotator, who follows the critical theory in general, including the Documentary Hypothesis, comments as follows: "There are several Babylonian stories of the Flood which are in some respects remarkably similar to the biblical narrative. This last does not derive from them but draws upon the same source, namely upon the memory of one or more disastrous floods in the valley of the Euphrates and Tigris which tradition had enlarged to the dimensions of a world-wide catastrophe. But there is this fundamental difference: the author has used this tradition as a vehicle for teaching eternal truths—that God is just and merciful, that man is perverse, that God saves his faithful ones

## THE WORLD BEFORE THE FLOOD 6:1-8

(cf. Heb. 11:7). The Flood is a divine judgment which foreshadows that of the latter days (Lk. 17:26f; Matt. 24:37f), just as Noah's salvation prefigures the saving waters of baptism, (1P 3:20-21)." (p. 23, n.). Again: "This 'regret' of God is a human way of expressing the fact that tolerance of sin is incompatible with his sanctity (1 S 15:29 warns us that the phrase is not to be taken too literally); but in a far greater number of passages it means that God's anger is appeased and his threat withdrawn, see Jer. 26:3." Cornfeld writes in similar vein (AtD, 26): "There is an architectural unity in the spirit of the traditions related to the ten generations preceding Noah. The writers sketch the gradual deterioration of man and an increase in sin and violence which parallels his increase in knowledge and skill. As he gains in power, man turns against his Creator and corrupts the earth through violence. There is an implied warning against the insidious dangers of man following his own designs without heeding his responsibility before God, to whom he is answerable. God is described as experiencing human feelings of grief that he had ever created man, and he decided to punish the world. Some steps were taken to curb this upsurge of man to semi-divinity, such as the reduction of man's hitherto phenomenally long life-span to 'one hundred and twenty years.' As violence did not abate, drastic punishment was called for. This is obviously an etiological tale meant to explain the proverbial span which one Jew still wishes another." (See *supra*: this 120-year life-span theory does not harmonize with Scripture as a whole. Abraham lived to be 175 (Gen. 25:7); cf. also Psa. 90:10 and similar O.T. passages. The theory is wholly at variance with relevant New Testament teaching. The 120 years were obviously years of Divine grace extended to the antediluvian people for the purpose of giving them opportunity to repent and reform their lives.)

Murphy states the problem involved here, with great clarity (MG, 182): "Repentance ascribed to the Lord seems to imply wavering or change of purpose in the Eternal Self-Existent. . . . In sooth, every act here recorded—the observation, the resolve, the exception—seems equally with the repentance to jar with the unchangeableness of God. To go to the root of the matter, every act of the divine will, of creative power, or of interference with the order of nature, seems at variance with inflexibility of purpose. But, in the first place, man has a finite mind and a limited sphere of observation, and therefore is not able to conceive or express thoughts or acts exactly as they are in God, but only as they are in himself. Secondly, God is a spirit, and therefore has the attributes of personality, freedom and holiness; and the passage before us is designed to set forth these in all the reality of their action, and thereby to distinguish the freedom of the eternal mind from the fatalism of inert matter. Hence, thirdly, these statements represent real processes of the Divine Spirit, analogous at least to those of the human. And, lastly, to verify this representation, it is not necessary that we should be able to comprehend or construe to ourselves in all its practical detail that sublime harmony which subsists between the liberty and the immutability of God. That change of state which is essential to will, liberty, and activity, may be, for aught we know, and from what we know must be, in profound unison with the eternity of the divine purpose." Green (UBG, 63): "'Human feelings attributed to God' (6:6, 8). Elohim is the general term for God, and describes him as the creator of the world and its universal governor, while Jehovah is his personal name, and that by which he has made himself known as the God of a gracious revelation. Hence divine acts of condescension to men and of self-manifestation are more naturally associated with the name Jehovah; whence

## THE WORLD BEFORE THE FLOOD 6:1-8

it follows that anthropopathies and anthropomorphisms occur chiefly in Jehovah sections. But there is no inconsistency between the ideas which these are intended to suggest and the most spiritual and exalted notions of the Most High. The loftiest conceptions of God are, throughout the Scriptures, freely combined with anthropomorphic representations. His infinite condescension is no prejudice to his supreme exaltation. These are not different ideas of God separately entertained by different writers, but different aspects of the divine Being which enter alike into every true conception of Him." (Cf. 1 Sam. 15:29, 35; Amos 5:8, 7:3, 5:21; Gen. 8:21; Lev. 1:13, 26:31; esp. Jer. 18:5-10). (An *anthropomorphic* passage is one in which God is represented as thinking and acting as human being would think and act; an *anthropopathic* statement is one in which God is represented as experiencing the feelings such as a human being would experience.)

Lange summarizes the problem before us with complete clarity, as follows (CDHCG, 287): "A peculiarly strong anthropopathic expression, which, however, presents the truth that God, in consistency with his immutability, assumes a changed position in respect to changed man (Psa. 18:27), and that, as against the impenitent man who identifies himself with the sin, he must assume the appearance of hating the sinner in the sin, even as he hates the sin in the sinner. But that Jehovah, notwithstanding, did not begin to hate man, is shown in the touching anthropomorphism that follows, '*and it grieved him in his heart.*' The first kind of language is explained in the flood, the second in the revelation of Peter, 1 Pet. 3:19, 20, and 4:6. Against the corruption of man, though extending to the depths of his heart, there is placed in contrast God's deep 'grieving in his heart.' But the repentance of God does not take away his unchangeableness and his counsel, but rightly establishes them, so neither does God's grieving de-

tract from his immutability in blessedness, but shows, rather, God's deep feeling of the distance between the blessedness to which man was appointed and his painful perdition. Delitzsch does indeed maintain it, as most real or actual truth, that God feels repentance, and he does not equate this position with the doctrine of God's unchangeableness, unless it be with the mere remark that the pain and purpose of the divine wrath are only moments in an everlasting plan of redemption, which cannot become outward in its efficacy without a movement in the Godhead. And yet movement is not change." Repentance, in Scripture, is a *turning* expressed in terms of will (Matt. 12:39-41; Jon. 3:8; Acts 26:17-18; Isa. 1:16-17; Heb. 6:1). Repentance, insofar as man is concerned, is a turning expressed in terms of will leading to a reformation of life, as clearly portrayed in the Narrative of the Forgiving Father (Luke 15:7, 18-24). With God also, repentance is a "turning" expressed in terms of attitude, disposition, will; a turning occasioned by the kind of response that is in harmony with changing attitudes in man, but in terms of the immutable norms of Divine justice and mercy. (This is illustrated most clearly, perhaps in Jer. 18:5-10). (Cf. Exo. 13:17-18, 32:1-14; Psa. 110:4, Heb. 7:21; Jer. 4:28: in many Scriptures, God's repentance indicates simply a change of purpose, without strong anthropopathic overtones.)

2. *Noah: Man of Faith* (Gen. 6:9-12).

9 *These are the generations of Noah. Noah was a righteous man, and perfect in his generations: Noah walked with God.* 10 *And Noah begat three sons: Shem, Ham, and Japheth.* 11 *And the earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence.* 12 *And God saw the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth."*

## THE WORLD BEFORE THE FLOOD 6:9-17

(1) Noah was a righteous man, that is, it was his disposition to do the will of God in all things (cf. Matt. 3:15, John 4:34). Noah was "perfect"—not sinless, of course, but committed to moral integrity in his dealings with God. ("The just is the right in law, the perfect is the tested in holiness," Murphy). "In his generations": probably not the offspring of a promiscuous union of the godly with the ungodly, as were many of his contemporaries. Noah "walked with God," as did Enoch (see *supra*). Hence, Noah "found favor in the eyes of Jehovah." (Note the A.V.—"grace"; grace is commonly defined as *unmerited favor*: the favor in Noah's case, however, was a recognition of his righteousness.) Noah was a man of faith: given the Divine plans and specifications for the ark, he obeyed in every detail and built it just as God had told him to build it. *Had he not done so, as we shall see later, he would have destroyed its typical (hence, testimonial) significance.* (Cf. Moses and the Tabernacle: Exo. 25:8-9, also chs. 39, 40). Faith manifests itself in implicit obedience: hence it is said that "thus did Noah: according to all that God commanded him, so did he" (v. 22); and so by faith "he prepared an ark to the saving of his house," etc. (Heb. 11:7). Moreover, having "been warned of God concerning things not seen as yet," that is, the certainty of impending Divine judgment, Noah became Christ's "preacher of righteousness" to the ungodly antediluvian world (2 Pet. 2:5).

### 3. *The Ark*

*"13 And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and, behold, I will destroy them with the earth. 14 Make thee an ark of gopher wood; rooms shalt thou make in the ark, and shalt pitch it within and without with pitch. 15 And this is how thou shalt make it: the length of the ark three hundred cubits, the breadth of it fifty cubits, and the*

*height of it thirty cubits. 16 A light shalt thou make to the ark, and to a cubit shalt thou finish it upward; and the door of the ark shalt thou set in the side thereof; with lower, second, and third stories shalt thou make it. 17 And I, behold, I do bring the flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven; every thing that is in the earth shall die."*

(1) *Ark*, from Hebrew word for "chest" or "box." Made of *gopher wood* (resinous trees, probably cypress, as used in ancient shipbuilding). *Rooms*: literally, "nests," metaphorically descriptive of the chambers of the ark. Caulked with *pitch* (bitumen), typical of Mesopotamian work. Note the *three stories* (v. 16): the text suggests that the chambers (cabins or cells) were arranged according to some definite plan, probably in rows on each side of the ark, with a passageway through the middle (or vice versa), and placed in tiers, one above the other. The vessel was obviously built in the form of a flatboat, designed, not for navigation, but solely for *floating* on the surface of the water. "While the statement in v. 16 can be taken in the traditional sense as describing three stories, it is also possible to understand it to indicate three layers of logs laid cross-wise, a view which would accord well with a construction of wood, reeds, and bitumen" (NBD, *s.v.*)

(2) *The Dimensions of the Ark* are given as 300 x 50 x 30 cubits. The common cubit was about 18 inches in length, the supposed average distance from the point of the elbow to the tip of the middle finger (Deut. 3:11). There was another cubit known, however, which was a handbreadth longer than the common cubit. Petrie, the noted Egyptologist, expresses the view that even the common cubit measured 22½ inches. (See. *Fl*, Rehwinkel, 59). (See NBD, under "Weights and Measures").

## THE WORLD BEFORE THE FLOOD 6:9-17

According to the lower standard, the ark would have measured 450 feet in length, 75 feet in width, and forty-five feet in height. According to the higher figure (22 to 24 inches, based on the likelihood that man before the Flood was of larger stature than modern man, and that the length from his elbow to the end of his middle finger was even longer than the suggested 22½ inches), the ark would have been six hundred feet in length, one hundred feet in width, and sixty feet in height. By way of comparison, the battleship *Oregon*, 348 feet long and 69 feet wide, was built in the same proportions as to length and width as the ark. The famous *Titanic* was 825 feet long and 93 feet wide with a displacement of 46,000 tons. "Marine experts have estimated that since the ark was built with a flat bottom and there was no waste space on the bow or stern, it being square on both ends and straight up on its side, it would have had a displacement of about 43,000 tons, a displacement nearly equal to that of the ill-fated *Titanic*" (*Fl.*, 60).

(3) *Window* and *Door*, v. 16. "A light shalt thou make to the ark" (note marginal rendering, *roof*). "To a cubit shalt thou finish it upward" (marginal, *from above*). Rotherham: "A place for light shalt thou make for the ark, and to a cubit shalt thou finish it upwards," etc. The new American translation gives it: "You are to make a roof for the ark, finishing it off at the top to the width of a cubit." The Hebrew word here indicates clearly a space for light, or a space by which the light could be admitted into the vessel. "The door of the ark shalt thou set in the side thereof," etc. Rotherham: "The opening of the ark in the side thereof shalt thou put." Lange thinks that each flat or story had an entrance or door in the side.

(4) Note the construction: v. 17—"And I, behold, I do bring," etc.; an emphatic declaration that the impending judgment was truly a Divine visitation, not simply a natural occurrence.



4. *The Noahic Covenant*

*"18 But I will establish my covenant with thee; and thou shalt come into the ark, thou, and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons' wives with thee. 19 And of every living thing of all flesh, two of every sort shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them alive with thee; they shall be male and female. 20 Of the birds after their kind, and of cattle after their kind, of every creeping thing of the ground after its kind, two of every sort shall come unto thee, to keep them alive. 21 And take thou unto thee of all food that is eaten, and gather it to thee; and it shall be for food for thee, and for them. 22 Thus did Noah; according to all that God commanded him, so did he."*

(1) "My covenant," that is, the already well known covenant which I have made with man. "The word *my* points to its original establishment with Adam; my primeval covenant, which I am resolved not to abandon" (Murphy). "Will I establish," that is, despite the fact that Adam failed me, I will maintain and execute my covenant of life with the generic seed of the woman, and in a special sense with the Eternal Seed, the Logos, who from the foundation of the world voluntarily purposes to effect the Plan of Redemption for all who accept the Covering for sin which He shall provide. A covenant in Scripture, in the fullest sense of the term, is a solemn compact (contract), between two parties in which each is bound to perform his part. "Hence, a covenant implies the moral faculty; and wherever the moral faculty exists, there must be a covenant. Consequently, between God and man there was of necessity a covenant from the very beginning, though the name do not appear. At first it was a covenant of works, in regard to man; but now that works have failed, it can only be a covenant of grace to the penitent sinner" (Murphy, MG, 188). The substance of the Noahic covenant was the agreement with respect

## THE WORLD BEFORE THE FLOOD 6:18-22

to Noah and his household; the remaining verses simply state the arrangements with regard to the subhuman orders.

The directions with reference to the ark, as given by God to Noah, embraced four particulars: (1) the Divine intention to destroy the human species, (2) the plans and specifications for the ark, (3) the announcement of the impending doom in the form of a catastrophic flood, and (4) the arrangements for the preservation of Noah and the members of his family, and certain specified kinds of animals. Other problems that arise in connection with the Genesis account of the Deluge will be treated here in subsequent sections. It will be noted that the title of this Part is "The World Before the Flood." We have dealt primarily, in this section, with the moral world, the world of man, his duties and privileges; in the following sections we shall deal with the problems also of the physical or geographical world.

\* \* \* \* \*

## FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

### *Does History Make Sense?*

This question is suggested by the Divine declaration, Gen. 6:3, "My Spirit shall not strive with man for ever." What has history to say with reference to this pronouncement?

It is interesting to note that the three over-all "philosophies" of history originated with the three great Greek historians.

Herodotus (5th century B.C.) was the first to give us what may rightly be called the *ethical* interpretation: namely, that history is largely the record of the work of the goddess Nemesis, Retributive Justice, who inevitably interferes in human affairs to overthrow inordinate human pride, ambition and insolence. This view is represented today, in broad outline, by the thought of such men as Berdyaev, Sorokin, Schweitzer, and Toynbee. Toynbee's

elaborately-worked-out theory is that of challenge-and-response. According to his view, modern man faces three primary challenges: that of setting up a constitutional system of co-operative world government (politically); that of formulating a workable compromise between free enterprise and socialistic endeavor, including peace in labor-industry relations; and that of putting the secular superstructure back on a religious foundation, that in which the dignity and worth of the person is made the supreme ethical norm. (This last-named, says Toynbee, is the most important of all). His over-all thesis is that our Western culture will survive only if it responds in a positive way to these basic needs or challenges.

Thucydides (c. 471-400 B.C.) emphasized the strictly *secularistic* interpretation of history: namely, that the events of history are brought about by purely secular (chiefly economic) causes. This view is echoed in modern times, first by Machiavelli, and later by Marx and Lenin with their theory of economic determinism and accompanying substitution of expediency for morality.

Polybius (c. 205-c. 125 B.C.) gives us the *fatalistic* view, namely, that all events of history are predetermined by a Sovereign Power, variously named Fate, Fortune, Destiny, etc. He gives us—accurately—the history of the Roman republic; his thesis is that Fortune foreordained that Rome should become the mistress of the world. (Of course, he died, long before the Roman Republic degenerated into the Empire of the Caesars.) Polybius was a Stoic, and this was the Stoic philosophy. This view is represented in our day, in a somewhat different form of course, by Oswald Spengler, in his massive work, *The Decline of the West*. According to Spengler, every culture inevitably passes through its four seasons—spring, summer, fall, and winter—the last-named being the period of decay ending in death, the period that should be properly designated

## THE WORLD BEFORE THE FLOOD 6:18-22

that of "civilization." Spengler was a pessimist: there is no escape from this remorseless cycle, according to his view.

What does the Bible have to say on this subject? It gives us clearly the *providential* interpretation (rather, revelation), specifically in Jeremiah 18:5-10. This may be stated in brief as follows: (1) God rules His world, both physical and moral, including the march of human events; (b) within the framework of His Providence, however, both individuals and nations are left relatively free to work out their own history and destiny (that is, God rules the world, but He does not rule it by force); (c) nations fall when they ignore and violate the moral law on such a scale that they make themselves vessels fit only for destruction; that is to say, the stability and premanence of the nation (or state) is dependent on the ethical quality of the national life. Nations are seldom destroyed from the outside: rather, they go down from rot on the inside. (d) God will never permit any human tryant to seize sovereignty over the whole earth, for the simple reason that universal sovereignty is Divinely reserved for the King of kings and Lord of lords. (Cf. Phil. 2:7-11, Eph. 1:19-23, 1 Cor. 15:20-28, Rev. 19:11-16). We must never forget that *just as sin was not inevitable in the beginning, so moral progress of any people or state is not inevitable*. Individuals and nations grow in righteousness only as they *will* to do so. In the very nature of the case neither righteousness nor holiness can be forced upon an individual or a people. However, a nation is not destroyed until its destruction has become a moral necessity. This is all stated explicitly in Jer. 18:5-10. (Note the story of Sodom and Gomorrah, Gen. 18:20-33, 19:23-28. Note also the case of Abraham, who himself never owned a foot of the Land which God had promised to him and his seed, except the small plot which he purchased for a burial ground. The fulfilment of the promise was delayed several generations—

to the time of the Conquest under Joshua—simply because in the interim the iniquity of the Canaanites had not reached fullness: cf. Gen. 15:12-16, Lev. 18:24-28).

May we cry out, then, as Americans, in the words of Kipling's "Recessional"—

"The tumult and the shouting dies;  
The Captains and the Kings depart;  
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,  
An humble and a contrite heart—  
Lord God of hosts, be with us yet,  
Lest we forget—lest we forget!"

\* \* \* \* \*

### REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART TWENTY

1. Explain the theory of the origin of the so-called heroes and demigods of prehistoric times.
2. Show why the theory that the "sons of God" originated in the intermarriage of angels and mortal women is unscriptural.
3. List the *poetic* references, in Scripture, to angels as "sons of God."
4. What does the phrase, "sons of God," generally signify in Scripture?
5. Are angels Scripturally represented as having sex distinctions? Cite Scripture for your answer.
6. Explain the sentence, "My Spirit shall not strive with man for ever."
7. Explain the clause, "for that he also is flesh."
8. Show why the 120-year period ordained by God could not have indicated the term of individual human life.
9. Explain what this time-period of 120 years obviously meant. How was it a manifestation of Divine grace?

## THE WORLD BEFORE THE FLOOD

10. Explain how this passage takes on the character of a prediction.
11. What was Aristotle's estimate of man? How does it agree with the clause, "for that he also is flesh"?
12. Is there any necessary connection between the Nephilim of Numbers 13:33 and those of Gen. 6:4? Explain.
13. Could the Nephilim have been of a pre-Adamic stock? Explain.
14. State Lange's explanation of the Nephilim, and that of Cornfeld also.
15. How has the Spirit of God uniformly striven with men?
16. How, and through whom, did the Spirit of God strive with the ungodly antediluvian people?
17. Explain Heb. 11:7, 2 Pet. 2:5, 1 Pet. 3:18-22.
18. Explain the terms "anthropomorphic" and "anthropopathic."
19. Explain what is meant by Yahweh's "repentance" in Gen. 6:6-7.
20. Explain how this is to be reconciled with His immutability.
21. In what sense are we to understand that Noah was "righteous," and that he was "perfect in his generations"?
22. What would have been the consequence if Noah had not complied fully with God's ordinations regarding the ark? What would have been the "testimonial" consequence?
23. Explain the following terms in reference to the ark: "rooms," "gopher wood," "pitch," "three stories," "window," and "door."

## GENESIS

24. State the probable dimensions of the ark as determined by the different meanings of the word "cubit."
25. What was the ark as to its general appearance and design?
26. What is a covenant? Explain what is meant by the Noahic Covenant.
27. List the four particulars included in God's directions with reference to the ark.
28. Distinguish between what is meant by the moral world and the geographical world in the study of the Deluge.
29. State the three over-all "philosophies" of history, and name the early and modern proponents of each.
30. Outline clearly the Biblical revelation of the meaning of history.

PART TWENTY-ONE:  
THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD  
(Gen. 7:1-24)

1. *The Embarkation* (Gen. 7:1-24). *The Biblical Account.*

"1 And Jehovah said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation. 2 Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee seven and seven, the male and his female; and of the beasts that are not clean two, the male and his female: of the birds also of the heavens, seven and seven, male and female, to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth. 4 For yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights; and every living thing that I have made will I destroy from off the face of the ground. 5 And Noah did according unto all that Jehovah commanded him.

"6 And Noah was six hundred years old when the flood of waters was upon the earth. 7 And Noah went in, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him, into the ark, because of the waters of the flood. 8 Of clean beasts, and of beasts that are not clean, and of birds, and of everything that creepeth upon the ground, 9 there went in two and two unto Noah into the ark, male and female, as God commanded Noah. 10 And it came to pass after the seven days, that the waters of the flood were upon the earth. 11 In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month, on the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened. 12 And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights.

"13 In the selfsame day entered Noah, and Shem, and Ham, and Japheth, the sons of Noah, and Noah's wife, and the three wives of his sons with them, into the ark; 14 they, and every beast after its kind, and all the cattle



## GENESIS

*after their kind, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth after its kind, and every bird after its kind, every bird of every sort. 15 And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh wherein is the breath of life. 16 And they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh, as God commanded him: and Jehovah shut him in. 17 And the flood was forty days upon the earth; and the waters increased, and bare up the ark, and it was lifted up above the earth. 18 And the waters prevailed and increased greatly upon the earth; and the ark went upon the face of the waters. 19 And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high mountains that were under the whole heaven were covered. 20 Fifty cubits upward did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered. 21 And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both birds, and cattle, and beasts, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: 22 all in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life, of all that was on the dry land, died. 23 And every living thing was destroyed that was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and creeping things, and birds of the heavens; and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only was left, and they that were with him in the ark. 24 And the waters prevailed upon the earth a hundred and fifty days."*

2. *The Moral World Under the Flood.* (1) By "moral world" we mean the totality of "moral" beings, that is, creatures constitutionally endowed with intelligence and free will, and hence made responsible to the Creator for their acts; in a word, all creatures who can properly be designated *persons*. In view of their distinct *personal* endowments they are said in Scripture to have been created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26-27). This world of persons *under* the Flood was made up of just two classes: the same two classes that have always made up human-kind, namely, those *who have*, and those who *have not*,

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

conformed their lives to the Will of God, the Author of all moral and spiritual law. (Cf. Matt. 7:24-27, 7:13-14, 25:31-46; John 5:28-29; Rom. 2:4-11; Rev. 20:11-15, 22:12-15). Similarly, the antediluvian moral world was made up of those who refused to heed the warnings of God about the impending doom (the world of the ungodly), and those who, by faith, took God at His Word and conformed to His plan for their deliverance: in sum, those *outside* the ark and those *inside* the ark of safety.

(2) The condition that necessitated the Flood was, as noted heretofore, the universal wickedness brought about by the intermarriage of pious Sethites and the irreligious Cainites. This condition became so intolerable that "it repented Jehovah that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart." "And Jehovah said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the ground" (6:6-7). (Cf. such passages as Num. 23:19, 1 Sam. 15:29, Ezek. 24:14, Mal. 3:6, Jas. 1:17). Haley ADB, 63-68): "God has promised blessings to the righteous and threatened the wicked with punishment. Suppose a righteous man should turn and become wicked. He is no longer the man whom God promised to bless. He occupies a different relation toward God. The promise was made to an entirely different character. . . . His attitude toward sin and sinners, on the one hand, and toward goodness and good on the other, is the same yesterday, today, and forever. It is precisely *because God is immutable*, that his relation to men, and his treatment of them vary with the changes in their character and conduct. In a word, *he changes not because he is unchangeable*. . . . To sum up, *if man changes, the very immutability of God's character requires that his feelings should change toward the changed man*." (SIB, I, 112, n.): "God's *repentance* denotes not any change of his purpose or will within himself. In this respect he is unchangeable, and cannot repent. . . . But it denotes the change of his

## GENESIS

providence correspondent with his fixed purpose. It is a word suited to our capacity; and here it denotes God's detestation of sin, and his fixed resolution to punish it, after man had made himself quite another thing than God had made him at first." (Cf. 1 Sam. 15:11, Ps. 106:45, Deut. 32:36, Hos. 11:8, Jer. 18:5-12). (3) Noah, on the other hand, was "a righteous man, and perfect in his generations." Two distinct Hebrew words are translated "generations" here (6:9). The first signifies "families" or "genealogies." The second signifies "the period of a man's life." Noah was righteous: it was his disposition to do the Will of God. He was perfect, that is, upright and sincere, a man of integrity. He was perfect in comparison with those of his period or age. (Cf. Luke 1:6, 2 Cor. 1:12, Phil. 2:15, 1 Pet. 2:15.) "Noah was perfect *in his generation*, amidst men extremely wicked, and notwithstanding their evil counsels, examples, and persecutions." His character is proved by the fact that he persisted through one hundred and twenty years pleading—all in vain—with those of his time, to repent and reform their lives in obedience to God's warning. What greater proof of a man's piety could be desired? What a contrast to the enormous impiety of the multitudes reveling unrestrained in lust and violence, sinning against God openly and presumptuously, without any fear of Him, any respect for His law, in very defiance of His justice!

3. *The Physical World Under the Flood.* (1) By the *physical* world we have reference here to the physio-graphical aspects of the planet Earth. Thus it becomes apparent at once that any treatment of this subject necessarily involves the problem of the *extent* of the Flood which is described in the seventh chapter of Genesis. That is to say, was the Genesis Flood universal? Or was it more or less localized in the region anciently regarded as the "world," or more especially the region known today as the Near East. To try to discuss this problem in its various

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

ramifications—Biblical, geological, palentological, physio-chemical, etc.—would require the writing of a book within a book, so to speak, a task for which we have neither time nor space available, in the preparation of the present text. We shall be content, therefore, with presenting the problem in its broad outlines and giving the reader the titles of the books published in recent years in which the different views are set forth. (These titles are named in the List of *Specific Abbreviations* at the forefront of this volume.)

(2) In this connection, the first problem we encounter is one of translation. The Hebrew *erets* as used in Genesis and generally throughout the Old Testament, translated consistently as "earth" in our English Bibles, is also the term used repeatedly for "land" or "country." (E.g., Gen. 13:10—"the land of Egypt"; 13:12—"the land of Canaan," etc.). (There is another word, *tebel*, which is used in the later Old Testament writings, which designates the habitable earth or the world as a whole; however, this word does not occur in the entire Pentateuch. Again, the word *adamah*, translated "ground," occurs in Gen. 7:23, 8:8, 8:13, 8:21 (cf. with its use in Gen. 3:17), and has reference strictly to the surface (productive) soil of the same area that is designated *erets* in other verses.) But it is *erets* alone, uniformly translated "earth," which is used throughout the Narrative of the Flood, and significantly in those very passages which convey the connotation of universality, and which, as stated above, could be just as correctly and meaningfully rendered "land" wherever it occurs (e.g., Gen. 6:17c could be as correctly translated, "everything that is in the *land* shall die"). On the other hand, the phrase, "under the whole heaven," as used in 7:19, causes difficulty: it cannot be easily explained as indicating a geographical *region* only. For this reason, such well-known Bible exegetes as Delitzsch in the last century (BCOTP) and in recent times Leupold (EG),

## GENESIS

and others, have not conceded the possibility of translating the seventh chapter of Genesis as describing a mere localized flood.

(3) Was the Flood universal or local? Jauncey writes (SRG, 76): "Some discussion has gone on as to whether the Flood was a local flood or whether over the whole complete earth. The reason for the discussion is that the word used, translated "earth" in Genesis 7:4 also means "land." Therefore, an equally good translation would make it appear that the whole land or area of Mesopotamia was inundated rather than the whole earth as we know it now. Against this, though, is the fact that there are memories of the Flood all over the world. Of course, some of these could have come through hearsay. Again, we do not know." Dean (OBH, 16): "It rained for forty days. The waters continued to rise for one hundred and fifty days, and to subside for two hundred and twenty-five days. It was either universal, or what is more probable, occurred early in the history of the race, before they had spread widely. Either view would account for the universal tradition." Dummelow (CHB): "The question has been discussed whether the Flood was limited in its extent to the early home of man, and the birthplace of the tradition, viz., Central Asia, or whether it was world-wide. Various scientific objections to a universal immersion of the earth have been brought forward, such as its inconsistency with the existing distribution of animals, the impossibility of the different species of animals finding accomodation in the ark, the want of sufficient moisture in our world, either in the form of vapor or of water, to cover the highest mountains, and the disturbance of the solar system which would have been caused by the sudden creation of the amount required. In consideration of these objections, we must remember that the impression of a general divine judgment would be quite adequately produced by the submergence of the comparatively small

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

district inhabited at the time by man; also, that the preservation of the record could only be due to the survivors, whose ideas of the extent of the catastrophe were drawn from their personal experiences, and the limited geographical knowledge of the time." (It should be noted that this writer, as do most of those who reject the idea of a universal deluge, ignores altogether the possibility of a Spirit-inspired revelation). Ramm (CVSS, 244-246) holds that insurmountable problems are raised by the view that the Deluge was universal in extent, such as, especially, the following: 1. According to best estimates, to cover the highest known mountains, such as the Himalayas, eight times more water than our earth now possesses would be required. 2. The withdrawal of such a huge volume of water would constitute an almost insuperable problem, in the fact that there would be no place or places to which it could drain off: the atmosphere could not store that much water in evaporated form, and there is no evidence that underground cavities exist capable of holding more than a fraction of the additional volume of water. 3. Hardly any forms of plant life could have survived submersion under salt water for any length of time. Moreover, the mingling of ocean water with rain water must have produced a lethal saline concentration, in which nearly all marine life surely would have perished through inability to withstand the tremendous pressures created. And in particular how could those species of marine life which migrate far from their feeding grounds have survived such migrations? Moreover, fresh water fish must have perished as well, even though the salinity might have been sufficient to support salt water fish. 4. Finally, says Ramm, certain areas of the earth's surface show no definite evidence whatever of a general submersion. He cites, for example, reports of ashes in Auvergne, France, produced by volcanoes thousands of years older than the Flood which show no evidence of disturbance by flood waters.

