

Exegetical Lessons 1–100 on Genesis

When I exegete a book, I tend to get very bogged down in the details and so, I decided to develop a series of a few short lessons on various chapters of the Bible, where I attempt to simply deal with the primary points of each verse without getting too detail-oriented. Each lesson is 2–5 pages long and designed to be read at one sitting. Although it is always nice to have a Bible open when studying this, I have, in almost all cases, included the actual Scripture within the text.

I began this study with a general introduction, followed by introductory lessons to studying the Bible, followed by some introductory lessons to the book of Genesis. These 21 lessons precede the lessons below.

[Top of the Page](#)

[Lessons 1–100](#)

[Doctrines in Genesis Lessons 1–100](#)

External Links

[Introductory Lessons
HTML](#)

[Introductory Lessons
PDF](#)

[Introductory Lessons
WPD](#)

[Genesis Lessons 1–100
HTML](#)

[Genesis Lessons 1–100
PDF](#)

[Genesis Lessons 1–100
WPD](#)

[Genesis Lessons 101–200
HTML](#)

[Genesis Lessons 101–200
PDF](#)

[Genesis Lessons 101–200
WPD](#)

[Genesis Lessons 201–300
HTML](#)

[Genesis Lessons 201–300
PDF](#)

[Genesis Lessons 201–300
WPD](#)

[Kukis Homepage](#)

[Exegesis](#)

[Doctrines](#)

Internal Links

[Lesson 1: Genesis 1 Introduction](#)

[Creation, Science and the Genesis Account](#)

[Lesson 2: Genesis 1:1](#)

[The Creation of the Heavens and Earth](#)

[Lesson 3: Genesis 1:2a](#)

[The Earth in Darkness \(the Ice Age\)](#)

[Lesson 4–5: Genesis 1:2a](#)

[The Angelic Conflict](#)

[Lesson 6: Genesis 1:2b](#)

[Day One of the Restoration of the Earth](#)

[Lesson 7: Genesis 1:3](#)

[Day One of the Restoration of the Earth \(continued\)](#)

[Lesson 8: Genesis 1:4–5](#)

[Day One of the Restoration of the Earth \(continued\)](#)

Lesson 9: Genesis 1:6–13	Days 2–3 of the Restoration of the Earth
Lesson 10: Genesis 1	Evolution, Creationism and Divine Design
Lesson 11: Genesis 1:14–18	Day 4 of the Restoration of the Earth
Lesson 12: Genesis 1:14–15	Creation Theories and Day 4 continued
Lesson 13: Genesis 1:14–19	Day 4 of the Restoration of the Earth continued
Lesson 14: Genesis 1:20–23	A Summary of Creation and Restoration and Day 5
Lesson 15: Genesis 1:24–1:27	Day 6 of the Restoration
Lesson 16: Genesis 1:26–1:31	Day 6 of the Restoration (continued)
Lesson 17: The Bible	Creation Throughout the Bible
Lesson 18: Genesis 2:1–2:3	Day 7—the Sabbath
Lesson 19: Genesis 2:4–6	Genealogies and Plant Life
Lesson 20: Genesis 2:7–9	God Makes Adam/God’s Name
Lesson 21: Genesis 2:8–14	The Garden of Eden (Part I)
Lesson 22: Genesis 2:15	The Garden of Eden (Part II)
Lesson 23: Genesis 2:16–17	The Garden of Eden (Part III)
Lesson 24: Genesis 2:18–25	God Makes Adam’s Partner
Lesson 25: Genesis 3:1	Satan
Lesson 26: Genesis 3:1–4	The Temptation of Eve—Part I
Lesson 27: Genesis 3:1–6a	The Temptation of Eve—Part II
Lesson 28: Genesis 3:1–7a	The Fall of Man
Lesson 29: Genesis 3:4–7	Human Good and Morality
Lesson 30: Genesis 3:6–7	How the Spiritual Impacts a Nation
Lesson 31: Genesis 3:6–11	God Comes into the Garden after the Fall of Man
Lesson 32: Genesis 3:8–11	God Speaks to Adam after the Fall
Lesson 33: Genesis 3	The Truth of the Bible
Lesson 34: Genesis 3:6–13	Adam and the Woman Offer up Excuses
Lesson 35: Genesis 3:14–15	God Judges Satan/the Gospel of Jesus Christ
Lesson 36: Genesis 3:14–15	The Seed of the Woman
Lesson 37: Genesis 3:14–16	The Woman’s Desire for Her Man
Lesson 38: Genesis 3:14–20	God Judges Adam, the Woman and Satan
Lesson 39: Genesis 3:21	The Sacrificial Death of Christ for our Sins
Lesson 40: Genesis 3:22–24	Expelled from the Garden
Lesson 41: Genesis 4:1–5	The Offerings of Cain and Abel
Lesson 42: Genesis 4:1–7	Cain’s Human Good and Mental Attitude Sins
Lesson 43: Genesis 4:1–8 1John 3:12	Cain Murders Abel
Lesson 44: Genesis 4:9–14a	God Punishes Cain
Lesson 45: Genesis 4:9–15	God’s Agenda in His Punishment of Cain
Lesson 46: Genesis 4:16–24	The Line of Cain
Lesson 47: Genesis 4:25–26	The Line of Seth
Lesson 48: Genesis 5:1–2	“These are the Generations of...”

Lesson 49: Genesis 5:3–31	The Gospel of Jesus Christ Hidden in Adam’s Line
Lesson 50: Genesis 5:3–32	Adam and his Descendants
Lesson 51: Genesis 6:1–2	Mankind Becomes Corrupted by Angelic Beings
Lesson 52: Genesis 6	Testimony to the Historical Accuracy of the Old Testament
Lesson 53: Genesis 6	The Historical Accuracy of the Bible Part II
Lesson 54: Genesis 6:1–3	Mankind Becomes Corrupted by Angelic Beings
Lesson 55: Genesis 6:1–3	Grace Before Judgment
Lesson 56: Genesis 6:1–3	Satan’s Counterfeits
Lesson 57: Genesis 6:1–5	Hebrew Structure and Ancient Mythology
Lesson 58: Genesis 6:1–5	Righteousness, Justice and the Thinking of Man
Lesson 59: Genesis 6:1–7	Civilizations/God Changes His Mind
Lesson 60: Genesis 6:6–9	Old Testament Sanctification
Lesson 61: Genesis 6:6–9	Basic Mechanics of the Spiritual Life
Lesson 62: Genesis 6:9–14	As in the Days of Noah
Lesson 63: Genesis 6:13–16	The Doctrine of the Ark
Lesson 64: Genesis 6:13–17	God Instructs Noah in How to Build the Ark
Lesson 65: Genesis 6:14–17	The Miracles of God
Lesson 66: Genesis 6:13–21	God’s Covenant with Noah and with us
Lesson 67: Genesis 6:19–21	God’s Instructions and Noah’s Creativity
Lesson 68: Genesis 6:13–22	Personal Faith and Action
Lesson 69: Genesis 7:1–5	Noah and Company Enter the Ark
Lesson 70: Genesis 7:6–16	Noah, his Family, the Animals and the Flood
Lesson 71: Genesis 7:6–16	The Deluge Begins/The Organization of Genesis 7
Lesson 72: Genesis 7:17–20	Genesis 1:3–8
Lesson 73: Genesis 7:17–20	The Great Deluge
Lesson 74: Genesis 7:17–24	The Worldwide Deluge
Lesson 75: Genesis 7	Worldwide Destruction/Lessons from the Deluge
Lesson 76: Genesis 8:1–3	The Deluge Compared to Ancient Myths and Traditions
Lesson 77: Genesis 8:4–14	The Flood Subsides/The Omniscience of God
Lesson 78: Genesis 8:15–22	The Flood Subsides/The Flood Timeline
Lesson 79: Genesis 8:1a, 22	Noah and Company Exit the Ark
Lesson 80: Genesis 6–8 and 8:1a	The Cyclical Nature of the Earth
Lesson 81: Genesis 9:1–7	The Organization of Genesis 6–8
Lesson 82: Genesis 9:8	God’s Commandments to Noah and Company
Lesson 83: Genesis 9:8–11	Covenant Theology versus Dispensations
Lesson 84: Genesis 9:8–17	The Noahic Covenant
Lesson 85: Genesis 9:18–29	The Noahic Covenant
Lesson 86: Genesis 10:1–5	The Progeny of Noah
Lesson 87: Genesis 10:6–20	The Founding Nations Descended from Japheth
Lesson 88: Genesis 10:21–32	The Founding Nations Descended from Ham
	The Founding Nations Descended from Shem

Lesson 89: Genesis 10:1, 32 11:1–2	The Movement of Noah’s Family
Lesson 90: Genesis 10:5, 20, 31–32 11:1–4	The Tower of Babel
Lesson 91: Genesis 11:1–4	The Tower of Babel
Lesson 92: Genesis 11:1–9	God Confuses the Languages
Lesson 93: Genesis 11	Archaeology, Primitive Man and Evolution
Lesson 94: Genesis 11	Traditional Archaeological Views
Lesson 95:	Archaeological Assumptions, C-14 Dating and Ancient Technology
Lesson 96: Genesis 11:10–26	The Straight-Line Genealogy of Shem
Lesson 97: Genesis 11	Ancient Biblical Texts
Lesson 98: Genesis 11:10–26	The Line of Shem
Lesson 99: Genesis 11:27–28	Population Growth; Abram’s Line
Lesson 100: Genesis 11:27–32	Abram’s Line

Doctrines in Genesis Lessons 1–100

Ancient Creation Myths	The Creation Verbs of Genesis	The Order of Creation
Why Gen. 1:2a is Translated But the earth became a wasteland and empty...	God and Light and Darkness	The Angelic Conflict
Genesis Creation Theories	How Light Illustrates the Trinity	Light on Day One/the Sun on Day Four
The Doctrine of Light	How Long is a Day?	Some of the Arguments Against Evolution
A New Theory of Creation and Restoration	Creation Theories	The Sun Theories
How the Sun is Analogous to God	What is God Teaching the Angels?	Summary of Creation and the Days of Restoration
Man, the Shadow Image of God	The Sabbath	Ten Amazing Statements from Genesis 1:1–2:7
The Pronunciation of Jehovah	The Tree of Life	The Garden of Eden in Scripture
Timelines of the Creation of Man and the Woman	What God will Make for Adam	Satan
The Basis of Satan’s Appeals	The Shifting Authority	The Doctrine of Human Good

<u>The Doctrine of Morality</u>	<u>The Doctrine of Truth and Lies</u>	<u>What Does the Bible Claim for Itself?</u>
<u>The Historicity of Adam, the Woman and the Fall</u>	<u>The Seed of the Woman as Found in the Bible</u>	<u>Genesis 3:14–15</u>
<u>Genesis 3:14–16</u>	<u>Genesis 3:14–19</u>	<u>The Doctrine of Atonement</u>
<u>How We Stand Corrupted and Condemned before God</u>	<u>Jesus Christ is the Only Way to God</u>	<u>Cainian Parallels</u>
<u>Why I Believe that Man Had Tools Early On</u>	<u>What Eve's Words Tell Us</u>	<u>The Genealogy of Jesus Christ</u>
<u>"These are the generations of..."</u>	<u>Adam, Created in the Likeness of God</u>	<u>The Gospel of Jesus Christ in the Genealogy of Adam to Noah</u>
<u>The Explanation of Jude 1:14–15</u>	<u>A More Accurate Chart of the Lifespans of Noah's Ancestors</u>	<u>Enoch, Noah and Jesus</u>
<u>Biblical States of the Earth</u>	<u>Amazing Things in Gen. 1–6</u>	<u>The Testimony of Jesus Concerning the Old Testament</u>
<u>Why the Sons of God in Gen. 6 are Angels</u>	<u>Satan's Counterfeits</u>	<u>The Structure of Gen. 6:1–5</u>
<u>Bits and Pieces of Ancient Mythology</u>	<u>Definition of an Anthropomorphism and an Anthropopathism</u>	<u>Civilizations</u>
<u>The Doctrine of Sanctification</u>	<u>The Basic Mechanics of the Christian Life</u>	<u>The Parallel of the Days of Noah</u>
<u>The Organization of Genesis 6:1–13</u>	<u>What the Ark of Noah Represents</u>	<u>The Doctrine of Ark in the Bible</u>
<u>The Dimensions of the Ark</u>	<u>Miracles in the Bible</u>	<u>The Organization of Genesis 7</u>
<u>The Changing Conditions of the Earth</u>	<u>Theoretical Changing Conditions of the Earth</u>	<u>Robert Dean on Why the Noahic Flood was Worldwide</u>
<u>Fossil Evidence for Massive Animal Graveyards</u>	<u>Dean's Lessons from the Deluge</u>	<u>The Principal Features of the Biblical Record</u>