## GENESIS

Gleason reviews these arguments as follows (SOTI, 195-196): "Perhaps difficulties 1 and 3 can be accounted for by special creative or recreative acts of God. (But why then the concern for the preservation of the land animals in the ark, if re-creation was so readily available?) But 2 would seem to call for a good deal of uncreation or complete annihilation of aqueous matter—which appears highly improbable. Difficulty 4 seems to defy explanation, unless the volcanoes involved were really of post-Noahic origin, and the criteria for dating them earlier turn out to be erroneous. Or else perhaps the scoria and ashes may not have been so easily disturbed by water action as the argument assumes. It cannot be maintained, however, that even a local flood will solve all these scientific difficulties. Genesis 7:19 states most explicitly that all the water level rose well above 'all the high mountains that were under the whole heaven.' Assuming that the mountains involved were merely local (a difficult interpretation to make out from the text), at the very least the peaks of Mount Ararat itself were covered, since the ark came to rest where the higher peak (over 17,000 feet high) would be visible. The unavoidable inference would be that the water level rose more than 17,000 feet above the present sea level. This creates difficulties almost as grave for the local flood theory as those which that theory is supposed to avoid. How could the level have been that high at Ararat without being the same height over the rest of the world? Only during a very temporary surge, such as that of a tidal wave, can water fail to seek its own level. To suppose a 17,000-foot level in Armenia simultaneous with an uninundated Auvergne in France would be to propound a more incredible miracle than anything implied by the traditional understanding of a universal flood. The only possible solution, apparently, would be found in the supposition that the height of Ararat was much lower than at present. It is very difficult to date

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

reliably a major upward thrust of the mountain-making variety, and hence it is quite possible that even in the few millenia which have followed the Flood the great mountain ranges have attained far higher elevation than they did before Noah's time. But such a supposition would be applicable not only to the Ararat range but also to the Himalayas and the Cordilleras as well, and it would alleviate somewhat the problem of water supply for a universal flood."

(4) T. C. Mitchell (NBD, 427-428) summarizes as follows: "That everything (6:17), including man (6:7, 7:21) and beast (6:7, 13, 17; 1:21, 22), was to be blotted out by the Flood is clearly stated, but it can be argued that these categories are qualified by the statements of locality: upon the earth (*erets*: 6:17; 7:17, 23); under heaven (*shamayim*, 6:17, 7:19); and upon the ground (*adamah*: 7:4, 23). *Erets* can mean 'land' (e.g. Gn. 10:10), *shamayim* can mean 'sky,' or the visible part of heaven within the horizon (e.g., 1 Ki. 18:45), and the extent of *adamah* would be determined by these other two words; thus it is possible that a flood of unexampled severity might meet these conditions without covering the entire surface of the globe. The argument that such a flood would make the preservation of animals unnecessary might be countered with the suggestion that if a whole environmental zone with its own individual fauna were involved, such a measure would be necessary. The statement that all the high mountains (*har*) under the whole heaven were covered (7:19, 20) and that near the end of the Flood they began to be seen (8:5) is interpreted in this scheme as a phenomenon due to the cloud and mist that must have accompanied the cataclysm. This interpretation favors a limited Flood, but the text is also capable of bearing the interpretation of a universal Flood, and dogmatism is not reasonable, either way. The



## GENESIS

theological teaching of the Bible has traditionally been interpreted in the sense that all men except Noah and his family were destroyed."

(5) R. Milligan (RR, 196-197) contends for the universality of the Flood. He writes: "The language of Moses, taken literally, proves, beyond all doubt, that the deluge was universal. (See Genesis 7:19-23 and 9:8-17). And so, also, do the words of Peter, in the third chapter of his second Epistle. This much is conceded by all parties. And, as it is a fundamental rule of interpretation that 'all words must be taken in their literal sense unless it can be shown, for reasons clear and satisfactory, that they should be construed figuratively,' the presumption is in favor of the old hypothesis, that the deluge was universal, and the burden of proof falls on those who would limit it to a portion of the earth's surface." To the above quotations, pro and con, I should call attention to certain scientific views bearing on the subject. Geologists tell us that they have the unequivocal testimony of the rocks that many of the high mountains of Eurasia and the Americas were, at a comparatively recent period, covered with water to such a depth that immense icebergs loaded with huge masses of granite, gneiss, sand, etc., were freighted over their summits and carried from the Polar regions toward the equator. They tell us that the rocky deposits found in our Central States came to be where they are in the following manner: that, during the successive periods of thawing and freezing in the Arctic regions, they were detached from mountain ranges; and that, at some time in the past, a vast inundation of water heaved them up, carried them across the continent, and deposited them where they are today. Again we quote Milligan: "It seems more reasonable to conclude, in the light of both Natural Science and Sacred Hermeneutics, that the Noachic deluge was universal; as the final conflagration will also be universal. But, which ever mode of interpreta-

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

tion is adopted, the student of the Bible may rest assured that there is here no more conflict between Natural Science and the Bible than there is between Natural Science and the testimony of every formation of the pre-Adamic earth."

(6) Again, the question has been raised as to whether in fact the Flood brought about the destruction of the whole human race. It has been pointed out that the lists of descendants of Shem, Ham and Japheth, as given us in the tenth chapter of Genesis do not permit any easy identification of these ethnic groups with the peoples inhabiting the remote reaches of Africa, Far East Asia, Australia, and the Americas; especially is this said to be true of Australia, the land area in which such strangely unique human and subhuman species still survive that obviously are far removed, supposedly as the consequence of long separation from the Eurasian continent, from any possibility of identification with the human and subhuman specimens who became passengers in Noah's ark. Again, as suggested heretofore, the possibility cannot be ruled out arbitrarily that we have in the Biblical story of Adam and Eve and their offspring the account of the real origin of *natural man* by special Divine act (that is man created in God's image for the actualization of His Eternal Purpose); moreover, that this does not necessarily exclude the concomitant existence of humanoid ("near-human") species that have long been lost in the oblivion of passing time and change. Let it be stated here positively, that no real reason can be put forward for questioning the possible—even probable—biological modification and variation ("evolution") of species *regressively* as well as progressively, whatever humanoid or genuinely human specimens may have been involved. Archer (SOTI, 197-198): "Perhaps, then, these scholars suggest, we are to see in the family of Noah only the ancestors of the nations more immediately surrounding the Holy Land, that is, the peoples of the Near and Middle East, and of the Mediter-

## GENESIS

anean coastlands." He then goes on to point up "three formidable difficulties, in the light of Biblical evidence," inherent in the notion of a more or less localized Flood, as follows: 1. The Divine purpose, as indicated in the Flood narrative, was to destroy the entire human race (Gen. 6:7, 17). "Even if we hold in abeyance the admissibility of translating *erets* here as 'land' rather than 'earth,' it seems quite evident that a total destruction of the human race was involved." 2. It is unquestionably evident in the Genesis account that it was man's wickedness *universally* that brought on the Divine judgment in the form of the Deluge. Cf. Gen. 6:5, 6:11. "It hardly seems likely that the ancestors of the Australians and Far Eastern peoples presented such a stark contrast in morals to the Middle Eastern nations that God saw fit to exempt them from the judgment of the Flood. The Scripture includes all mankind in the verdict of guilty (e.g., Rom. 3:19: . . . 'that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may be guilty [RSV, 'accountable'] before God'). This is a basic premise of the New Testament gospel. No ground for differentiating between the nations closer to Palestine and those more remote from it can be possibly made out." 3. "The unequivocal corroboration of the New Testament that the destruction of the human race at the time of the Flood was total and universal." Cf. 2 Pet. 3:6, 2:5; and especially the words of Jesus, Matt. 24:38, 39—"knew not until the flood came, and took them all away." "While the word 'all' may not always be used in a completely universal sense in Scripture, it is consistently used to apply to the whole number of individuals involved in the situation under discussion. Certainly all men since Adam have been sinners; therefore even in Noah's day all must have been included in the destruction of the great Deluge." 4. The universality of the traditions (oral and written) of the Flood which have long persisted among the most widely

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

distributed geographically and most culturally diverse peoples of earth. (This will be treated *infra*.) Cf. again Matt. 24:37-39, Luke 17:26, 27: *the writer of the present text wants it to be clearly understood that he has no intention, now or ever, of entering into a controversy with the Lord Jesus Christ on any subject whatsoever, the One before whose mind the vision of eternity as well as of time (as defined by Plato, "the moving image of eternity") was ever-present.*

(7) Dr. Henry M. Morris, distinguished professor of engineering science, states what he calls "very cogent reasons" for accepting the Scripture account of the Flood as describing a universal catacyclism, as follows (SBS, 40-42): 1. "The expressions of universality in the account (Genesis 6-9) are not confined to one or two verses, but are repeated in various ways more than a score of times, the writer apparently guarding by every means possible against this very theory that the Flood might only be a limited inundation." 2. "There are numerous references to the Flood in later parts of Scripture, all plainly indicating that the writers regarded the account in worldwide terms. The Lord Jesus Christ (Matt. 24:37-39, Luke 17:26, 27) makes the worldwide judgment of the Deluge to be a type of His own return in judgment on the present world." 3. "The record makes it plain that the waters overtopped the mountains which even in the vicinity of the Tigris-Euphrates region reach great heights. The mountains of Ararat contain peaks over fifteen thousand feet high. The waters 'prevailed upon the earth' at least 150 days, so that waters which covered mountains in one region of the world must necessarily have attained to similar elevations in all other parts of the world." 4. "The primary purpose of the Flood was to 'destroy all flesh' and especially to destroy man from the earth. During the years before the Flood (perhaps 1600), conditions were evidently favorable to abundant procreation. The idea that man could

## GENESIS

only have spread over a small region during this period is quite unreasonable and certainly could not be said to harmonize with anthropology. Consequently, the geographical extent of the Flood would have to be world-wide." 5. "The purpose of the Ark was to 'keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth,' but this purpose was entirely superficial and unreasonable if the only life that was destroyed was within a certain limited area. The Ark had a carrying capacity at least equal to that of 500 ordinary cattle cars, far too large for the needs of merely a small region." 6. "Most important, the entire Biblical record of the Flood becomes almost ridiculous if it is conceived in terms of a local flood. The whole procedure of constructing a great boat, involving a tremendous amount of work, can hardly be described as anything but utterly foolish and unnecessary. How much more sensible it would have been for God merely to have warned Noah of the coming destruction, so that he could have moved to another region to which the Flood would not reach. The great numbers of animals of all kinds, and certainly the birds (which migrate vast distances), could easily have moved out also, without having to be stored and tended for a year in the Ark. The entire story thus becomes little more than nonsense if it is taken as a mere local flood in Mesopotamia."

(8) Under the caption of "geological implications" of the Narration of the Flood, Dr. Morris has added other telling points, as the following: 1. "There were great volcanic and tectonic disturbances, and great quantities of juvenile water (i.e., water which emerged for the first time from the earth's crust to become part of the earth's surface waters) poured out on the earth. This is the reasonable implication of statements made concerning the breaking up of the fountains of the great deep (Gen. 7:11, 8-2)." 2. "Antediluvian meteorological conditions

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

were quite different in character from those now prevailing. Otherwise, it would have been quite impossible for rain to have fallen continuously for forty days and forty nights all around the world, especially in such torrential fashion that it was described as the 'flood-gates' (A.V. 'windows') of Heaven being opened. The tremendous amounts of water implied are not possible under present atmospheric conditions," etc. 3. "The great volumes of water which were thus turned loose on the earth, both from 'the fountains of the great deep' and from the 'flood-gates of heaven, must, of absolute necessity, have accomplished a vast amount of geologic work in relatively short period. The Bible also speaks of the waters 'going and returning continually' (Genesis 8:3), then of 'the mountains rising and the valleys sinking, with the waters hasting away' (Psa. 104:6-9, A.S.V.), and of the waters overturning the earth' (Job 12:15). Erosion and resedimentation must have taken place on a gigantic scale. Previous isostatic adjustments, of whatever sort they were, must have been entirely unbalanced by the great complex of hydrostatic and hydrodynamic forces unleashed in the floodwaters, resulting very likely in great telluric movements. Associated with the volcanic phenomena and the great rains must also have been tremendous tidal effects, windstorms, and a great complexity of currents, cross-currents, whirlpools, and other hydraulic phenomena. After the flood-gates were restrained, and the fountains of the deep stopped, for a long time much more geologic work must have been accomplished at the masses of water were settling into new basins and the earth was adjusting itself to new physiographic and hydrologic balances." 4. "Since the Flood was said to have killed 'every living substance upon the face of the ground,' and in view of the great masses of sediment being moved back and forth and finally deposited by the flood-waters, it would be expected that great numbers of plants and animals would be buried

## GENESIS

by the sediments, under conditions eminently favorable to preservation and fossilization. Conditions for extensive fossil production could never have been so favorable as during the Deluge. Since the Deluge was worldwide and recent, this can only mean that many, probably most, of the fossils that are now found in earth's sedimentary rock beds were entombed there during the Flood." 5. "Finally, it may very fairly be inferred from the record that it would now be impossible to discern geologically much of the earth's history prior to the Flood, at least on the assumption of continuity with present conditions. Whatever geologic deposits may have existed before the Flood must have been almost completely eroded, reworked, and redeposited during the Flood, perhaps several times. Such geologic time-clocks as we may be able to use to date events subsequent to the Flood cannot therefore legitimately be used to extend chronologies into antediluvian time. The basic premise of all such chronometers is uniformity and, if the Flood record be true, the premise of uniformity is, at that point at least, false."

*Uniformitarianism might be used legitimately to describe changes in the permanently fashioned earth, but the theory simply does not lend itself to an adequate description of the origin of earth as a separate planet. There are indeed many aspects of geology, as earth-science, in the explanation of which catastrophism is far more felicitous than uniformitarianism. As Dr. Morris concludes (pp. 43-44): "In view of all the above facts, it is necessary to conclude that the geologic principle of uniformity would not have been in operation during at least two extremely important periods of earth history, the Creation and the Deluge. Thus the Bible, and not the present, is the key to the future. This is a very important fact, because the entire structure of evolutionary historical geology rests squarely upon the assumption of uniformity, and the scientific basis of the theory of evolution is almost*

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

entirely grounded on the testimony of historical geology. And in turn the theory of evolution has been made the basis of all the godless philosophies that are plaguing the world today and in particular is the spearhead of attack against Biblical Christianity."

*To this we add that any person with normal intelligence could easily see that the earth could not have been brought into existence by the same physical forces and processes which operate to preserve it in existence and to effect whatever changes that may take place from time to time, as cause-and-effect, in its constitution as an existing entity (planet). It would be absurd to propose uniformitarianism as the explanation of the hypothetical origin of the earth (and indeed of astronomical bodies in general) as suggested by the contents of such recently published books as Struve's *Stellar Evolution*, Ashford's *From Atoms to Stars*, Gamow's *Biography of the Earth*, Hoyle's *Nature of the Universe*, etc.*

Rehwinkel, in his book entitled *The Flood*, presents a description of the world (earth) before the Flood that is intriguing, to say the least. As he pictures it, it was a world characterized by such features as the following: 1. A vast amount of "living space" (as compared with our postdiluvian earth with its uninhabitable desert and mountain belts, its tundras, its swamps, its ice-covered continents, etc.). 2. A uniformly mild climate in all its parts, as a consequence probably of various phenomena, such as (a) a non-tilted stance of the earth (whereas our earth's axis inclines about  $23\frac{1}{2}$  degrees in relation to its orbital plane), (b) the consequent distribution of warm ocean waters around the then existing land masses, and (c) the probable enshrouding of the earth of that time under a canopy of vapor which intercepted the direct rays of the sun. 3. A flora and fauna far superior to that of our age (note, for example, the luxuriance of plant life in that early world, as indicated by the great coal beds



## GENESIS

found in every continent today). 4. A human population endowed with far greater physical vigor than that on earth subsequent to the flood, and consequently long-lived. 5. A human race which had grown to sufficient proportions to enable it to take possession of a very large part of the earth as it then existed, and which had made great progress both in the useful arts and in the fine arts, thus indicating a highly advanced civilization. On what evidence does Rehwinkel base these conclusions? We have not the space here, of course, to present the details of his argument. Suffice it to say that his main supporting evidence is the fact of diversified mammal remains which have been found in ossiferous fissures in widely separated places in both hemispheres. Because no complete skeleton has been found, the inference is that these animals did not fall into the fissures while yet alive. Moreover, there is no indication of weathering in these bones nor of their being rolled by water. Hence, since they were found to be cemented together by calcite, the conclusion is that they must have been deposited under water in the first place. These finds point, undoubtedly, to a sudden catastrophe which broke up the earth's crust into enormous cracks, into which were poured the corpses of great numbers of animals that had been overwhelmed suddenly by a flood. In some instances, the remains indicate that the animals had perished instantly in great numbers. The remains of the mammoth—an *extinct* species—have been found in many divergent places of earth; hence, in this case the matter of first importance is the actual date of their extinction. The unsolved problem here is whether or not fluorin dating and carbon 14 tests would indicate a date sufficiently late to identify the catastrophe with Noah's Flood. Of course, the reliability of carbon 14 dating is now being questioned in several quarters. For instance, Albright in an interview repeated in *Christianity Today* (Jan. 18, 1963, p. 4) went so far as to say that

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

"carbon 14 is now almost totally useless in dating bones, which contain a minimum of carbon." Rehwinkel, generally speaking, thinks of the antediluvian world as contemporaneous with the history of early man as we find it in the first eight chapters of Genesis. To appreciate the details of his argument, one must read his book; this the student of the Bible who really wants to be informed will do.

For a thoroughgoing presentation of the evidence for the universality of the Flood, from every point of view—both Biblical and scientific—the student should read the excellent book by Drs. Henry M. Morris and John C. Whitcomb, Jr., the former a scientist of high repute and the latter an equally informed Bible scholar. The title of the book is *The Genesis Flood* (See GF in our list of Bibliographical Abbreviations *supra*). These authors summarize their basic arguments for the geographical universality of the Flood as follows: "(1) The Bible says that the waters of the Flood covered the highest mountains to a depth sufficient for the Ark to float over them; (2) the Bible also informs us that this situation prevailed for a period of five months and that an additional seven months were required for the waters to subside sufficiently for Noah to disembark in the mountains of Ararat; (3) the expression, 'fountains of the great deep were broken up,' points unmistakably to vast geological disturbances that are incompatible with the local-Flood concept, especially when these disturbances are said to have continued for five months; (4) the construction of the Ark with a capacity of at least 1,400,000 cubic feet, merely for the purpose of carrying eight people and a few animals through a local inundation is utterly inconceivable; (5) if the Flood had been limited in extent, there would have been no need for an ark at all, for there would have been plenty of time for Noah's family to escape from the danger-area, to say nothing of the birds and beasts; (6) Peter's use of

## GENESIS

the Flood as a basis for refuting uniformitarian skeptics in the last days would have been pointless if the Flood had been merely a local one, especially when we consider the cosmic setting into which he placed that cataclysm (2 Pet. 3:3-7); and (7) a widely distributed human race could not have been destroyed by a local Flood. In support of our seventh argument, we presented four Biblical reasons for the necessity of a total destruction of humanity in the days of Noah: (1) since the stated purpose of the Flood was the punishment of a sinful race, such a purpose could not have been accomplished if only a part of humanity had been affected; (2) the fact that the Flood destroyed the rest of mankind is greatly strengthened by repeated statements in Genesis, 1 Peter, and 2 Peter, to the effect that *only* Noah and his family were spared; (3) the Lord Jesus Christ clearly stated that all men were destroyed by the Flood (Luke 17:26-30); and (4) the covenant which God made with Noah after the Flood becomes meaningless if only a part of the human race had been involved. In addition to these arguments for total destruction of the human race except for Noah's family, we give two reasons for believing that the human race could not have been confined to the Mesopotamian Valley at the time of the Flood: (1) the longevity and fecundity of the antediluvians would allow for a rapid increase in population even if only 1,655 years elapsed between Adam and the Flood; and the prevalence of strife and violence would have encouraged wide distribution rather than confinement to a single locality; (2) evidence of human fossils in widely-scattered parts of the world makes it difficult to assume that men did not migrate beyond the Near East before the time of the Flood. The writers are firmly convinced that these basic arguments, if carefully weighed by Christian thinkers, would prove to be sufficiently powerful and compelling to settle once and for all the long-debated question of the geographical extent of

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

the Flood. This is not to say, of course, that a universal Flood presents no serious scientific problems; for the remaining chapters of this volume are devoted largely to an examination of such problems. But we do believe that no problem be it scientific or philosophical, can be of sufficient magnitude to offset the combined force of these seven Biblical arguments for a geographically universal Flood in the days of Noah" (GF, 33-35). The foregoing excerpt should encourage the genuinely interested Bible student to secure a copy of the Morris-Whitcomb book and study in searchingly from beginning to end before joining the ranks of the mythologizers and "demythologizers."

### 4. *The Alleged Composite Character of the Flood Narrative*

The analytical critics have parceled out the sixth, seventh, and eighth chapters of Genesis among their hypothetical J and P and R (for "redactor") sources. However, as Archer puts it (SOTI, 119), "these divergencies are made possible only by an artificial process of dissection." For example, it is insisted by the critics that the general command to take two of every species into the ark (assigned to P) is incompatible with the exceptional provision to take seven of every "clean" species (attributed to J). But the basis for this distinction seems so obvious that any ordinary reader should understand it. Green (UBG, 91, 92): "There is no discrepancy between the general direction (6:19P), to take a pair of each kind of animals into the ark in order to preserve alive the various species, and the more specific requirement, when the time arrived for entering the ark, that clean beasts should be taken by sevens and the unclean by twos (7:2J). If it had been said that only two should be taken of each kind, the case would have been different. J also relapses into the general form of statement (7:9); or if the critics prefer, R does so, which amounts to the same thing, as by

## GENESIS

hypothesis he had J's previous statement before him. There is no contradiction here any more than there is between the general and the more exact statement of Noah's age in 7:6 and 11."

Again, the critics profess to find a discrepancy concerning the number of days during which the Flood lasted. They insist that J gives the duration of it as forty days (Gen. 7:12, 17; 8:6—plus two more weeks for the sending out of the dove), whereas P makes it to have been 150 days (Gen. 7:24). Archer (SOTI, 119): "But a consecutive reading of the whole narrative makes it apparent that the author put the length of the downpour itself at forty days, whereas the prevalence of the water level above the highest portions of the land surface endured for 150 days (for 7:24 does not say that it rained during that entire period." Allis (FBM, 97-100) points out that only in the three major points that are emphasized in the Flood narrative is it possible to make out a case for alleged "parallel accounts." These are: universal wickedness as occasioning the necessity for Divine judgment; the destruction of "all flesh" as the purpose of it; and the gracious rescue of a chosen remnant of human and subhuman creatures from this destruction. These three points of emphasis exemplify the characteristic Hebrew device of reiteration for the sake of emphasis. Outside these points, however, says Allis, it is impossible to ferret out parallel accounts which do not depend on each other to supply the missing links (details). All this boils down to the fact that the data involved in the Mosaic text are easily reconcilable with unity of authorship, but on the other hand present serious obstacles to attempted allocation into divergent sources. (It seems to be a characteristic of the Teutonic analytical mentality to see discrepancies where none exist, that is, to be unable to see the forest for the trees.) Green (UBG, 9-93) exposes in detail this false methodological device of "parading a part as though it

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

were a whole." The student is referred to this work if he is interested in pursuing the study of this critical problem. Green's treatment of the documentary theory here, that is, with respect to the narrative of the Flood, is so thorough as to compel rejection of the theory by all unbiased minds. Again we quote Allis: "The second feature of the Biblical style which readily lends itself to source analysis is the frequency with which elaboration and repetition occur in the Bible. It is true that the style of the Bible is often marked by brevity and compactness. A great deal is often said in remarkably few words. But the Bible is a very emphatic book. Its aim is to impress upon the hearer or reader the great importance of the themes of which it treats. The most natural way of securing emphasis in a narrative is by amplification or reiteration. Consequently the Biblical style is often decidedly diffuse and characterized by elaborateness of detail and by repetition. . . . There is perhaps no better illustration of repetitive style in the Old Testament than this flood narrative in Genesis."

### 5. *Universality of the Traditions of the Flood*

(1) The extent to which oral and written traditions of the Flood have persisted in all parts of the world is most significant. Uniformly these are accounts of an earlier race or an early world that was once destroyed by the Deluge. The peoples of Southwest Asia—Sumerians, Akkadians, Babylonians, Assyrians, etc.—might be expected, of course, to cherish a tradition similar to that of the Hebrew people, as they inhabited the areas generally accepted as the seat of antediluvian cultures. The Egyptian version is repeated in Plato's *Timaeus* (his "likely story" of the Creation of the world by the Demiurgos). In the version preserved by Manetho the Egyptian priest (3rd century B.C.) the only one saved from the Deluge was the god Thoth. In the Greek account, Zeus, the

## GENESIS

supreme god of the Greek pantheon, is represented as having determined to destroy the race because of its utter degeneracy. However, on the basis of their piety, it was decided to save one Deucalion and his wife Pyrrha. Deucalion built a ship in which he and his wife floated in safety during the nine days' flood which destroyed all the rest of the people. The ship finally came to rest on Mt. Parnassus in Phocia, whereupon the two survivors consulted the sanctuary of Themis and gained knowledge as to how the race might be restored. Thus arose the tradition of the autochthonous origin of the Attican people, from stones thrown by Deucalion and Pyrrha behind them: from those thrown by the former, men sprang up out of the soil, and from those cast by Pyrrha, women sprang up. (This story is exquisitely told by Ovid in his *Metamorphoses*). The Egyptian and Greek traditions might have been a borrowing, of course, from the Near East. The same could be true of the Noah tradition in Apamea (in Asia Minor) which apparently inspired a representation of the ark on some of their coins. Archer (SOTI, 199): "But what shall we say of the legend of Manu preserved among the Hindus (according to which Manu and seven others were saved in a ship from a world-wide flood); or of Fah-he among the Chinese (who was the only survivor, along with his wife, three sons and three daughters); or of Nu-u among the Hawaiians, or of Tezpi among the Mexican Indians, or of Manabozho among the Algonquins? All of these agree that all mankind was destroyed by a great flood (usually represented as world-wide) as a result of divine displeasure at human sin, and that a single man with his family or a very few friends survived the catastrophe by means of a ship or raft or large canoe of some sort."

(2) Again, what shall we say of the numerous Flood traditions which do not include the saving instrumentality

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

of an ark or boat of some kind? Among the Andaman Islanders, for example (in the Bay of Bengal), and the Battaks of Sumatra, a high mountain top is said to have provided the refuge for a lone survivor. Other primitive traditions follow the basic structure of the Genesis narrative: they preserve the report of a universal deluge which wiped out the whole human race with the exception of only one or two survivors. Among those holding such traditions, Archer (p. 199) lists the Kurnai (a tribe of Australian aborigines), the Fiji Islanders, the natives of Polynesia, Micronesia, New Guinea, New Zealand, New Hebrides, the ancient Celts of Wales, the tribesmen of Lauke Caudie in the Sudan, the Hottentots, and the Greenlanders. He summarizes as follows: "Whether or not the world-wide prevalence of these traditions is reconcilable with a local-flood theory, at least it emphasizes the inclusion of all human races in the descendants of Noah, rather than excepting some of the populations of Africa, India, China and America (as Ramm seems to imply in CVSS 239-240)." It seems most reasonable to conclude that this universal tradition must have emanated from a common origin and become world-wide through diffusion of peoples from that common origin. And certainly the Biblical account of the Noachic Flood must be accepted as that common origin, if on no other ground than that of its moral and spiritual motif. (The student is referred to Richard Andree's German work *Die Flutsagen* [1891] for the most complete collection of Flood legends from all over the world, and to Sir James Frazer's *Folklore in the Old Testament* [Vol. I, 1918] for what is perhaps the most comprehensive collection in English).

### 6. *The Babylonian Story of the Flood*

(1) This version of the Deluge story constitutes the eleventh book of the famous Assyrian-Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh. The cuneiform text in its extant form came



## GENESIS

from the library of the Assyrian king, Ashurbanipal (669-626 B.C.), but was evidently transcribed from much older originals. The Flood tablets were unearthed by Rassam at what was once Nineveh, but not identified until 1872, when George Smith, who was then engaged in studying and classifying cuneiform finds, first recognized them. This was one of the most spectacular discoveries in the whole history of Biblical archaeology. However, this Assyrian version of the story of the Deluge was similar in substance to an older Sumerian legend, recorded on the fragment of a tablet found at ancient Nippur in north central Babylonia. In this tablet it is recorded how a certain king-priest Ziusudra, warned of an approaching deluge which the assembly of the gods had decreed for the purpose of destroying mankind (despite the groanings of the goddess Ishtar for her people), built a huge boat in which he "rode out" the threatened catastrophe. This tablet dates from about 2000 B.C., but the story had been known in Mesopotamia for centuries. It is found in Akkadian versions from both Babylonia and Assyria, in more than one composition. The best known of these is the one mentioned above, which forms part of Tablet XI of the longer composition, the Epic of Gilgamesh, and which was an Assyrian recension of the Akkadian, and in which Ziusudra of the older Sumerian version reappears as the legendary hero under the name of Utnapishtim ("the day of life").