<u>Similarities between Genesis and Gilgamesh</u>	<u>In both the Genesis and Galgamesh stories</u>	<u>Significant Differences Between Genesis and Epic of Gilgamesh</u>
<u>The Omniscience of God</u>	<u>Map of Armenia</u>	<u>The Deluge Time Frame</u>
<u>The Priesthoods</u>	<u>Associating Continental Drift, the Tilting of the Earth's Axis and the Flood</u>	<u>Axis-Shift Addendum</u>
<u>The Organization of Genesis 6–8 (from Robert Dean)</u>	<u>Galatians 2:15–17a as a Chiasmus</u>	<u>God Blesses Adam and the Woman</u> <u>God Blesses Noah and his Sons</u>
<u>The [Short] Doctrine of Murder</u>	<u>A Review of Dispensations</u>	<u>Covenant Theology</u>
<u>Problems with Covenant Theology</u>	<u>Dispensationalism versus Covenant Theology</u>	<u>Additional Reading on Dispensations and Covenant Theology</u>
<u>Points on Covenants</u>	<u>God's Omniscience</u>	<u>Summary Points on the Noahic Covenant</u>
<u>Additional References to Antediluvian Meteorological Conditions</u>	<u>What is the Purpose of the Bible?</u>	<u>The Sons of Japheth and their Ancestors</u>
<u>Hamite Descendants by Tim Osterholm</u>	<u>Ham and his Descendants (who Primarily Occupy Southwest Asia and Africa)</u>	<u>The Descendants of Shem who Occupy the Middle East</u>
<u>Noah's Descendants</u>	<u>The Map of Noah's Son's Sons</u>	<u>Noah, His Descendants, and their Distribution</u>
<u>A Modern Map of Iraq and Iran (which includes the journey of Noah's Family)</u>	<u>The 5 Divine Institutions</u>	<u>Attacks Against the Divine Institutions</u>
	<u>What is the problem with this tower?</u>	
<u>Philology from Bible Believers . Org</u>	<u>Traditional View of the Ages</u>	<u>The Assumptions of Archaeology and Paleontology</u>
<u>C-14 Accuracy</u>	<u>Scientific Achievements of Ancient Hamitic Peoples</u>	<u>When did the flood occur?</u>

[The Biblical Chronology of Genesis 11](#)

[Ancient Manuscripts of the Bible](#)

[The Meaning of the Names in Abram's Line](#)

[Transitional Point in the Book of Genesis](#)

[The Genealogies of the book of Genesis](#)

[A Map of Abraham's Journey](#)

[an exponential decay curve](#)

Lesson 1: Genesis 1 Introduction

Creation, Science and the Genesis Account

We live in an amazing universe. It is so vast that, it is beyond our ability to grasp its hugeness. The sizes of the various stars, the variety of the planets and their atmospheres, are the stuff which grabs the imagination of a young child as well as that of an old astronomer. One of the few emails which I forwarded, I also posted on my website called the [Perspective of the Universe](#). It is just a succession of groups of planets and nearby stars, so that we can get a feel for their relative sizes. Not only is it difficult (if not impossible) for man to have some grasp of the size of the earth, the size of Jupiter and then of the sun are even further outside our mind's ability to perceive. But then to find that there are stars whose size dwarfs that our own sun, is completely mind-boggling.

If we go in the other direction, toward the actual molecular makeup of all that is, we come to molecules, which can be broken down into individual atoms, which are made up of just 3 things: protons, neutrons and electrons. It appears as though these might be further broken down into even smaller component parts. We could take the tiniest speck of dust from around our house and examine it and, for all intents and purposes, write a doctoral thesis on this tiny speck, examining its molecular makeup, its structure, and its origins. If we were to take any living organism within our house, choosing one which is too small to see, not only could we easily write a doctoral's thesis on this living thing, but we would never begin to plumb the depths of the mystery of it and all of its myriad functions.

Whether we attempt to examine that which is infinite (the universe) or that which is seemingly infinite (all that is microscopic), we inevitably find it to be complex beyond our ability to fully comprehend it; strangely beautiful; and subject to a whole host of laws, all of which interact in a manner which, in itself, is strangely beautiful. Even more amazing, all that we see is made up of 3 essential building blocks: protons, neutrons and electrons, which are too small for us to see with the most powerful of microscopes, yet virtually every person reading this believes in these three.

All of this came from somewhere, and the first couple chapters of Genesis give us a primer in the creation of the earth, the universe and man.

With regards to the title of the first book of the Bible, the name *Genesis* does not come from the Greek or the Hebrew of the first couple verses of the book of Genesis, but from the first verse of the first chapter of the first book of the New Testament, Matt. 1:1, which

begins: **The Book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ the Son of David, the son of Abraham.** The first two words in that verse are Biblos geneoseôs (βίβλος γενέσεως), accurately translated **the Book of [the] genealogy.** The Greek word Genesis (γένεσις) [pronounced GHEHN-ehs-iss] means *source, origin; genealogy.* Strong's #1078. Quite obviously, the first word is from whence we get the name *Bible.*

We find these same two Greek words in Gen. 2:4 5:1 in the Septuagint (also known as the LXX, which is a Greek translation made of the Hebrew Old Testament a few centuries prior to the incarnation of Jesus Christ). We find the word *Genesis* by itself in the Greek of Gen. 6:9 10:1, 32 11:10, 27 25:19 36:1, 9 37:2.

There are all kinds of creation myths in existence, but the Genesis account is clear, concise, and lacks weirdness. It is very similar, at the first, to what science calls the "Big Bang Theory" where all the universe was created suddenly and from a single point (the theory behind the Big Bang Theory is simpler than you may realize—since the universe is expanding, going out in all directions, then, if you reverse this process, you come to a certain point from which all the universe emanated).

When it comes to the creation of the earth, there is a great majesty, understatement and reasonableness in the first two chapters of Genesis. In order to appreciate this, let's first see how other ancient peoples viewed the beginning of the world. I chose two examples from the same time period:

Ancient Creation Myths	
Civilization	Creation Myth
Chaldean	The "All" consisted of darkness and water, filled with monstrous creatures, and ruled by a woman, Markaya. Bel divided the darkness, and cut the woman into two halves, from which he formed the heaven and the earth. He then cut off his own head, and from the drops of blood men were formed.
Phœnician	The beginning of the All was a movement of dark air, and a dark, turbid chaos. By the union of the spirit with the All, a slime was formed, from which every seed of creation and the universe was developed; and the heavens were made in the form of an egg, from which the sun and moon, the stars and constellations, sprang up. By the heating of the earth and sea there arose winds, clouds and rain, lightning and thunder, the roaring of which wakened up sensitive beings, so that living creatures of both sexes moved in the waters and upon the earth.

These are 2 examples of the dozens which exist. There are, interestingly enough, some creation stories which are very similar to what we find in the Bible.

Taken from Keil and Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*; from e-Sword; Genesis 1 introduction.

Modern science—at least, a very vocal subset of the members of modern science—does everything possible to remove God from the creation of matter and from the creation of life. In previous centuries, scientists were able to maintain a faith in God and still be able to discover the wonders of His creation. In the past century, science has become much more antagonistic toward God, to the point of trying to develop theories apart from God, which theories go against well-established scientific principles. Let me give you an example: we all know that if you throw a grenade into a building, the result will be greater disorder than order. No scientist believes that, if we repeat this experiment enough times, an explosion will result in a better building; no scientist believes that, because all of the ingredients are there for a better building, that a grenade will bring that about. However, many godless scientists believe in the big bang theory where, somehow, in some way, the universe exploded, expanded, and the end result was an amazingly ordered universe with a myriad of natural laws, with incredible beauty throughout our universe. The believer in Jesus Christ can easily believe in the Big Bang Theory (where God created everything from a single point), and this is in line with all scientific law; but it is much harder to have faith in the big bang theory, where the universe began from some unguided explosion/expansion from a single point.

Scientists believe and can demonstrate that mutations are a detriment to any living organism (for both man and animal). They might use a figure like 99% of all mutations do *not* result in a better organism; however, when it comes to observed science, 100% of all mutations result in an inferior creature. Furthermore, no observable mutation (or succession of mutations) results in a brand new function or in a different species. Yet, evolutionists believe that mutation in man and animals is one of the essential building blocks of all living things that you see today. They teach that every living organism is the result of millions of mutations, which resulted in stronger, healthier, more capable organisms—just the exact opposite of what we actually observe 100% of the time.

Is it wrong for science to pursue our origins or to propose various theories? Certainly not. I have no problem with scientists who propose evolution as a possible theory of origins. However, they ought to be honest about it. When it is taught in school for the first time, there ought to be honest and genuine caveats. For instance, “Evolution is one theory that many scientists believe. In fact, it is the only theory which is seen as a reasonable alternative to the idea that God created the heavens and the earth and man.” They ought to say, “Evolutionists believe that all men and animals are the result of successive mutations occurring over millions of years, some minor and some major. However, it should be pointed out that no scientist has ever observed a mutation which improved the life of any man or any animal; a mutation which resulted in a new and different function of any sort in any man or animal; nor has science ever observed a new species of animal result from a mutation of any sort.” Simple, honest, scientific statements, made to children when they are age-appropriate. Or, “There are three basic theories of the origins of man which are generally accepted today: (1) man evolved ultimately from nonliving matter; (2) man evolved ultimately from nonliving matter as a result of the guidance of God; or (3) man did not evolve, but was created by God. Now, because it has been deemed inappropriate by most adults to teach the idea of a creative God in the classroom in a science class, that leaves us only with the first theory. I promise you that, as we study this

theory, I will present to you not only the theory of evolution, but the many objections and scientific counter-arguments which have been made to it.” If words like these were found in scientific textbooks; if the strength and weaknesses of evolutionary theory were taught, side-by-side, there would be virtually no outside movement to teach Creationism or Intelligent Design in the classroom.

I should point out, science and a belief in God (and, more specifically, a belief in Jesus Christ) are not antithetical; science and the Bible do not define two sides of some intellectual or philosophical battle. There are many modern scientists who *do* believe in the Genesis account of creation and do not believe in evolution. Such scientists are in at least the tens of thousands if not more. Almost all scientists of note prior to, say 1900, believed in God, and many of them believed in the Genesis account of creation.

There are basic laws of science which line up with the Genesis account and are fundamentally opposed to evolution. Much of science is based upon cause and effect. For everything that exists, it was caused in some way to come into existence. Nothing can cause itself to come into existence (water, apart from heat and pressure, cannot become ice or steam). At some point, we trace everything back to the First Cause, which is God. The book of Genesis recognizes that; some modern scientists today refuse to.

No matter what it is that we observe in this life, it has great structure, intricacy and beauty. It is subject to a series of laws, many of which we do not fully understand, but some of which we can quantify to some limited degree. Whether we see a house, a car or a watch, we recognize that someone designed and built this thing (in fact, hundreds of people were often involved) and that energy was expended in order to build it as well. These things are built to exacting specifications, and it is adhering to these specifications which make these things work. Man is also built to exacting specifications. The earth is built to exacting specifications. The design, structure and intricacy of every living organism on this planet is built to a set of exact specifications, the blueprint of which appears to be found in every part of the organism itself. If we are able to recognize that every random car that drives by had a myriad of designers and builders who built this car to some very precise specifications (all of whom used some kind of energy in the process); then how hard is it to imagine that our bodies, which are wonderfully made (Psalm 139:14), are not the result of a Designer, a Builder and Energy as well? In the Bible, this is God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit.

The evolutionist believes that the most complex things on this earth just sort of happened; in fact, they pretty much just caused themselves to occur. However, the person who believes in the creation account of Genesis believes in cause and effect and that things which are made require a Designer, a Builder and Energy—concepts which are completely in line with scientific thought. Just as importantly, these 3 functions or rolls closely mirror the Trinity in the creation and restoration of the earth and all that is in it.

Several times in the Bible, we are told to look to God’s creation in order to recognize God. [The heavens \[continuously\] proclaim the glory of God and their expanse \[the ever expanding universe\] declares the work of His hands](#) (Psalm 19:1). [For since the creation](#)

of the world, His invisible attributes, His eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly observed, being understood through that which has been made, so that they [unbelievers] are without excuse (Rom. 1:20). And God has initiated the process by which we are formed today: For You formed my internal organs; You knitted me together in my mother's womb. I praise You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made. Wonderful are Your works; my soul knows it very well (Psalm 139:13–14). There is nothing superstitious or unscientific about recognizing that we just did not happen; that man is not just the result of an almost infinite series of random events which had no design or originating cause. It is intellectually reasonable to recognize that our very being and existence is based upon the most fundamental scientific principles. If anything, it is superstitious, unscientific and closed-minded to think that there was no First Cause, that we just evolved without a Designer, and that millions of years combined with a fantastic succession of mutations explains who and what we are. It is just as foolish as to imagine our very life (which equals energy) just happened. Any man who is not a fool, recognizes that his thinking is more than just electrical impulses and chemicals sloshing around in our skulls.

Lesson 2: Genesis 1:1

The Creation of the Heavens and Earth

The first chapter of Genesis begins with the creation of the heavens and the earth (v. 1), the lapse of the earth into an icy darkness (v. 2a) followed by the restoration of the earth (vv. 2b–26).

In this first verse, we will deal with the creation of the heavens and the earth. The verb used here, which means *to create*, is not found again until God creates animal life and man.

Gen 1:1 In a beginning God created the [two] heavens and the earth.

The first two words of Gen. 1:1 could be reasonably rendered *in the beginning, at the beginning, or at the first*. We do not find this combination of preposition and feminine noun except in Jer. 28:1 49:34. Hosea 9:10.

God is in the plural here; the Hebrew word is *Elohim*; the *-im* ending indicates a plural noun. God is One in essence but 3 in person. We find this to be the case from the very first verse of the Bible. All 3 members of the Trinity will be involved in the restoration of the earth; we may reasonably assume that all 3 members of the Trinity were involved in the original creation of the heavens and the earth. We will find allusions to the Trinity even in this first chapter of Genesis. The Holy Spirit will be mentioned in v. 2 (**the Spirit of God hovered over the earth**) and that creation was accomplished by more than one Person is found in both the plural noun *Elohim* and in Gen. 1:26a, where **God [Elohim] said, "Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness."** Furthermore, the analogy which I have presented—the Designer, the Builder and Energy—perfectly describe the function of the members of the Trinity in the creation and restoration of the earth, as well as the creation of animals and man. God the Father planned it, God the Son executed it, and God the Holy Spirit provided the energy by which creation and restoration came to pass.

We find the exact same functions of the Trinity applied to our salvation, accomplished on the cross.

God, although a plural noun in the Hebrew, always takes a singular verb.

There are 4 Hebrew verbs associated with the creation of all things which are found throughout the Genesis account of creation.

The Creation Verbs of Genesis		
Hebrew Word	Meaning	Location
bârâ' (אָרַב) [pronounced <i>baw-RAW</i>]. Strong's #1254.	<i>to create (always with God as subject); to shape, to fashion; possibly to create out of nothing</i>	Gen. 1:1 (heavens and earth) 1:21 (sea creatures and animals which fly) 1:27 (man) 2:3-4 (heavens and earth) 5:1-2 (man) 6:7 (man)
‘âsâh (עָשָׂה) [pronounced <i>gaw-SAW</i>]. Strong's #6213.	<i>to make [produce], possibly to make out of existing material; to do, to work; to act, to effect; to prepare; to make (an offering); to attend to, put in order; to observe, celebrate; to acquire (property); to appoint, ordain, institute; to bring about; to use; to spend, pass</i>	Gen. 1:7 (atmosphere) 1:16 (sun and moon) 1:25 (land animals) 1:26 (man) 1:31 (all) 2:2-4 (all, heavens and earth) 2:18 (woman specifically)
bânâh (בָּנָה) [pronounced <i>baw-NAW</i>]. Strong's #1129.	<i>to build, rebuild; to build a house (i.e., establish a family); to make</i>	Gen. 2:22 (the woman being built, made of Adam's rib)
yâtsar (רָצַי) [pronounced <i>yaw-TSAHR</i>]. Strong's #3335.	<i>to form, fashion [by God or man]; to form [by God in creation, in original creation]; of individuals at conception; of Israel as a people; to frame, pre-ordain, plan (figuratively of divine) purpose of a situation</i>	Gen. 2:7-8 (man being formed of the dust of the ground) Gen. 2:19 (land animals)

You will note that each verb has its own very specific meaning and is carefully applied throughout the first two chapters of Genesis.

Isa. 45:18 has 3 of these verbs in it: For so says Jehovah, Creator [bârâ = to create] of the heavens—He is God, forming [yâtsar = to form, to fashion] the earth and making [âsâh = to make, to produce] it; He establishes it, not creating [bârâ = to create] it empty, but forming [yâtsar = to form, to fashion] it to be lived in— “I am Jehovah, and there is none else.”

Gen 1:1 In a beginning God created the [two] heavens and the earth. The first verb which we find suggests that the heavens and the earth were created out of nothing (more accurately, created out of energy). One of the fantastic aspects to this first verse of the Bible is, the creation of the universe from nothing (again, more accurately, created from energy).

Mark Rooker, writing in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct-Dec 1992, speaks to this: “It is the first great achievement of the Bible to present a divine creation from nothing in contrast to evolution or formation from a material already in existence. Israel’s religious genius expresses this idea with monumental brevity. In all other creation epics the world originates from a primeval matter, which existed before. No other religion or philosophy dared to take this absolute first step. Through it, God is not simply the architect, but the absolute Creator of the universe. No sentence could be better fitted for the opening Book of Books. Only an all pervading conviction of God’s absolute power could have produced it.”¹

Heavens is not a plural noun but a *dual* noun. Where the throne room of God is, is considered the 3rd heaven (Psalm 11:4 14:2 2Cor. 12:2 Heb. 8:1 1Peter 3:22) and outer space is often called the heavens (Gen. 1:14–15). The earth does not have an atmosphere designed for man yet (as of Gen. 1:1), which is sometimes known the heavens (Gen. 1:8 7:11) or as heaven (James 5:18). The word *heaven*, in the Old Testament, is typically found as a dual noun. The *two heavens* spoken of here would be space and the location of the throne room of God.

There are many unanswered or only partially answered questions. Obviously, God put all of this into motion, but nothing put God into motion. This is not so much an unanswered question as something which is difficult to grasp. Furthermore, we do not have God’s motivation. However, we do have clues. Man is a creative being and we, being made in the image of God, may reasonably assume that God is also a creative being. Therefore, it is His nature to create.

What is left out of the Genesis account of creation is the creation of angelic beings. Satan, created originally as the angel Lucifer, will show up, seemingly out of nowhere, in Gen. 3. That angels are not created in Gen. 1, and barely alluded to in Gen. 1:3 (you’ll see how when we get there), suggests that, at some point in time, prior to man being created,

¹ Taken from <http://76.220.82.30/AmadorBible/BNOTES/Genesis/Gen1/> accessed November 11, 2008 and slightly edited

angels had been created. For this reason, many theologians believe that there was an entire creation which predated man which consisted of the angels, which appear to have lived on the earth. These ideas are pieced together by threadbare Scripture. The Bible clearly teaches that there is more to this world and this universe than just man and God. Angels are spoken of again and again throughout Scripture. There are references to angels speaking to God about us and our actions (Job 1–2) as well as references to our being observed by angels (Heb. 12:1 1Peter 1:12). Satan, as a serpent, will insert himself into human history in Gen. 3. That Satan would spend time on earth suggests that he has some sort of tie to this land. God created the earth to be inhabited (Isa. 45:18), so that it is not a great jump in logic to think that angels may have inhabited this earth before us. It is unclear whether they were subjected to the same sorts of physical laws as we are subjected (some angels now are clearly not so bound).

The Bible does give us a clear order of creation: God exists eternally, then He created the heavens and earth, then angels, and then man.

The Order of Creation

1. God exists eternally, outside of time. *Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever You had formed the earth and the world, from everlasting to everlasting You are God* (Psalm 90:2). *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God* (John 1:1–2). The *Word*, of course, is Jesus Christ (John 1:14).
2. God created the heavens and the earth. Gen 1:1 *In a beginning, God created the [two] heavens and the earth.*
3. God created angelic beings: *Praise him, all His angels; praise him, all His armies! Let them praise the name of the LORD! For He commanded and they were created* (Psalm 148:2, 5).
4. The angels were at hand to observe the restoration of the earth, but man was not. In Job 38:4–11, God is speaking to Job. These questions are not made to Job, per se, but to all mankind. *“Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth? Tell me, if you have understanding. Who determined its measurements--surely you know! Or who stretched the line upon it? On what were its bases sunk, or Who laid its cornerstone, when the morning stars [angels] sang together and all the sons of God [angels] shouted for joy? Or who shut in the sea with doors when it burst out from the womb, when I made clouds its garment and thick darkness its swaddling band, and prescribed limits for it and set bars and doors, and said, 'Thus far shall you come, and no farther, and here shall your proud waves be stayed'?”* Angels cannot be shouting for joy as they watch God restore the earth unless they already have been created and are able to watch what He does.
5. The heavens and earth were created first, and all things after that. *For by Him [Jesus Christ] all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities--all things were created through Him and for Him* (Col. 1:16). In order to create all things *in heaven and on earth*, there must be a heaven and an earth to begin with.

The Order of Creation

6. Then man was created and given dominion over the earth: Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth." (Gen. 1:26). When I look at Your heavens, the work of Your fingers, the moon and the stars, which You have set in place, what is man that You are mindful of him, and the son of man that You care for him? Yet you have made him a little lower than the heavenly beings and crowned him with glory and honor. You have given him dominion over the works of Your hands; You have put all things under his feet (Psalm 8:3–6). Now it was not to angels that God subjected the world to come, of which we are speaking. It has been testified somewhere, "What is man, that You are mindful of him, or the son of man, that You care for him? You made him for a little while lower than the angels; You have crowned him with glory and honor, putting everything in subjection under his feet." Now in putting everything in subjection to him, He left nothing outside his control. At present, we do not yet see everything in subjection to him (Heb. 2:5–8; Psalm 8:4–6). In order for God to make man *a little lower than the angels*, angels have to first exist.
7. Because the angels were created sometime between Gen. 1:1 (the creation of the heavens and earth) and Gen. 1:26 (the creation of man), and because angels are not mentioned specifically in Gen. 1, we must reasonably place them between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2.

There is a lot which is explained theologically by the existence of angels. Our very existence and the reason for our being may be predicated upon the existence of angels.

Lesson 3: Genesis 1:2a

The Earth in Darkness (the Ice Age)

V. 1 is the creation of the heavens and the earth; in v. 2a the earth becomes a desolate wasteland.

Gen 1:2a But the earth became a wasteland and empty, and darkness covered the deep water.

The first thing which I should dispense with is some very basic Hebrew grammar. They did not have punctuation as we do—for instance, they do not have periods to end a sentence. In a narrative passage, the Hebrew uses what are called *wâw* consecutives to tie thoughts together. We translate this word (which is actually just one letter) *and*, *then* or *and so*. The Hebrew also uses what is known as a *wâw* conjunction, which is the same Hebrew letter, but with a different vowel point (*wâw* consecutives precede verbs and *wâw* conjunctions precede nouns). This Hebrew word is generally translated *and*. However, in the English, these *wâw* conjunctions and *wâw* consecutives are sometimes better conveyed with a period and then beginning the new sentence with a capital letter (things which cannot be done in the Hebrew, as they do not have capital letters or symbols of punctuation). If we

put in *and*'s everywhere that they are found, then a Hebrew narrative would sound like the world's longest run-on sentence. In the English, it is reasonable to leave these wâw's out and translate this verse: *The earth became a wasteland and empty, and darkness covered the deep water. The Spirit of God was hovering over the water.* (I have left out two wâw conjunctions in my translation).

In this case, however, the first wâw conjunction is used to connect adversative sentences or thoughts, and therefore rendered *but, yet, however*.

The first verb found in v. 2 is important: it is hâyâh (הָיָה) [pronounced *haw-YAW*], which means *to be, is, was, are; to become, to come into being; to come to pass*. Strong's #1961 BDB #224. Unfortunately, both *was* and *became* are accurate translations here.

What the earth became is the onomatopoetic expression: tōhûw wâ bōhûw (וְהָיָה וְהָיָה) [pronounced *TOH-hoo-waw-BOH-hoo*], which means *a wasteland [or, formless, a place of chaos] and empty [or, a waste, a void, emptiness; and possibly unpopulated]*.

God did not create the earth a wasteland and empty. Isa. 45:18 reads: *For thus says the LORD—Who created the heavens (He is God!), Who formed the earth and made it; He established it; He did not create [bârâ' = to create] it a wasteland [formless, chaotic, a waste place], He formed [or fashioned, designed] it to be inhabited!—"I am the LORD, and there is no other."*

There are two ways to legitimately translate v. 2a:
And the earth was a wasteland and empty...
Or, *But the earth became a wasteland and empty...*

Why Gen. 1:2a is Translated But the earth became a wasteland and empty...

- When God creates or makes something, it is pronounced *good* throughout this chapter of Genesis (vv. 4, 10, 12, 18).
 - It is not in keeping with the God of the Bible to create something which is imperfect or needs fixing.
 - The God of the Bible is perfect; therefore, it would follow that whatever He creates is perfect.
 - Of those things which God makes or creates in Gen. 1, nothing is said to need improvement, except for the earth created in this verse. It is illogical to assert that here, at the very beginning, God created something which was so chaotic that He needed to repair it. God is not the Author of confusion (1Cor. 14:33). Throughout the Bible, there are examples of areas becoming desolate and wasted because of the acts of man (Isa. 34:11 Jer. 4:23–26) but there are no instances recorded in the Bible where something which God creates was messed up to begin with.
 - The word *darkness* comes from a verb which can also mean *to confuse*.
 - Darkness is often something which God brings upon a person or a nation because of their apostasy or sinfulness (Ex. 10:21–22 1Sam. 2:9).
-

Why Gen. 1:2a is Translated But the earth became a wasteland and empty...