As the story is given in the Assyrian (generally designated the Babylonian) narrative, the hero Gilgamesh is seeking the last survivor of the great Flood to learn from him the secret of immortality. After crossing difficult mountain ranges and successfully navigating the Waters of Death, Gilgamesh finally meets Utnapishtim, who tells him all about his salvation from the Flood through his obedience to the god Ea, the god of wisdom. The follow-

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

ing is Utnapishtim's story, as summarized in texts by Cornfeld (AtD), Unger AOT), Archer (SOTI), et al (translations in quotes from Pritchard [Ed], *Ancient Near East Texts*). The gods in assembly had decided on the destruction of mankind by a flood. The god Ea wanted to warn Utnapishtim, but apparently it was forbidden to divulge the proceedings of the assembly. Nevertheless Ea devised a strategy by which he enabled Utnapishtim, who dwelt at Shuruppak, a city on the Euphrates, to escape the impending doom by means of a huge cube-shaped boat. The poet then describes the approaching storm: "The gods were frightened by the deluge; the gods crouched like dogs." Especially did Ishtar, the sweet-voiced mistress of the gods, bewail her part in the destruction of her people by the Flood; and after contemplating the terrible doom that was falling upon mankind as a consequence of their decree, all the gods mourned. The storm, which was brief, lasting only six days and six nights, was of such violence of wind and rain, that the gods themselves were terrified. After landing on Mount Nisir, one of the mountains of "Urartu" (Ararat?) in the Zagros Range northeast of Babylon, the ark held fast, and Utnapishtim sent out, in the order named, a dove, a swallow, and a raven. The raven did not return. Then he let out all "to the four winds and offered a sacrifice." The gods responded in a most undignified way to the sacrifice so gratefully offered by the hero: "The gods smelled the savor, The gods smelled the sweet savor, The gods crowded like flies about the sacrifice." Enlil (or Bel) showed up later incensed that Utnapishtim had escaped death, but Ea successfully appealed to his sense of justice, and thereupon he elevated Utnapishtim and his wife to a blessed immortality. (It is interesting to note here than in an older version of the Flood tradition—the Atrahasis Epic—a different, and very significant, cause of the Deluge is

## GENESIS

given. "The land became wide, the people became numerous, the land hummed like a lyre (or: bellowed like old oxen). The god (Enlil) was disturbed by the uproar. Enlil heard their clamor, And said to the great gods: 'Oppressive has become the clamor of mankind; by their clamor they prevent sleep.'" This sounds very much like the cause of Divine judgment declared in Genesis 6:13: "The earth is filled with violence." It bears not too remote a resemblance to the clamor—riots, revolutions, demonstrations, orgies, cruelties, wars—of mankind in our own time.

What, then, are we to conclude as regards the relation between the Babylonian and the Hebrew accounts of the great Deluge? It must be admitted that there are several striking similarities. Unger (AOT, 55-65) lists these as follows: both accounts (1) state explicitly that the Flood was divinely planned; (2) agree that the fact of the impending catastrophe was divinely revealed to the hero involved; (3) connect the Deluge with moral degeneracy of the human race; (4) tell of the deliverance of the hero and his family; (5) assert that the hero was divinely instructed to build a huge boat for this deliverance; (6) indicate the physical causes of the Flood; (7) specify the duration of the Flood; (8) name the landing place of the boat; (9) tell of the sending forth of birds at certain intervals to ascertain the measure of the subsidence of the waters; (10) describe acts of worship by the hero after his deliverance; (11) allude to the bestowing of special blessings on the hero following the disaster.

On the other hand, account must be taken of the differences in details between the narratives, and in those details especially that are of ethical and spiritual significance. Heidel (GEOTP, 14) has carefully analyzed a number of these differences (repeated briefly by Morris and Whitcomb [GF, 39] according to the following table:

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

### *Genesis Narrative*

### *Babylonian Account*

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| 1. The <i>Author</i><br>of the Flood                 | The one living and true God brought on the Flood to wipe out universal human degeneracy.   | The Flood was invoked by the rashness of the god Enlil, and in opposition to the will of the other gods.   |
| 2. The <i>Announcement</i><br>of the Flood           | God Himself warned Noah of the impending judgment, but gave man 120 years to repent and reform.  | The fact of impending doom is kept as a secret by the gods, but Utnapishtim is surreptitiously warned of it by the god Ea.   |
| 3. The <i>Ark</i> and its<br><i>Occupants</i>        | Noah's ark is said to have been 300 x 50 x 50 cubits, with three decks, carrying eight persons, two pairs of each unclean animal species, seven pairs of each clean animal species, plus the necessary food. | The Ark is 120 x 120 x 120 cubits, with nine decks, carrying the hero's family and relatives plus all his gold and silver, the boatman, all craftsmen (or learned men), and "the seed of all living creatures."  |
| 4. <i>Causes</i> and <i>Duration</i><br>of the Flood | Caused by the breaking up of the fountains of the great deep and the openings of the windows of heaven, continuing for 150 days followed by an additional 221 days during which the waters subsided.         | The only cause mentioned is rain, and this lasted only six days, then after an unspecified number of days the occupants left the vessel.   |
| 5. The <i>Birds</i>                                  | A raven is sent out first, then a dove three times at intervals of seven days.   | A dove is sent out first, then a swallow, and finally a raven, at unspecified intervals. No mention is made of the olive leaf.   |
| 6. The <i>Sacrifice</i><br>and <i>Blessings</i>      | The Lord graciously received Noah's sacrifice, gave him and his family a commission to repopulate the earth, emphasized the sanctity of human life, promised never again to destroy the earth by a flood.    | The hungry gods "gathered like flies" around the offerer because they had been so long deprived of food. A quarrel between Enlil and Ea ensued. Finally Enlil blessed Utnapishtim and his wife, after being rebuked by Ea for his rashness in bringing the Flood upon them. Finally, the hero and his wife were rewarded by deification. |

## GENESIS

What, then, can we reasonably conclude about the relation between these two Flood narratives? *That the Babylonians borrowed from the Genesis account?* Hardly, because the earliest known tablets from Mesopotamia are undoubtedly much older than the book of Genesis: indeed they are dated back as far as the third millenium B.C. On the other hand, it is possible that the version of the Deluge given us in Genesis may have existed in some form, even possibly in oral tradition, centuries before it became embodied by supervisory inspiration of the Spirit in the Mosaic account. Then can we accept the view advanced by certain archaeologists, *That the Genesis account is a borrowing from earlier Babylonian traditions?* Or, *that it was a transplant, as some have contended, from western Amorite traditions both to Palestine and to Babylonia?* Here, however, we encounter an insuperable difficulty—that of the divergent character, in motif and in tone, of the two accounts. That is to say, the Biblical account of the Flood is so far more rational, consistent, and ethically elevated in content, that it would be unreasonable to assume that it is in any respect borrowed from, or de-thetical earlier sources. For example, in the Babylonian Flood story the gods are represented as gathering clouds and bringing on thunder and lightning, thus producing such fearsome celestial clamor; that the terror of the storm drives the gods themselves into the most inaccessible heaven. But, as Kaufmann points out, in the Genesis account there is no mention of terrifying natural spectacles; on the contrary, “God brings on the Flood by opening the gates of the deep and the windows of heaven; clouds are not even mentioned,” nor is there any mention of “divine raging in storm.” Cornfeld (AtD, 31): “The parallels between the Biblical account and the Babylonian version are fairly obvious and at times remarkable for their resemblance, though the major part of the Epic of Gilgamesh is far different. Its polytheist spirit is in contrast

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

with the basic purpose of the Hebrew narrative. In form the latter is impersonal and it purports to account for God's actions, his motives and his judgment by the depravity of humanity. The story told by Utnapishtim is in the form of an illustrative tale, in which he tries to convince his listeners that immortality was granted to him under unique circumstances, never again to be achieved by a mortal. It contains no judgment on the concern of the gods or on the moral conduct of man." (See Unger, AOT, 65-71, for a thoroughgoing presentation of the vast differences between the two accounts, in their conceptions of God, in their moral conceptions, and even in their philosophical assumptions—hopeless confusion of matter and spirit and attribution of eternity to both, etc.).

Finally, in this connection, could it possibly be, as a third explanation of the relation between the two accounts, *that both might have originated from a common source which had its beginning in an actual occurrence?* On this point, Unger (ATO, 70) quotes A. T. Clay (*The Origin of Biblical Traditions, Yale Oriental Series, XII* [1923], p. 164) as follows: "Assyriologists, as far as I know, have generally dismissed as an impossibility the idea that there was a common Semitic tradition, which developed in Israel in one way, and in Babylonia in another. They have unreservedly declared that the Biblical stories have been borrowed from Babylonia, in which land they were indigenous. To me it has always seemed perfectly reasonable that both stories had a common origin among the Semites, some of whom entered Babylonia, while others carried their traditions into Palestine." To this, Unger himself adds (ATO, 71): "The Hebrews scarcely lived an isolated life, and it would be strange indeed if they did not possess similar traditions as other Semitic nations. These common traditions among the Hebrews are reflected in the true and authentic facts given them by divine inspiration in their sacred writings. Moses very likely was

## GENESIS

conversant with these traditions. If he was, inspiration enabled him to record them accurately, purged of all their crude polytheistic incrustations and to adapt them to the elevated framework of truth and pure monotheism. If he was not, the Spirit of God was able to give him the revelation of these events apart from the need of any oral or written sources. In either case supernatural inspiration was equally necessary, whether to purge the perverted polytheistic tradition and refine it to fit the mold of monotheism or to give an original revelation of the authentic facts apart from oral or written sources." We are in complete agreement with these conclusions.

### 7. *The Physiographic Causes of the Flood*

(1) *Gen.* 7:11; cf. 8:2. (a) "*All the fountains of the great deep were broken up*" (R.S.V., "burst forth"). T. Lewis (CDHCG, 305) suggests that the "great deep" here refers to the concept of subterranean oceans from which the waters burst forth. Likewise Skinner (ICCG, 164): "Outbursts of subterranean water are a frequent accompaniment of seismic disturbances in the alluvial districts of great rivers; and a knowledge of this fact must have suggested the feature here expressed. In accordance with ancient ideas, however, it is conceived as an eruption of the subterranean ocean on which the earth was believed to rest. At the same time *the windows of heaven were opened* allowing the waters of the heavenly ocean to mingle with the lower." The view seems to prevail among commentators that the phrase, "fountains of the great deep" implies that the waters of all seas broke out and poured over the land, that the earth was rent asunder in many areas, and great fissures or chasms appeared on its surface. But such changes as these are cataclysmic, such as are caused only by earthquakes, volcanic activities, tidal waves, etc. (Cf., however, my *Genesis*, Vol. I, pp. 270-276, in which it is emphasized that the "deep" of *Gen.* 1:2 could well have been *the depths of infinite space*, on the basis

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

of the meaning of the context in which the word occurs, and on the basis also of the fact that in the thinking of the ancients what we today call *chaos* really did mean *empty space*. Of course, all such events as those associated with the bursting forth of subterranean waters and even with the downpour of waters in the form of rain *incur atmospheric changes of all kinds* (and surely the "firmament" [literally, "expanse"] of Gen. 1:6-8 is descriptive of the regions of the atmosphere which make up space in general). Lange suggests this fact, in relation to the meaning of Gen. 7:11 (CDHCG, 305): "*All the fountains of the great deep were broken up*: the passive form denotes violent changes in the depths of the sea or in the action of the earth—at all events in the atmosphere.") (b) "*The windows of heaven were opened*" (A.S.V., "the heavens"); that is, the flood-gates (sluices) were opened for rain from above. "*And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights.*" Literally, "*there was violent rain,*" etc. The verb here is not that which is used to designate any rain, but that which clearly designates torrential rain: it is used of other things which God is said to pour down from heaven (Exo. 9:18, 16:4). (For the phrase "windows of heaven," see Gen. 8:2, 2 Ki. 7:19, Isa. 24:18, Mal. 3:10.) Whitelaw (PCG, 117, 118): "Though the language is metaphorical and optical, it clearly points to a change in the land level by which the ocean waters overflowed the depressed continent, accompanied with heavy and continuous rain, as the cause of the Deluge . . . yet 'the exact statement of the natural causes that concurred in the Deluge is a circumstance which certainly in no wise removes the miraculous nature of the whole fact—who has unveiled the mysteries of nature?—but certainly shows how exact was the attention paid to the external phenomena of the Deluge' (Havernick)." But, someone may object, the water cycle on our planet operates in a closed system. The critic overlooks the fact that the



## GENESIS

Flood could have changed the original balance between lands and seas and heavy rain of the duration specified could have contributed greatly to this change. But—*where did all the water come from?* Rehwinkel suggests: (a) in normal times there are areas in the world where heavy rains continue to fall day after day, year in and year out; (b) there is clear evidence that the Flood was accompanied by an abrupt change in climate resulting finally in the rigors of the polar regions of the earth; (c) extensive volcanic activities in all parts of the earth could have contributed to the formation of clouds and heavy rainfall. In a word, the impact of these sudden changes must have been terrific as cold air and cold water currents met and mingled with the warm, producing mountains of fog and cloud rising into the air and discharging their load in torrential rains. *Noah's flood was not just a "normal" flood—it was cataclysmic. This is in harmony with the teaching of Scripture from beginning to end, that special Divine Judgments are, to say the least, horrendous, producing catastrophe and temporary chaos in the physical world, and terror in all mortals who experience them (cf. Exo. 19:16-24; Rom. 2:8-11; Heb. 10:26-31, 12:18-29; Rev. 4:5, 6:15-17). Even the experience of the Divine Presence in blessing is awesome beyond the power of mortal man to apprehend or describe in words (cf. Gen. 19:16-17).*

8. *Successive Stages in the Increase of the Flood (7:17-19).*

V. 17: The waters increased, that is, *grew great*: this first increase was marked by the elevation of the Ark above the land. V. 18: The waters increased greatly, the second degree of increase marked by the moving (floating) of the Ark upon the waters. V. 19—The waters prevailed (became strong) exceedingly, the third degree of increase being marked by the submergence of the high mountains. Note Whitelaw's comment here (PCG, 119):

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

"While it is admitted that the words may depict a complete submergence of the globe, it is maintained by many competent scholars that the necessities of exegesis demand only a partial inundation." Again (p. 121) in reference to the universality of the Flood: "The conclusion seems to be that, while Scripture does not imperatively forbid the idea of a partial Delugem science seems to require it, and, without ascribing to all the scientific objections that are urged against the universality of the Flood that importance which their authors assign to them, it may be safely affirmed that there is considerable reason for believing that the *mabbul* which swept away the antediluvian men was confined to the region which they inhabited." (For the pros and cons of this controversy, see PCG, under "Homiletics," pp. 119-121). Strange as it may seem, Murphy, whose orthodoxy can hardly be questioned, takes the same view. He writes (MG, 193): "*Upon the land.* The land is to be understood of the portion of the earth's surface known to man. This, with an unknown margin beyond it, was covered with the waters. But this is all that Scripture warrants us to assert. Concerning the distant parts of Europe, the continents of Africa, America, or Australia, we can say nothing. *All the hills were covered.* Not a hill was above water within the horizon of the spectator or of man." Again (p. 192): "The beautiful figure of the windows of the skies being opened is preceded by the equally striking one of the fountains of the great deep being broken up. This was the chief source of the flood. A change in the level of the land was accomplished. That which had emerged from the waters of the third day of the last creation was now again submerged. The waters of the great deep now broke their bounds, flowed in on the sunken hurface, and drowned the world of man, with all its inhabitants. The accompanying heavy rain of forty days and nights was, in reality, only a subsidiary instrument in the deluging of

## GENESIS

the land." (It should be noted here that Murphy renders *erets* as "land" and *har* as "hills" [not "mountains"] in these verses.) (All these various excerpts from eminent authorities of all persuasions—"conservative" or "liberal" or in-between—certainly show that the controversy between the advocates of the universal-flood theory and those of the localized-flood theory is still going on, and without any prospect of dogmatic resolution. The author of the present text must confess that he is inclined to the acceptance of the vigorous presentation of the universal-flood theory, as found in the texts by Rehwinkel, and by Morris and Whitcomb.)

### 9. *The Contents of the Ark.*

(1) These included Noah and his wife, their three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, and their respective wives, eight persons in all (Gen. 7:7, 8:17; also 1 Pet. 3:20; 2 Pet. 2:5); of every living species, by twos, that is, male and female (6:19, 7:2, 7:8-9; and 7:15-16, which especially makes it clear that "two and two" means, "by twos," or male and female). It seems evident that in the first communication from God (6:19), which was given 120 years previous to the actual event, when detailed instructions were not as yet necessary, it was simply stated that the animals should be preserved by pairs; that in the second, when the Ark was finished and the animals were about to be assembled, an exception was to be made to the previously announced general rule, namely, that not just one pair, but seven pairs of one kind (*clean* animals) and two pairs of another kind (*unclean* animals), were to be preserved. (Cf. 7:2, "*of beasts that are not clean by two*," etc. Whitelaw [PCG, 115]: "Cf. Gen. 2:25, where the phrase denotes the ethical personality of human beings, to which there is here an approximation, as the preserved animals were designed to be the parents of subsequent races. The usual phrase which is employed in ch. 1:28 [a so-called Elohist] and ch. 7:3 [a so-called Jehovist]

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

section] refers to the physical distinction of sex in human beings.") (This, of course, negates the notion sometimes suggested that "seven and seven" of 7:2, or "by sevens," specifies three pairs, with one left over for sacrificial purposes.) To sum up: Of living species all went in *by twos*, male and female (6:19), divided as follows: of *clean* animals, seven pairs of every kind (7:14), of *unclean* animals, two pairs of every kind (7:2), of birds of the heavens, seven pairs of every kind (7:3). (Note especially the significance of the word *kind*, as used in 7:14 of all these categories.) Cf. 6:19-20, 7:14, and 7:21-23: it will be noted that the classification here is precisely that which is given in the first chapter of Genesis (v. 24) to describe the different *kinds* of land animals, namely, *cattle* (domesticated animals, mainly Herbivora, probably), *beasts of the field* (wild beasts, roughly Carnivora), and *creeping things* (reptiles, insects, and very small quadrupeds). Morris and Whitcomb affirm—rightly, this author believes—that these passages destroy the argument that is frequently offered, that only domesticated animals were taken into the Ark. They write (GF, 13): "If only domesticated animals were to be taken into the Ark, are we to assume that only domesticated animals were created by God in the first chapter of Genesis? The fact of the matter is that no clearer terms could have been employed by the author than those which he did employ to express the idea of *the totality of air-breathing animals in the world*. Once this point is conceded, all controversy as to the geographical extent of the Deluge must end; for no one would care to maintain that all land animals were confined to the Mesopotamian Valley in the days of Noah." (Cf. Gen. 6:7; 6:17; 6:12-13, 19-21; 7:2-4; 8, 14-16; 8:1, 17-19; 9:8-17, and especially 7:21-23, with Gen. 1:20-27). (NBD, 427: "No mention is made of sea-creatures, but these may have been included in 'every living thing of all flesh' [6:19] and could have been accomodated outside

## GENESIS

not a matter of any consequence to Noah—he needed a boat for *floating* only). (Cf. the construction of Odysseus' "raft," *Odyssey* V, 243-261.)

(2) Again, *What shall we say about the capacity of the Ark in relation to its cargo?* This raises the question as to what the word "kind" includes, with reference to the Ark's living cargo (7:14). The problem is not how "kinds" are classified by man, but how they are classified by God; not what man means by the term, but what God means by it, for, let us not forget, it is God who, by His Spirit, is telling the story. Does "kind," then, refer to a phylum, or a genus, or to a species? The common unit in such classifications by scientists is the *species*, which is roughly defined as a distinct (hence, "specific") kind of animal or plant whose members breed together and produce fertile offspring, *though not necessarily a rigidly fixed kind*. Because protoplasm is characterized by the power of molding itself to various environments, the lines of classification cannot be regarded as inevitably determined. As a matter of fact, as Rehwinkel puts it (*Fl*, 71), "a species is a concept in the eye of the scientist." (It seems to be a tendency among present-day zoologists to multiply species unnecessarily.) How many species are there in the world today? Who can say? How many were there in Noah's time? Again, who can say? Were there as many in Noah's time as there are today? Who knows, or even can know? (It seems obvious that the remains of prehistoric species—e.g., dinosaurs, brontosaurus, ichthyosaurs, pterodactyls, mammoths, etc.—were fossilized either before the Flood or as a consequence of the Flood.) Biologists of our day suppose a classification of fifteen separate phyla. But life, we are told, tends to appear in these few basic forms and then to move in ever-spreading diversity. We simply do not know, we cannot know, how many "kinds" are in existence today, much less how many there were in Noah's day or how many were represented in the

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

animal population of the Ark. All we need know, as a matter of fact, is that the diversity was sufficient to allow for the preservation of those species (prototypes) necessary for the preservation of all species, necessary to the total life of the inhabited world, and necessary in a special sense to the welfare of man, the crown of the whole creation (Ps. 8).

Concerning the problem of the Ark and its cargo, Archer (SOTI, 200) presents one view, as follows: "There are, of course, manifold problems connected with maintaining such a large number of animals over so many months (especially if they maintained their normal eating habits), but none of them are insuperable. Perhaps it should be remarked at this point that a mere local flood, only coextensive with the human race in the Mesopotamian or Aral-Caspian depressions is hard to reconcile with the divine insistence (cf. Gen. 6:19, 20) upon the preservation of representatives of all the various kinds of animal. There are very few species today which are confined to that particular region, and so it is difficult to see why the animals in the surrounding, non-flooded area would not have been able to repopulate the devastated region without hindrance, once the waters had receded. Hence it would have been pointless to include them in the Ark." T. Lewis (CDHCG, 298) really states the crux of the problem in these words: "There is more force in the objection arising from the stowage of the ark, if we take the common estimate of the animals. But here, again, everything depends upon the theory with which we start. Throughout the account the several *alls* . . . become universal or specific, widen or contract, according to our pre-judgment of the universality or partiality of the flood itself." (This writer's Excursus on this problem, CDHCG, 314-322, is recommended as being probably the most thoroughgoing defense of the localized-Flood theory available to the student. The excerpts quoted in foregoing

## GENESIS

sections will serve to show that there is disagreement as to whether the Flood was universal or only regional in extent, even among authorities who do not even question the Divine inspiration and authority of the Bible.)

(3) Again, *How was it possible for eight persons to feed and provide drink for all the different animals housed in the Ark for more than a year? How was it possible for them to clean the vessel? How could the Ark have accommodated the natural increase of the animals in it?* In answer to these related problems, the suggestion has often been made that probably the animals *hibernated* during the greater part of the time they were in the Ark. This certainly is not beyond the realm of possibility, and it surely would provide a solution for many troublesome questions.. However, it implies a miraculous interference with the living habits of most of the animals aboard, and certainly Divine interference for Divine ends, by the Divine Intelligence and Will which is the constitution of all being, is not to be ruled out arbitrarily, except by those "intellectuals" who pride themselves on being known as "naturalists." But, after all what is *nature*? Certainly it is not an entity in itself; rather, it is only a convenient term for observed phenomena. And who knows, as Santayana is said to have put it, but that the "supernatural" is simply the "not-as-yet-understood natural"? As for the task of keeping the Ark clean and sanitary, at least for human occupancy, we may well suppose—to use a favorite Darwinian phrase—that this too was accomplished in some satisfactory manner by Divine direction. Again, could not the natural increase of species have been controlled by means known to those persons who were in charge of the Ark and its cargo? It would appear that this might have been accomplished by separation of females from the males at proper rhythmic intervals natural to each kind: indeed it is possible that the sexes were kept separate throughout their entire occupancy of the vessel;

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

according to Scripture their procreative functions were to be renewed especially for repopulating the *postdiluvian* world with their various "kinds." Moreover, should there have been increase of the various "kinds" (of clean animals especially) within the Ark, this undoubtedly would have been used for food and for sacrificial purposes also. If the Ark was of the dimensions indicated above, the stowage of necessary vegetable food ("fodder") for the animals seems not to involve too great a problem. As for preservation of plant life, that is no problem whatsoever. The life of the plant is in the seed, of course. And seeds that were buried beneath the sands of Egypt five thousand years ago have been dug up, planted, and found to reproduce their respective kinds. Therefore, it follows that Noah had only to preserve intact the seeds of the various plant forms to effect the restoration of all kinds of flora in the postdiluvian world.

### 11. *The Distinction Between Clean and Unclean Animals*

It should be noted that this distinction prevailed prior to the building of the Ark: it was embodied in God's specifications as to the kinds of species, and numbers of each kind, that were to be taken into it (Gen. 7:2). There is no evidence that the distinction originated after the Flood or even in connection with the Flood. On the contrary, Scripture points indubitably to the fact that the distinction was an integral part of the Law of Sacrifice from the beginning. In Genesis 4:4, we are told that Abel brought of the "firstlings" of his flock, that is, on the basis of "the best for God," and, undoubtedly by Divine authorization, to point forward to God's Firstborn (Only Begotten) as the Lamb of God slain (in the Eternal Purpose) "from the foundation of the world" (Exo. 12:3, 5; Exo. 13:12; John 1:29, 3:16; Col. 1:15, 18; Heb. 1:6; Isa. 53:7; Rev. 1:5, 13:8; Matt. 25:34; Rev. 17:8; 1 Pet. 1:18-21). Although this distinction involved the moral virtue of obedience, it was essentially a *positive*



## GENESIS

enactment; that is, its validity rested solely on the ground that God ordained it. (It must be remembered that a moral law is commanded because it is right *per se*, whereas a positive law is right because God commands it.) This distinction between clean and unclean animals was carried over into the Mosaic System, not only in connection with the institution of sacrifice, but also with respect to man's food. Clean beasts included the following: "whatsoever parteth the hoof, and is clovenfooted, and sheweth the cud, among the beasts, that ye may eat" (Lev. 1:1-3). It did not suffice for an animal to possess only one of these characteristics: it had to possess all three of them to be classed as a clean animal. Sacrificial victims had to be taken from clean animals and birds (Gen. 8:20): these could be bullock, goat, sheep, dove, or pigeon (Lev. 11:1-3, Gen. 15:9), but not camel, hog, ass, or hare (Lev. 11:4-8, 46-47; Exo. 13:13). As shown in previous sections herein, the Law of Sacrifice is coetaneous with true religion (Gen. 3:21, 4:1-5; Heb. 11:4; Rom. 10:17).

### 12. *The Supernatural in the Genesis Story of the Flood*

(1) Much has been said and written about the "natural" and the "superatural" in the Biblical account of the Deluge. It is not necessary, however, to assume that a universal Flood would have necessitated (as Ramm puts it, CVSS, 244) "an endless supplying of miracles." On the other hand there are certain aspects of the narrative which clearly indicate special Divine intervention, that is, "supernatural" Divine activities, commonly called "mighty works" or "miracles," works which lie beyond the scope of human power to effect (cf. Acts 2:22). This supernatural element cannot be ruled out altogether, nor can it be "explained away": it is there to be reckoned with, if the Deluge was anything like the event described in Genesis, and especially if it accomplished the ends for which God brought it on the wicked antediluvian world.

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

(2) It will be noted, first of all, that it was God who warned Noah of the impending judgment, that it was God who gave Noah the plans and specifications for the Ark and its contents by means of which they were to ride out the catastrophe in safety; that it was God who, when the vessel was completed, invited Noah to come into it with all the members of his house (7:1). It was God who said to Noah concerning the animals, "two of every sort *shall come unto thee*" (6:20); hence we read that "*they went in unto Noah into the ark*, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath of life" (7:15). Note well that God directed the animals *to come* unto Noah, not Noah to go in search of the animals (6:20; 7:9, 15). As Noah and the members of his house, eight souls in all (1 Pet. 3:20), went in unto God into the Ark, so all the animals went in unto Noah into the Ark, to man who was by God's appointment lord tenant of the creation (Gen. 1:27-28). How is this gathering of the species unto Noah to be accounted for? Obviously, only by a Divine impartation to them of some form of *instinctive* migratory response which impelled them to their destination. After all, what is *instinct* but the Universal Intelligence operating through the whole of the subhuman world to direct all species to the actualization of their respective inherent ends of being? Rehwinkel (Fl, 72): "In the expression 'they came' it is clearly indicated that the animals collected about Noah and entered the ark of their own accord, that is, without any special effort on Noah's part. The animals came by instinct, but God had planted in them this special instinct for this occasion. Just as, in the beginning, God had brought the animals to Adam that he should name them, so he now brought them to Noah that he might keep them in the ark for a replenishing of the earth after the Flood." Morris and Whitcomb (GF, 76): "Once we grant God's power in

## GENESIS

bringing the animals *to* the Ark, we have no right to deny His power over the animals while they were *in* the Ark. The simple fact of the matter is that one cannot have *any* kind of a Genesis Flood without acknowledging the presence of supernatural elements" (cf. Ps. 29:10, where the reference is clearly to the Noahic Deluge, *mabbul*). Again: "That God intervened in a supernatural way to gather the animals into the Ark and to keep them under control during the year of the Flood is explicitly stated in the text of Scripture. Furthermore, it is obvious that the opening of the 'windows of heaven' in order to allow 'the waters which were above the firmament' to fall upon the earth, and the breaking up of 'all the fountains of the great deep' were supernatural acts of God. But throughout the entire process, 'the waters which were above the firmament' and 'the waters which were under the firmament' acted according to the known laws of hydrostatics and hydrodynamics."

(3) Again, in this connection, Lange (CDHCG, 295) notes that "the history of the Flood is a *hapax legomenon* in the world's history, analogous to the creation of Adam, the birth and history of Christ, and the future history of the world's end." And again Morris and Whitcomb (GF, 793: "Whether or not such a concept can be adjusted harmoniously into one's theological or philosophical presuppositions, it happens to be true nonetheless that the Flood was an utterly unique and never-to-be-repeated phenomenon, a year-long demonstration of the omnipotence of a righteous God which mankind has never been permitted to forget, and a crisis in earth-history that is comparable in Scripture only to the creation and to the final renovation of the earth by fire at the end of the age. It is because the Bible itself teaches us these things that we are fully justified in appealing to *the power of God*, whether or not He used means amenable to our

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

scientific understanding, for the gathering of two of every kind of animal into the Ark and for the care and preservation of those animals in the Ark during the 371 days of the Flood."