- Gen. 1:2 tells us that the earth is a wasteland and empty, but Isa. 45:18 tells us that God did not create the earth to be a wasteland.
- The Greek Septuagint uses a mild adversative (the adversative δε) to translate this wâw conjunction rather than a simple kai (καί) conjunction (the common translation for a wâw conjunction). This is how we get the translation: **But the earth became a wasteland and empty,...** *But* is the common English translation for the mild adversative δε.
- The common Hebrew order is *verb, subject, object* (which is what we find in v. 1); v. 2 places the subject first, then the verb followed by the object (actually, the predicate nominative here). This grammatically calls attention to the fact that this is not just a normal series of events or that v. 2 is simply a part of or a continuation of v. 1.

The approach to Gen. 1:1–2 suggests that something occurred between vv. 1 and 2. God created the earth to be inhabited with life (originally, with angelic life). However, after a time, when a third of the angels fell, they made the earth a mess, and God covered the earth in ice, which we know as the Ice Age.

Gen 1:2a But the earth became a wasteland and empty..

We have this phrase, tôhûw wâ bôhûw (וְהָיָה וָאֵם) [pronounced *TOH-hoo-waw-BOH-hoo*] (a wasteland and empty) in one other place in the Bible. Jer. 4:23–28: I looked on the earth, and, lo, it was a wasteland and empty; and [I looked to] the heavens, and they had no light. I looked on the mountains, and, lo, they quaked; and all the hills were shaken. I looked, and, lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heavens had fled. I looked, and, lo, the fruitful place was a wilderness, and all its cities were broken down before the face of Jehovah, before His fierce anger. For so Jehovah has said, “The whole land shall be desolate, yet I will not make a full end. The earth shall mourn for this, and the heavens above shall be black, because I have spoken, I have purposed, and will not change My mind nor will I turn back from it.” We have to be careful in this interpretation. The context refers to the destruction of Jerusalem during the time of Jeremiah. However, as we find often in the Old Testament, there is a parallel meaning (we will see this when we come to two descriptions of Satan in the next lesson). This suggests, just as God judged Jerusalem in 586 B.C., so He also judged the earth and the sins of the fallen angels before man’s time began.

Gen 1:2a But the earth became a wasteland and empty, and darkness covered the deep water.

The word used for *darkness* here is the one found in the next several verses. After this chapter, the next time we come across this *darkness*, it marks God’s judgment of Egypt for not releasing the Jews from bondage. Ex. 10:21–22: **And Jehovah said to Moses, Stretch out your hand toward the heavens, that there may be **darkness** over the land of Egypt, so**

that one may even feel the **darkness**. And Moses stretched forth his hand toward heaven. And there was a thick **darkness** in all the land of Egypt three days. We have the phrase *the wicked are silenced in darkness* in 1Sam. 2:9.

It is possible that David even writes of God judging the earth and the fallen angels in 2Sam. 22:8–16: And the earth shook and trembled. The foundations of the heavens moved and shook because He was angry. Smoke went up out of His nostrils, and fire out of His mouth devoured. Coals were kindled by it. He bowed the heavens also, and came down. **Darkness** was under His feet. He rode upon a cherub and did fly and He was seen upon the wings of the wind. He made **darkness** coverings around Him, dark waters, thick clouds of the skies. From the brightness before Him were coals of fire kindled. Jehovah thundered from the heavens, and the Most High uttered His voice. And He sent out arrows, and scattered them; lightning, and troubled them. And the channels of the sea appeared, the foundations of the world were uncovered, at the rebuking of Jehovah, at the blast of the breath of His nostrils. Although the context indicates that this is God dealing with the enemies of David, this is yet another example of parallel meanings found throughout the Old Testament.

In any case, *darkness* is often seen as a part of God's judgment against His enemies.

Gen 1:1–2a In a beginning God created the [two] heavens and the earth. But the earth became a wasteland and empty, and darkness covered the deep water.

The most common explanation for the event which occurred between vv. 1 and 2 is as follows: God created angelic beings, a third of them rebelled against Him, and God judged the angels which fell, the angels who occupied the earth. It is possible that, for a time, the angels were confined to the earth, as twice, Satan is said to have been cast to the earth (Isa. 14:12 Ezek. 28:17—your Bible may read *ground*); however, in Job 1–2, Satan clearly has access to the Courts of God as well as to the earth. In both passages where Satan is cast to the earth, the immediate context is Satan's fall.

My hypothesis is, God confined the sinning angels to the earth and then turned the earth on its axis while the angels were on the earth, flooding the earth, freezing it solid, possibly freezing the angels in place (which did not kill them, but kept them in one place). Here are some reasons for this hypothesis: In Rev. 12:4, Satan (the dragon) drew a third of the stars (angels) and cast them to the earth. We have two passages where Satan is said to be cast to the earth. We have some angels being reserved in chains of darkness until the great judgment in Jude 6. Whereas, this is not the same set of angels, this tells us that God may restrain fallen angels in chains of darkness for a time. *Darkness* covering the deep water may simply refer to God withdrawing His light from the earth and confining all fallen angels to the earth.

Whether God turned the earth on its axis, or simply withdrew His light, it is clear that Satan and the fallen angels were confined to the earth, that the waters of the earth were frozen, and that, for a time, the angels which fell were held by chains of darkness.

As we will find out, much of Gen. 1 will make more sense if we see it from the perspective of being on earth as opposed to the perspective of God the Holy Spirit hovering above the earth. In fact, as we examine the restoration of the earth, what God does is going to be very logical and methodical.

I should point out that there is a slightly different view to all of this, which R. B. Thieme Jr. taught. He has taught that, while the earth was encased in ice, the Satan and the fallen angels were on trial before God, obviously not confined to the frozen earth. Bob, at this time (1971) also taught that there was some sort of salvation offered to angels.² Although I would certainly never break fellowship with a believer who believed these things, I have a slightly different opinion. Our opinions of this time between vv. 1–2 in Gen. 1 are based on threadbare Scripture. What we agree upon is, there was a trial and a sentencing; and that God did not carry out this sentence against Satan and the angels who fell. This suggests (1) there was an appeal and (2) man was created to resolve Satan’s appeal. More on this topic in the next lesson.

Since we find the earth enshrouded in darkness, and that, in v. 3, God will bring light to the earth, we ought to compare light and darkness as these words are found throughout the Old and New Testaments.

God and Light and Darkness	
Point of Doctrine	Scriptural Reference
God is light. The antithesis of God is darkness.	This is the message we have heard from Him [Jesus Christ] and proclaim to you, that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all (1John 1:5).
From the very beginning, God distinguishes between light and darkness.	And God saw that the light was good. And God separated the light from the darkness (Gen. 1:4).
Darkness and light are metaphors for good and evil; in this illustration, men try to present their evil deeds as good.	Woe to those who call evil good and good evil, who put darkness for light and light for darkness, who put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter! (Isa. 5:20).

² R. B. Thieme, Jr., *Angelic Conflict*; ©1971 by R. B. Thieme, Jr.; pp. 14–15. I believe that this booklet has not been updated and reprinted possibly because of one or both of these issues.

God and Light and Darkness

Point of Doctrine

Scriptural Reference

God leads His people from darkness into light.

“And I will lead the blind in a way that they do not know, in paths that they have not known I will guide them. I will turn the darkness before them into light, the rough places into level ground. These are the things I do, and I do not forsake them.” (Isa. 42:16). Again Jesus spoke to them, saying, “I am the light of the world. Whoever follows me will not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life.” (John 8:12).

Jesus Christ is the light which has come into the world. Men have hated Him because what they do is evil, and light exposes what they do.

And this is the judgment: the Light has come into the world, and people loved the darkness rather than the Light because their works were evil (John 3:19).

When Jesus first appeared to Paul, He was as a blinding light to Paul.

In going [to persecute Christians], it happened as Paul drew near to Damascus, suddenly a light from the heaven shone around him. And he fell to the earth and heard a voice saying to him, “Saul, Saul, why do you persecute Me?” And he said, “Who are You, lord?” And the Lord said, “I am Jesus Whom you persecute.” And he was three days not seeing (Acts 9:3–5a, 9a).

Jesus Christ appeared to Paul so that Paul might lead men away from the power of Satan and to the light of God. Therefore, there is a close association between Satan and darkness.

“But rise and stand upon your feet, for I have appeared to you for this purpose, to appoint you as a servant and witness to the things in which you have seen Me and to those in which I will appear to you, delivering you from your people [Jews] and from the Gentiles--to whom I am sending you to open their eyes, so that they may turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and a place among those who are sanctified by faith in Me.” (Acts 26:16–18).

God and Light and Darkness

Point of Doctrine

Scriptural Reference

Salvation moves us from darkness to light.

At one time you were darkness, but now you are light in the Lord. Walk as children of light (Eph. 5:8). But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for his own possession, that you may proclaim the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light (1Peter 2:9).

Or, the quick and dirty way to look at this: light is associated with God and truth (John 1:4–5 1John 1:7 James 1:17 Rev. 21:23–24) and dark is associated with Satan, sin and judgment (Eph. 5:11 6:12 Col. 1:13 1John 1:6 2:11). Light and dark are so contrasted throughout the Scriptures (Matt. 6:23 John 3:19 Acts 26:18 Rom. 13:12 Eph. 5:8 2Cor. 6:14 1Peter 2:9 1Thess. 5:4–5).

That there is no light of God shining upon the earth, that the earth is enshrouded with darkness, suggests that the inhabitants of the earth went from light to darkness.

There are two theories when it comes to the lighting and heating of the earth—one is, the sun was created when the heavens were created, and it provided energy, light and heat for an angel-inhabited earth. In some way, the sun's light and heat were lessened or withdrawn, resulting in the earth being packed in ice. The other theory, which I am leaning toward, is that God Himself provided the light, heat and energy for the earth (which could suggest that there were very different physical laws at that time). We have a future precedence for this—the New Jerusalem will be lighted by the glory of God rather than by the sun and moon (Rev. 21:23). As we go further into this chapter, keep these two theories in the back of your mind.

Lessons 4–5: Genesis 1:2a

The Angelic Conflict

This particular doctrine ended up being 10 pages in length, so I have am sending this out as two week's worth of lessons, and will send out a new lesson two weeks from now.

So far, we have gone this far in the Bible:

Gen 1:1 In a beginning God created the [two] heavens and the earth.

Gen 1:2a But the earth became a wasteland and empty, and darkness covered the deep water.

I have shown logically how the Bible reveals that God first created the heavens and the earth, then He created angels, and then He created man. This order was logically

documented in Scripture. The reason that I am going to cover angelic creation in this lesson is, between Gen. 1:1 and Gen. 1:2a, angels were created.

I send these lessons out to a variety of people, some of whom have heard and understand the Angelic Conflict, and many of whom have no clue as to why there are angels or that there is a relationship between man and angels. For most believers, the mention of angels in the Bible seems unscientific, so they ignore the idea of angels, or they understand angels to be like they are seen on television, invisible, superhuman creatures who watch over us.

Insofar as I know, Lewis Sperry Chafer was one of the first men to present a clear and concise doctrine of the angelic conflict, which doctrine R. B. Thieme Jr. has taught for years, with some extremely important and invaluable additions.³

It is important to know that angels do exist, that they have a relationship to both God and man, and that their existence prior to man is related to the creation of the heavens and earth, and the earth becoming a waste place devoid of life.

In covering the Angelic Conflict, I may introduce a few terms which you may not be familiar with.

From time immemorial, man understands that there is some reason for his existence, some purpose for his short life on this earth, and this topic is a theme found in the writings of philosophers, theologians and even playwrights and musicians. One of the most important topics in the Bible is angels and our relationship to them. Angels are not just some peripheral set of created beings; they are the key as to why we were created.

The Angelic Conflict

1. The Bible teaches us that angels exist. Psalm 8:4,5 148:1–8 Heb. 2:6–7 2Peter 2:11
2. In lesson #2, we covered the order of creation: the heavens and the earth, angels, the restoration of the earth, followed by the creation of man. The Bible is the source of this order.
3. Almost every ancient and modern religion teaches something about angels. Like the creation of the earth, some religions teach some really weird things about angels whereas Christianity, if anything, is understated when it comes to angelic creation (not unlike the Biblical approach to the creation and restoration of the earth).
4. The Bible does not have an off-handed reference to angels here or there; angels are mentioned specifically nearly 300 times in the Old and New Testaments. There are a number of additional passages where angels are spoken of as *spirits, lights, cherubs, stars, demons, a cloud of witnesses, etc.*
5. Furthermore, it is made clear, even in the New Testament, that we are involved

³ Donald Barnhouse also wrote a book in 1960 called *The Invisible Warfare*, which I have not yet read.

The Angelic Conflict

in an invisible conflict, an unseen war. **For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against nations, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places** (Eph:6:12).