(4) Finally, it should be noted well that once Noah and his family, and the animals, and the food for their sustenance, had all been gathered into the Ark during the seven days of embarkation, it was Yahew who closed the door of the Ark and shut them in, thus sheltering them from the catastrophe which broke upon the earth in all its fury: from the raging of the elements and from the blind rage no doubt of a wicked generation whose sins had finally found them out (Num. 32:23, Gal. 6:7). (I am reminded of the title of a sermon by a preacher friend, "What Happened to the Carpenters who Helped Noah Build the Ark?") Noah could—and did—build the Ark according to the specifications God had given him, he could receive the animals who came to him for deliverance from the Flood, he could spend 120 years warning the ungodly antediluvian world of the terrible judgment about to descend upon them, and calling them—all in vain—to repentance and reformation of life, but when in God's time-clock the period of probation came to its end, it was God Himself, and *only* God, who could close the door of the Refuge provided by His grace for the eight souls whom He found worthy of His mercy (cf. Deut. 33:27; Psa. 46:1, 62:7, 94:22; Jer. 16:19).

### 13. *The Embarkation*

In the six hundredth year of Noah's life the Ark was completed (7:6). Note 7:4—"for yet seven days," that is, *after seven days*: in this interim the embarkation was begun and completed. "In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month, on the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were

## GENESIS

opened" (7:11). The Flood was upon the world. God's judgments on the unbelieving and the impenitent may be delayed by His longsuffering grace, *but they are inevitable* (cf. 2 Pet, 2:4-10).

\* \* \* \* \*

### FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

#### *New Testament Witness to the Genesis Narrative of the Flood*

The applications of the Genesis account of the Flood to Christian teaching and life, as found in the New Testament, are most significant, as follows: 1. It is referred to *as evidence of God's judgment and justice* (2 Pet. 2:4-10, cf. Psa. 89:14, Gal. 6:7-8). 2. It is referred to *as a warning of our Lord's Second Coming* (Matt. 24:37-39, Luke 17:26-30). 3. It is referred to *as an example of the faith that leads to salvation* (Heb. 11:7, Jas. 2:14-26). 4. It is referred to *as prototypical in certain respects of the Gospel Plan of Salvation* (1 Pet. 3:19-21: note the phrase, A.S.V., "after a true likeness"; A.S.V. marginal, "in the antitype"; A.V., "the like figure"; R.S.V., "baptism, which corresponds to this"). In this Scripture we are told that through the Holy Spirit, Christ went and preached unto the spirits in prison, that is, in the prison-house of sin (Isa. 42:7, 61:1), when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah "while the ark was a preparing." (It seems obvious that the Divine message was communicated to the antediluvian world through Noah who, consequently, is called "a preacher of righteousness" to those of his own time, 2 Pet. 2:5.) (Cf. 1 Cor. 1:21, Rom. 10:6-17, 1 Thess. 2:13).

#### *Analogies Between Noah's Deliverance and Salvation in Christ*

The following analogies between Noah's deliverance from "the world of the ungodly" (2 Pet. 2:5) and our deliverance from the guilt and consequences of sin on the

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

terms of the New Covenant ("the keys of the kingdom of heaven," Matt. 16:19; cf. Eph. 1:13, Rom. 10:16, 2 Thess. 1:8, 1 Pet. 4:17), are clearly indicated in Scripture as follows: 1. Noah was saved by the *grace* of God (Gen. 6:8—grace is *unmerited favor*); so are we saved by grace. No man was ever saved by virtue of his own merits; salvation is, without exception, an outpouring of Divine grace. It is through the grace of God that redemption has been provided for fallen man (Tit. 2:11, Eph. 2:8, John 3:16). 2. Noah was saved by *faith*: so are we. (Heb. 11:6, 7; Rom. 5:1; Mark 16:16; John 20:30-31). We are *not* saved by faith *alone*, but by faith as the continuous principle which motivates us to repentance, obedience, and good works (Jas. 2:14-26). 3. Noah was saved by *godly fear*. Moved by godly fear, he prepared an ark to the saving of his house (Heb. 11:7). Likewise, when we are moved by godly sorrow, by the awareness of God's goodness, we *turn* from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God: this is *repentance*. (2 Cor. 5:11, Heb. 10:31, Rom. 2:4, 2 Cor. 7:10, Luke 13:3, Acts 17:30, Matt. 12:41; Jonah 3:8, Isa. 55:7, Acts 26:18). 4. Noah and his house were saved *through water*, the transitional element through which they passed from the world of the ungodly into a world cleansed of its wickedness. The antitype is Christian baptism, immersion (Rom. 6:4-6, 1 Pet. 3:19-21, Acts 2:38-47, Gal. 3:27, Matt. 28:18-20). In each of the nine cases of conversion recorded in the book of Acts specific mention is made that those who obeyed the Gospel were baptized. For all accountable human beings, baptism was, and is, the line which divides the world and the church, the kingdom of Satan and the Kingdom of Christ. When Jesus had expired on the Cross, one of the Roman soldiers pierced His side with a spear, and out of the wound came blood and water (John 19:34). We are saved, if saved at all, by the efficacy of Christ's blood which was shed for the sin of the world (John 1:29,

## GENESIS

1 John 1:7), and the only place divinely appointed where the penitent believer meets the efficacy of that blood is the grave of water (baptism): cf. Rom. 6:1-7, Gal. 3:27. Water is the transitional element through which the believing penitent passes from Satan's authority, the kingdom of this world, into the jurisdiction (reign, authority) of Christ, the Kingdom of God's Son (Col. 1:13, 2 Cor. 4:4, Eph. 2:2). Hence we are baptized *into the name*, that is, into the authority, into the jurisdiction, of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19). Although baptism involves the moral virtue of obedience, it is indicative essentially of this *change of relationship* (Gal. 3:27). Baptism is the institution in which Divine grace and human faith meet together, and the Divine promise inseparably linked to it for the obedient believer is remission of sins (Acts 2:38). No doubt this is the reason why it has been so persistently attacked by Satan throughout our entire Christian era, by Satan acting through human agency, and in particular through churchmen, who have ignored it, distorted it, belittle it, ridiculed it, and actually blasphemed it and the Lord who ordained it. Because it stands here, at the entrance to the church, the ordinance which marks the dividing line between the world and the church, it is against this ordinance that Satan has directed his most vicious and unrelenting warfare. Men still call baptism "a mere outward act," "a mere external performance," etc. When in the name of all that is holy did our Lord ever go into the business of setting up "mere outward acts" or "mere external performances," or "mere" anything? 5. Noah was saved through the instrumentality of the *Ark*. The ark points forward both to Christ and to the Church: to be *in* Christ is to be in the Church, which is the Body of Christ (Gal. 3:27, Rom. 8:1, 2 Cor. 5:17, Eph. 1:22-23, Col. 1:18). 6. To summarize: Noah was not saved by grace *alone*, nor by faith *alone*, nor by repentance *alone*, nor by

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

the water *alone*, nor by the Ark *alone*, but by *all of these* as constituting the total Divine plan of deliverance. Similarly, in the Christian Dispensation, we are not saved by faith *alone*, nor by repentance *alone*, nor by baptism *alone*, nor by the church *alone*, but by all these taken together as constituting the Gospel Plan of Salvation. And even to these must be added the essentials of the Spiritual Life, because life, in any form, is growth, and where there is no growth, there is only stagnation and death. "Eternal security" is realized only by God and His saints working together, in God's way, and according to God's plan. (Acts 2:42; 2 Pet. 3:18, 1:5-11; Phil. 2:12-13; 1 Cor. 15:58; Gal. 5:22-25; Rom. 14:17; Heb. 12:14, etc.).

### *Analogies Between the Ark and the Church*

We do not insist here that Scripture specifically declares the Ark to have been a type of the Church. We simply call attention to many interesting, and meaningful, analogies between the two institutions (Rom. 15:4), as follows: 1. The Ark was made of *gopher wood* throughout; that is to say, of one and only one kind of material (Gen. 6:14). Similarly, the Church, the Body of Christ is made up of just one kind of material—baptized penitent believers (Eph. 2:19-22, 2:10; 1 Pet. 2:1-5; Acts 2:38-47, 8:12, 8:34-39, 10:47-48, 16:14-15, 16:31-34, 18:8, 22:16; Rom. 10:9-10, 6:1-11; John 3:5; Col. 2:11-12; Gal. 3:26-27). Christ has but one Body, the Church (John 10:16, 17:20-21; Eph. 4:4-6, Matt. 16:18; 1 Cor. 12:12). In our days, it is common to exhort a man "to join the church of his choice." But this is nonsense from the Scriptural point of view, for two reasons: (1) no man "joins" church: instead, he obeys the Gospel commands and then the Lord adds him to His Church (Acts 2:47); (2) our Lord has established the Church, His Body, in which salvation is to be enjoyed, and has given us the pattern of this Church in the apostolic writings (Acts 1:1-3; John 14:26, 16:13-15; 2 Pet. 1:3; Jude 3; 2 Tim.



## GENESIS

3:16-17). This Church is the *one* Body of Christ; He purchased her with His own precious blood (Eph. 4:4, Matt. 16:16, Eph. 5:23, Acts 20:28). In a word, the choice of Church has already been made by our Lord, the Head (Eph. 1:20-23). There is no salvation in denominationalism; salvation is possible only by one's living and dying in Christ (Gal. 3:27, Rom. 8:1, Rev. 14:13), and to live and die in Christ is to live and die in the true Church. 2. There was one window in the Ark. (Note how this differs from the usual pictorial representations of the vessel as a kind of flatboat with windows on all sides like portholes.) Just what this was, and how it was built into the vessel has always been a matter of some speculation. The consensus seems to be that it was an opening of some kind extending around the top of the Ark constructed either to reach within a cubit of the edge of the roof or a cubit below the roof (Gen. 6:16). A window is the medium through which light shines into a building from an outside source. The Word (Bible) is the window through which the Holy Spirit provides spiritual light for the Church (1 Cor. 2:9-11; Psa. 119:105, 130; 2 Tim. 3:16-17, Rom. 10:6-11). We have so many denominations in Christendom simply because men have added so many windows. The Holy Spirit, shining into a man's heart through the Bible alone, will make nothing more nor less than a *Christian* (Acts 11:26, 26:28; 1 Pet. 4:16; Col. 3:17; Acts 4:11-12). 3. There was one door in the Ark (6:16). Christ is the Door to the Church (John 10:7, 9). Faith, repentance, confession lead *unto* the Door (Rom. 10:10, Matt. 10:32-33, 2 Cor. 7:10); baptism leads *into* the Door (Gal. 3:27). (It is equally true, of course, that all of these taken together induct one *into* the Door.) To be in Christ is to be in the Door and in the Church (Acts 2:47). 4. *Clean animals* went into the Ark first. Jews were admitted to the Church first (John 1:11, Acts 2:5-7, Rom. 1:16). 5. *Unclean*

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

*animals* were taken in last. Similarly, Gentiles were admitted to the Church several years after Pentecost (Acts 10, 11:1-18, 15:7-11). 6. When all the occupants were inside the Ark, it was Yahwe who closed the door. The door to the Church was opened on Pentecost and stands wide open today; nor will it be closed until the Lord comes again. He alone has the authority (that is, moral power, the right) to open the Door of the Church and to close it. And when He shall close it, it will be closed forever. And, as in the days of Noah, so shall it be at the coming of the Son of man (Matt. 24:37, Luke 17:26), the cry of the ungodly, shut out forever from the presence of God, will be the cry of uncontrollable despair. So intense will be their sense of loss that they will cry for the rocks and the mountains to fall upon them and hide them from the righteous wrath of Eternal Holiness (Rev. 6:16-17, Matt. 25:31-46, John 5:28-29, 1 Cor. 15:50-57).

\* \* \* \*

### REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART TWENTY-ONE

1. What were the two classes in the *moral* world before the Flood?
2. What general condition precipitated the Divine Judgment on the antediluvian world?
3. How can it be said that God "changes because He is unchangeable"?
4. How is God's *repentance* to be explained?
5. What is meant by the *physical* world before the Flood?
6. What might be the import of the Hebrew word *crets* in relation to the extent of the Flood?
7. Summarize what Dr. Jauncey has to say about the extent of the Flood.
8. Summarize what B. S. Dean has to say about this problem.
9. What are Ramm's arguments against the universal-Flood theory?

## GENESIS

10. Summarize Archer's review of Ramm's arguments.
11. List Mitchell's remarks about the extent of the Flood.
12. State the gist of Milligan's treatment of the subject.
13. State Archer's three objections to the view that only a part of the race perished in the Deluge.
14. State Morris' argument for the universality of the Flood.
15. Give his summary of the "geologic implications" of the Genesis account.
16. What is the theory of uniformitarianism?
17. Can this theory be extended to explain anything more than changes in the permanently fashioned earth?
18. Show why it cannot be used to explain the origin of the earth.
19. Summarize Rehwinkel's account of the earth and its inhabitants prior to the Flood. On what does he base his conclusions?
20. Summarize the seven arguments for a universal Flood as presented by Morris and Whitcomb.
21. What are the four Biblical reasons which they give to support their view?
22. What two reasons do they give for maintaining that the human race could not have been confined to the Mesopotamian region prior to the Deluge?
23. Review the objections to the view that we have in the Genesis narrative "parallel accounts" of the Flood.
24. What is meant by the *repetitive* characteristic of the Old Testament writings?
25. How universal are the traditions of the Flood?
26. What conclusions are we to derive from this universality?
27. List the similarities between the Babylonian and Genesis accounts of the Flood.
28. List the differences. What do the Jewish authors, Kaufmann and Cornfeld, have to say about these differences?

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

29. What is Unger's general conclusion about the origin of the Genesis account?
30. Is there any justification for ignoring the revelatory work of the Spirit of God in this case? Why, then, is it ignored by so many so-called "scholars"?
31. State the physiographic causes of the Flood.
32. Identify the successive stages in the increase of the Flood.
33. How many persons went into the Ark, and who were they?
34. How many pairs of each kind of clean animals went into the Ark? How many pairs of each kind of unclean animals?
35. What probable needs were there for the greater number of clean animals?
36. What is the probable meaning of the phrases, "two of every sort," "two and two" or "by twos"?
37. What other material completed the Ark's cargo?
38. What is the probable meaning of the term "kind" in this classification?
39. Compare this classification of kinds as given in the Flood story with that of the Creation narrative (Gen. 1:24).
40. What are the objections to the view that only domesticated animals were taken into the Ark?
41. What probably was the capacity of the Ark?
42. What were the dimensions of it?
43. How do you suppose it was possible for eight persons to feed and provide drink for all the animals on board for so long a time, probably more than a year?
44. How could they have cleansed the vessel?
45. How do you suppose the Ark could have accommodated the natural increase of the animals on board?
46. Could hibernation be a solution for these troublesome questions?

## GENESIS

47. What were the characteristics of a clean animal in Old Testament times?
48. How did this distinction between clean and unclean animals arise? When, and in connection with what institution, must it have originated?
49. Why do we say that this distinction must have been a positive law?
50. What is the distinction between a moral law and a positive law?
51. List the supernatural elements in the Genesis account of the Deluge.
52. How do we account for the assembling of the animals at one time to enter the Ark?
53. With what two other crucial events in God's Cosmic Plan is the Flood to be associated?
54. How did Peter apply the story of the Flood as evidence of God's unfailing justice?
55. What does the writer of Hebrews tell us about Noah's faith?
56. How did Jesus associate the Flood story with the circumstances of His Second Coming?
57. List the analogies between Noah's deliverance from the wicked antediluvian world and our deliverance from the bondage of sin under the New Covenant.
58. What factors entered into Noah's deliverance? What factors enter into our salvation through the atoning blood of Christ?
59. In what sense did water as the transitional element through which Noah's deliverance was accomplished *typify* Christian baptism? Where is the Scripture to be found which states this truth?
60. In what sense was Noah saved "through water"?
61. What is the design of baptism in God's Eternal Purpose?
62. Why is this ordinance downgraded, even belittled and blasphemed, by churchmen?

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

63. What do we mean by saying that in baptism Divine grace and human faith find a meeting place?
64. What does God promise us through our obedience in baptism (Acts 2:38).
65. List the analogies between Christ and the Church.
66. How many windows in the Ark? How does the Scripture representation of the Ark differ from pictorial representations of it as a kind of flatboat with windows all around it like portholes?
67. How many doors did the Ark have?
68. What function is served by a window? How many windows in the Church?
69. Show how window-adding by human authority has divided Christendom.
70. Who is the Door to the Fold (the Church)?
71. What are the Scripture requirements for entrance into this Door?
72. What people were first admitted to the Church of Christ? Who were last to be admitted? How are these facts analogous to the reception of the animals into the Ark?
73. When the entire cargo of living beings and accompanying stowage had been gathered into the Ark, who closed the door?
74. Who *only* has the authority to open and to close the Door of the Church?
75. Has our Lord Himself chosen the Church through which salvation will be enjoyed? Where is the pattern of this Church to be found?
76. Is this Church a denomination of any kind? When and by whom will the Door to the Church of Christ be closed for ever?
77. What will be the ultimate destiny of those left outside?
78. What, according to Scripture (2 Pet. 3:1-13), will be the character of the next—and last—universal judgment?

PART TWENTY-TWO:  
THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD  
(Gen. 8:1-22, 9:1-29)

1. *The Subsidence of the Flood (8:1-14).*

*"And God remembered Noah, and all the beasts, and all the cattle that were with him in the ark: and God made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters assuaged; 2 the fountains also of the deep and the windows of heaven were stopped, and the rain from heaven was restrained; 3 and the waters returned from off the earth continually: and after the end of a hundred and fifty days, the waters decreased. 4 And the ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat. 5 And the waters decreased continually until the tenth month: in the tenth month, on the first day of the month, were the tops of the mountains seen. 6 And it came to pass at the end of forty days, that Noah opened the window of the ark which he had made: 7 and he sent forth a raven, and it went forth to and fro, until the waters were dried up from off the earth. 8 And he sent forth a dove from him, to see if the waters were abated from off the face of the ground; 9 but the dove found no rest for the sole of her foot, and she returned unto him to the ark: for the waters were on the face of the whole earth: and he put forth his hand, and took her, and brought her in unto him into the ark. 10 And he stayed yet other seven days; and again he sent forth the dove out of the ark; 11 and the dove came in to him at eventide; and, lo, in her mouth an olive-leaf plucked off: so Noah knew that the waters were abated from off the earth. 12 And he stayed yet other seven days, and sent forth the dove; and she returned not again unto him any more. 13 And it came to pass in the six hundred and first year, in the first month, the first day of the month, the waters were dried up from off*

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

*the earth; and Noah removed the covering of the Ark, and looked, and, behold the face of the ground was dried. 14 And in the second month, on the seven and twentieth day of the month, was the earth dry."*

### 2. *The Chronology of the Flood.*

(1) Noah entered the Ark on the 17th day of the second month of the 600th year of his life (7:11). The earth was found to be dry on the 27th day of the second month of the 601st year of his life (8:14). On the basis of a thirty-day month, this means that the duration of the Flood was 371 days. (This total is computed as follows: Of the 600th year of Noah's life, the 14 remaining days of the second month must be added to the 300 days of the next ten months; that is, 314 days in all. [Note that Noah removed the covering of the Ark on the first day of the first month of the next (601st) year of Noah's life (8:13), hence it follows that 314 days elapsed between the entrance into the Ark, and the removal of the covering of the Ark.] Now, of the 601st year of Noah's life, to the first month of 30 days must be added the 27 days of the second month, that is, 57 days in all. The two figures, 314 days and 57 days, give us a total of 371 days of Noah's life that were spent in the Ark. These figures serve as a framework for determining the details that we get, on breaking down the various phases of the duration of the Flood.)

(2) These 371 days break down into two general parts: the period of "prevailing" (7:24) and the period of "assuaging" or abating (8:1).

(3) The period of "prevailing" began with torrential rains extending over a period of 40 days (7:12); then followed an additional rise of the waters for 110 days (as a consequence of the awesome terrestrial, oceanic, seismic, and stratospheric forces that were unleashed); that is, 150 days in all (7:24).



## GENESIS

(4) The period of abating (8:1) included a phase of decrease which extended from the 17th day of the seventh month to the 1st day of the tenth month (8:4-5), that is, 13 plus 30 plus 30 plus 1, or 74 days in all; an additional forty days until Noah sent forth the raven (8:6-7); then seven days (by implication of the phrase, v. 10, "other seven days") until he sent forth the dove the first time (8:8), another seven days until he sent forth the dove a second time (8:10-11), and still another seven days until he sent forth the dove the third and last time (8:12). It will thus be seen that we have now accounted for 150 plus 74 plus 40 plus 21 days, or 285 in all. But the chronology of Noah's life, as given above, in which we find that 314 days elapsed between the entering into the Ark and the removal of the covering of the Ark (8:13) indicates a period of 29 days between these two events (314 minus 285 days: cf. again 7:11 and 8:13). And it was 57 days after this that the whole earth was found to be dry enough for the disembarkation (8:14). (It should be noted that only "the face of the ground" was found to be dry when the covering of the Ark was removed, 8:13). Adding all these figures, 40 plus 110 plus 74 plus 40 plus 21 plus 29 plus 57, we have a total of 371 days between the occupancy of the Ark and the withdrawal therefrom. (See E. F. Kevan, NBD, 427).

(5) There certainly is a noticeable lack of any discrepancy in these various figures. For example: (a) After the waters had "prevailed upon the earth" 150 days, they began to "assuage" (8:1). (b) On the same day the Ark rested on the mountains of Ararat (Urartu of Assyrian inscriptions) between the lakes of Van and Urmia. That is, the 17th day of the seventh month, the day on which the Ark came to rest (8:4) was exactly 150 days after the Flood began on the 17th day of the second month (7:11). (Note well: The circumstances that, from the beginning of rainfall to the grounding of the Ark on

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

seems not to be an insoluble problem. Evidently they returned to the sources whence they came, that is, all that were not congealed in polar icecaps and glacial beds, or buried in newly formed subterranean seas. But—*Is there enough water on our planet to cover the entire earth?* Eminent authorities tell us: (a) that the proportion of land area to water area on the earth is about three-tenths to seven-tenths (that is, there is more than twice as much water as land); (b) that the average depth of the ocean is twelve times the average height of the land surface (hence, if deeper parts of the ocean and the highest elevations of land were brought to an average level, a world-wide ocean that would cover the entire earth to the depth of one and one-half miles would be produced); (c) that, moreover, if the water now stored in the form of ice at the polar icecaps and glacial beds were released, the volume of the ocean would be raised by one hundred and fifty feet; (d) that if in addition to all these changes, there were others of a cataclysmic nature, such as the rise of sea beds and the sinking of continents, there is no difficulty whatever to find enough water for a flood that would cover the whole earth. And it must be remembered that even though God apparently unleashed natural forces in bringing on the Flood, the fact still remains that the phenomenon as a whole was essentially supernatural in character. We do not propose here to set limits to the power of God nor to enter into a controversy with the Lord Jesus Christ. We see no reason for assuming, however, that the Genesis Flood was in any respect a violation of the natural fact that "the water cycle on our planet operates in a closed system."

(9) *God remembered Noah and all the creatures with him in the Ark.* (8:1). Lange (CDHCG, 309): "God has always remembered Noah—but *now* he remembers him in a special sense—that he may accomplish his deliverance. There comes a turn in the flood, and the ground

## GENESIS

of it lay in the government of God. To the rule of judgment upon the human world, succeeds the rule of compassion for the deliverance of Noah and humanity, as also of the animal-world. It is his *compassion*, not simply his *grace*. For God also remembered the beasts." God remembers the survivors in mercy (cf. Gen. 19:29, 30:22). God remembers man's sins when He punishes them (cf. Ps. 25:7), and the needs of His people when He supplies them (Neh. 5:19). One wonders if Noah, throughout all those dark days in the Ark, did not become depressed by a feeling that God must have forgotten him. (Cf. the words of Moses, Num. 11:11-15; those of Habakkuk the prophet [1:2-4]; those of the Psalmist, 44:24; and especially the cry of Jesus from the Cross, Matt. 27:46). But "even when we seem lost to everything else we are not lost to God." In Whittier's words:

"I only know I cannot drift  
Beyond His love and care."

*And God also remembered the animals with Noah in the Ark*, "a touching indication of the tenderness of God toward His creatures." Skinner (ICCG, 165): "The inclusion of the animals in the kindly thought of the Almighty is a touch of nature which should not be overlooked." (Cf. Deut. 25:4; Psalms 36:6, 145:9, 15, 16; Jonah 4:11). The passage is anthropomorphic, of course, essentially anthropopathic: it has been said rightly that "the most God could do for man was to supply him with an anthropomorphic image of Himself."

(10) *The Raven and the Dove*. The raven, an unclean bird, a bird of prey capable of sustaining itself by feeding on carrion, was a creature especially fitted for the mission imposed upon it. This bird was evidently so named because of its black color (cf. Prov. 30:17, Song of Sol. 5:11): note the Latin equivalent *corvus*. There are numerous references to the *dove* in Scripture (e.g., Lev.

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

5:7, 12:6 [its use for sacrificial purposes]; Psa. 68:13 [its beautiful plumage]; Psa. 55:6 [its power of flight]; Isa. 38:14, 59:11 [its plaintive cry]; Matt. 10:16 [its gentleness]). The dove is also an emblem of the purity and gentleness of the Holy Spirit: cf. Matt. 3:16-17, Luke 3:21-22, John 1:32-34, Acts 10:38. Owen (DHS, 46): "At the beginning of the old creation, the Spirit of God moved on the waters, cherishing and communicating a prolific, vivifying quality to the whole, as a dove gently moves upon its eggs, communicating vital heat; so at the new creation, He comes as a dove upon Him who was the immediate author of it." Skinner (ICCG, 156): "The description of the return and admission of the dove is unsurpassed . . . for tenderness and beauty of imagination." Note also the account of the *freshly plucked olive-leaf* (8:11). The olive tree did not grow at great altitudes, and is said to have flourished even under water. The olive branch is frequently mentioned in ancient literature as an emblem of peace. Brownville (SHS, 23): "As John describes the descent of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove, he distinctly says that the Spirit is to remain as an abiding presence in Him [Christ: cf. John 1:29-34]. Referring back to the experience of Noah, we remember that when the window of the ark was opened for the third time and the dove sent forth, it did not return but went to its abiding-place on the cleansed earth. Thus the Holy Spirit did not go back into heaven, but abode in Jesus in all His fullness. This fullness of the Spirit was His not only at all times in the Incarnation, but eternally; we cannot divide the Trinity of the Godhead. But here it is manifest, that we might believe and understand." Marsh (EHS, 9-18): "Noah's dove came forth from the ark. God's Dove came from heaven. There are two thoughts suggested by this. As the dove came forth from the ark, the ark being a type of Christ, so the Holy Spirit, because of what Christ is, and has done, comes forth to

## GENESIS

the earth of man's iniquity; and to tell him of the only ark of salvation wherein he can find safety and peace. The lighting of the Holy Spirit on Christ as the Dove proclaims two things; first, He could come as the Dove on the Lamb of God, for there was a correspondence between the spotlessness of God's Lamb and the gentleness of God's Dove. Second, He came upon Christ as the Dove, to qualify Him for his ministry, and to act through Him in blessing to others." Again: "What were the results from the sending forth of the dove from the ark, and the coming of the Spirit upon Christ? There were three sendings forth of the dove from the ark. The first time it found no rest for the sole of its feet, and returned to the ark. Josephus says that 'the dove came back to Noah with her wings and feet all muddy.' May we not take this as illustrative of the fact that in all the missions of the Spirit, from the Fall to the coming of Christ, He always had to bear testimony to man's sin and iniquity? . . . The second time the dove came back to the ark with an olive-leaf in its mouth, which is significantly said to be 'plucked off.' The word means, to be freshly torn from the tree. The Hebrew word *Taraph* comes from a root which means to tear in pieces, and is generally used to describe the action of wild beasts in rending their prey to pieces. It is rendered 'rent in pieces' in Gen. 37:33, where Jacob takes it for granted that Joseph had been killed by a wild beast when he sees blood-stained garments of Joseph. The same root is given as 'ravening' in Psalms 22:13, where Christ speaks of the wicked who were surrounding Him like a lot of wild beasts. Rotherham translates this verse, 'They have opened wide their mouth, a lion *rending* and roaring.' Putting these Scriptures together, do they not suggest to us the thought, that as the olive-leaf was torn off, and the dove bore in its mouth this emblem of peace, so the Holy Spirit bears testimony to the death of Christ, Who was 'cut off' out of the land

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

of the living for our transgressions, and now proclaims that Christ has made peace by the blood of His cross? The third time the dove came forth from the ark it did not return. It had found a resting-place. So with the Holy Spirit. He had gone to and fro from the presence of the Lord, in Old Testament times, finding no resting-place, but when He beheld the One in Whom God delighted, then He rested upon Him. The first three gospels mention that the Spirit descended or lighted upon Christ; but John adds, the Spirit 'abode' upon Him. The Greek word *meno* means to dwell, and is so rendered again and again. God rested after His creative work; Christ in figure having accomplished His redemptive work, rests in the sanctification of God (Heb. 4:10); and now the Spirit rests upon Christ, henceforth to find His permanent abode in Him. All His mission emanates from Christ, all His blessings are found in Him, all His instructions are from Him, all His ministry is toward Him, all His unfoldings are about Him, all His aim is to enhance His glory, and all His working in the believer is to reproduce Him. . . . Why is the Holy Spirit given to believers? For the same reason that the dove came to Noah, and the Spirit came upon Christ. First, to assure us that for us the judgment of sin is past, for the storm has burst upon Christ and has exhausted itself upon Him. Second, to take up His abode in the mystical body of Christ through our union with the Head, and to impart His nature and infuse His grace in every part. . . . We can only rise to the dove-like character as we have the fullness of the Dove-like Indweller." This author goes on to name the chief characteristics of the dove as *purity* (Song of S. 2:14, 6:8-9; cf. Eph. 5:22-23, John 3:29; Rev. 21:2, 22:17, 2 Cor. 11:2; Col. 3:12; 1 Pet. 2:5; Gal. 5:22-25); as *cleanness*, hence suitable for sacrifice; as *gentleness* of manner (cf. Matt. 5:3, 5, 9; 10:16; Rom. 8:9); and as

## GENESIS

*constancy* (cf. Rom. 12:1; 1 Cor. 15:58; Rev. 2:7, 11, 17; 3:3, 12, 21). (Doves, we are told, are strictly monogamous). "The very fact that the dove could be offered in sacrifice is proof that it was a clean bird. Two of the characteristics of a clean bird were that it could fly and that it did not feed upon flesh. All grain-feeding birds that did not feed upon flesh were clean. The difference between a raven and the dove is plainly to be seen in the two which were sent out of the ark. The raven did not come back into the ark; it undoubtedly found carrion outside upon which to feed; but the dove was forced by the necessity of hunger to come back to Noah. The Holy Spirit is very particular about the food upon which He feeds. His one aim and ministry is associated with the Word of God. He finds His satisfaction in making known the message God has given Him to reveal. He is the Inditer of the Word, and He is also the Explainer of it" (Marsh, EHS, 18). Biederwolf (HSHS, 178): "Think of the many beautiful characteristics of a dove. How lovely was the character of Jesus because of these dove-like traits, sweet-tempered and gentle, yet just like Him may we be. There is gentleness, tenderness, loveliness, innocence, mildness, peace, purity, patience—all this and more for him in whose heart is made a place for the dove-like Spirit to nestle." J. W. McGarvey (FG, 86): "The dove suggests purity, gentleness, peace, etc. In fact the nature of the bird makes it a fit emblem of the Spirit, for it comports well with the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22-23). The nations of the earth emblazon eagles upon their banners and lions upon their shields, but He who shall gather all nations into His kingdom appears as a Lamb, and his Spirit appeared under the symbol of a dove. Verily His kingdom is not of this world. It is a kingdom of peace and love, not of bloodshed and ambition. Noah's dove bore the olive branch, the symbol of peace, and the Holy

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

Spirit manifested Jesus, God's olive branch of peace sent into this world (Psa. 72:7, Luke 2:14, John 14:27, Eph. 2:11-18)."

(11) *The Covering of the Ark* (8:13). Since the word used here, *mikseh*, is used elsewhere only to designate the third and fourth covering of the ark of the testimony (Exo. 26:14, etc.) and of the holy vessels when the procession was on the march (Num. 4:8, 12), a covering made of leather and skins, it has been supposed that this was the kind of covering which Noah removed from the Ark, or, rather, it would seem from the *door* of the Ark. Lange thinks this does not necessarily follow, in view of the fact that "the deck of an ark on which the rain-storms spent their force, must surely be of as great stability as the ark itself" (CDHCG, 311). The *Jerusalem Bible* (p. 23) renders this: "Noah lifted back the hatch of the ark and looked out. The surface of the ground was dry." The hatch is defined, in nautical terms, as the covering of an opening in the deck: it would seem that in Noah's ark the opening must have been the *door*. *Was this covering designed to point forward to the Covering (Atonement) for man's burden of sin which was provided by our Lord up the Cross (John 1:29)?*

### 3. *The Disembarkation* (8:15-19).

"15 And God spake unto Noah, saying, 16 Go forth from the ark, thou, and thy wife, and thy sons, and thy sons' wives with thee. 17 Bring forth with thee every living thing that is with thee of all flesh, both birds, and cattle, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth; that they may breed abundantly in the earth, and be fruitful, and multiply upon the earth. 18 And Noah went forth, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him: 19 every beast, every creeping thing, and every bird, whatsoever moveth upon the earth, after their families, went forth out of the ark."



## GENESIS

(1) *Note that Noah obeyed God in every detail.* M. Henry (CWB, 21): "Noah did not stir until God bade him. Those only go under God's protection that follow God's direction and submit to his government." God had said to Noah, "Come thou and all thy house into the Ark" (7:1); once the occupants were all inside the Ark, God closed the door (7:16); and now that the Flood had abated and the earth was again ready for re-population, God spake unto Noah and his house, "Go forth from the ark" (8:16). Always it was God who directed, and *always* Noah obeyed. Again, Henry (CWB, 21): "Note, God consults our benefit rather than our desires. We would go out of the ark before the ground is dried: and perhaps, if the door be shut, are ready to remove the covering. God's time of showing mercy is certainly the best time, when the mercy is ripe for us and we are ready for it."

(2) *Note some interesting facts about Noah's family:*

(1) The name of Noah's wife is not given, nor are the names of the wives of Noah's sons. Though no mention is made of the fact specifically, it seems obvious that their loyalty to their husbands and to God was evidenced by their obedience. By way of contrast, the names of the women in the Line of Cain are given, and they are names which indicate sheer worldliness and irreligiousness (cf. 4:16-24).

(2) The sons of Noah were Shem, Ham, and Japheth. The etymology of these names is not certain but they seem to have the following import: Shem ("name," "renown"), Ham ("dark-colored"), and Japheth ("wide spreading," "he enlarges"). Traditionally Shem has been regarded the oldest of the three; however, there are authorities who take the position that Japheth was the eldest and Ham the youngest of the three (cf. 10:21). (See under Part XIX *supra*). (3) The language of Gen. 9:18-19 apparently forbids our assumption that Noah sired other

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

sons after the withdrawal from the ark; nor is there any statement made in earlier chapters (especially ch. 5) that Noah begat *sons and daughters*, as is made of each of the patriarchs who preceded him, before the Flood. (4) Finally, it is most significant—is it not?—that there is no indication that either Noah or any of his sons was a *polygamist*. This again is evidence of the general piety which seems to have characterized the Line of Seth. It seems evident that the men in the Ark respected the Divine origin and sanctity of the marriage relation.

(3) *The withdrawal from the Ark* took place on the 27th day of the second month of the 601st year of Noah's life. On that day Noah and his house, and all creatures that were with him in the Ark, came forth on dry land. They had gone into the Ark from a world filled with debauchery and violence; they came forth from the Ark into an earth purged by Divine judgment, new and clean, and bright with opportunity. "The Ark became the second cradle of the race: from it Noah and his family went forth to a new probation."

### 4. Noah's Altar (8:20-22).

20 *And Noah builded an altar unto Jehovah, and took of every clean beast, and of every clean bird, and offered burnt-offerings on the altar. And Jehovah smelled the sweet savor; and Jehovah said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake, for that the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth, neither will I again smite any more every living thing, as I have done. While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease."*

(1) These few verses are further evidence that Sacrifice had been a long-established Divine institution, dating indeed as the Bible dates it, from the very fountainhead of the race and the beginning of true religion (Gen. 4:1-8).

## GENESIS

(2) Note that Noah's first act on coming forth from the Ark was *to worship God*, and to do so in the manner and by the means which God had long before ordained. The means were three, as noted heretofore: the altar, the sacrifice, and the priesthood. From the beginning these have been the divinely established elements of true religion. The altar was a raised structure or mound of natural earth and stones: not hewn stones, because by Divine ordination to lift up a tool on it was to pollute it (Exo. 20:24-26). In this case, as throughout the Patriarchal Dispensation, Noah acted as priest (mediator) for his entire household; for his sacrifice "he took of every clean beast, and of every clean bird, and offered burnt-offerings on the altar." It is important to note, in this connection, that Noah worshiped God. Had he been a superstitious person, he would have prostrated himself before the Ark which was visible; instead he built his altar "unto Jehovah" the invisible but living and true God. Noah walked by faith: and faith knows that the things which are seen are temporal, that only the things which are not seen are eternal (Heb. 11:2, 2 Cor. 4:18). Note that these were *burnt-offerings*, that is, *things that ascend*, in allusion to the ascent of the smoke of such offerings to heaven (cf. Judg. 20:40, Jer. 48:15, Amos 4:10).

(3) *Note the Divine Soliloquy.* (a) The circumstances of Noah's offering were of Divine appointment, as evidenced by the fact that his service was accepted. "All religious services which are not perfumed with the odor of faith are of an ill savor before God" (Calvin). "Jehovah smelled the sweet savor." Whitelaw (PCG, 132): "The meaning is that the sacrifice of the patriarch was as acceptable to God as refreshing odors are to the senses of a man; and that which rendered it acceptable was (1) the feeling from which it sprang, whether gratitude or obedience; (2) the truths which it expressed—it was tanta-

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

mount to an acknowledgment of personal guilt, a devout recognition of the Divine mercy, an explicit declaration that he had been saved or could only be saved through the offering up of the life of another, and a cheerful consecration of his redeemed life to God; and (3) the great sacrifice of which it was a type." This Great Sacrifice was, of course, the Sacrifice of the Lamb of God for the sin of the world (John 1:29, Eph. 5:2). (b) The Divine soliloquy which follows (vv. 21-22) is rich in overtones. Bowie (IBG, 547-548): "Few sentences in Genesis reflect thought as naive as this. God is pleased with the smoke of sacrifice, and he begins to feel more warmly disposed. Like 'de Lawd' in *The Green Pastures*, he resigns himself to recognize that the heart of man is just about hopeless. It has been evil *from his youth*. So the only thing to do was to accept the situation and not put any dependence upon the possibility of correcting matters by another flood. There is something to the credit of humanity in the person of Noah, and that perhaps is all God can expect. As theology, that is childlike; yet there is a strange instinctive wisdom in it, just as there is sometimes in the pictures that children draw. There is the recognition that human sin is incredibly stubborn, that only a patient God could put up with it, that in spite of everything he will not visit upon us our deserts. The vision of what God's infinite compassion actually went out to do in Christ is a long way off, but even so the window of instinctive trust is open in that direction." Again, the sentiment is strongly anthropopathic, expressive, it would seem, of the Divine regret at so calamitous a judgment on man as the Deluge was, yet one that had to be, in the interest of absolute Justice.

5. *The Beginning of the Beginning Again* (9:1-7): *The New World-Order*. (This last felicitous phrase is borrowed from Skinner, ICCG, 169).

## GENESIS

*"And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth. 2 And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every bird of the heavens; with all wherewith the ground teemeth, and all the fishes of the sea, into your hand are they delivered. 3 Every moving thing that liveth shall be food for you; as the green herb have I given you all. 4 But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat. 5 And surely your blood, the blood of your lives, will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it: and at the hand of man, even at the hand of every man's brother, will I require the life of man. 6 Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man. 7 And you, be fruitful, and multiply; bring forth abundantly in the earth, and multiply therein."*

(1) The *Divine blessing* bestowed on Noah and his sons is an almost verbal repetition of the primeval blessing bestowed upon mankind (Gen. 1:28). It is conferred on Noah and his sons (and not upon their wives directly) as the new heads of the race. It is significant also that here (in contrast to 1:22) animals are not included in the Divine benediction. Man's dominion over the animals is reaffirmed, but now in the form of *fear and dread* on their part; "into your hand are they delivered," that is, the power of life and death over the subhuman orders is reestablished in man as lord tenant of the earth. (JB, 25, n.): "The laws of nature are stabilized again. Aware of man's continuing malice God nevertheless preserves what he himself has made and, in spite of man, will lead it to the goal that he has determined. In the beginning man was blessed and was consecrated lord of creation; he is now blessed and consecrated anew, but his rule is tranquil

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

no longer. In this new age man will be at war with the beasts and with his fellows. The peace of Paradise will not return until 'the latter days,' Isa. 11:6."

(2) The *central injunction* here is the authorization of the eating of animal flesh for food: "every moving thing that liveth shall be food for you" (thus excluding such as had died of themselves or been slain by other beasts: cf. Exo. 22:31, Lev. 22:8). We see no reason for assuming, as some commentators do, that man had been permitted only a vegetarian diet prior to the Flood: Skinner, for instance, speaks of the "central injunction" here as the "removal of the prohibition of animal food." Where is any such prohibition to be found in previous chapters of Genesis? Certainly 1:29-30, while expressly authorizing vegetarian food, does not in itself exclude the eating of meat. (But what about the expression, 9:3, "as the green herb I have given you all"? The JB renders it: "Every living and crawling thing shall provide food for you, no less than the foliage of plants." This makes sense). The view that animal food was permitted prior to the Flood is supported by the following matters. (a) the distinction between clean and unclean animals (this certainly implies some correlation between the more hygienic kinds of animal flesh and the use of it for food); (b) the language of 1:29 does not explicitly forbid the use of animal flesh for food; (c) shortly after the Fall, animals by Divine direction were slain for sacrifice, and hence probably for food also (by no means an unwarrantable inference from Gen. 4:4); (d) the sufficient reason for emphasis on the authorization of animal food in 9:3 is that it is subjoined with the restrictions which follows (9:4); however, it affords no ground for assuming the existence of previous limitations; (e) if the eating of animal flesh was supposed to heighten human sensuality ("carnality"), certainly vegetarianism thought to have

## GENESIS

been practised exclusively before the Flood, was no less productive of the same effect, as evident from the licentiousness and violence of the Line of Cain. We find no reason, therefore, for assuming that the human race was by Divine ordination or by any other authority restricted to a vegetarian diet before the Flood or after that event.

(3) *The Law Prohibiting the Eating of Blood* (9:4), that is, the eating of flesh from which the blood has not been properly drained. This prohibition, supposed to have been enjoined on all peoples through Noah who preceded Abraham by some ten generations (hence as universal in scope as the Rainbow Covenant), was later incorporated in the Mosaic legislation (Lev. 3:17, 7:26-27, 17:10-14, 19:26; Deut. 12:16, 23, 24; Deut. 15:23), and subsequently was imposed upon Gentile converts to Christianity by the authority of the Holy Spirit and the Apostles (Acts 15:21, 28-29). Among the reasons for the original promulgation of this law undoubtedly were the following: (a) the desire to guard against cruelty to animals; (b) the design to protect human life by demonstrating the inviolability which attaches in God's sight even to the lives of lower animals; (c) the intention to emphasize the sanctity of all life as God's most precious gift; (d) the design to point up the intimate connection between the blood and the life which subsists even in the animal world (cf. Lev. 17:10-13); (e) the design to emphasize especially its symbolic use in relation to atonement for sin (Heb. 9:22). Is not this law intended to enforce the truth in a special way that all life is sacred and must be restored to God before the flesh can be eaten? (W. Robertson Smith (RSFI, 338) suggests that this law originally may have been directed, at least in part, against the superstition that by eating the blood in which is the life of the totem animal, the worshiper appropriated the life and shared the attributes of the god thus worshiped.)

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

(4) *The Law against Murder* (9:5-7). (Murder is rightly defined as the taking of another man's life on one's own authority and with malice aforethought). (a) *Whoso sheddeth*, i.e., wilfully and unwarrantedly, and not simply *accidentally* (manslaughter, Num. 35:11), or *judicially*, for that is ordained here by the wording of the law itself. (*Man's blood*, literally the *blood of man*). *By man shall his blood be shed*: Whitelaw (PCG, 141): "Not openly and directly by God, but by man himself, acting of course as God's instrument and agent—an instruction which involved the setting up of the magisterial office by whom the sword might be borne." (The law here certainly harks back to the principle of *blood revenge* which had existed from the beginning [as implicit in the words of Cain, Gen. 4:14-15] and has continued to be practised for many centuries among primitive peoples, although in the verse before us the manner of execution is not specified. According to this procedure, when a murder was committed, the victim's relatives, usually by direction of the elders of the tribe, were bound to retaliate by taking the life of the murderer. This was earliest man's only means of preventing wholesale murder. He who took from his victim God's greatest gift and man's greatest possession, life itself, must needs forfeit his own life as the only penalty sufficient to restore the balance of justice.) (JB, 25n.): "The blood of every creature belongs to God, cf. Lev. 1:5f., but man's in particular because man was made to God's likeness. God will avenge human blood, cf. 4:10, and delegates this office to man himself to be exercised through the state, or, Num. 35:19f., through the individual 'avenger of blood.'" Murder has never been tolerated by any ethnic group because the right to life is man's fundamental right, and it is so because he was made in the image of God (v. 6). Whitelaw (PCG, 141): "*Shall*. Not merely a permissive legalising, but an imperative command enjoining, capital punishment,



## GENESIS

the reason for which follows: *for in the image of God made he man.*" Some expositors have found nothing in this law but an ordinary prophecy that the shedding of blood would always bring reprisal in civil law (in the form of capital punishment). It is plain, however, that the law against murder was a positive Divine enactment, and not a prophecy in any sense, as well as the penalty for its violation. Whether Christ, in any of his teaching, has given us the right to believe that the penalty has been removed, is yet an open question. "Given to Noah, this statute, however, was designed for the universal family of man, until repealed by the Authority who ordained it. Not having been exclusively a Jewish statute, the abrogation of the Mosaic economy does not affect its stability. Christ, not having come to destroy the fundamental laws of Heaven, may fairly be presumed to have left this standing. Inferences from the spirit of Christianity have no validity against an express Divine commandment." The principle of Atonement, operating between Heaven and earth, seems always to have been *life for life*. (It should be noted too that a beast which might kill a human being was to forfeit its life, just as any human murderer must do: cf. v. 5, Exo. 21:28-29). To summarize the precepts given here: animals could be killed for food, but the blood must not be eaten; though the life of animals might be taken, human life was to be held sacred. Some would hold that we have in addition to the law of abstinence from blood, and the law prohibiting murder, the recognition of civil authority (cf. Rom. 13:4).

### 6. *The Rainbow Covenant* (9:8-17).

"8 *And God spake unto Noah, and to his sons with him, saying, 9 And I, behold, I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you; 10 and with every living creature that is with you, the birds, the cattle, and every beast of the earth with you; of all that go out of*

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

*the ark, even every beast of the earth. 11 And I will establish my covenant with you; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of the flood; neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth. 12 And God said, this is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations; 13 I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth. 14 And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud, 15 and I will remember my covenant which is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh. 16 And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth. 17 And God said unto Noah, This is the token of the covenant which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth."*

(1) Note the word "covenant." It designates, not a compact, not a contract, not even an agreement, but a dispensation of Divine grace to be appropriated by human faith. The God of the Bible is a covenant God. God overtures and states the conditions: man accepts the conditions and thus enters into covenant relationship with God.

(2) *The Pre-Diluvian Covenant* (Gen. 6:18-22). In v. 18 here we have the first occurrence of the word *berith*, translated "covenant," in the Scriptures. God informs Noah that He will establish His covenant with him. "It is a sovereign dispensing of grace on God's part, and the security arises from the action of God. It is God's covenant, and He establishes it. Flowing from this dispensation to Noah there are corresponding obligations. Noah and his family were to come into the ark and he was to bring with him the specified number of animals and birds

## GENESIS

and creeping things. Thus there is no conflict between sovereign administration of grace and ensuing obligations" (NBD, 264).

(3) *The Post-Diluvian Covenant* (Gen. 9:8-17). (a) This covenant is unconditional, that is, unilateral: no conditions are specified as terms on which the Divine grace bestowed is made contingent. (b) It is conceived and established by God Himself. "There is no human contribution to the agency by which the promises are fulfilled. The sign does not even take the form of an ordinance to be performed by man at the divine behest. The bow in the cloud is for the purpose of attesting the faithfulness of God and, in anthropomorphic terms, is to bring to God's remembrance His covenant promise. It is not a sign over which men exercise any control." (c) It is universal in its scope. It embraces not only Noah but also his seed after him and every living creature. *It is a covenant between God and all flesh.* (d) It is everlasting. "No uncertainty or mutability can belong to God's unconditional promise." (e) The bow in the cloud is the sign of the covenant. (f) The essence of the covenant is that the earth shall never again be devastated by a Flood (cf. 8:21-22).

(4) *The Bow in the Cloud*: the token or sign of the covenant, that is to say, of the Divine promise. (a) Was this the first appearance of the rainbow? We think not. Experience informs us that a rainbow has always been formed when sunshine and rainfall occur in the relationship determined by the Lawgiver of the physical (astronomical) world. But, some will say, there was no rainfall before the Flood: they base their view on the words of Gen. 2:5-6. However, in these two verses we have (as explained in my *Genesis*, Vol. I, pp. 426-427) an account of the conditions that prevailed on the third "day" of the Creation, following the creation of energy-matter and

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

light (on Day 1), and the atmosphere (on Day 2), and the lands and seas (on Day 3), prior to the first appearance of plant life (on the same Day). All these physical phenomena—light, atmosphere, lands, seas—necessarily preceded the return of the vaporous substances (“mists”) to the earth in the form of rainfall. There is no reason for assuming that rainfall did not continue to occur from that point on, even to the age of the Flood when “the windows of heaven” were thrown wide open to let torrential rains through upon the wicked antediluvian peoples. (b) Note 9:13—“I do set my bow in the cloud.” White-law (PCG, 143): “Literally, *I have given*, or *placed*.” Rotherham (EB, 40): “My bow *have I set* in the cloud.” By way of comparison, when Jesus established the Communion service, He did not then make the bread or the fruit of the vine (Matt. 26:26-29, I Cor. 11:23-26): He merely selected these two substances which had existed from time immemorial and *appointed them* to be the emblems of His crucified sinless body and his shed blood as long as the Church should exist on this earth, that is, to the time of His Second Coming. So it was with the rainbow in Noah’s time: as if God said to the patriarch, “I have placed my bow in the cloud. I now appoint it to be a sign of the my covenant promise that I will never again bring a flood upon the earth to destroy mankind. Every time you and your posterity see this rainbow in the heavens you will remember my promise, and I will remember this, my everlasting covenant, which is between me and you and all living creatures.” Thus we rightly designate the Rainbow Covenant the Covenant of Hope. (JB, 25 n.): “The covenant with Noah, the rainbow its emblem, involves the whole creation: Abraham’s covenant, whose sign is to be circumcision, embraces his descendants only, Gn. 17; under Moses the Covenant is confined to Israel, and brings with it an obligation: fidelity to the Law, Ex. 19:5, 24:7-8, and to the sabbath observance in

## GENESIS

particular, Ex. 31:16-17.” The seal of the New (spiritual) Covenant is the Holy Spirit (2 Cor. 1:21-22; Eph. 1:10, 4:30).

### 7. Noah's Last Days (9:18-28.)

*“18 And the sons of Noah, that went forth from the ark, were Shem, and Ham, and Japheth: and Ham is the father of Canaan. 19 These three were the sons of Noah: and of these was the whole earth overspread. 20 And Noah began to be a husbandman, and planted a vineyard; and he drank of the wine, and was drunken; and he was uncovered within his tent. 22 And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without. 23 And Shem and Japheth took a garment, and laid it upon both their shoulders, and went backward, and covered the nakedness of their father; and their faces were backward, and they saw not their father's nakedness. 24 And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his youngest son had done unto him. 25 And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. 26 And he said, Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem; and let Canaan be his servant. 27 God enlarge Japheth, and let him dwell in the tents of Shem; and let Canaan be his servant. 28 And Noah lived after the flood three hundred and fifty years. 29 And all the days of Noah were nine hundred and fifty years; and he died.”*

### (1) Noah's Progeny (9:18-19).

(a) Cornfeld (AtD, 36): “Genesis does not tell us where Noah and his family lived after the Flood, but only that the earth was repopulated by Noah's three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. The chronicler regards Noah as the main link in the generations reaching to Abraham, and carefully notes that Ham, father of Canaan, is not of the same stock as Shem, the father of the Hebrews.” It should be noted, however, that the emphasis continues to be on the Messianic Line, beginning with Shem and

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

continuing through Noah to Abraham. Cornfeld again (AtD, 36): "As we continue to read the genealogies, we note that the focus grows more and more narrow. The emphasis at the conclusion is on Shem, the ancestor of the Semites (see Gen. 10:21-30), which include "all the sons of Eber" who embraced the Hebrews. The final narrowing of the generations of Eber would come in the next chapter: read 11:16-26)." (b) Of Shem, Ham, and Japheth it is said: "of these was the whole earth overspread." This statement leaves us little room for doubt that Noah sired no other children than the three sons mentioned. (Of course again we have to consider the fact that in this text *erets* could be just as correctly translated "land" as "earth.").

(2) *Noah's Sin* (9:20-23). "Noah began to be a husbandman, and planted a vineyard." A "husbandman" is a farmer, a tiller of the ground. Hence JB renders this line, "Noah, a tiller of the soil, was the first to plant the vine." This could mean, without any rending of the text and context, that he was the first to plant a vineyard *after the Flood*. Two views of this incident have been rather common among Bible students: one is that the patriarch, having been the first to cultivate a vineyard was not aware of the intoxicating qualities of its fruit, and that his intoxication was the consequence of this ignorance. Thus Skinner (ICCG, 181): "Noah is here introduced in an entirely different character, as the discoverer of the culture of the vine, and the first victim to immoderate indulgence in its fruit." The other view is simply that Noah, probably in an exuberance of joy over his deliverance and newly found freedom, imbibed a little too freely of the fermented juice of the grape, even to the point of intoxication and some of the shameful indecencies which not infrequently attend such over-indulgence. The present writer can hardly convince him-

## GENESIS

self that Noah was the first to plant a vineyard and hence was unaware of the intoxicating character of wine.<sup>o</sup> It is inconceivable that husbandry and vine cultivation were unknown throughout all those centuries before the Flood. Whitelaw (PCG, 148): "That Armenia is a vine-growing country is testified by Xenophon (*Anab.* iv, 4, 9). That the vine was abundantly cultivated in Egypt is evident from representations on the monuments, as well as from Scriptural allusions. The Egyptians said that Osiris, the Greeks that Dionýsos, the Romans that Saturn, first taught men the cultivation of the tree and the use of its fruits. . . . Though this is the first mention of wine in Scripture, it is scarcely possible that the natural process of fermentation for so many centuries escaped the notice of the enterprising Cainites, or even of the Sethites. . . . Since the sin of Noah cannot be ascribed to ignorance, it is perhaps right, as well as charitable, to attribute it to age and inadvertence. . . . But from whatever cause induced, the drunkenness of Noah was not entirely guiltless; it was sinful in itself, and led to futher shame." The simple fact is that Noah "slipped," lapsed, this one time only, we hope, from the path of virtue. He planted a vineyard and, doubtless through knowledge acquired in antediluvian experience, he made wine from the grapes which his vineyard produced. In spite of his lifelong piety, and his experience with the debauchery and viciousness of his former neighbors, recollections of which should have prompted him to restrain himself, he drank so much of the wine that he became intoxicated. Intoxication naturally leads to sensuality, carelessness, immodesty, and the like, and the old patriarch lay "uncovered" in his tent, that is, he shamefully exposed himself in some way in the presence of his sons. Ham, it seems, was the first to find him in this condition, and instead of being filled with pity on seeing his father in late age in such a maudlin

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

state, laughed about it as if the whole thing were a lark, and rushed to tell his brothers. Shem and Japheth immediately came to the tent, took a garment, and laid it on both their shoulders, and walking backward placed it over their father without even looking on his nakedness. Thus did the other two brothers act with becoming modesty while at the same time protecting their father's honor, whereas Ham had been guilty of a profane breach of filial piety and disregard for elders in general, which was an offense of the first magnitude among primitive and early historic peoples (cf. Exo. 20:12). (Noah's lapse in his old age is evidence that humankind was still a "fallen" race).

The fact should be re-emphasized here that *the Bible pictures life just as it is*. It is the only book in the world which portrays human character realistically. Not for one moment does it turn aside from the faithful record to conceal the weaknesses and derelictions of its great men: it pictures their lives just as they lived them. Biographers of men usually dwell glowingly on the virtues of those about whom they are writing, to the neglect of recording their faults. Not so with the Bible. No matter that Noah was "perfect" in his generations; no matter that he walked by faith; no matter that he was God's chosen representative in the Messianic Line; he finally sinned, and that in his declining years. And the Bible does not attempt to conceal his fault. There is no false modesty in the Book of Books. It uses old-fashioned words to designate old-fashioned things. It is primarily the *Book of Life*.

(3) *Noah's Prophecy* (9:24-27). We read that Noah "awoke from his wine, and knew what his youngest son had done unto him." Evidently he knew this by inspiration (or intuition?), and immediately uttered a series of terse prophetic statements which undoubtedly were inspired. We can hardly question this fact, because human



## GENESIS

history surely records, in broad outlines at least, the fulfillment of these pronouncements. (A word of caution here: I must be understood that the destinies of the peoples who sprang from the loins of Shem and Ham and Japheth were not foreordained to be what they were. Rather, these destinies were determined by the respective progenies themselves; however, they were foreknown to God and so could be communicated to Noah by Divine inspiration and thus disclosed to mankind long before they actually occurred. We must remember that foreknowledge does not necessarily imply foreordination, except with reference, of course, to the details of the Plan of Redemption. Obviously, in uttering these predictions Noah was not moved by personal resentment, but was acting simply as God's mouthpiece. Prophecy has always been used by the Spirit to attest the truth of revelation.)

(a) "Cursed be Canaan, A servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren." Note that the dominant feature of this entire prophecy is the curse on Canaan, which not only stands first, but is repeated in the blessing on the two brothers. It seems evident that prophetic insight testified that Canaan would inherit the profane disposition of his father, Ham, and that the Canaanites would abundantly deserve the destiny foretold of them; also that the curse was general in its nature and hence included the entire posterity of Ham and Canaan (for which see 10:6-20). Note the phrase, "a servant of servants," etc. This is the superlative degree, literally, "the meanest slave." The curse simply means that the descendants of Canaan were doomed to enslavement to the other two branches of the family. This destiny seemingly was reversed when Nimrod and Mizraim founded Babylonia and Egypt respectively. But it was abundantly fulfilled in early antiquity when the Canaanites in Joshua's time were partly exterminated and partly reduced to abject slavery by the Israelites who belonged to the family of Shem, and those

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

that remained were further reduced by Solomon (Josh. 9:23, 1 Ki. 9:20-21). It was fulfilled later when the Phoenicians, Carthaginians, and Egyptians, all of whom belonged to the Line of Canaan, were reduced to subjection by the Japhetic Persians, Macedonians, and Romans. These peoples, the Canaanites included, all were obsessed with the gross sexual indulgences characteristic of the ancient Cult of Fertility, as described by the Apostle Paul in Romans 1:18-32. It may be fulfilled too in the long-standing moral and spiritual (and cultural) backwardness of the South African peoples who perhaps more than any other have been forcibly reduced to abject slavery by Semitic, and more particularly Japhetic, nations. As a matter of fact, "African slavery" is one of the darkest blots on the whole history of mankind. The fact is that there is no moral ground on which any man can obtain a legitimate title to another man's person; this is true for the simple reason that one soul is worth as much as another in the sight of God and hence that Christ died for all men alike.