6. There are two groups of angels—the elect or holy angels and the fallen angels. Matt. 25:31, 41 Acts 10:22 2Peter 2:4 Rev. 14:10
7. There are some obvious differences between man and angels: man can procreate, angels cannot (at least amongst themselves). The human race was begun with two people, both created and made directly by God and we have expanded our numbers through procreation; angels were all immediately created by God. They do not procreate; their numbers do not increase or decrease. Ezek. 28:15 Matt. 22:30 Col. 1:16
8. Whereas, we have corporal bodies and a soul and spirit, resulting in both physical life and a metaphysical life; angels appear to be confined, most of the time, to spirit bodies or bodies of light which we cannot always see. Matt. 28:2–3 Luke 10:18 Acts 12:27 1Cor. 15:40–41 Heb. 1:7, 13–14 Rev. 18:1
9. There are times when angels enter into human history, and in a variety of ways.
 - 1) Satan either takes on the form of a serpent or indwells a serpent in Gen. 3.
 - 2) Angels take on human-like bodies and are capable of procreation in conjunction with human wives (there is no opposite arrangement; that is, there are no human males copulating with female angels). Apart from this incident, angels do not marry nor are they given in marriage, which suggests that angels are all of one gender (male). Gen. 6 Matt. 22:30
 - 3) Fallen angels (demons) indwelt various people during the time of Christ, having at least partial control of their bodies. Often these were many demons controlling one body. This concentrated activity of demon possession appears to have been most apparent during the incarnation of Jesus Christ (Matt. 4:24 8:16, 28 John 13:27). We do not find demonic possession as a recurrent theme in the book of Acts nor as a topic of extended discussion in any of the epistles). There are individuals whose behavior suggests demon possession—Adolph Hitler or Richard Trenton Chase, for example. However, we are not given the mandate or the mechanics to search out and *heal* such individuals.
 - 4) Angels influence us today with their corrupt thinking, called doctrines (or, *teachings*) of demons. 1Tim. 4:1
10. The most beautiful angel to come from the hand of God is Lucifer, son of the morning.
 - 1) Although Satan is found first in the Bible in Gen. 3, he obviously had to exist prior to that time. He is spoken of in Isa. 14:12–17: **"How you are fallen from heaven, O Day Star, son of Dawn! How you are cut down to the ground, you who laid the nations low! You said in your heart, 'I will ascend to heaven; above the stars of God [angelic creation] I will set my throne on high; I will sit on the mount of assembly in the far reaches of the north; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will make myself like the Most High.'** But you are brought down to Sheol, to the far reaches of the

The Angelic Conflict

pit. Those who see you will stare at you and ponder over you: 'Is this the man who made the earth tremble, who shook kingdoms, who made the world like a desert and overthrew its cities, who did not let his prisoners go home?' One of the fascinating things about the Old Testament is, a passage will be speaking of one thing (here, one of the kings of Babylon) and then it will morph into speaking about something else, a parallel situation or person (in this case, Satan). What we need from this passage is, Satan's sin, to think that he could be like the Most High (i.e., equal to God) and that He has been judged and will be brought down to Sheol.

- 2) Quite obviously, the caricature of Satan with horns, a trident, a long forked tail and red epidermis has no basis in fact (like the picture of a gentile Jesus with the long flowing locks of brown hair). Satan is extremely attractive, charismatic and personable.
- 3) Ezek. 28 is about the King of Tyre, but it also parallels the person of Satan: "You have been in Eden, the garden of God. Every precious stone was your covering; the ruby, the topaz, and the jasper, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the turquoise, and the carbuncle, and gold; the workmanship of your tambourines and of your flutes in you. In the day you were created, they were prepared. You were the anointed cherub that covers, and I had put you in the holy heights of God, where you were. You walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. **You were perfect in your ways from the day you were created, until iniquity was found in you.** By the multitude of your trade, they filled your midst with violence, and you sinned. So I cast you defiled from the height of God, and I destroyed you, O covering cherub, from among the stones of fire. Your heart was lifted up because of your beauty; you corrupted your wisdom because of your splendor. I have cast you to the ground. I will put you before kings, that they may see you. By the host of your iniquities, by the iniquity of your trade, you have defiled your holy places. So I brought a fire from your midst and it shall devour you, and I will give you for ashes on the earth in the sight of all who see you. All who know you among the peoples shall be appalled at you. You shall be terrors, and you will not be forever." (Ezek. 28:13–19). Here, we are told that Satan was in the garden of God and that he was created perfect until iniquity was found in him.
- 4) Satan is called an angel of light, the god of this world and the ruler of this world. John 14:30 2Cor. 4:4 11:14
- 5) God created the Lake of Fire where Satan and his angels and men who do not believe in Jesus Christ will be cast into this Lake of Fire. Jesus taught: "Then He will also say to those on His left, Go away from Me, cursed ones, into the everlasting fire having been prepared for the Devil and his angels." (Matt. 25:41). See also Rev. 20:10–15.
- 6) Satan will be cast into everlasting fire because he has been judged. "The ruler of this world has been judged." (John 16:11b).
- 7) His being cast into the Lake of Fire is future: **And the Devil leading them**

The Angelic Conflict

astray was thrown into the Lake of Fire and Brimstone (Rev. 20:10a).

11. Why is Satan out and about now?

- 1) From the judgement of Satan and his fallen angels to this point in time, thousands and possibly millions of years have gone by. Satan sinned, he has been judged, and he will be thrown into the Lake of Fire. Therefore, we ought to ask, why has this not occurred yet? Why has God not carried out this sentence? Why is Satan out there loose in the world?
- 2) R. B. Thieme Jr. has postulated that Satan's sentence is now under appeal. This is based upon several Scriptures.
 - (1) In Job 1–2, Satan and the angels are assembled before God and Satan is raising objections to the way things are. He claims that Job is dedicated to God only because of the many blessings which God has given him. Remove these blessings, Satan alleges, and Job will curse God. The book of Job is God showing Satan (and the angels who are observing) that Satan is wrong.
 - (2) Some associate the name *Satan* with *lawyer, prosecuting attorney, attorney*. Although I was unable to find a clear indication of this in the several lexicons which I own, this seems to be a Jewish tradition.
 - (3) Satan is said to accuse believers before God day and night. Rev. 12:20
 - (4) The use of the words *judgment* and *punishment* in conjunction with Satan suggest a trial.
- 3) Let me suggest the basis of Satan's appeal (the first of which is postulated by Thieme):
 - (1) How can a loving God cast any of His creatures into a Lake of Fire?
 - (2) Satan to God: "God, You made me this way. I am not responsible for Your creation." God is at fault for not making a perfect creation. If Satan is imperfect, then it must mean that God is imperfect.
 - (3) Satan's sin is originally one of pride, was discovered by God—how can a hidden sin like this deserve eternal death? How is this overly harsh sentence just?
 - (4) Can't a God of love simply forgive His creatures?
 - (5) Let's accept the premise that Satan and the fallen angels have sinned. Why not just give Satan some little space in the universe and let him and the other fallen angels hang out there?
 - (6) Elect angels have chosen this path simply because God rewards them for their choice.
 - (7) Essentially, Satan's objections call into question God's actions in comparison to His character and essence. God has to be consistent, as He is immutable. God is righteous and just, so His judgment has to be righteous and just. God is love, so His actions should reflect His love.
 - (8) There are inherent contradictions in God's character (creating

The Angelic Conflict

beings which will suffer forever in the Lake of Fire does not demonstrate love or righteousness). Therefore, the inherent defects in Satan's character cannot be judged by Someone with inherent defects. In other words, if Satan is imperfect, then God is imperfect. God is unable to demonstrate perfect character in all respects at all times (that is the argument of Satan).

- (9) Right and wrong are relative concepts; there really is no such thing as absolute standards of right and wrong. The acts of Satan and those angels who fell are not inherently wrong, because there is no such thing as inherent wrong.
 - (10) Right and wrong, good and bad, are simply arbitrary standards, set up by God.
 - (11) God is incapable of creating creatures with free will who will not, at some point in time, disobey Him.
 - (12) Finally, Satan, in a sense, alleges, "I could do a better job than God with this earth and with His creatures." He said, "I will be like the Most High." (Isa. 14:14b).
- 4) If you know much about the Bible, you know that each of these objections is addressed in the Bible in conjunction with human history being played out.
 - 5) Whatever objection you have ever formed in your mind against God, God's plan or God's grace, God will deal with that objection in time. Furthermore, it is even possible that this was an objection of Satan's from his appeal trial.
 - 6) Whatever objections unbelievers lodge against God will also be dealt with in time. God's answering all of Satan's objections will simultaneously answer all of the objections of mankind throughout the ages.
12. The time frame of all of this is important. This helps us to understand our place in this world:
- 1) God created angels.
 - 2) Satan fell and took a third of the angels with him. Rev. 12:4
 - 3) There was a trial of some sort.
 - 4) Satan and the fallen angels were judged and sentenced. Matt. 25:41
 - 5) This sentence is not carried out immediately.
 - 6) The implication is, Satan lodged an appeal.
 - 7) Temporarily, the habitation of the angels (the earth) is frozen, which possibly restrains the fallen angels.
 - 8) The earth is restored, man is created.
 - 9) Human history is played out.
 - 10) Then Satan and the fallen angels are cast into the Lake of Fire. Rev. 20:10
 - 11) This implies that we, lowly human beings, are somehow involved between the fall and sentencing of Satan and the carrying out of the sentence against Satan. In other words, we apparently are involved in the appeal

The Angelic Conflict

portion of the trial of Satan and the fallen angels.

13. This explains our place in this world. We were created inferior to angels, but we have an essence similar to angels, inasmuch as we can think, we have self-consciousness, we have a concept of right and wrong, we have a vocabulary, we have emotions, and we have volition. These are things which angels possess, and these things are a reflected image of God. Heb. 2:5–10 12:1
14. By our creation and our lives on this earth, God reveals the nature of His character—His perfect love, justice and righteousness—in dealing with man. Psalm 145:17 Isa. 5:16 John 3:16
15. By our creation and our life in this world, God reveals the consistency of His character through His interaction with man—man as created perfect and man as a fallen creature. God will interact with man under a number of varying conditions, including perfect environment and far less than perfect environment. These interactions, observed by angels, will reveal that God is love, righteousness, justice, and that every single thing which God does is consistent with His character. All of the objections which I suggested, will be answered in human history many time under a variety of conditions.
16. By the function of Bible doctrine in our souls, God reveals the importance of truth, which is embodied in the Bible that we have. God reveals the importance of His creatures knowing and adhering to His Word. Prov. 8 1Cor. 2:16 Philip. 2:5 3:15 4:7
17. God's judgments are revealed as being holy and righteous; His character is revealed as being perfect in all respects. Our function on this earth glorifies God. John 11:4 1Cor. 10:31
18. The simplest way for us to understand this is by our relationship to our own children. When they do wrong, we punish them, and sometimes the punishment is difficult for us and them. However, ideally speaking, before, after or during the punishment, we explain to them what they have done wrong and why it is wrong. In this way, a child develops norms and standards; he develops a conscience; and he learns how to function in this world in such a way that is both moral and right and is beneficial to him and to those around him. This allows a child to build up an entire framework of norms and standards which will carry him through his entire life. Parents who do not do this are destroying the little souls of the children God has entrusted to them.
19. This is how God interacts with us, and helps to explain why, over and over again, believers are called His children. It explains why God disciplines us. Heb. 12:5–11
20. Men and angels, in this process, develop an understanding and an appreciation for Who and What God is and for the wonder of their own existence.
21. The Angelic Conflict explains a great many things to us:
 - 1) Why we exist. We exist in order to resolve the Angelic Conflict and to both glorify and vindicate God. His love and mercy toward His creatures is revealed in the cross, as is His righteousness and justice. Our daily interaction with God after the cross reaffirms God's character and

The Angelic Conflict

- essence.
- 2) Why is there sin? Sin is a result of our free will. Satan and a third of the angels chose to sin, and man chose to sin. There is the difference that we are born with a sin nature because Adam sinned; all fallen angels had to go from a sinless state to a fallen state.
 - 3) Why God cannot overlook or tolerate sin. It is said that there is nothing more vicious than man's inhumanity to man. Whether this begins as a schoolyard taunt, a mean piece of gossip exchanged, or a radical religious movement which kills people in order to make a political statement; sin causes great pain and suffering. Sin is not something which people are willing to engage in on their own. As an example, people claim that pornography is a victimless crime. However, people are kidnaped and enslaved even today in order to further the pornography (and sex-trade) industry. People are led toward drug-addiction in order to keep them involved in the sex trade. Marriages are destroyed and children's lives are ruined because of pornography. The results of any sin can be carried out to reveal how damaging that sin can be.
 - 4) Satan's inhumanity toward man is even greater than we can imagine. We see in the book of Job how much suffering Satan inflicts upon Job, only in an attempt to make a point.
 - 5) Why sin must be judged. There are few among us, when we observe man's cruelty to his fellow man, do not desire to see justice done. Even in a movie, when we are drawn into the evil of some of the characters, it is a great release it is to see these characters receive their comeuppance at the very end of the movie. No one watches a *Die Hard* movie and is disappointed that Bruce Willis prevails at the end of the movie. That is the satisfying resolution to good versus evil.
 - 6) Why is there suffering? Men suffer as a result of sin. This is why God will remove sin completely from our lives in the future. This is also why He will create a new heavens and a new earth, completely separate from the stain of sin.
22. The Angelic Conflict is not a static event or series of events. Satanic strategy and Satanic attacks change from dispensation to dispensation (a dispensation is a period of time as defined from a theological perspective). Although I will personalize this, and speak of Satan's attacks, bear in mind, that we are dealing specifically with his strategies, but that much of his strategy is executed by fallen angels, called demons (although, on occasion, Satan will personally attack some believers).
- 1) In the Age of Innocence, Satan observed the man and the woman, and not being content to leave well enough alone, interfered, causing the woman to sin by deceiving her, and the man to sin knowingly, because the woman he loved had sinned.
 - 2) Satan's strategy in the Age of the Gentiles: When God promised a Savior (first to Adam and Eve and later to other believers), Satan's focus was on

The Angelic Conflict

this Savior and destroying the line of the Savior. The killing of Abel was probably the first Satanic attack against the line of the Messiah (Satan possibly assumed that Abel was the One promised by God). Satan apparently knew that he had influence over Cain.