(b) "Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem, And let Canaan be his servant." To "bless" Yahweh is simply to praise Him. The blessing here must be *indirectly* a blessing on the Line of Shem, that is, in assuming the spiritual primacy of the Semites by virtue of their having Yahweh for their God. The second part of the prophecy was fulfilled in the conquest of Canaan under Joshua, Saul, David and Solomon. By the time the Israelites were ready to enter Canaan under Joshua, the Canaanites by their grossly idolatrous and licentious "religious" practices had proved themselves vessels fit only for destruction (Judg. 1:28, 31, 33; Gen. 15:13-16; Acts 7:6).

(c) "God enlarge Japheth, And let him dwell in the tents of Shem; And let Canaan be his servant." That is, "make room for the one who spreads abroad." This part

## GENESIS

of the prophecy was simply a foretelling of the widespread diffusion and remarkable prosperity of the Japhetic (Aryan) peoples; as a matter of fact, the history of the human family is largely the record of this "enlargement," geographically, politically, economically, and socially. Indeed the phenomenon is evident also in the extension of Biblical religion into all parts of the world. The descendants of Japheth pushed across Asia Minor into Europe, and moving thence both to the North and to the West they populated the European continent, ultimately finding their way to the shores of the Americas. Nordic, Alpine and Mediterranean peoples are all of the Line of Japheth. "And let him dwell in the tents of Shem." The fulfillment of this passage is obvious: certainly it occurred in the reception of the Gentiles into the duties, privileges, and rewards of Biblical religion, especially in the admission of the Gentiles into the Body of Christ (cf. Acts 10:44-48, 11:15-18; Eph. 2:11-18; 1 Cor. 12:12-13). Smith and Fields (OTH, 443): "Japheth has come to dwell in the tents of Shem as a result of the Semitic Jews' rejection of their Messiah, Jesus. When this occurred the Japhetic Gentiles were given the gospel of God and entered into the spiritual relationship with God that the Jews (except for a believing remnant) forfeited: Rom. 11:11, 20-24." The last part of this Noahic prophecy, "Let Canaan be his servant," was used for many years as a Divine warrant for the institution of African slavery. There is a great difference, however, between a positive command such as in Gen. 9:5-6, and an inspired *prophecy*. Even though Noah, looking into the future, may have foreseen the spiritual and cultural backwardness of many Hamitic peoples, still and all these words do not constitute a divine authorization of slavery. They should be looked upon as only a prophetic statement of what history shows to have been a fact.

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

(4) *Noah's Death* (9:28-29).

Noah, we are told here, lived after the Flood three hundred and fifty years. His life terminated, when he was nine hundred and fifty years old, on the same tragic note that characterizes the family of man: "an he died" (Heb. 9:27). It is interesting to note, in this connection, by way of comparison, that Abraham lived to be only one hundred and seventy-five years old (Gen. 25:7), and Moses only one hundred and twenty years old (Deut. 34:7). How shall we account for this constantly decreasing longevity?

\* \* \* \* \*

## FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

### *The Bow in the Cloud*

1. *The rainbow in the cloud was a most meaningful emblem.* It had the prime characteristic of *universality*. It is a phenomenon which occurs in all parts of the earth where there is the proper relation between sunshine and shower. The Rainbow Covenant was not for just one people, one nation, one race. Unlike the covenant of circumcision which was for the fleshly seed of Abraham only, the Rainbow Covenant was God's promise to the entire family of man, in fact, to "every living creature of all flesh" (9:15). Hence the sign of this covenant has to be one which is universal in scope, one that might be seen in every land. It was an *attractive* sign. Nothing is more beautiful, more attractive to the human eye, than the rainbow in the cloud. It stirs the finest of our emotions and the most fruitful of our meditations. In its selection, then, we detect another evidence of Divine grace. But, above all, it was a *hopeful* sign. It expresses the optimism of the entire book of Genesis. The darker the cloud, the more impressive is the bow in the cloud! And how forcefully this bow in the cloud reminds us of Calvary! There a cloud so dark descended upon the earth

## GENESIS

that even at midday there was intense darkness over the land (Matt. 27:45, Mark 15:33, Luke 23:44). But the eye of faith discerns in that, the heaviest cloud that ever gathered, the bright rainbow of eternal love suffering for a lost world! There is an aura of hope connected with the rainbow, even in Noah's experience, suggestive of the new world, the cleansed world, into which he had entered on withdrawing from the Ark, and of the Divine grace which had been extended to him all along the way. The Rainbow Covenant is rightly called the Covenant of Hope.

2. *The Rainbow Covenant teaches us that the blessings of nature are no longer conditioned on man's moral conduct.* All the blessings and benefits of what we call "the regular course of nature" are covenant blessings, flowing out of God's post-diluvian covenant with Noah. This covenant was to the effect that "while the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease" (8:22). Isaac Errett (EB, 80): "Even though the imaginations of men's hearts should be evil from their youth, the sun will rise, the moon will wax and wane, the rains will descend, and the seedtime and harvest will come in their appointed seasons. Men in their wickedness may deprive themselves of the blessings God thus designs to bestow, but His promise is none the less fulfilled. He makes the sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends His rain on the just and the unjust; for this is His promise (Matt. 5:45). Thus, as Paul writes, God 'left not himself without witness in that he did good and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with food and gladness' (Acts 14:17). When we pause to reflect on what science unfolds to us of the ceaseless motions of innumerable worlds, and learn how the slightest variation from the established order might plunge system after system into confusion and disaster, we cannot but adore that everlasting truthfulness and unfailing goodness which hold all

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

the mighty words and systems in harmony, and enable the astronomer to foretell for ages the sun's rising and setting, the transits of the planets, the eclipses of the sun and moon, and even the motions of comets. God's covenant of the day and night secures all this. God is forever true." *God is absolute Truth, absolute Beauty, and absolute Goodness.*

3. *However, the Rainbow Covenant is evidence that the present world-order is not to last forever.* The promise itself contains an intimation to the contrary: note well the words, "while the earth remaineth." Is not this an intimation that our earth will not always remain, or at least *not always remain what it is now?* But the earth will never again be devastated by *water*: this was the Divine assurance. Cf. 2 Pet. 3:5-7: the earth was once purged with water; it will in the next instance be swept clean by fire, in the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. Nevertheless, God's saints look for "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. 3:13; cf. Isa. 65:17, 66:22; Psa. 102:25-27; Heb. 1:10-12, 12:26; Rev. 21:1-4).

### *The Design of Positive Institutions*

A moral law commands a thing to be done because it is right, but a positive law makes a thing right because God commands it. In popular parlance God's positive enactments are commonly designated "ordinances." All such positive institutions, although always embodying the moral quality of obedience, are primarily for the purpose of proving (testing?) the faith of the worshiper.

The fact that Noah, on entering the new and cleansed world, worshiped God instead of paying homage to ("blessing," burning incense to, pouring holy water on) the Ark, has a lesson of tremendous significance for all ages. In this act the very heart of the design of positive institutions revealed in Scripture is exemplified. The three following

## GENESIS

propositions will amplify this statement and serve to set forth the truly Divine purpose in all such institutions.

1. *Superstition makes everything of a positive ordinance.* Had Noah been a superstitious man he would have worshiped the Ark because it was the *visible* instrument of his deliverance. Man's corrupt nature makes it difficult for him to look beyond the visible and temporal to the invisible and eternal (2 Cor. 4:18). These facts account for the mass of ritual which has grown up under the aegis of the older denominations of Christendom: men have gotten so thoroughly imbued with traditions and superstitions, many of them borrowed from pagan sources, that they are willing to bow before lifeless images, put crucifixes on their walls, sprinkle holy water, wear sacred relics as amulets, etc. Their cathedrals reek with the light of candles and the odor of incense as all ancient pagan temples did. In all such cases the Christian faith itself becomes an empty shell, just sounding brass or a clanging cymbal. There are those in New Testament churches who worship baptism instead of the Christ who commanded it. No one can literally *believe in* baptism; rather, one believes in Christ who has ordained that believers should witness by this act of faith, to the facts of the Gospel—the death and burial and resurrection of Christ (1 Cor. 15:1-4, Rom. 6:17). There is no efficacy in the water *as such*, that is, there is no *magic* involved in the institution; the efficacy is in the faith that is exemplified in this positive act of the obedience of love for the redeeming Savior. If there is any efficacy in water, it might be right to practice infant sprinkling (infant baptism is infant immersion); if there be such a thing as "water regeneration," it certainly would be implicit in the act of sprinkling or pouring water on a baby (the act which is generally and erroneously called "infant baptism"). The unknowing babe has no understanding of what is going on; it has no

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

conscience entering into the transaction (cf. 1 Pet. 3:21); hence the efficacy in such an act, if any, must lie in the water and in the water alone. But who believes such a thing? Is it not sheer magic, sheer superstition? Most certainly the Bible does not teach "water regeneration," nor does it authorize the patting of a few drops of water on a baby's head and calling that a "baptism." Baptism is for the penitent believer: it is the expression to the world of his faith in Christ and of his love for Christ; it is his testimonial to the facts of the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. The moment the sinner begins to worship the ordinance instead of the Christ who ordained it, his faith—if it can be called that—has degenerated into mere superstition. Take an example from the Old Testament: As long as the Children of Israel looked on the brazen serpent in the wilderness, and looked through it to the God who ordained it and its specific purpose, and then took God at His Word by doing what He commanded them to do, they were healed (Num. 21:9, John 3:14). However, there came a time when they drifted into the worship of the *thing* itself instead of worshiping the God who, in His benevolence, had ordained it for their good; it was then that Hezekiah the king ordered the brazen serpent broken into pieces, calling it "Nehushtan," that is, "a piece of brass" (2 Ki. 18:4).

2. *Mysticism, infidelity, and profanity make nothing of a positive institution.* The mystic prates about "the mere word," as if it were something to be trifled with. He forgets that this is the Word which created and which sustains our universe in all its aspects and processes (Psa. 33:6-9, 148:1-6; John 1:1-3; Heb. 1:1-4; Col. 1:13-17; Rom. 10:4-17). The mystic depends on feeling as his spiritual barometer, talks a great deal about "heartfelt religion," "spiritual experiences," about "being in tune with the Infinite," etc., but, insofar as his actions are the norm, seems to care very little about the Bible. (Such



## GENESIS

groups as the Quakers, the Christian Scientists, the Unity cults, etc., "spiritualize" both baptism and the Lord's Supper out of concrete existence altogether.) The unbeliever scoffs at Divine institutions, and dubs them "superstitions," "hangover of folklore," etc. The profane person, while halfheartedly recognizing a positive ordinance as having something of divinity, still manifests no respect for it or for the God who ordained it. To all these classes we might issue the warning expressed in the old axiom, "He who despises an ordinance of God, despises the God of the ordinance," and in the blunt words of the prophet Samuel to King Saul, "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams" (I Sam. 15:22).

3. *Faith regards and uses a positive institution as a Divine appointment*, as God intended it to be used. Noah made use of the Ark as he was supposed to do, according to God's leading, in obedience to God's Word. Biblical positive ordinances are solemn trysts, Divine appointments, wherein Divine grace and human faith "meet together." Christian baptism, for example, is the appointed institution wherein God meets the penitent believer to bestow on him remission of sins and the indwelling Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38; Rom. 5:5; 1 Cor. 3:16-17, 6:19-20; Gal. 3:2). The Lord's Supper is the appointed memorial institution wherein our Elder Brother meets, from Lord's Day to Lord's Day, with all whom He has bought with His own precious blood and incorporated into His Body, the Church (Matt. 26:26-29; 1 Cor. 10:16-17, 11:23-30; Acts 20:28; Eph. 1:7; 1 Pet. 1:18-20; Rev. 5:9). In like manner, the Ark was the Divinely appointed meeting-place wherein Noah met God and received deliverance from the Divine judgment which fell upon the ungodly antediluvian world. Noah was a man of faith, and faith takes God at His Word (Heb. 11:7, Rom. 10:17). Faith, which is the substance of things hoped for and a convic-

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

tion with respect to things not seen (Heb. 11:1), appropriates the Divine positive ordinances as solemn appointments as God intends them to be used.

### *Noah: God's Man for an Emergency*

God always has His man for an emergency, and Noah certainly was no exception to the rule. Let us note the successive phases of Noah's life.

1. *Noah in "the world of the ungodly."* Contemplation of faithful Noah living in the midst of a perverse generation, warning them of judgment "not seen as yet," pleading with the people to repent and reform their lives, should remind the Christian of his constant duty in spite of every obstacle and discouragement; that he should go his way testifying of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment to come, regardless of the sneers of the worldly wise, the tauntings of the vicious, and the opposition of the hypocritical purveyors of false, assumed piety. A true Christian cannot expect to pitch his tabernacle on the mountain top, as Peter wanted to do on the Mount of Transfiguration (Matt. 17:4); his work lies down in the valley where there is poverty, passion, toil, sorrow, pride, incestuousness, sin of every kind.

"I said, 'Let me walk in the fields,'

God said, 'No, walk in the town.'

I said, 'There are no flowers there,'

He said, 'No flowers, but a crown.'

I said, 'But the sky is black,

And there is smoke and bustle and din';

He wept as He brought me back again,

And said, 'There is more—there is sin.'"

2. *Noah passing through the Flood.* His deliverance through the raging waters of the Deluge is a striking figure of Christian baptism (1 Pet. 3:20-21). Water is the symbol of cleansing: hence in all ages God has maintained His water-line between the saved and the lost, between

## GENESIS

His people and the people of the world (cf. 1 Cor. 10:2; Exo. 29:4, 40:12; Lev. 8:6, 16:4, 24 with 1 Pet. 2:9; Rev. 1:6; Matt. 3:5-7, 28:19, etc.). As the water separated those of faith, in the days of Noah, from the world of the ungodly, so in our Dispensation the same line of demarcation is fixed between the church and the unsaved world. The water which rolled over the eight persons in the Ark sanctified them, set them apart for Divine deliverance. As they passed from the wicked antediluvian world, "through the water," into a new world where all was cleansed by this Divine judgment, so the penitent believer leaves the bondage of sin, comes to the water, passes through it, and arises to walk in newness of life (John 3:5, Gal. 3:27, Rom. 6:1-11). As Noah and his family were completely buried from view so that they could neither see nor be seen by those about them, so the penitent believer must be *buried* in the water, completely hidden from view, before he can claim to be baptized Scripturally (Col. 2:12, Matt. 3:16, Acts 8:36-39). Baptism is a profound spiritual heart act of the obedience of love (John 14:15, Rom. 6:17).

3. *Noah in the Ark* presents a different picture from the Noah in the ungodly world. In the antediluvian society there was no rest for his troubled soul, no peace of body or mind or spirit, but in the Ark was profound seclusion. No matter if the elements were raging without, he and his family must have felt, in the ark, that security and peace which obedient faith alone can give. In this respect the Ark becomes a figure of Christ. All of God's "waves and billows" (Psa. 42:7, Jonah 2:3) rolled over the innocent Jesus when He hung on the Cross (Matt. 27:46), and, as a blessed consequence of His vicarious Sacrifice, none of these must pass over the saints, all of whom He has purchased with His own precious blood. At Calvary we see once again "the fountains of the great deep broken up and the windows of heaven opened." At

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

Calvary we see "deep calling unto deep at the noise of thy waterfalls" (Psa. 42:7). Jesus bore the burden of humanity's sin in His own body and paid humanity's debt (John 1:29, 1 Pet. 2:21-25). "He put himself under the weight of His people's liabilities and discharged them fully. The acceptance of this truth, through unqualified belief in Him, gives to the soul that peace 'which passeth all understanding.' Christ is our Ark of safety; in Him only can we find that blessed security which only redeeming love can bestow." (Phil. 4:7).

4. *Noah coming out of the Ark and taking his place in the cleansed new world* must have experienced mingled feelings of awe, gratitude, and sadness: *awe*, because of the strange and mighty works of God, *gratitude* for the deliverance of himself and his family, and *sadness* at the thought of his friends and neighbors having all perished in the Flood. Throughout all his experience, he had placed himself unreservedly in the hands of Jehovah and been guided by Him. The same God who said at first, "Make thee an ark of gopher wood," and later, "Come, thou and all thy house, into the ark," now "remembered" Noah and all that were with him in the ark, and "made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters assuaged; the fountains also of the deep and the windows of heaven were stopped, and the rain from heaven was restrained." The rays of the sun now poured down on a planet that had been baptized with a baptism of judgment. Judgment is one of God's terrible acts: He takes no delight in it, though He is glorified by it. The same God now said to Noah, "Go forth from the ark." And Noah went forth . . . and builded an altar unto Jehovah." All is simple faith and obedience. Noah, in all his varied experiences, never raised a question when God spoke! He did what God told him to do and in the way God told him to do it. What a different thing from the carping, caviling, evasive thing that men have today which they call "faith"! Faith never

## GENESIS

asks the *why* or *wherefore*, when God commands. (Heb. 11:7).

5. *When God closed the door of the Ark behind Noah and his house, he shut out the unbelieving and impenitent world.* Then the "fountains of the great deep were broken up and the windows of heaven were opened," and judgment was at hand. No matter that there were "giants in the earth" in those days, "mighty men, men of renown"; no matter that there were walled cities, and great herds and flocks on the outside; no matter that there were sounds of reveling by night, and wars and rumors of war by day—all had to be swept away! The sounds of the harp and the lyre were stilled, the forger's hammer lay unused, and the people cried for the rocks and the mountains, but it was *too late*! We may imagine that, if Noah could have given just one invitation from the door of the Ark, the people would have crowded in over each other's dead bodies! The Lord Jesus Christ opened the door of His Church on Pentecost, through His Apostles guided into all the truth by the Spirit, and it has never been closed from that day to this. It still stands ajar, ready to receive all who will enter in on the terms of the Gospel Covenant. The time is bound to come, however, when the Lord Himself shall close the door of His Church, and gather her unto Himself "as a bride adorned for her husband" (Rev. 21:2, 21:9-10, 22:17). When that time comes all opportunity for repentance will have terminated. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye (1 Cor. 15:51), He will come with His mighty angels, "in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Thess. 1:7-10). Multitudes will cry for the rocks and the mountains to fall upon them, but everlastingly too late. The hopeless answer will be, "Jesus of Nazareth has passed by." *Now* is the accepted time, sinner friend: this should be the day of your salvation.

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

Noah was God's man for an emergency. God always has His man in the time of crisis, and Noah was this man in the early moral history of the race. Dean (OBH, 16): "Some names are forever associated with great epochs: Lincoln with Emancipation, Cromwell with the Commonwealth, Moses with the Exodus, so Noah with the Deluge. Read Gen. 6:9, 7:1; Ezek. 14:14. Noah was God's man—a heroic figure in an apostate age. Altar after altar had crumbled, but the fires on Noah's altar did not go out till quenched by the Flood. It calls for courage to stand alone. But Noah dared to lead where few dared to follow. The absolute obedience and safety of Noah, the hopeless corruption and ruin of the race—such as the impressive lessons. For one hundred and twenty years Noah faithfully preached and heroically lived. Only seven converts rewarded his labors: his wife, and his sons, Shem, Ham, and Jepheth, and their wives. Yet Noah was successful: he did *his* duty, and he outrode the Flood."

\* \* \* \* \*

### REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART TWENTY-TWO

1. How many days of Noah's life were spent in the Ark?
2. List the successive phases of "the days of prevailing" of the waters upon the earth.
3. List the successive phases of the days of "assuaging."
4. On what basis do we conclude that a month in Noah's life was a period of thirty days?
5. Would you consider it reasonable to hold that the period of Noah's life spent in the Ark can be harmonized with the localized-Flood theory? Explain.
6. Where did the Ark finally come to rest?
7. Is there any definite conclusion to be drawn from the fact that the word *erets* may be translated either "earth" or "land"?

## GENESIS

8. What are the three pivotal events in the history of earth?
9. How answer these questions: (1) Is there enough water on our planet to cover it entirely? (2) Whence came the waters which produced the Deluge? (3) Where did they go when the Flood subsided?
10. What is meant by the statement that God "remembered" the occupants of the Ark when the time arrived for them to disembark?
11. What is the significance of the statement that He "remembered" the animals that were with Noah in the Ark?
12. Why was the raven probably sent out first?
13. What was the significance of the sending out of the dove? How many times was the dove sent out?
14. What was probably the symbolism of the freshly-plucked olive-leaf?
15. What are the characteristics of a dove? What does the dove symbolize in the Scriptures?
16. What is the connection between this symbolism and the manifestations which occurred after the baptism of Jesus?
17. What probably is meant by the "covering" of the Ark?
18. What interesting facts are revealed about the families in the Ark?
19. Name the sons of Noah and state what each name means.
20. What was Noah's first act on withdrawing from the Ark?
21. What is the significance of the fact that Noah worshiped God and not the Ark?
22. How do we know that Noah was not a superstitious man?
23. What probably did the statement mean that Yahweh "smelled the sweet savor" of Noah's sacrifice?

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

24. What seems to have been the deeper meaning of God's soliloquy in 8:21-22?
25. In what special way was man's dominion over the lower animals reaffirmed?
26. What was the change in the feelings of the animals toward man after the Flood?
27. What does Noah's altar teach us about the institution of Sacrifice?
28. What was the Divine blessing bestowed on Noah and his sons?
29. Is there any conclusive Scripture evidence that man was permitted only a vegetarian diet prior to the Flood?
30. What part of living creatures was prohibited as food after the Flood?
31. What law was ordained about the eating of blood? Why this prohibition?
32. What law was ordained about murder? What is murder?
33. What was the ordination with respect to a beast that killed a human being?
34. What was the purpose of the practice of blood vengeance?
35. How shall we regard the law against murder in relation to capital punishment?
36. Were these fundamental laws universal or only Mosaic in their scope? Explain your answer.
37. What is a covenant?
38. What was God's pre-diluvian covenant with Noah and his house?
39. What was the essence of His post-diluvian covenant with Noah?
40. What Divine promise did this covenant include about future floods?
41. Was this covenant unilateral? If so, in what sense?
42. What was the sign of this covenant?



## GENESIS

43. Does this necessarily mean that no rainbow had appeared before this time? Explain.
44. Of what people was the earth "overspread" after the Flood?
45. What sin did Noah commit after the Flood?
46. What light does this throw on our statement that the Bible is the Book of Life?
47. What various attitudes did Noah's sons take with regard to their father's sin?
48. What does the New Testament teach about drunkenness?
49. What was wrong in Ham's attitude? What fundamental moral law did he break?
50. Explain the historical fulfillment of Noah's curse on the Line of Ham and Canaan.
51. Explain the historical fulfillment of Noah's blessing on the Line of Shem.
52. Explain the historical fulfillment of the blessings pronounced by Noah on the Line of Japheth.
53. How old was Noah when he died? Compare this with Abraham's age when he died, and with the age of Moses when he died? How account for the descending longevity?
54. What lessons are to be derived from the story of the Rainbow Covenant?
55. What is the essential character of a Divine positive ordinance?
56. How does a superstitious man treat a positive Divine ordinance?
57. What lesson do we learn from the Old Testament story of the Brazen Serpent about the design of positive institutions mentioned in Scripture?
58. What attitude does the mystic take toward Divine positive institutions?
59. How does unbelief treat such an institution?

## THE WORLD AFTER THE FLOOD

60. How does a profane person treat God's positive ordinances?
60. What two kinds of worship does God require of His people? What is the essential character of external worship?
61. What do we mean when we say that positive ordinances are Divine appointments?
62. What does this teach us about the design of the Christian ordinances, baptism and the Lord's Supper?
63. What was wrong in Peter's attitude on the Mount of Transfiguration?
64. Summarize the successive phases of Noah's life.
65. What does the writer of Hebrews say about Noah's faith? How did Noah show his great faith?
66. Why did we say that Noah was "God's man for an emergency"?

PART TWENTY-THREE:  
THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NATIONS  
(Gen. 10:1-32)

1. *The Families of Noah* (10:1).

*"Now these are the generations of the sons of Noah, namely, of Shem, Ham, and Japheth: and unto them were sons born after the flood."*

It seems that Noah gave to Shem and Japheth, by prophetic insight of course, the names that would be descriptive of their respective destinies: Shem ("name," "renown," because Yahweh would be his God in a special sense), Japheth "wide-spreading," "enlargement," with widespread occupancy of the earth and accompanying civil power, and by sharing ultimately the spiritual blessings of the Line of Shem. As for Ham, his name is usually rendered "dark-colored"; however, the etymology is said to be uncertain. As a matter of fact, it is difficult to identify the various ethnic groups that were, or are, associated with this progenitor and his name. Anthropological classifications in our day do not recognize a specific Hamitic Line. It is noteworthy, however, that a surprising number of the names listed in Chapter x. have been reliably identified, as we shall see below.

2. *The Table of Nations*

This is the name usually given to the content of this chapter. The word "nation" is best defined as a specific ethnic group or *people*. Hence, we are correct in speaking of the United States as the "melting-pot of nations."

Note well (JB, 25): "In the form of a genealogical tree this chapter draws up a Table of Peoples; the principle behind the classification is not so much racial affinity as historical and geographical relationship. The sons of Japheth inhabit Asia Minor and the Mediterranean islands, the sons of Ham people the lands of the south, Egypt, Ethiopia, Arabia, to which is added Canaan in memory of the time when she was Egypt's satellite. In the regions

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NATIONS

between these two groups live the sons of Shem: Elamites, Assyrians, Aramaeans, and the ancestors of the Hebrews. . . . This table sums up such knowledge of the inhabited world as Israel would possess in Solomon's time and asserts the unity of the human race which, from a common stock, has split up into various groups." Pfeiffer (BBA, 37): "The Table is arranged in climactic form. The first reference is to the Japhetic peoples who occupied Europe and parts of Asia. These were the people most remote from Biblical Israel. The Hamitic peoples of Asia and Africa were given second place. Many of these had close contacts with the Israelites. Semitic history, of which the family of Abraham is a conspicuous part, is presented last."

### 3. *The Trend of the Narrative*

It is evident that the writer of Genesis (Moses), in setting forth the account of man's original temptation and fall, and his degeneracy into universal wickedness as a result of the intermingling of the pious Sethites with the irreligious Cainites, was not only leading up to the narrative of the Flood, but also was pointing the finger of inspiration to another pivotal event in the unfolding of the Scheme of Redemption, namely, the giving of the Law. This purpose becomes more apparent in the ninth and tenth chapters of the book. The ninth chapter gives us the story of the beginning of the new world-order, and specific mention of the laws against the eating of blood, and against murder. The tenth deals with the dispersion and settlement of the descendants of Shem, Ham and Japheth, which followed of course the confusion of tongues at Babel the account of which appears in the eleventh chapter. Then every event, from the call of Abram to the Exodus, *points forward clearly to Sinai*. The Apostle Paul states the case tersely in these lines: "What then is the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise hath been made" (Gal. 3:19). In the same chapter (Gal. 3:16) the Apostle

## GENESIS

writes: "Now to Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his seed. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." Thus the true Seed. Messiah, became the fulfillment of the Genesis oracle (Gen. 3:15) and of the Abrahamic Promise (Gen. 12:3, 22:18, 26:4, 28:14; Acts 3:25; Luke 1:44; Rom. 4:13-16, 9:1-5). Thus the internal unity of the Biblical revelation *as a whole* is again demonstrated beyond all possibility of reasonable doubt.

### 4. *Problems of the Table of Nations*

This Table presents some difficulties for which no solution has been found, up to the present time at least. Note the following facts, in this connection: (1) The account is that of the peopling of the earth after the Flood (10:32), and the area in which this began to take place must have been relatively small; therefore we must depend on subsequent history to trace the continued diffusion. (2) Some of the names which might be known to us in their native forms may seem unfamiliar because of having been vocalized incorrectly in the Hebrew tradition, by which the purely consonantal text has been supplied with vowel signs. Kraeling (BA, 47): "Thus Gomer should have been Gomer, Meshech should have been Moshech, and Togarma should have been Tegarman according to the evidence of the Assyrian inscriptions." (3) Apparently, the same, or very similar, names occur in separate Lines of descent. (Of course this may be accounted for on the ground that a particular people may have occupied—by conquest or by infiltration—an area already held by another and taken over the established *geographical* name of the prior ethnic group (as, for example, the English became known as Britons, and the Germanic peoples as Teutons, etc.). (4) The greatest difficulty, however, is that of the intermingling of individual with national (tribal) names. Smith and Fields et al (ITH, 46): "Now this is really of little

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NATIONS

consequence, since, with a few exceptions, as that of Nimrod (Gen. 10:8-9), the purpose is clearly to exhibit the affinities of *nations*. The record is *ethnographical* rather than *genealogical*. This is clear from the plural forms of some of the names (for example, all the descendants of *Mizraim*), and from the ethnic form of others, as those of the children of *Canaan*, nearly all of which are simply *geographical*. The genealogical form is preserved in the first generation after the sons of Noah, and is then virtually abandoned for a mere list of the nations descended from each of these progenitors. But in the line of the patriarchs from Shem to Abraham the genealogical form is strictly preserved, since the object is to trace a *personal* descent." Here it becomes Messianically oriented.

On the positive side of this problem, the following facts should be kept in mind: (1) As to the area from which the dispersion began to take place certainly the highlands of Armenia ("the mountains of Ararat") were especially adapted to be the center from which peoples (after Babel) began to move in all directions. Thence diffusion continued at first by way of the great river systems—the Tigris-Euphrates, the Nile, the Indus, the Hwang-ho and Wei—the invention of the sail-boat having made these the arteries of transportation. Just before the beginning of the historic period the peoples began to move in several directions at once: some into India, China, and across the Bering Strait into the Americas; others toward the Mediterranean and into the Lower Nile; still other groups such as the Megalithic traversed the Mediterranean into the Atlantic and up the coast as far as the Tin Islands (Great Britain), and as the Beaker peoples who brought bronze into Europe made their way up the Danube to the Baltic areas. That Southwest Asia was the cradle of the human race seems evident from the testimony of anthropology and early history. The unity of the race is a scientific

## GENESIS

fact; as one anthropologist, Goldenweiser, puts it (*Anthropology*, 32): "All the fundamental traits of the psychic make-up of man anywhere are present everywhere." Philology, the study of the origin of language, insofar as science has been able to penetrate this mystery, corroborates this view. (2) The geographical explanations which appear in the Table itself greatly facilitate the identification of the peoples who are named. (3) Through the help afforded by classical sources and by the ancient inscriptions which tell us so much about the world in which ancient Israel lived, "a surprising number of the names in this Table of Nations have been reliably identified" (Kraeling, BA, 47). (4) Note the following summary by Mitchell (NBD, 867): "The names in the Table were probably originally the names of individuals, which came to be applied to the people descended from them, and in some cases to the territory inhabited by these people. It is important to note that such names could have different meanings at different points in history, so that the morphological identification of a name in Gn. x with one in the extra-biblical sources can be completely valid only if the two occurrences are exactly contemporary. The changes in significance of names of this kind are due largely to the movements of peoples, in drift, infiltration, conquest, or migration. There are three principal characteristics of a people which are sufficiently distinctive to form some nuance of their name. These are race or physical type: language, which is one constituent of culture; and the geographical area in which they live or the political unit in which they are organized. Racial features cannot change, but they can become so mixed or dominated through intermarriage as to be indistinguishable. Language can change completely, that of a subordinate group being replaced by that of its rulers, in many cases permanently. Geographical habitat can be completely changed

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NATIONS

by migration. Since at times one, and at other times another, of these characteristics is uppermost in the significance of a name, the lists in Gn. x are unlikely to have been drawn up on one system alone. Thus, for instance, the descendants of Shem cannot be expected all to have spoken one language, or to have lived all in one area, or even to have belonged to one racial type, since inter-marriage may have obscured this. That this could have taken place may be indicated by the presence of apparently duplicate names in more than one list, Asshur (see *Assyria*), Sheba, Havilah, and Lud (im) under both Shem and Ham, and probably Meshek (Mash in Shem's list) under Shem and Japheth. Though these may indicate names that are entirely distinct, it is possible that they represent points where a strong people had absorbed a weaker." Again: "It is necessary to observe that names have been adopted from this chapter for certain specific uses in modern times. Thus in language study the terms 'Semitic' and 'Hamitic' are applied, the former to the group of languages including Hebrew, Aramaic, Akkadian, Arabic, etc., and the latter to the group of which (ancient) Egyptian is the chief. This is a usage of convenience, however, and does not mean that all the descendants of Shem spoke Semitic languages or all those of Ham Hamitic. Thus the entry of Elam under Shem, and Canaan under Ham, is not necessarily erroneous, even though Elamite was non-Semitic and Canaanite was a Semitic tongue. In short, the names in Gn. 10 probably indicate now geographical, now linguistic, and now political entities, but not consistently any one alone." W. F. Albright comments that the Table of Nations "shows such a remarkably 'modern' understanding of the linguistic situation in the ancient world . . . that it stands absolutely alone in ancient literature, without even a remote parallel even among the Greeks, where we find the closest approach to a distribution of the peoples in genealogical framework. But among the Greeks the framework is mythological and



## GENESIS

the people are all Greeks or Aegean tribes" (quoted by Cornfeld, *AtD*, 37). Cornfeld adds: "This Table is not the basis of the division of the races of mankind into the Aryan, Semitic and dark-skinned races. It knows nothing of the Far East and the Pacific and Atlantic races or of dark Africa south of Egypt. But it contains data about the geographical distribution of the ancient Near East, from the confines of Iran and Edom down to Arabia, of commercial and linguistic ties, and far-scattered tribes, 'nations,' countries and towns."

5. *The Line of Japheth* (10:2-5).

2 *The sons of Japheth: Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan, and Tubal, and Meshech, and Tiras.* 3 *And the sons of Gomer: Ashkenaz, and Riphath, and Togarmah.* 4 *And the sons of Javan: Elishah, and Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim. Of these were the isles of the nations divided in their lands, every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations."*

The Line of Japheth included the northern and western peoples: those who later spread over Europe and the Americas. *Gomer*: called *Gimirrai* in Assyrian texts: in Homer the Cimmerians (*Odys.*, 11:13-19): lived north of the Black Sea. *Ashkenaz*: probably the Scythians, living in the Black Sea region (cf. *Jer.* 51:27). *Riphath*: unidentified. *Togarmah*: *Tegarama* in Hittite, *Tilgarimmu* in Assyrian, inscriptions: lived in what was later known as Cappadocia (cf. *Acts* 2:9; 1 *Pet.* 1:1; *Ezek.* 27:14, 38:6). *Magog*: name of northern nomads, living in regions around the Caspian Sea (cf. *Ezek.* 38:2, 39:6; *Rev.* 20:8), equated by Josephus with the Scythians. *Madai*: uniformly translated Medes who lived South of the Caspian Sea, later formed an important part of the empire of Cyrus the Persian. *Javan*: Ionians: the name for the Greeks of Asia Minor. *Elishah*: the name traditionally associated with the Greeks of Sicily and southern Italy. *Tarshish*: many writers identify Tarshish with Tartessus

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NATIONS

of southern Spain (cf. Jonah 1:3, 4:2; Isa. 23:1, 6, 10; Jer. 10:9). *Kittim*: the island of Cyprus; later used to refer to the Romans (Dan. 11:30). *Dodanim* (or *Rodanim*): probably the inhabitants of the island of Rhodes (cf. 1 Chron. 1:7). *Tubal* and *Meshech*: names occur together in Scripture (Ezek. 27:13; 32:26; 38:2, 3; 39:1); *Tabali* in Assyrian texts, in inhabited area near Cilicia. *Meshech*, in Phrygia, was Assyrian *Mushki*, Greek *Moschi*. *Tiras*: probably identical with the Tyrsenoi of classical tradition and Turusha of earlier Egyptian texts; probably also the piratical sea people who invaded Egypt and Syria in the thirteenth century before Christ, thought by some to have been the Thracians. Occupied islands and coastlands of the Aegean, and said to have been ancestors of the Etruscans.

### 6. *The Line of Ham* (10:6-20).

6 *And the sons of Ham: Cush, and Mizraim, and Put, and Canaan.* 7 *And the sons of Cush: Seba, and Havilah, and Sabtah, and Raamah, and Sabteca; and the sons of Raamah: Sheba, and Dedan.* 8 *And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth.* 9 *He was a mighty hunter before Jehovah; wherefore it is said, Like Nimrod a mighty hunter before Jehovah.* 10 *And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar.* 11 *Out of that land he went forth into Assyria, and builded Nineveh, and Rehoboth-lr, and Calah,* 12 *and Resen between Nineveh and Calah (the same is the great city).* 13 *And Mizraim begat Ludim, and Ananim, and Lehabim, and Naphtubim,* 14 *and Pathrusim, and Caslubim (whence went forth the Philistines), and Caphtorim.* 15 *And Canaan begat Sidon his first-born, and Heth,* 16 *and the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgashite,* 17 *and the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite, and the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hamathite: and afterward were the families of the Canaanite spread abroad.* 19 *And the border of*

## GENESIS

*the Canaanite was from Sidon, as thou goest toward Gerar, unto Gaza; as thou goest toward Sodom and Gomorrah and Admah and Eboim, unto Lasba. 20 These are the sons of Ham, after their families, after their tongues, in their lands, in their nations."*

*Cush*: Nubia, the region below the First Cataract of the Nile, misnamed Ethiopia by the Greeks. *Seba*: distinguished from Sheba by spelling; early geographers mention a city named Saba on the African coast of the Red Sea, but the identification is uncertain. *Havilah*: in central Arabia. Cf. 10:29, under the Line of Shem. *Sabtah*: definite location impossible as yet: Greek geographer Pliny mentions Sabota, a name that corresponds to Shabwat of the South Arabian inscriptions, on southeast coast of Arabia or on African Coast of Red Sea. *Raamah*: probably in southeastern Arabia. Two divisions of Raamah were *Sheba*, the land of the Sabaeans in Yemen (cf. v. 28), and *Dedan*, probably a people of northwestern Arabia along the Red Sea. *Nimrod*, the "mighty hunter" (see *infra*).

*Mizraim*: Egypt, extending northeast almost to Gaza. *Ludim*: in North Africa (served as bowmen in the armies of Egypt and Tyre [Isa. 66:19; Ezek. 27:10, 30:5]; probably not the Ludim [Lydians] of the Line of Shem [v. 22].) *Lehabim*: probably Lybians, on southern shore of the Mediterranean, west of Egypt. *Naphthubim*: identification uncertain; perhaps in the vicinity of Memphis, or in the Egyptian Delta, people of "lower" or northern Egypt. *Pathrusim*: identified with Pathros (Ezek. 29:14, Jer. 44:15), people of Southern or Upper Egypt, from Aswan to the head of the Delya. *Caslubim*: people from whom the Philistines were descended (v. 14); probably occupied northern coast of Africa, near Gulf of Sidra (inlet of Tripolitanian coast). *Caphthorim*: The people of Crete (Amos 9:7).

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NATIONS

*Put* or *Pbut*: late name for North African district lying west and south of the Nile Delta; however, its precise location is disputed. Some identify it with Cyrenaica on the North African Coast.

*Canaan*: originally used of the land of the Phoenicians and Canaanites of Syria and Palestine. We have here a list of the important Canaanite groups. *Sidon*: famous Phoenician city on west coast of Asia Minor; mentioned in the Amarna letters; the greatest of the Phoenician coastal cities until surpassed by its "daughter" Tyre. *Hetb*: father of the Hittites whose political and cultural center was Hattusas, in the bend of the Halys River. In the days of Abraham they were settled in the Hebron area. *Jebusites*: their stronghold was Jebus, the name which was finally incorporated into the name Jerusalem. The city was captured by David and made the capital of united Israel (cf. 1 Ki. 9:20). *Amorites*: occupied the hill country on either side of the Jordan. (Cf. Exo. 33:2; Gen. 14:7, 13; Deut. 1:44, 3:8; Num. 21:34-35). They later settled in Mesopotamia where one of their leaders, Hammurabi, in Babylon, became famous as an able king and lawgiver. *Girgashites*. Nothing more is known of them as yet. *Hivites*: mentioned in connection with Shechem (Gen. 33:18, 34:2), Gibeon (Josh. 9), and Mount Hermon (Josh. 11:3), and Hamath (Judg. 3:5). (Cf. also 1 Ki. 9:20-22). *Arkites*: inhabitants of the Phoenician city of Arqa, at the foot of the Lebanons. *Sinites*: Assyrian records mention the people of *Siannu* "on the shore of the sea" (Mediterranean) along with the cities or Arqa and Simirra. *Arvadites*: people of Arvad, most northerly of Phoenician cities, 125 miles north of Tyre. *Zemarites*: location not definitely established: Amarna letters mention city of Sumur, and mention of Simirra occurs in Assyrian records of Tiglath-Pileser III. *Hamathites*: people of Hamath, a city on the Orontes River in Syria; at one time it formed the northern boundary of

## GENESIS

Israel (2 Sam. 8:9, I Ki. 8:65, II Ki. 14:25). Note that the land of the Phoenicians and Canaanites is described as extending from Sidon on the north to Gaza on the south, and inward as far as the Dead Sea. Note also that the people known as Hamites rose to prominence early in history, having settled generally in northern Africa and southwestern Asia. Israel had closer contacts with the Hamites than with the more remote Japhetic peoples.

### 7. *Interlude: Nimrod the Empire-BUILDER.* (10:8-12)

The story of Nimrod is intriguing, to say the least. He is described as "a mighty one in the earth," as "a mighty hunter before Jehovah." What does this mean? Lange answers (CDHCG, 349): "By such a proverb there may be noted a praiseworthy, Herculean pioneer of culture, as well as a blameworthy and violent despot [in ancient terms, tyrant]. In truth, the chase of the animals was, for Nimrod, a preparatory exercise for the subjugation of men." It can hardly be denied that Nimrod was an empire-builder. He belonged, it would seem, to what in Greek tradition was known as the Heroic Age: that is, he was a hero in the sense that Homer uses the word to describe the valiant (and often licentious and bloodthirsty) Greeks and Trojans of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. He impressed his name on subsequent generations to such an extent that the empire which he established was still, in the time of Micah the prophet, "the land of Nimrod" (Mic. 5:6). It is interesting to note, too, that the cities that are associated in Gen. 10:10-12 with Nimrod's empire-building have, for the most part, been clearly identified in secular history.

Cornfeld (AtD, 38): "According to this story, in the beginning Nimrod's kingdom was in Babylon, and from there he went to Assyria. This may not be historically true, but it accurately reflects the historic background pertaining to the early Babylonian and Assyrian kingdoms. The names of cities connected with him are well attested

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NATIONS

by archaeological research. The name of Nimrod is preserved in that of the present-day Arab village Nimrud, where ancient Calah was excavated. The modern name Nimrud may possibly contain an echo of that used in antiquity for its chief protector, Ninurta, god of war and the chase. The biblical name Nimrod, according to E. A. Speiser, does not echo a god but the reign of the vigorous Tutukli-Ninurta I (1243-1207) who built Calah, Assyria's second capital, and conquered Babylon. The description of Nimrod as a builder and 'mighty hunter before the Lord' well typifies characteristics of Assyria's early kings, as featured in illustrations of hunting scenes carved on rock."

"Nimrod" was a *personal*, rather than a geographical, name. He is presented in Scripture as founder of the following Babylonian and Assyrian cities: *Babel*: the rise of the great cities of Babylonia occurred very early in the historic period: "the whole religion, culture and political organization of Assyria were derived from the southern state" (Skinner, ICCG, 211). *Erech*: Babylonian city, *Uruk*, today ruins of *Warka*. *Epic of Gilgamesh* glorifies a legendary king of this perhaps most ancient city of southern Mesopotamia. *Accad* (Akkad), probably near modern Bagdad. Seat of the first Semitic empire and of a notable culture under its kings Sargon and Naram-Sin. *Calneh*: also in the modern Bagdad area. Cf. Calno (Isa. 10:9, Amos 6:2); this city, however, apparently was in Syria. The real Calneh was identified by Rawlinson with the ruins of Niffer on the east of the Euphrates. *In the land of Shinar*, that is *Sumer*. Note that Nimrod is described as having *gone forth into Assyria*, where he founded certain other cities, as follows: *Nineveh*: the original Assyrian capital was Asshur. Nineveh seems to have been put first here among Assyrian cities because of its dominant role in the ancient world beginning with the reign of Sennacherib in the 8th century B.C. *Reboboht-Ir*: Cf.

## GENESIS

Gen. 36:37—"Rehoboth by the River," that is, the Euphrates? Then was this an appellation for Asshur? No positive identification has yet been made. *Calah*: excavated by Layard 1845-8 and the British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1949-61. Thought to have been founded by Asshur, a follower of Nimrod, moving from Shinar. Situated 24 miles south of Nineveh on the east bank of the Tigris, near the modern *Nimrud*. *Resen*: said to have been located between Nineveh and Calah. Must have been along the river Tigris, although positive identification has not yet been made.

The following brief sketch of the history of Mesopotamia is needed here (Cornfeld, AtD, 40): "In lower Mesopotamia, the region at the head of the Persian Gulf, the dominant ethnic, political and cultural group in the 3rd millenium B.C.E. called its land Sumer (biblical Shinar). This phase is featured in material and written illustrations from Ur, Uruch (biblical Erech), Lagash, and Eshnunna, among others. Following the long phase of Sumerian ascendancy came the historic period of the first Empire under the Semitic dynasty founded by Sargon of Accad. Sumerian and Semite co-existed and contended with each other for political leadership until the end of the millenium, but the prevailing culture was very much of a joint effort. Though Accad was the main city and capital of the first empire in Mesopotamia, it has not yet been identified. As the civilization of Mesopotamia expanded, it separated into different channels. In the south of Mesopotamia were the Babylonians, whose city Babylon (biblical Babel) became the capital of the great kingdom. Its peak of power and glory was reached in the 18th and 17th centuries under Hammurabi, one of the great rulers of Babylonia's first dynasty. The Semite inhabitants of western Mesopotamia were known as Amorites. In the north a city on the river Tigris was rising slowly to ever-increasing prominence. Its

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NATIONS

name was Ashur, as was also that of its chief god. The state the city came to control was Assyria. The political tide swung for the first time decisively in favor of Ashur during the reign of the vigorous Tukutli Ninurta I. The expansion of Ashur northward brought with it successive transfers of the capital of Assyria from Ashur to Calah to Nineveh. But Ashur remained the old tribal and religious capital in which the kings were buried, and Calah was the military capital of ancient Assyria until it was transferred to Nineveh. Thus Ashur, Calah, and Nineveh were Assyria's successive capital cities, well known in history and through archaeological discoveries."

8. *The Line of Shem* (10:21-32, 11:10-32).

21 *And unto Shem, the father of all the children of Eber, the elder brother of Japheth, to him also were children born.* 22 *The sons of Shem: Elam, and Asshur, and Arpachshad, and Lud, and Aram.* 23 *And the sons of Aram: Uz, and Hul, and Gether, and Mash.* 24 *And Arpachshad begat Shelah; and Shelah begat Eber.* 25 *And unto Eber were born two sons: the name of one was Peleg; for in his days was the earth divided; and his brother's name was Joktan.* 26 *And Joktan begat Almodad, and Sheleph, and Hazarmaveth, and Jerah,* 27 *and Hadoram, and Uzal, and Diklah,* 28 *and Obal, and Abimeal, and Sheba,* 29 *and Ophir, and Havilah, and Jobab: all these were the sons of Joktan.* 30 *And their dwelling was from Mesha, as thou goest toward Sephar, the mountain of the east.* 31 *These are the sons of Shem, after their families, after their tongues, in their lands, after their nations.* 32 *These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations; and of these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood."*

The writer of Genesis, it will be noted, arranged his genealogies in such a way that the student is prepared for the elaboration of the Line of Shem through Terah and



## GENESIS

Abraham. The five major branches of the Semitic family are presented here: Elam, Asshur, Arpachshad, Lud, and Aram.

It is fitting to add here the complementary genealogical information from ch. 11:

*10 These are the generations of Shem. Shem was a hundred years old, and begat Arpachshad lived after he begat Shelah four hundred and three years, and begat sons and daughters. 14 And Shelah lived thirty years, and begat Eber: 15 and Shelah lived after he begat Eber four hundred and three years, and begat sons and daughters. 16 and Eber lived four and thirty years, and begat Peleg: 17 and Eber lived after he begat Peleg four hundred and thirty years, and begat sons and daughters. 18 And Peleg lived thirty years, and begat Reu: 19 and Peleg lived after he begat Reu two hundred and nine years, and begat sons and daughters. 20 And Reu lived two and thirty years, and begat Serug: 21 and Reu lived after he begat Serug two hundred and seven years, and begat sons and daughters. 22 And Serug lived thirty years, and begat Nabor: 23 and Serug lived after he begat Nabor two hundred years, and begat sons and daughters. 24 And Nabor lived nine and twenty years, and begat Terah: 25 and Nabor lived after he begat Terah a hundred and nineteen years, and begat sons and daughters. 26 And Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nabor, and Haran. 27 Now these are the generations of Terah. Terah begat Abram, Nabor, and Haran; and Haran begat Lot. 28 And Haran died before his father Terah in the land of his nativity, in Ur of the Chaldees. 29 And Abram and Nabor took them wives: the name of Abram's wife was Sarai; and the name of Nabor's wife, Milcah, the daughter of Haran, the father of Milcah, and the father of Iscah. 30 And Sarai was barren; she had no child. 31 And Terah took Abram his son, and Lot the son of*

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NATIONS

*Haran, his son's son, and Sarai, his daughter-in-law, his son Abram's wife; and they went forth with them from Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan; and they came unto Haran, and dwelt there. 32 And the days of Terah were two hundred and five years: and Terah died in Haran."*

Two important facts stand out in these Scriptures: (1) the steady decrease in the longevity of the patriarchs named (from 400 to about 200 years in the above table; later to 175 years in the time of Abraham [Gen. 25:7], and still later to 120 years in the time of Moses, Deut. 34:7); (2) that the inspired writer steadily narrows the Line of Shem down to its proper Messianic orientation as has been his objective from the beginning. He is pointing the Messianic development firstly toward the Abrahamic Promise, and secondly to the giving of the Law at Sinai, and ultimately to the incarnate ministry of Messiah Himself, Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ, the Son of the living God (Matt. 16:16). Such again is the unity of the Book of Genesis in relation to the Bible as a whole. We shall now return to the account of the Line of Shem.

*Elam*: well-known as the area beyond the Tigris, north of the Persian Gulf, in the region around Susa. The Elamites were warlike and at one time controlled Lower Mesopotamia. Later, Elam became a province of the Persian Empire. In the Behistun Rock inscriptions of Darius I, the Old Persian text is accompanied by Elamite and Babylonian translations.

*Asshur*: Assyria; the shortened form, Syria. The most fertile and densely populated area which lay east of the central section of the Tigris valley. Its three great capitals were Asshur, Calah, and Nineveh (cf. Jonah 1:1). Archaeology has proved that it was inhabited before 5000 B.C. At one time the Assyrian Empire extended across southwest Asia as far as the Mediterranean and Lower Egypt.

## GENESIS

*Arpachshad* (or Arphaxad): name not yet found in inscriptions, hence identification is not possible. (Cf. *Arrapa* of Ptolemy's Geography). *Shelah*: brought in from Gen. 11:12. Was this a *personal* name (cf. Methuselah, Gen. 5:22)? *Eber* (cf. v. 14): the name is translated "one who passes over," and is the same as the word *Hebrew* (*Habiru*) and as such was used later to designate Semitic semi-nomads. "In his days was the earth divided," hence the name of his son, *Peleg*, meaning "division." Does this have reference to the dispersion following Babel (11:1-9)? Or does it indicate a division between nomadic Arabs (a name which is probably a dialectical variant of 'eber', 'wanderer') and those peoples settled on irrigated lands, under Peleg (cf. NBD, 331)? *Peleg* (cf. v. 16), "division." *Joktan*, Peleg's brother. Here we have the list of the thirteen Arabian tribes sired by Joktan; these tribes (or peoples) occupied the southern regions of the Arabian peninsula. Two of the names occur in the Hamitic Line, namely, *Sheba* and *Havilah* (cf. 10:7). Note the story of the Queen of Sheba who visited Solomon (1 Ki. 10:1-13, cf. 2 Sam. 20:1, 1 Chron. 5:13, Josh. 19:2, Ezek. 27:22, Matt. 12:42; also the mention of the "gold of Ophir," 1 Ki. 9:28, 10:11). Sheba and Ophir obviously were regions in the vicinity of modern Yemen; Havilah was north of these areas (cf. Gen. 25:18, 1 Sam. 15:7). (Concerning the appearance of Sheba as a descendant both of Ham [v. 7] and of Shem [v. 28], Archer writes [SOTI, 201]: "In all probability the Sabaeans were originally Hamitic, but continual intermixture with Semitic neighbors in South Arabia finally altered their ethnic complexion to make them predominantly Semitic. Thus both the relationship of verse 7 and that of verse 28 would be correct.") Note here also the supplementary list of the successive descendants of Peleg in the Messianic Line (11:18-26): *Reu*, probably a short form of Reuel, but not

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NATIONS

as yet identified; *Serug*, mentioned in Assyrian texts as a city of the Haran district; *Nabor*, appears as *Nakburu* in Mari texts of the 2nd millenium B.C.; *Terah*, the old city name of Haran district.

*Lud*, son of Shem. Probably refers to the Lydians of Asia Minor. When the rich Lydian King Croesus was defeated by Cyrus the Great (c. 540 B.C.) Lydian autonomy came to an end.

*Aram*: the fifth son of Shem named, v. 22. The region known as Syria; the most important of the Aramaic states, Damascus, played a leading role in later Biblical history. "Aram of the Two Rivers" (i.e., Paddan-aram) was the name given to the region around Haran in northern Mesopotamia where Laban and other members of Abraham's family settled. Note the "sons of Aram," v. 23: *Uz*, *Hul*, *Gether*, *Mash*: all unidentified as yet. Josephus takes Hul to be Armenia, Gether to be Bactria, and Mash to be district of Mesene at the mouth of the Euphrates. These identifications, however, are very questionable.

(For further appearances of the names in the Table of Nations, the student is referred especially to First Chronicles, chapter 1, and to any complete Concordance of the Old and New Testaments. For additional etymological, historical and geographical information concerning the names and places mentioned in the Table, see the Rand McNally *Bible Atlas* (BA), Baker's *Bible Atlas* (BBA), *The New Bible Dictionary* (NBD), and the Table of Nations Map 1, in the small but excellent *Standard Bible Atlas* (Standard Publishing, Cincinnati). Account must be taken of the fact that some differences occur as to the location of the different peoples represented in the Table, in the various maps in which they are placed geographically. Many of the persons and peoples given in the Table are simply as yet unidentifiable.)

## GENESIS

### 9. *The Importance of the Table of Nations*

Whitelaw (PCG, 156): "It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this ethnological table. Whether regarded from a geographical, a political, or a theocratical standpoint, 'this unparalleled list, the combined result of reflection and deep research,' is 'no less valuable as a historical document than as a lasting proof of the brilliant capacity of the Hebrew mind.' Undoubtedly the earliest effort of the human intellect to exhibit in a tabulated form the geographical distribution of the human race, it bears unmistakable witness in its own structure to its high antiquity, occupying itself least with the Japhetic tribes which were farthest from the theocratic center, and were latest in attaining to historic eminence, and enlarging with much greater minuteness of detail on those Hamitic nations, the Egyptian, the Canaanite, and Arabian, which were soonest developed, and with which the Hebrews came most into contact in the initial stages of their career. It describes the rise of states, and, consistently with all subsequent historical and archaeological testimony, gives the prominence to the Egyptian or Arabian Hamites, as the first founders of empires. It exhibits the separation of the Shemites from the other sons of Noah, and the budding forth of the line of promise in the family of Arphaxad. While thus useful to the geographer, the historian, the politician, it is specially serviceable to the theologian as enabling him to trace the descent of the woman's seed, and to mark the fulfillments of Scripture prophecies concerning the nations of the earth."

Dean (OBH, 18): "The tenth chapter of Genesis is the oldest authority on ethnology. It gives the descendants of Noah's sons and their distribution. (1) Ham had four sons who settled the Lower Euphrates and the Nile valleys. The earliest civilizations were Hamitic. (2) Shem's five sons settled southwestern Asia. They were ancestors of the Chaldeans who conquered the earlier

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NATIONS

Hamitic race on the Euphrates, of the Assyrians, Syrians, Arabians, and Hebrews. (3) Japheth had seven sons, from whom sprang the Medes, Greeks, Romans, and all the modern races of Europe. They scattered widely, were in obscurity for thousands of years, but for twenty-four hundred years have been the ruling races of the world."

### 10. *The Antiquity of Man*

We have already noted that in the Neolithic Age (roughly from 10,000 or 8,000 to 5,000 B.C.) plant and animal domestication was fully developed, and pottery began to put in appearance. We must take account also of the polychrome paintings on cave walls, of hand-carved artifacts (such as batons, used probably for magical purposes), many specimens of which have been dug up by the archaeologists and which must have been in existence about the beginning of the Neolithic Period. The Chalcolithic Age (c. 5,000 to 3,000 B.C.) was marked by many cultural advancements, skilled workmanship in copper, flint, basalt, marble, limestone, ivory and bone; high development of the imaginative-esthetic powers in man; and along with this a highly developed agricultural civilization. This age produced metallurgists, potters, weavers, smiths and many other artisans of high attainments. The beginning of skilled workmanship in bronze (in Scripture, brass) occurred between 3,000 and 2,500 B.C. (Bronze is, of course, an alloy of copper and tin). The discovery and widespread use of iron had its beginning from about 1,500 B.C.

When did *homo sapiens* first put in appearance? Some of the extravagant claims that are being made today for the antiquity of man are ridiculous beyond description. In recent months articles have appeared from time to time claiming the discovery of human skeletal remains—a few here, and a few there—which indicate an antiquity of some 100,000 years for the human being; by some this figure has been extended farther back into the limbo of

## GENESIS

unrecorded time. One Dr. Leakey has been spreading his assumptions of this character in the metropolitan press as if they were "law and gospel," when as a matter of fact there is no possibility of proving the reliability of his claims. One fact stands out in this connection which, to this writer, needs some explanation. It is this: At the rate of population growth such as we have witnessed in our time, if *homo sapiens* existed 100,000 years ago, or even 25,000 years ago, or even much fewer years ago, there would have been billions of such creatures walking the earth. If so, what happened to them? Have we found any abundance of skeletal remains to prove that they had already covered the surface of the earth with their presence? Why did they not invent anything of importance? Why did they make little or no progress? What are the evidences of their culture, even as existing prior to the evidences of culture found in the caves and on the cave walls of early prehistoric species? If the human race had spread over the earth fifty thousand years ago, or twenty-five thousand years ago, it must have been a race of "helpless critters." Or, is it a fact that the Flood did come and destroy them all? But even so, where are their fossilized remains? It is not about time to mix a little common sense with academic nonsense? Some of these claims are so absurd that—as an English philosopher once put it—only a very learned man could possibly conjure them up. It takes a great deal more "blind faith" to accept these academic conjectures than to let God work His sovereign Will as He may have chosen to do and does now choose to do.

\* \* \* \* \*

### REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART TWENTY-THREE

1. How do the names of Noah's sons indicate the character of their respective Lines?
2. What is the correct meaning of the word "nation"?