3) Satan's Strategy in the Age of Israel, parts I and II: When God called Abraham, and promised to preserve his line and to make a great nation of him, Satan began to attack the line of Abraham as well as the nation Israel.

(1) As an aside, I should point out that, if the Jews are removed from this earth, most of the prophecies found in the Bible become null and void; they cannot be fulfilled. Therefore, from the exodus to this very moment, Satan encourages anti-Semitism and does everything that he can to remove Jews from this earth. This is why widespread rioting by Muslims often includes attacks upon Jews specifically.

(2) God made a number of promises to Israel—the Abrahamic Covenant and the Davidic Covenant, to name two—and Satan has acted not only to keep this covenants from being fulfilled, but he also acts to cast doubt upon the fulfillment of these covenants. Many Jews today wonder about their relationship to God and the promises which He made to them. In the end times, Jews are going to rediscover books like Esther and passages like Gen. 22, Psalm 89 and Isa. 53, and suddenly their eyes will be opened, and they will understand what those passages are saying to them. I believe that this is where the 144,000 evangelists will spring from during the Tribulation.

(3) Satan also inspires doubt in Gentiles, with respect to God's fulfillment of His covenants with Israel. One of the results of this is known as Covenant Theology, where all the promises which God made to Israel are reinterpreted and spiritualized, and that the church is seen (falsely) as *spiritual Israel* and that God's covenants are transferred over, somehow, to Gentile believers in the Church Age. The idea is, the Jews just sinned too much, God decided that they were not His people, and He started up the church, which has been mostly a gentile organization (although Jews do believe). This is a false system of theology because it calls into questions God's veracity, His immutability and His omniscience.

i Is God really truthful? He made some very clear promises to Israel, and it is difficult to take God seriously when these promises are *spiritualized*.

ii We are told that God does not change, but, if He just gave all his promises to Israel over to the church, which requires these promises to be *spiritualized* in order for them to make sense, then He is not immutable.

The Angelic Conflict

- iii How can the Jews go so far as to fall outside of God's plan? Isn't an omniscient God able to know this is going to happen and to make provision for it?
 - iv At the very least, Covenant Theology ends up calling into question these 3 attributes of God. These are not tenets of Covenant Theology, but they are logical questions which arise from believing in Covenant Theology (a dispensational interpretation of history is the alternative to Covenant Theology).
- (4) Satan did everything that he could to destroy the nation Israel, inspiring countless attacks against them. He had a hand in splitting up Israel into two nations (the northern and southern kingdoms), and a hand in removing Israel's sovereignty on several occasions.
- (5) This should help to explain not only the continual attacks of the surrounding nations against Israel, but it explains the holocaust and it explains the remarkable hatred of Islam for the Jew today.
- 4) Satan's strategy for the Age of the Hypostatic Union: direct attacks upon Jesus Christ (and, to a lesser extent, His disciples). Here, we have one of the most amazing historical events, simply from the standpoint of strategy. Satan knew Who the Messiah was, and Satan attacked Him in every way possible. Satan did everything he could to move Jesus to the cross, to what he believed would be tremendous humiliation. Satan was able to exercise his considerable hatred toward Jesus throughout this process of Jesus being taken to the cross. However, what Satan did not seem to realize was, God would provide our salvation by means of the cross, and that the cross was His ultimate destination. Blinded by intense hatred, Satan moved Jesus toward the cross, not realizing that the cross would be the turning point in the Angelic Conflict. It is with the cross that Jesus provided all mankind salvation. Had Satan been able to figure this out, he would have done everything possible to keep Jesus from the cross.
- 5) In the Church Age, the Angelic Conflict is intensified for the individual believer. The Messiah promised by God has come, died for our sins, and been resurrected. Therefore, Satan attacks man in general and believers specifically. Satanic strategy moves on two fronts:
- (1) Satan tries to blind the unbeliever from the gospel and tries to keep any person from believing in Jesus Christ. Religion plays as great a role in this as does sin. 2Cor. 4:4
 - (2) Once a person believes in Jesus Christ, Satan does everything that he can to neutralize his spiritual impact. Satan again uses religion to neutralize the spiritual impact of individual believers. This is one reason there are so many Christian cults; this is the reason the Catholic Church has become so corrupt; this is the reason so few Protestant churches concentrate on the teaching of the Bible; this is the reason that so many churches lean toward social action and

The Angelic Conflict

even toward liberation theology—these attacks keep a believer from growing and having any sort of spiritual impact. Quite obviously, Satan continues to use sin to keep man from growing spiritually. 1Tim. 4:1

- 6) When the church is taken up (the rapture), there will be no one who believes in Jesus Christ left on the earth. There will be 7 more years of the Age of Israel to play out, called the Tribulation in the Bible. Satan will have more power at this time and he will seek to kill every person who believes in Jesus Christ. We know that, for instance, in the history of Communist nations, there will be a strong, charismatic leader who rises up to *liberate* his people and to offer them *hope*. Meanwhile, behind the scenes, he is killing every person who is against his *revolution for freedom*. The Beast will rise up in much the same way, adored by millions, if not billions, of people; who will, at the same time, engage in a vicious holy war against God's elect. This will be a double-intensification of the Angelic Conflict.
- 7) The Millennium will be marked by perfect environment, the knowledge of God throughout the earth, people being born without sin natures, and Satan being locked up, so to speak. However, Satan will be let out of confinement at the end of the Millennium, and he will again be given limited power, and he will lead some men in a revolution against God—men who have enjoyed a thousand years of perfect environment. Rev. 20:2–9
- 8) General strategies in all dispensations:
 - (1) Satan would do anything to make God a liar. So, he will continue to attack and attempt to eradicate the Jews. If there are no Jews in the end times, God cannot fulfill His plan.
 - (2) In order to make God a liar, Satan will do anything to show even one promise of the Bible to be wrong. There is no amount of pain that Satan is not willing to inflict in order to prove any promise of the Bible wrong.
 - (3) We all associate Satan with sin and evil, but Satan is heavily involved in *good* as well. Satan attempts to produce human good panaceas—which panaceas often deny the existence or importance of God. Socialism and Communism are clear examples of this, where man has tried to make men equal, which involves the eradication of religion, freedom and, in many cases, life. In this past American presidential campaign (2008), I saw many people paraded in front of us, and their sad and difficult lives revealed, and who or what would solve this? The candidate themselves who parades these people before us. He or she would be the solution to the ills of these people. The idea is, we ought to put our trust and hopes in a particular man or a particular form of government, rather than in God. If our lives are difficult, this has nothing to do

The Angelic Conflict

with God nor does it have anything to do with us, but it is because the wrong man or the wrong party is in power in government. This is Satanic strategy and it is all about *good*. Fanatical environmentalism is a Satanic strategy. Clean air and clean water are good things, and that is a part of our taking control of our environment, as God told us to do. However, environmentalism has gotten completely out of control today with such things as global warming mania and the preservation of such animals as the snail darter or the spotted owl. One of the many reasons why US jobs have been *shipped overseas* is environmentalism, which has shut down industry and building all over the United States (e.g., the lumber industry in the northern United States). These are all strategies where Satan inspires man to try to create a perfect international kingdom here on earth.

- (4) Along the same lines of Satan's involvement with good, many fanatical Islamic groups are also associated with doing good as well, e.g., feeding those who are hungry. Here, Satan is able to combine good works with religion.
 - (5) Satan would like to establish a perfect environment on this earth, and man is constantly frustrating him. So Satan seeks to establish as much control over man's free will as possible, to the extent of determining the amount of money man ought to be allowed to make and at what temperature he ought to set his thermostat at home. Satan would like to create a happy balanced world of people, animal life and nature. In this way, he could prove himself to be like the Most High. Satan is behind all international efforts and international control, because it is easier for him to direct and control human behavior if we are all subject to the same government.
 - (6) Satan would like to establish equality on this earth (not equality of opportunity, which creates inequities, but actual equality).
 - (7) Satan would like to improve who and what man is, mentally and physically, and eliminate people who are substandard.
23. Because of Satan's original sin, because all of his appeals will have been exhausted, God will toss him, the angels which fell and all unsaved men into the Lake of Fire at the end of the Millennium. Rev. 20:10–15
 24. Then God will create a new heavens and a new earth, as the Angelic Conflict will have been resolved. Rev. 21:1

A number of people have covered this particular topic, and their studies are available online:

http://www.gbible.org/files/pdf/The_Angelic_Conflict_Part1.pdf

<http://www.gbible.org/index.php?proc=fea&pid=2>

http://www.markkwilliamson.com/angelic_conflict.htm

<http://www.eccentrix.com/members/beacon/conflict.htm>

http://www.ironrangebible.com/griffith/Angelic_Conflict/angelic_conflict.htm

<http://www.cotsk.org/faq/MeaningOfLife.html> as well as

<http://www.cotsk.org/archives/specialstudies/AppealTrialOfSatan.html>

http://www.versebyverse.org/doctrine/angel_con.html

http://www.answerbag.com/q_view/523978 (go down to Moosemose and his answer)

See also R. B. Thieme, Jr., *Angelic Conflict*; ©1971 by R. B. Thieme, Jr. and from Lewis Sperry Chafer, D.D., Litt. D., Th. D.; *Systematic Theology*; Kregel Publications; ©1976 Dallas Theological Seminary; Vol. 2, pp. 3–38.

This study does not even begin to exhaust the concept of the Angelic Conflict; however, it is good to find out just what Satan and fallen angels are up to, so that we can recognize it when Satan tempts the woman in the garden, or when we see examples of it around us.

Lesson 6: Genesis 1:2b

Day One of the Restoration of the Earth

What we have covered so far is: God created the heavens and the earth, along with all angelic creation. A third of the angels have sinned, apparently following their leader, Lucifer, son of the morning. Their fall affected the earth, causing it to become a vacant waste place, encased in ice (one might even hypothesize that God withdrew His light from the earth).

Gen 1:1 In a beginning God created the [two] heavens and the earth.

Gen 1:2a But the earth became a wasteland and empty, and darkness covered the deep water.

At this point, the restoration of the earth begins (the various creation theories will also be discussed in this lesson). The earth will be restored and repopulated in 6 days; vv. 2b–5 cover the first day of restoration.

Gen 1:2b And the Spirit of God was hovering over the water.

The reason that we know that the Spirit of God *hovering* over the earth is actually warming the waters is, the same verb used for a mother hen laying atop of her eggs warming them (Deut. 32:11). At some point in time, after Gen. 1:1 (the creation of the earth) and after v. 2a (the earth falling into a frozen chaos)—maybe millions of years later—God the Holy Spirit warmed the earth: **The Spirit of God brooded [as a mother hen] over the [frozen] waters** (Gen. 1:2b).

What you have observed in these first few verses of the Bible is a very precise use of language. However, even with that precision of language, one can take v. 2b in two ways: (1) the Holy Spirit enveloped the earth, holding everything in place until the restoration process was to begin. Or, (2) this describes the first step of the restoration process, which is the heating of the earth.

Ichthys.com renders these two first two verses: **Before all else, God created the heavens and the earth. But the earth came to be ruined and despoiled - darkness lay upon the face of the abyss while God's Spirit brooded over the surface of its waters.** This interpretation does not suggest the beginning of the restoration as of yet. The language of the Holy Spirit *brooding* over the earth may be reasonably understood as a hen sitting atop her eggs; she is waiting for the time that they will break forth out of the shells, exposing themselves to the light. Once the chicks come out of their shells, the mother hen remains on the scene, but she no longer fully covers her young (and, perhaps I have taken this analogy too far).

The word translated *waters* can refer to water in any state—as ice, liquid or vapor. Given all that happens, I am going to suggest that the earth was packed in ice—an Ice Age—which was the earth becoming *tohu wa bohu* (v. 2a). The ice that the earth was packed in became water and steam because of the warming effect of the energy of the Holy Spirit. A second option is, when God said, “Let there be light,” that began the actual process of restoration. In any case, the end result would have been a great deal of steam, and, for a time, the earth was very humid, the entire earth enveloped by steam.