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NATIONS

3. What is the over-all principle of classification in the Table of Nations?
4. Explain how the Table is arranged in climactic form?
5. State the geographical distributions of the progenies of Shem, Ham, and Japheth, respectively.
6. Why is the Table finally narrowed down to the Line of Shem?
7. What is the general trend of the content of Genesis at this point?
8. Why does the Line from Shem to Abraham trace a *personal* descent?
9. Explain some of the problems involved in the "explanation" of this Table of Nations.
10. Why were rivers the first arteries of transportation?
11. What do we conclude as to the original unity of the race?
12. What are some of the facts which help us in the interpretation of the Table of Nations?
13. Explain the three distinctive characteristics of a people which may cause subtle variability in names.
14. How can we account for duplicate names in two or more lists?
15. Explain what is meant by the statement that names can be taken over from the Table of Nations to equate with specific usages in modern times.
16. What is Albright's comment about this Table?
17. What is meant by the statement that this Table is not the basis of the common threefold division of the races of mankind into Aryan, Semitic, and dark-skinned peoples.
18. What was the geographical spread of the Japhethites?
19. Identify the following names in the Line of Japheth: Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tarshish.
20. Identify the following sons of the Line of Ham: Cush, Mizraim, Put, and Canaan.



## GENESIS

21. Identify Havilah and Sheba of the Line of Canaan.
22. List the various Canaanite peoples and locate them geographically.
23. What was the general geographical location of the Phoenicians and Canaanites?
24. How is Nimrod described? What type of ruler does this description indicate that he was?
25. Name and locate the Babylonian cities associated with the name of Nimrod.
26. Name and locate the Assyrian cities associated with his name.
27. Explain the historical and geographical relations between Babylonia and Assyria.
28. Name the sons of Shem and indicate the areas held by the progeny of each.
29. Who were the Elamites and what was their location and general history?
30. Who were the Assyrians and what were their great Cities?
31. Who was Joktan? How many tribes were sired by him and what territory did they occupy?
32. With what people is the name of Lud associated?
33. Who were the Arameans and what territory did they occupy?
34. Identify Sheba and Ophir.
35. Discuss the importance of this Table of the Nations.
36. How long has *homo sapiens* been upon this earth? What are the objections to the extravagant claims regarding his antiquity?
37. To what ultimate events of such great importance to the Plan of Redemption does the writer of Genesis point by his method of gradually narrowing down the genealogies from Shem to Abraham?
38. To what extent does the genealogical table in chapter 11 contribute to that of chapter ten?

PART TWENTY-FOUR:  
THE BEGINNING AGAIN OF  
HUMAN PRESUMPTION

(Gen. 11:1-9)

1. *The Story of Babel*

*"And the whole earth was of one language and of one speech. 2 And it came to pass, as they journeyed east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and they dwelt there. 3 And they said one to another, Come, let us make brick, and burn them thoroughly. And they had brick for stone, and slime had they for mortar. 4 And they said, Come, let us build us a city, and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven, and let us make us a name; lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. 5 And Jehovah came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded. 6 And Jehovah said, Behold, they are one people, and they have all one language; and this is what they begin to do: and now nothing will be withholden from them, which they purpose to do. 7 Come, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech. 8 So Jehovah scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off building the city. 9 Therefore was the name of it called Babel; because Jehovah did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did Jehovah scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth."*

2. *Relation between the Tenth and Eleventh Chapters of Genesis.*

The prevailing opinion seems to be that the *outspreading* of the descendants of Noah, which is the subject-matter of chapter ten, and the beginning of their *scattering* (dispersion) that is narrated in chapter eleven (the story of Babel), refer to the same event. The latter being included as a description of the *manner* in which the *outspreading* originated. It will be recalled that God commanded Adam

## GENESIS

and his posterity to "be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it" (Gen. 1:28), and that at the beginning of the rebuilding of the race, after the Flood, He issued the same command to Noah and his progeny (Gen. 9:1, 7). This command undoubtedly envisioned a dispersion leading to the occupancy of the entire earth. But what did man do, after the Flood? He did just the opposite of what God had commanded; instead of spreading abroad over the earth, the race concentrated on "a plain in the land of Shinar" and started building "a city, a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven" (v. 4). What motivated this defiance of God? "Let us make us a name," is the answer. Man from the beginning has been trying to play God, to make a name *for himself*; that is, to set his own authority up above the sovereignty of God. Just as the Devil did, when he started the first rebellion against the Divine government in Heaven, saying to himself, "I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God. . . . I will make myself like the Most High" (Isa. 14:13-14); and just as Mother Eve, moved by the deceptive suggestion that by eating of the forbidden fruit she would "be as God, knowing good and evil," took of the fruit thereof and did eat" (Gen. 3:6) and so brought sin into the world; so did the progeny of Noah start building a tower to heaven that they might make for themselves a name. (Is it not amazing what human beings will do just to perpetuate a personal or family name after their death?) Man has always persisted in trying to be as God, to put his own will above God's will, to attain Heaven in his own way and on his own terms instead of God's way and on God's terms. His history on earth is the sad story of his burning passion to achieve freedom from all restraints, his determination to prostitute liberty into license under specious claims of "academic freedom," "personal liberty," and the like. In his present state man is potentially an anarchist, and in

## BEGINNING AGAIN OF HUMAN PRESUMPTION

our day his drive for anarchy—for the rule of force above that of reason—seems to be more widespread than it has ever been in all human history.

### 3. *The Tower of Babel*

(1) *Geography*. Noah's progeny journeyed "eastward," we are told, that is, in an easterly direction. They came to a plain in the land of Shinar "and dwelt there." This was the land in which the great cities of Babylon, Erech, and Akkad were situated; hence the region is known in the Bible, as it was known throughout the ancient world, as Babylonia. It is generally held that the people who first occupied this area were Sumerians (who may have come down from the Armenian highlands); hence it came about that Sumer is regarded by many authorities as roughly equivalent to the area called Shinar in the Bible. Shinar is first mentioned in Scripture as the place of the Tower of Babel; in later history it became the place of exile for the Jews (Isa. 11:11, Dan. 1:2).

(2) *Nimrod and Babel*. (a) Kraeling (BA, 46): "The story of Nimrod is meaningful in several respects. That the beginning of his kingdom was in Babylonia and that from there he went to Assyria, accurately reflects the fact that the Assyrian civilization was of Babylonian origin; and that he was a great builder and hunter typifies two leading characteristics of the eastern monarchs as such. Tiglathpileser I (1100 B.C.) well illustrates for us what it means to be a 'mighty hunter before the Lord.' A servant goes *before* his master in executing his commands, and hence a king, too, goes before God as His servant. At the command of his god, says Tiglathpileser, he killed four wild bulls on the Syrian border and ten elephants in the Haran area; at the command of his god he killed 120 lions, hunting on foot, and 800 from his chariot. . . . Hunting was not a mere sport, but part of royalty's obligations." (b) Though not one of the ethnic heads in the Table of Nations, Nimrod is introduced into the regis-

## GENESIS

ter of peoples as the *founder of imperialism*. Under him, society passed in a large measure from the patriarchal system, in which each separate clan or tribe recognized the sovereignty of its natural head, into that (more abject, or more civilized, depending on the way it is viewed) in which different tribes or nations recognized the governance of one who was not their natural head, but has acquired his ascendancy and dominion by conquest. Eastern tradition has always pictured Nimrod as a gigantic oppressor of the people's liberties and a rebel against God. Josephus charges him with actually having instigated the building of the Tower of Babel. Attempts have been made to identify him with Marduk, the patron deity of Babylon, and with Gilgamesh, the Babylonian national hero, but of course such identifications are without positive confirmation from any as yet known source. The Bible record positively associates him with Babel, the primitive name for Babylon, but not explicitly with the building of the Tower of Babel, although from the account we have of him such an act of presumption on his part would have been wholly in character.

(3) *The Tower*. (a) In the story of the Tower of Babel, we have the first mention in the Bible of brick-making and cement work. Tacitus, Strabo, Josephus, and Pliny are unanimous in stating that the brick walls of Babylon were cemented with bitumen (A. V. slime). Layard the archaeologist tells us that the bricks were united so firmly that recent excavators have found it impossible to detach one from the mass. (Clay was used for bricks, and bitumen for mortar). The people involved in building this tower were motivated, we are told in Scripture, by the urge to build something that would reach up to heaven, thus to make them a name for themselves lest they be scattered over the earth; that is, by the building of such a tower to frustrate God's will for them to replenish the whole earth. This sounds entirely

## BEGINNING AGAIN OF HUMAN PRESUMPTION

and tragically *human*. "This, we may depend upon it, was no republic of builders, no cooperative association of bricklayers and bricklayers' laborers, bent on immortalizing themselves by the work of their own hands. This early effort at centralization, with a huge metropolis as its focus, sprang, we may be quite sure, from the brain of some ambitious potentate, and was baptized, from the very first, in the blood and sweat and misery of toiling millions" (*Biblical Illustrator, in loco*). (b) It should be noted that the tower was built in connection with a city. The difficulty of identifying the site of this undertaking arises chiefly from the fact that the materials of which the tower was built have been removed at various times for the construction of the great cities which have successively replaced it. There is but little question, however, that the city was Babylon itself, and the trend of scholarship at first was to identify the Tower of Babel with the Temple of Belus, described by Herodotus, which is found in the dilapidated remains of the Birs-Nimrud. Kitto has written (CBL) "To Nimrod the first foundations of the tower are ascribed; Semiramis enlarged and beautified it; but it appears that the Temple of Bel, in its most renowned state, was not completed until the time of Nebuchadnezzar, who, after the accomplishment of his many conquests, consecrated this superb edifice to the idolatrous object to whom he ascribed his victories." The signal disappointment of the founders of this edifice shows that, from the very first, the entire project was an offense unto God. It seems to have existed, from the outset, in derogation of the Divine glory. Throughout the Scripture, Babel, Babylon, and Baal, are terms which stand for everything opposed to the testimony of God.

(b) Recent and more complete knowledge of Babylonian writing has caused archaeologists to reject the identification suggested in the foregoing paragraph. Kraeling (BA,

## GENESIS

54): "The lofty *Birs Nimrud*, the ruins of which are visible far across the plains, was long believed to be the Tower of Babel. Since the site of Babylon was known because of the mound *Babil*, near modern Hillah, it had to be supposed that the city covered a very large area. But after scholars learned to read and understand the Babylonian writing it was shown that *Birs Nimrud* was the tower of the city of Borsippa. The tower meant by the Biblical story was, of course, that of Babylon itself. This tower, frequently rebuilt and renewed by the Babylonian kings, was called in Sumerian *E-temen-an-ki*, 'House of the Foundation of Heaven and Earth,' and the temple in which it stood was called *E-sag-ila*, 'House that Lifts up the Head.' The tower was leveled to the ground by Alexander the Great, who planned to rebuild it in surpassing glory but who died before he could do so. In the excavations carried on at Babylon by the German Oriental Society, 1899-1918, the site where it stood was determined."

(c) The temple-tower (*ziggurat*) was an architectural feature characteristic of Babylonian cities, the center of their worship, and home of the priestly caste. The typical *ziggurat* is described by Wiseman (NBD, 116) as follows: "The base measured 295 x 295 feet and was 108 feet high. Above this were built five platforms, each 20-60 feet high, but of diminishing area. The whole was crowned by a temple where the god was thought to descend for intercourse with mankind. Access was by ramps or stairways."

(4) *The Name, Babel*. In the Genesis account, the name Babel is explained by popular etymology based on a similar Hebrew root, *balal*, meaning "mixing" or "confusion." Other authorities insist that the name is actually Babylonian, and is composed of two words, *Bab-ili*, meaning "gate of god." Babel, as Babylon throughout its history became

## BEGINNING AGAIN OF HUMAN PRESUMPTION

a symbol of man's pride and arrogance which led inevitably to his fall. (We have here an echo of the theme of the histories by Herodotus, "The Father of History," namely, that Nemesis [Retributive Justice] is certain ultimately to overtake human pride and arrogance. (JB, 27, n.): ". . . mankind sinned and this was his punishment: it was a sin of overweening pride (v. 4) like that of our first parents, ch. 3. Unity will be restored only in Christ the savior, cf. the Pentecostal gift of tongues, Ac. 2:5-12, and the gathering of all the nations in heaven, Rv. 7:9-10."

4. *The Confusion of Tongues.* (1) Note the anthropomorphism here, "And Jehovah came down to see the city and tower, which the children of men builded" (v. 5). Note the emphasis on "the children of men"—is this irony? (2) Note also the "us" in v. 7, "Let us go down, and there confound their language," etc. Obviously, the Lord said that *within Himself*. Does not this statement, as in the other similar passages in the Old Testament (cf. Gen. 1:26, Isa. 6:8) indicate a Divine *consilium* between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? (3) That human iniquity has its root always in rebelliousness is a theme that pervades the Bible from first to last. By way of contrast, however, the superstition that God's jealousy is grounded in His fear that man might usurp a measure of His sovereignty was a commonplace throughout the ancient pagan world, and this Divine jealousy was thought of as reaching at times the point of exasperation which brought down upon the sinner the wrath of all the polytheistic deities. (Aristophanes, for example, in one of his great comedies, *The Birds*, pictures the establishment of a kingdom of the birds, midway between earth and Mount Olympus and the consequent exasperation of the Olympian deities at being able no longer to smell the sweet savor of human sacrifices: cf. Part Twenty-two *supra*, under "Noah's Altar," Gen. 8:21). Modern Biblical critics, those



## GENESIS

who insist on reading "folklore" into the Old Testament narratives would have us believe that the Genesis account of Babel is simply an echo of the pagan concept of Divine motivation. *The more reasonable view is that the pagan concept was simply a corruption of the fundamental Scripture truth that what happened at Babel was just another instance of man's trying to play God, or to be as God* (cf. Satan's motivation, 1 Tim. 3:6, Isa. 14:13-14, Luke 10:18; and Eve's, Gen. 3:5-6), *as a matter of fact a manifestation of man's insolence and disobedience that God could not overlook; to have done so would have been equivalent to His sanctioning human rebelliousness (sin).* Again, we find that truth becomes apparent to the unbiased mind only when the whole of Bible teaching is taken into consideration. God's jealousy is a "godly jealousy" (2 Cor. 11:2-3), which has for its end man's own good. True love can never be unconcerned when it is scorned by the one who is loved, and rejected in favor of the way of sin, the broad way that is certain to lead to man's destruction (Matt. 7:13-14). The whole inhabited world is threatened today by man's misuse of the forces he has discovered and unleashed. What the consequence would be if he should ever attain the fullness of knowledge of himself and his physical environment is horrible to contemplate. (4) The action of Noah's descendants, in concentrating on the plain of Shinar, and attempting to build a city and a tower that would reach unto Heaven, displeased God for several reasons: in the first place, it was the beginning of imperialism and hence was in direct defiance of eternal righteousness, as all world empires have been; cf. Matt. 26:52, that is, the individual or the nation that makes force the guiding principle of life will sooner or later encounter, and be destroyed by, superior force; in the second place, it manifested a tendency toward inordinate pride, the very opposite of that humility which should always characterize human intercourse with the

## BEGINNING AGAIN OF HUMAN PRESUMPTION

Creator and Preserver of mankind; in the third place, it was a case of flagrant disobedience to God's command, as we have noted: He commanded Noah's progeny to replenish the whole earth, but they did just the opposite—they concentrated on the plain of Shinar and tried to storm the battlements of Heaven. What then did God do? He came down and confounded their language and scattered them abroad "upon the face of all the earth."

(5) Could it be that there was another aspect of the people's motivation at Babel, namely, that they had either forgotten God's promise never again to destroy mankind with the waters of a flood, or probably put no trust in His covenant-promise, and sought by the building of this tower unto Heaven to put themselves out of reach of a repetition of the Deluge?

### 5. *The Problem of Race*

The origin of race distinctions continues to be an unsolved problem in anthropology and indeed in all sciences. That all ethnic groups, primitive, prehistoric and historic, "can be regarded as integrating varieties of a single species, *homo sapiens*," seems to be one unavoidable conclusion. That the lines of demarcation between races have again and again been obliterated by interbreeding, is another. The consensus of the scientific world seems to be that three primary races must be recognized: these are the Caucasoid, the Mongoloid, and the Negroid. To these some anthropologists add the Composite (resulting from "the hybridization of one or more of the three primary groups or of races derived from them severally") and the Amerindian. Even these classifications leave unsolved the mysteries of such peoples as the native Australians, the Veddoid peoples (of India, Farther India, and the East Indies), the Ainu of northern Japan, and the Polynesians, living within "the great island triangle Hawaii-New Zealand—Easter Island." (See Kroeber, *Anthropology*, Ch. 4,

## GENESIS

published by Harcourt, Brace). The fact remains, however, that the origin of primary racial distinctions and distributions is clouded in obscurity.

The origin of language, and of the diversity of languages, is equally obscure. (See my *Genesis*, Vol. I, pp. 523-525). Science is simply lacking any naturalistic theory of the origin of language: the only two theories thus far advanced, the interjectional and the onomatopoeic, are woefully inadequate, a fact which is recognized by the scientists themselves. It seems obvious that diversification of languages must have gone hand in hand with diversification of ethnic groups. As one anthropologist puts it: "Anthropologists are in general agreement that language grew up in correlation with culture." "Culture began when speech was present; and from then on, the enrichment of either meant the further development of the other" (Kroeber, *ibid.*, 225). And a culture, to be sure, is the culture of a particular ethnic group or people. This boils down to the fact that diversification of language must have taken place along with the separation of peoples from one another. Thus in the final analysis we can account for the origin of diversity of tongues most logically on the basis of *supernatural impulse* that brought abroad the replenishing of *the whole earth* by the progeny of Noah, according to the story of what happened to Babel. But we must not overlook the fact that diversification in either case, whether of language or of ethnic groups, certainly points back to an original unity, and so sanctions the truth declared by the great Mars Hill preacher, that God "made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth" (Acts 17:26).

### 6. *Other Accounts of the Dispersion*

The Chaldeans had a tradition, we are told, that the first men, relying on their size and strength, built a tower toward Heaven in the place where Babylon afterward was

## BEGINNING AGAIN OF HUMAN PRESUMPTION

situated, but that the winds assisted the gods in bringing the building down on the heads of the builders, and that out of the ruins of the tower Babylon was later built. The same tradition informs us that prior to this event, men had spoken the same tongue, but afterward, by the agency of the gods they were made to differ in speech. Plato reports a tradition that in the Golden Age, which is pictured by many of the Greek poets and philosophers, men and animals made use of one common language, but too ambitiously aspiring to immortality, Zeus confounded their speech as a punishment. Inkling of the same event are to be found in the traditions of other peoples. For some strange reason, however, Berosus does not refer to the event. Eusebius quotes Abydenus as saying that "not long after the Flood, the ancient race of men were so puffed up with their strength and tallness of stature that they began to despise and condemn the gods, and labored to erect that very lofty tower which is now called Babylon, intending thereby to scale the heavens. But when the building approached the sky, behold, the gods called in the aid of the winds, and by their help overturned the tower, and cast it to the ground! The name of the ruin is still called Babel, because until this time all men had used the same speech; but now there was sent upon them a confusion of many and diverse tongues" (*Praeo. Ev.*, ix, 14). Whitelaw (PCG, k66): "The diligence of the late George Smith has been rewarded by discovering the fragment of an Assyrian tablet (marked K 3657 in British Museum) containing an account of the building of the tower, in which the gods are represented as being angry at the work and confounding the speech of the builders." Let us remember that corrupted versions of events in the early ages of mankind point directly to the certainty of a true account. Every counterfeit presupposes a genuine.

\* \* \* \* \*

## GENESIS

### FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

1. "*Let us make for ourselves a name,*" cried the builders of the Tower of Babel. To make a name for himself was man's objective on the plain of Shinar, and it seems to be his overpowering ambition even to this day. To make a name for himself, Satan rebelled against the Divine government, and man has persistently followed in his steps. History is replete with the names of men who have lived and died and performed mighty works, just to make a name for themselves. For world honor, Alexander of Macedon conquered the peoples of his day and is said to have wept because there were no more to conquer. For world honor Caesar planted the Roman eagle in the mountain fastnesses of Gaul and Germany, and wrote several volumes in praise of himself and his armies. For the sake of a great name Napoleon swept across the continent of Europe, while the widow's sob and the orphan's wail furnished the music for his marching hosts. For political baubles, a seat in Congress, a place on the judicial bench, yes, even a paltry county office, men have sold out moral principle, forsaken the church, and crucified Jesus Christ anew. Personal ambition has been the real cause of more wars in human history than any other single factor. What sins have been committed for the sake of world honor! Whether we contemplate man on the plain of Shinar, or on the banks of the Tiber, or in the Hindenburg Line, or before the burning walls of Stalingrad, we find him to be the same worldly-ambitious, self-seeking, God-excluding, rebellious creature. And as it is in the state, so has it been in the history of the Church: Personal ambition has ever been the source of the usurpation of authority by a self-constituted clergy, and the consequent growth of hierarchical systems that destroy the freedom of local churches and even presume to legislate for the state as well as for the denominational world. Man loves *power*,

## BEGINNING AGAIN OF HUMAN PRESUMPTION

and to have a *name* that elicits such modes of address as "Reverend," "Right Reverend," "Very Reverend," etc., is to have power over a fawning constituency. "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

2. *Nimrod was probably the first of that type of "national heroes" ("benevolent dictators" who become tyrants) to whom the world has always accorded deference.* He was a noted, and probably notorious, hunter, builder, ruler; no doubt he was a hero in the eyes of the populace. We are all inclined to hero-worship, said Thomas Carlyle, and he told the truth, but the trouble is that we overrate *physical*, and underrate *moral*, heroism. It takes more courage oftentimes to stand for a principle, and to resist a temptation, than to help take a city. We admire the soldier with his khaki and gun and martial tread (as indeed we should if he fights and often dies for a good cause), but we forget about the patient souls who have lived and died for the testimony of Christ: missionaries and preachers of the Cross who have poured out their blood for humanity without expecting anything of this world's goods in return. Moral heroism is the noblest kind of heroism. Think of Paul, Huss, Savonarola, Wycliffe, Livingstone, and indeed the multitude who have lived for the faith and died for it, including the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ. When we compare the heroism of Nimrod with that of the world's greatest Hero, the former pales into insignificance. Consider, therefore, the true Hero as He is portrayed by the prophet Isaiah (53:1-9). Which kind of heroism do you seek to exalt and prefer to emulate, that of the mighty hunter before Jehovah, or that of the Cross of Calvary?

3. *God does not approve the concentration of population.* His original command to Adam was to multiply, replenish the earth, and subdue it. Instead of heeding the Divine order, Adam's posterity proceeded to build cities and gather into them (cf. Gen. 4:17). The Divine

## GENESIS

command to Noah and his sons was the same, to "multiply, and replenish the earth" (Gen. 9:1), not just a part of it, but all of it. God built the earth for man and He wants man to use it in its fullness. Instead of obeying God's command, however, Noah's progeny followed in the footsteps of their antediluvian forebearers and began to erect cities and to live in them. What an array of cities is mentioned in the tenth chapter of Genesis! Instead of *dispersing*, the race *concentrated*, as on the plain of Shinar. Concentration of population, however, has always been productive of increased vice, crime, neurosis, insanity, divorce, suicide, and like social ills. It fosters disregard for the dignity and worth of the individual: in the big city he degenerates into the mass-man. The social ills which press upon us today for solution, such as gangsterism, racketeering, all forms of crime, slum districts, juvenile delinquency, political graft and corruption, breakdown of home life, etc., are largely the consequence of the gathering of population into urban centers. History confirms the fact that city life breeds lust, vice, crime, and sin in all its forms. Babylon, Nineveh, Susa, Persepolis, Memphis, Thebes, Athens, Sparta, Tyre, Sidon, Carthage—the great cities of history—dropped from world power into oblivion simply because their iniquities were too great for Jehovah to endure. Where are the hotbeds of crime in our day? Paris, London, Rome, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Canton, Tokyo, Istanbul, Cairo, Manila, Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro, etc., etc., all the big cities on the face of the earth. We are told by government statisticians that the American people are forsaking rural life rapidly in our time and crowding into the big cities. The automobile has urbanized rural life. The Industrial Revolution has accelerated urbanization. This inevitably will spell tragedy. Disintegration of home life, corruption of social life, and neglect of church life, are the certain consequences to be expected, and they are

## BEGINNING AGAIN OF HUMAN PRESUMPTION

already upon us. Regardless of racial characteristics or moral standards, wherever and whenever men have concentrated instead of scattering, they have degenerated. Of course God knows this: hence His order was to multiply, and to replenish the whole earth.

4. *God has provided a spiritual plan of association for man to counteract the immoral influences to which an ever-increasing population is always subject.* Isa. 8:9-10. When men associate themselves, they do it to make a name for themselves in the earth. Hence God does not approve these associations for human ends, especially when they are extended beyond all reasonable limits. When God associates men, however, He does it, not for an earthly, but for a Divine purpose. On the great Day of Pentecost, as recorded in the book of Acts, the Holy Spirit came down and associated men on His own ground, around His center (Christ), and for His purpose (redemption). At Babel there was confusion of tongues, and dispersion; on Pentecost, there was confusion of tongues, and unification! God came to Pentecost to gather humanity under one language (the language of the Spirit, 1 Cor. 2:6-15), one faith, one hope, one life, one Body of Christ. He came to gather fallen men and women around the glorious Person of a crucified and risen Christ, and to unite them in the one spiritual Body, the Church. Human association breeds wickedness, but this Divine association, through spiritual means, on a spiritual basis, and for a spiritual purpose under God, makes this world a fairly decent place in which to live. And this is the only fellowship that will do so. One of the important arguments for foreign missions is that the world must be Christianized, at least to a considerable extent, or humanity will degenerate into self-destruction. We face the alternative today, as man never faced it before, of Christianizing humanity or of becoming paganized ourselves. Christianity is a religion of this world as well as of the world to come.



## GENESIS

5. *Babel, man's work, pointed forward to Pentecost, God's work.* When men associate themselves, they do it for selfish purposes; hence God does not look with favor on such associations. Imperialism, whether of king, caste, or class, is an avowed enemy of righteousness (cf. Acts 17:26). When God associates men, He does it for a Divine principle and upon a Divine basis. At Babel, there was confusion of tongues and dispersion. On Pentecost, in Jerusalem, A.D. 30, there was confusion of tongues and unification (Acts 2:1-36). God came on Pentecost through the Holy Spirit to gather humanity into one body, with one hope, one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one language, and one life. Human associations too often breed irreligiousness, but this Divine association, on a spiritual basis, and for a spiritual purpose, makes all those who enter the Covenant partakers of the Divine nature (2 Pet. 1:4). We may prate about "peace," "peace with justice," and the like, until we are blue in the face: the fact is that order, peace, and justice are possible only in Christ (Gal. 3:27, Rom. 8:1, 1 Cor. 12:13, 2 Cor. 5:17, Eph. 2:11-22, etc.). The Church is God's Spiritual Temple which reaches unto Heaven (Eph. 2:19-22, Heb. 12:23, Rev. 11:19).

6. *Babylon, in scripture, stands for everything that is opposed to the testimony of God.* In the early age of the world, at Babel we have the beginning of organized opposition to God's command. Thereafter, Babylon stands for organized opposition to Christianity, for organized imperialism in church and state. As Babylon, in Old Testament history, was the unfailing enemy of Jerusalem, so spiritual Babylon, the apostate church, in the history of Christendom, has been the unfailing enemy of the true Church of Christ (cf. the many references to Babylon in the Old Testament; also Rev. 14:8, 17:5, 18:10, 21; Gal. 4:26; Rev. 3:12, 21:2, 10).

\* \* \* \* \*

## BEGINNING AGAIN OF HUMAN PRESUMPTION REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART TWENTY-FOUR

1. Relate the story of Babel as found in Genesis 11.
2. What is the relation between the tenth and eleventh chapters of Genesis?
3. What did God tell man to do about occupying the earth after the Flood?
4. What did man do about this?
5. What, according to Scripture, prompted Noah's progeny to try to build a tower to Heaven?
6. How was their attitude indicative of man's attitude in all ages?
7. Where was the land of Shinar?
8. What was the connection between Nimrod and Babel?
9. What probably did the phrase descriptive of Nimrod as "a mighty hunter before Jehovah" mean?
10. What change in political structure probably began with Nimrod?
11. Why do we say that man has always been inclined to hero-worship?
12. What is probably the correct identification of the Tower of Babel?
13. State briefly the history of this famous Tower.
14. State the Hebrew etymology of this name. State the Babylonian etymology of it.
15. What has Babel always symbolized in human history?
16. State the Herodotean doctrine of Nemesis. Would you say that it is true?
17. What was the Babylonian temple-tower called. Give Wiseman's description of such a tower.
18. What is the significance of the "us" in v. 7?
19. What is the pagan view of God's motivation in such cases as that of the Babel incident?
20. What motivation does the Biblical account of Babel ascribe to God?

## GENESIS

21. How does this compare with God's motive in putting down human rebellion in other cases mentioned in Scripture?
22. How does it compare with Satan's rebellion? With Eve's decision?
23. What were the reasons why the people's attitude at Babel was so displeasing to God?
24. Does science have any explanation of the origin of race distinctions?
25. What are considered to be the three primary races?
26. Name some of the ethnic groups which do not fit into these classifications.
27. Why do we say that diversification of ethnic groups is accomplished by diversification of language, and vice versa?
28. What are some of the other accounts of the Dispersion?
29. What has always been man's besetting ambition, as exemplified by the story of Babel?
30. Why cannot men be entrusted with power?
31. Why do men overrate *physical* heroism and underrate *moral* heroism?
32. State the reasons why God does not approve concentration of population.
33. What social and moral ills always accompany excessive urbanization?
34. What is God's spiritual Plan of Association of mankind as distinguished with man's own systems of association?
35. Contrast Babel and Pentecost.
36. What does Babylon stand for in Scripture?
37. Trace the Biblical doctrine of the conflict between "Babylon" and "Jerusalem."