It is also important to note that nothing is said about God creating the water in the first place; the water was a package deal with the earth and the chemical composition of the earth. When God created the heavens and the earth, He created the entire molecular structure of things, and all that was on the earth. The earth fell into a chaotic frozen state with the fall of the angels, which suggests that was a part of the judgment of the angels who sinned. If the earth is judged along with the angels, then it is only reasonable that the earth was the primary angelic habitat.

Before we take this any further, let’s look at the various theories which have developed over the years:

There are 4 basic theories when it comes to the creation account of Genesis. The first 3 are the most commonly held to.

Genesis Creation Theories

Theory	Description	Commentary
<p>Literal 6 Day Creation</p>	<p>God created the heavens and the earth and then made the earth habitable by man in 6 literal days.</p>	<p>There are 2 big problems with this theory and they are not what you think: (1) angels are never mentioned in Genesis 1–2 and yet obviously already exist (Gen. 3); when were they created? (2) This theory also suggests that when God created the earth, did He not do a very good job at first, and therefore, had to spend a couple of days fixing what He did. Does that really make sense?</p>
<p>Day Age Theory</p>	<p>Each day of Genesis represents a long period of time—at one time, this was thought to be a 1000 years, but now, people consider each day to represent an age; perhaps millions of years.</p>	<p>This theory surrenders to the evolution theory. It assumes that evolution, to some degree, is true and attempts to reconcile the Bible with evolution. The biggest problem is, it views God as not being quite able to create things correctly from the get-go, but as a God Who must work with His creation and many millions of failures in order to get each stage correct. This approach contradicts the phrase found in this first chapter of Genesis: And God saw that it [whatever He had just formed or created] was good (Gen. 1:10b, 12b, 18b, 21b, 25b).</p> <p>The idea that God guided evolution so that each mutation was good and worked correctly from the beginning, I have never heard put forth. Perhaps some who believe in this theory, believe that?</p> <p>We may, of course, leave evolution out of this and believe that God requires a lot of time to create and make everything mentioned on each day.</p> <p>Another serious problem with the <i>Day Age Theory</i> is, the language used in Genesis 1 seems to <i>emphasize</i> that we are speaking of 24 hour days. And so is evening and so is morning—day one. There are not many ways to express a 24 hour day more clearly than this in the Hebrew.</p>

Genesis Creation Theories

Theory	Description	Commentary
<p>Gap Theory</p>	<p>The heavens and the earth were all created at some point in time, maybe millions or billions of years ago. This included the creation of the angels who lived on planet earth, which was somewhat different then than it is now. Sometime after a third of the angels sinned, God packed the earth in ice, which is His temporary and partial judgment of Satan's rebellion. After the Ice Age, God, in 6 literal days, restores the earth to be inhabited by man and then He creates man.</p>	<p>As we have already seen, God did not create this world as vast waste area (Isa. 45:18). Every time He created something, it was <i>good</i> (Gen. 1:4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25). That means, there were no original design flaws nor did God need to fix or tinker with His creation in order to make it work. The understanding that God creates things perfectly from the beginning is completely consistent with the God of the Bible.</p> <p>God packs the earth in ice as is related to the angelic rebellion (when a third of the angels fell with Satan—Isa. 14:12–16 Rev. 12:4). From v. 2b on is the restoration of the earth, which takes 4 literal days, after which God populates the earth with animals and man on the 5th and 6th days.</p> <p>This approach is completely consistent with the God of the Bible, with other texts which deal with creation, and with the text of Genesis.</p>
<p>Modified Gap Theory</p>	<p>Although the heavens, the earth and the angels were created at some point in the distant past, God then modified or restored the earth, each day representing some unspecified period of time.</p>	<p>This theory does not necessarily give in to the theory of evolution; it just allows for these things which God does to take longer than a 24 hour day. God is not guiding evolution, but He is simply restoring and creating things over a longer period of time. The biggest problem with this theory (which I have never heard espoused before) is, Genesis 1 appears to be speaking of 24 hour days.</p> <p>The rationale behind this theory would be, the heating of the waters of the earth would have had to have taken a very long time. the 6th day has a lot of events occurring in it, which appear to require more than 24 hours.</p>

Genesis Creation Theories

Theory	Description	Commentary
Modified Gap Theory #2	God creates the heavens and the earth, along with the angels, and provides the light for the earth Himself. The first 3 days of restoration are of an undetermined time period, as there is no sun or stars, so there are no traditional measures of time. At day four, we move into 24-hour creative periods of time.	This unique theory occurred to me and has merit for two reasons: (1) we do not have the sun or the stars or the moon, all of which is used to mark time, until the 4 th day. Therefore, a 24-hour day during restoration days 1–3 makes little sense. Now, I realize that the counter argument here is, <i>an hour is an hour is an hour, whether it is light or dark</i> . However, the language simply speaks of light turning dark and dark turning light. (2) We have language on Day 3 which sounds as if the plants are growing, but, in one 24-hour day, God would have to essentially make them grow as if we are watching time-lapse photography. Now, God is fully capable of this, so it is not God's capabilities which I am questioning. It is the order of this restoration project, which may imply a time frame different than people have theorized up until this point in time.

The Gap Theory addresses several problems: (1) the idea that God was unable to produce something which worked correctly the first time, and so He needed to spend a few million years getting it to work properly, calls into question God's power and abilities. (2) Death does not appear to be part of the pristine world into which Adam is introduced; however, a world which came about by means of evolution would have involved a great deal of death. (3) If God created all that there is in these 6 days, why does He not mention angelic creation? Various passages in the Bible indicate that there are angels and that there seems to be a history and an interaction between God and angels which predates man (Job 1–2 Isa. 14:12–16 Rev. 12:4). The Gap theory is consistent with the God of the Bible and it is consistent with the other events of history (angelic creation) presented in the Bible.

The Gap Theory teaches that God created a perfect heavens and earth sometime in prehistoric past (before man). He did not make any mistakes. During this same time period, He created angelic beings who then occupied the earth. There is death during this time period when God packs the earth in ice (after a third of the angels fell, death probably became a part of their world as well—the death of animal and plant life during their time).

We actually have a future precedent which would allow for a restoration of the earth. In the future, God will create a new heavens and a new earth, because they have been corrupted by sin (Rev. 21–22). Therefore, understanding Gen. 1 to be primarily a restoration of the earth is reasonable and completely in line with Scripture.

The idea that the earth is millions of years old is consistent with science insofar as, there are some scientific studies which make the earth out to be very old (these studies do disagree with one another, however). The idea that man is 6000 (or so) years old is consistent with human population growth studies (the idea that man is 1,000,000 years old—as evolutionists believe—is inconsistent with today’s current human population).

Although there are several websites where the Gap Theory is discussed, one very good one is:

<http://www.ichthys.com/sr2-copy.htm>

He suggests that the first two verses of Genesis be translated: *Before all else, God created the heavens and the earth. But the earth came to be ruined and despoiled - darkness lay upon the face of the abyss while God's Spirit brooded over the surface of its waters.*

Either v. 2b or v. 3 begins the first day of restoration (called, incorrectly, the first day of creation). In either case, there was likely a gap of millions and even billions of years between God’s creation of the heavens and the earth (v. 1) and God’s restoration of the heavens and earth (vv. 3–31).

There are many men of God who believe otherwise who, despite that mistake in their theology, are excellent teachers of God's Word. However, paraphrasing what J. Vernon McGee would say, “There are other viewpoints held by brilliant men of God; but if you're interested in the correct viewpoint, then here it is.”

Gen 1:2b *And the Spirit of God was hovering over the surface of the waters.* I believe that the actual mechanics here, are as follows: the Holy Spirit hovers above the earth, as the earth spins on its axis, turning much of the ice instantly to steam. One entire revolution of the earth (24 hours) would allow the Holy Spirit to heat the entire earth. Associated with the heating of the earth is *light*, which is v. 3.

Bear in mind that, during this time, the fallen angels have likely been held immobile in the ice.

Lesson 7: Genesis 1:3 Day One of the Restoration of the Earth (continued)

Day One:

Gen 1:2b *And the Spirit of God was hovering [as a mother hen] over the surface of the waters.*

Gen 1:3 *Then God said, "Let there be light!" So there was light.*

From the standpoint of being on earth, suddenly, there was light. This is in contrast to the darkness over the deep water ([and there was] darkness on the face of the deep water). This did not mean that, during this process, there was no light anywhere above the earth. However, if a person stood on land upon the earth, this land would have been under a chunk of ice and it would have been pitch black dark. From a vantage point above the earth, there may have always been light from the sun on the earth; but from the vantage point of the earth, all would have been dark.

There is the other theory that, there was no light at all and God created (or restored) light at this point in time. The problem with this idea is, we do not have any verb here which means *to make*, *to create*. Therefore, God is not necessarily creating something here where was not here already. On the other hand, God does not necessarily need to create light since He Himself is light. The Holy Spirit brooding over the earth may have provided both light and heat. I'll discuss these various theories in a moment.

I should first deal with chronology and Hebrew writers. You and I tend to think sequentially or chronologically. First this happened, and then this happened, and that is how we often present our perception of anything which we have seen. Therefore, when we read: [Gen 1:2b–3](#) *And the Spirit of God was hovering over the surface of the waters. Then God said, "Let there be light!" So there was light.* we think in terms of God hovering over the water, heating the earth and then, once that is done, then He makes it light. God the Holy Spirit can be hovering over the earth, and then, suddenly, there is light and heat applied to the frozen earth. You will recall how I made the analogy between the Trinity and the Designer, the Builder and Energy. The Holy Spirit, being energy, may be reasonably seen as producing the heat and light which are applied to the earth.

The Hebrew is actually very simple and poetic here. [And so says Elohim, "Light be." And so light is.](#)

In the Hebrew, the verbs are first and the subjects are second; which is typical Hebrew. In both cases, we have the 3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect of the verb *to be* followed by the substantive *light*. The first time the verb is used, it is a jussive, which is often used for a 3rd person command. This is where we get the common translation, "[Let there be light.](#)" It may be more accurately rendered, "[Let light be.](#)" After God calls for there to be light, we have 3 very short words [And light is.](#) The imperfect is either future or ongoing action; and the perfect tense is completed action. The imperfect tense is used here to indicate that light came about as a command from God, but that this light continues to be.

Interestingly enough, the verbs *to create* or *to make* are not found in vv. 2–15. This does not mean that there was no creative activity taking place; it is just not called that.

The Bible tells us that **God is light and in Him is no darkness at all** (1John 1:5b). When restoring the earth, the first thing which God makes apparent is *light*. Light is something which, to this very day, is not fully understood. Science is able to describe what light does or how it interacts with that which is in its path, but science does not fully understand what light is, even to this day.

I spoke of the Trinity and here, in v. 3, we have *light*. Light helps to give us an example of something which is a trinity—light is one in essence, unable to be separated, but there are 3 components to it. Light is luminiferous, calorific and actinic.

How Light Illustrates the Trinity

Property	Description	Parallel
Actinism	The actinic property of light produces photochemical effects. Actinism is neither seen nor felt, but it can produce actual chemical reactions when in contact with matter.	This illustrates God the Father, Who, although not seen nor felt, changes that which He comes into contact with.
Luminance	The luminiferous property of light is what allows us to see things. Objects reflect light which is shined upon them, and we see these objects for what they are. The luminiferous property of light is both seen and felt	This illustrates God the Son, Whom is seen and felt, and Who reveals the true nature of man.
Calorescence	The calorific property of light is its energy, which produces heat. When light is shined upon an object, that object is heated. The calorific property of light is felt but not seen.	This illustrates God the Holy Spirit, Who, because He does not glorify Himself, is <i>felt</i> but not seen.

Light is a package deal. You cannot physically separate the calorific property of light from its actinism. The components or properties of light can only be separated academically or theoretically. They all go together. Light is one, yet it has 3 distinguishable yet inseparable properties or components. This is God—God is one in essence, yet 3 in person. Theoretically, we can separate God into God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit.

When it comes to God's interaction with man and with the universe, we can assign specific actions to specific members of the Trinity; for instance, in relations to creation, God the Father is the Designer; God the Son is the Builder; and God the Holy Spirit provides the energy. However, God's essence is such that, we cannot completely separate God into 3 Gods no more than we can divide light into 3 separate entities.

Light helps us in other ways to understand God. God has various characteristics which make up His essence. God is love, righteousness, justice, eternal life, truth, omnipotence, etc. However, when God essence shines upon this or that circumstance, we may only see 2 or 3 of the components of this essence, just as, when light is reflected from a surface, we see what that surface reflects and we do not see what that surface absorbs. That is, light contains all of the colors of the rainbow, but when light is shown upon a red surface, we only see the red, as yellow and blue are absorbed by that surface. Now for the analogy: when Jesus healed in the Bible, we see God's love, compassion and omnipotence revealed. When Jesus spoke, God's truth and omniscience are revealed. When God flooded the earth, His omnipotence, righteousness and justice are revealed. So, each time that God's light is shown upon this or that circumstance, what is apparent to us is a subset of His essence.

This is also important when understanding Who Jesus Christ is. When Jesus Christ speaks—since He is man, since He is God, and since He is the Hypostatic Union of man and God—not everything He says reflects the entirety of His being. When Jesus says, “I thirst” or “The Father is greater than Me,” He is speaking from His humanity. When He says, “Before Abraham, I am [i.e., I existed eternally],” He is speaking from His Deity. When He says, “I am the way, the truth and the life; no man comes to the Father but by Me,” He is speaking from His Hypostatic Union.

Understanding that each action of God does not reveal each and every characteristic of Him (at least, not apparently) and that each thing that Jesus says may refer to one of His three natures, keeps us from falling into cults and believing Christian cult doctrines. This also keeps us from saying stupid things like, “The God of the Old Testament is a mean, vengeful God, but the God of the New Testament is compassionate and caring.”

One of the few particular objections to the Genesis record of creation and restoration (apart from those who simply reject it out of hand) is that God says, “Let there be light” and there is light on day one, but the sun is not mentioned until day four. This also distinguishes the thinking of man from the thinking of God. Ancient man and ancient religions have always seen the sun as the great life-giver, and, for this reason, many have worshiped the sun. Today, we have a more full understanding as to the importance of the sun, the light, energy and the heat which it provides; and we know that the sun has a life span which will far outlive the earth, and that the earth and the sun are in a perfect juxtaposition with one another as well (the earth at an axis, spinning around the sun, a perfect distance from the sun, with the perfect amount of atmosphere upon the earth). Quite obviously, for this period of time, the sun is necessary to our very existence. And, if we do not believe in God, it is, quite frankly, even reasonable to worship the sun.

There are actually three theories with respect to the light here on day one and the sun on day four.

Light on Day One/the Sun on Day Four

The first theory is that the sun was a part of God creating the heavens and the earth in the first place (Gen. 1:1), and that it had always been there, and that, when the Holy Spirit warmed the surface of the earth, melting the ice which encased the earth, the light of the sun became visible upon the surface of the earth. Being able to see the sun from the earth as a distinguishable heavenly body does not occur until the 4th day. We have all been out in foggy weather or on a cloudy day, where it was light, but we could not see the sun itself. That is what this first theory suggests. The language on this day and day four allow for this interpretation, as God says, “Let light be, and light is” and on day four, God says, “Let lights be in the place of the heavens,...and so it was.” (Gen. 1:14a, 15b; more explanation will be required when we come to day four).

A second point of view—and I am admittedly torn between these two—is that the light over the earth is God; and the Holy Spirit provided the heat which melted the ice packed earth. As the ice melted, the light of God became more and more visible from the earth below, piercing further and further into the newly melted waters and humid atmosphere. In other words, the light here is God’s light, and not from a solar body. Rev. 21:23 tells us that the glory of God, and not the sun or moon, will light up the New Jerusalem. This theory would hold that the sun and moon were not created until the 4th day.

I suppose that we could actually have a third point of view where the sun is, at this time, up in the sky, not visible on the surface of the earth yet, but that God’s light is visible on the earth, and, in a few days, the sun will be visible from the earth, separate from the light of God.

If I was to lean toward any theory, it would be the third theory—that **God is Light and in Him is no darkness at all**—and it is His Light here which shines upon the earth and melts the frozen encasement. However, given the language of this verse and vv. 14–16, any one of these 3 theories is reasonable (I will wait until we get to Day Four before I explain in detail vv. 14–16).

Putting these views aside for a moment, let me ask you a question: *why is light of any sort necessary?* God is fully capable of doing all that we find here in the light, in darkness, or in a very dim light. God does not require light in which to work. He may want to *turn on the lights* before man walks on planet earth, but prior to this, *why is there light?* Three answers: (1) **God is light and in Him is no darkness**, so it is His very nature to be light. (2) Light is needed so that God can reveal to angelic creation just what He is doing. Although the fallen angels have been temporarily restrained in chains of darkness, God reveals to the elect angels what He is doing (as well as to the fallen angels, who have probably been confined to the earth). (3) It is possible that the light and the heat are both from God the Holy Spirit is principally His light which heats the earth.

We do not know the exact nature of angels and how much this nature has changed over time, nor do we know the exact restrictions which God has placed upon angels throughout their history. In Gen. 6, angels are able to have physical relationships with women, and that women bear their children. In Job 1–2, we have angels speaking to God in the throne

room of God. Therefore, angels have a mode of travel available to them which may be related to the composition of their bodies and physical changes which their bodies can go through.

It is possible and even reasonable that God created the universe and the earth, and either gave the angels the earth to live upon and/or, gave them full access to all the universe. In my opinion, the earth was originally made for angelic creation, and that it was packed in ice when a third of the angels fell (this done as a part of the judgment of the angels which fell, which judgment has not been brought to its fruition yet). Quite obviously, the ability of angels to live and move is not based upon the earth or upon the sun.

In any case, the light of God being shown upon planet earth—particularly if this was once an angelic habitat—would certainly get the attention of all angels. That God, from the very beginning, would make it so that His work on earth could be seen by all the angels, makes perfect sense.

In case you question whether God could or would restrict or affect the physical nature of angels, bear in mind that we will be given resurrection bodies at the resurrection, which bodies will be like the resurrection body of Christ, capable of many things which our bodies cannot do now (Jesus walked through a closed door and He ascended into heaven in His resurrection body). Adam's body was originally designed to live forever. However, he will be subject to death when he eats the fruit in the garden, which is another dramatic physical change, as well as a very serious restriction placed upon the physical body. Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that fallen angels have, from time to time, been restricted as to what their bodies were capable of (for instance, fallen angels being frozen upon the earth; fallen angels being allowed physical contact with man and then having that privilege revoked).

Quite obviously, you may question the existence of angels in the first place, because you have never personally seen an angel. My belief in angels comes solely from the Bible. I have never seen one before either nor have I even talked to an angel. There are a lot of things which I believe in which I have never seen with my own two eyes: Australia, Uranus, bacteria, the expanding of the universe, atoms, my own kidneys, and the souls of the people I know—I have never actually seen any of these things myself (although I have obviously seen photos of the first three), but I strongly believe that they all exist.

In any case, at least one passage suggests that the angels observed the creation and restoration of the heavens and earth. God speaking to Job, said, “[Where were you \[spoken not just to Job, but to mankind in general\] when I laid the foundations of the earth? Tell \[Me\], if you have understanding. Who determined the measures of it, if you know? Or who stretched the line on it? To what were the foundations of it fastened? Or who laid its cornerstone, when the morning stars \[angels\] sang together, and all the sons of God \[angels\] shouted for joy?](#)” (Job 38:4–8).

There is a lot which we can say about angels based upon the Bible; however, suffice it to say that the light of God shown upon the earth is, in part, for their benefit. When Satan

drops in on the woman (in Gen. 3), we will examine angelic creation again—and Satan himself—in greater depth.

Twice now, in 3 short verses, angels are implied, yet not spoken of directly. They have already been created, and I would postulate that has occurred around the time the earth was created (in Job 38, the angels are apparently observing and shouting about the foundations of the earth (the physical laws associated with the earth). Secondly, God makes the earth light, which implies that He shown a light upon the earth for a reason. I have suggested that reason is, angelic creation.

Interestingly enough, in a December 2008 Harris poll survey of Americans, 80% of Americans believe in God and 71% believe in angels.

Lesson 8: Genesis 1:4–5 Day One of the Restoration of the Earth (continued)

Gen 1:4 God saw the light was good. God separated [or, *distinguished*] the light from the darkness.

The light which God produced either directly (with God being the light) or indirectly (if this is the ability to perceive the light of the sun from the earth) was judged by God to be good. This means that, God’s creation of light was exactly what He wanted it to be. It satisfied God’s criteria for being exactly what it should be.

The earth, instead of it being entirely encased in ice, to the point of it being dark below the ice, now has light upon it, so that those upon the earth can see this light. The ice was melted and there was light and warmth upon the surface of the earth, which is still all water and ice. Rising from the earth would be a huge amount of steam, from all of the water being evaporated as the ice is quickly melted. Light could be seen from the surface of the earth through all of this fog, but not necessarily the exact source of the light.

On the earth, at this point in time, light could now be distinguished from darkness. The covering of ice was mostly melted, there was steam in the air as we have never seen before—the thickest fog you could imagine—but even in this thick fog, light could be distinguished from the darkness. As the earth rotates on its axis, each portion of the earth goes from darkness to light to darkness once again.

Light is an extremely important concept in Scripture. Therefore, let me pursue a few places in the Bible where we have references to light.

The Doctrine of Light

1. When restoring the earth, the first thing which God does is provide light for the earth. This makes the earth visible to anyone on the earth (e.g., angelic life) and possibly is involved in heating the earth as well. Gen. 1:2–3
2. As we have already seen, light can be broken down into 3 component parts,

The Doctrine of Light

which can be separated from one another theoretically, but not in actuality: actinic light, luminiferous light and calorific light. This helps to illustrate the Trinity, wherein God is always presented as One God—He is One in essence; but He exists in 3 persons.

3. The Bible tells us that **God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all.** 1John 1:5
 - 1) This is because light can be used to illustrate God as One and as the Trinity.
 - 2) God reveals man exactly for what man is (as light reveals the colors of an object it is shined upon.
 - 3) There is no part of God which needs to be hidden; there are no hidden characteristics of God. There is nothing about God which cannot be exposed to us which could indicate that there is anything wrong with his character.
 - 4) Light is absolutely necessary for our existence, just as God is.
4. Jesus proclaims, **"I am the light of the world."** John 8:12 9:5
5. The gospel (the good news as to Who Jesus is and what He has done) is light. 2Cor. 4:4
6. The gospel brings us out of spiritual darkness into the light. Luke 1:79 1Peter 2:9 cf. Col. 1:12-14
7. Believers should always be aware that Satan presents himself as an angel of light. This is why all religion is of Satan. 2Cor. 11:14
8. The glory of God will provide the light for the new Jerusalem. Rev. 21:24

There are at least two places on the internet where you can find a more complete doctrine of Light:

<http://www.portlandbiblechurch.com/DoctrineFolder/DOCTRINE%20OF%20LIGHT.pdf>

<http://www.swordofthespiritbibleministries.com/RJSonnet/RJSonnetNOTES/RJS%20Notes%20DLI%20Doc%20of%20Light.pdf>

Gen 1:5 God named the light day, and the darkness he named night. There was evening, then morning—the first day.

From the very beginning, God developed a vocabulary—a technical vocabulary, if you will. Furthermore, scientific studies have shown that man is hard-wired for language (since we are made in God's image, this would make sense). And, if the human brain is not exposed to language during the critical years, the brain will be unable to develop any real language skills (as we have seen in studies of wild children). Therefore, from the very beginning, God will name things and do things, and this information will be conveyed to man with language when man is created.

Let me add that God has chosen to communicate with man through language. The Bible does not tell us to put ourselves into a religious trance; it does not require us to work up

some sort of an emotional fervor; and there are no formulas provided for us to have a so-called deep and non-verbal connection with God. However, God does communicate with us through His Word, the Bible. That is language. All that we understand about Who God is and what He has done and what He will do is all found in the Bible, and all of this information is communicated with language. God made certain that we have been created with verbal skills; that we can understand language and that we can develop our intellect through the use of language. And once we reach a certain point—called God-consciousness—then God often communicates with us (those who have an interest in God will be presented with the gospel, spoken to them in words, which they can then either accept or reject).

Let's put all of Day One together now:

Gen 1:2b And the Spirit of God was hovering over the water. God the Holy Spirit heats the earth as it turns on its axis.

Gen 1:3 Then God said, "Let there be light!" So there was light. God was the light over the earth as it is turned on its axis.

Gen 1:4 God saw the light was good. God separated [distinguished] the light from the darkness. As the earth turned on its axis, there was a distinction between light and dark.

Gen 1:5 God named the light day, and the darkness he named night. There was evening, then morning—the first day. God develops a vocabulary later to be used with man.

This creation narrative appears to be that which is seen from the point of view of someone on the earth, and not someone in the sky looking down. We may either envision God the Son standing upon the waters on the earth and calling for these things to come to pass; or we may envision angels upon this earth observing all of the changes that the earth is going through. There is a period of time when it is light, there is a period of time when it is dark. This sounds a lot like the rotation of the earth on its axis. The sky is filled with thick clouds, porous enough to allow light to come through, but opaque so that the sun and moon cannot yet be seen in the sky (if, indeed, they are even there at this time). Or, as has already been covered, God the Holy Spirit (and perhaps God the Son or God the Father) is hovering over the earth providing light and heat while the earth turns on its axis. The sun and moon may be seen as being created or revealed on day four.

There are a couple of technical literary points to attend to. **Gen 1:5b** There was evening, then morning—the first day. God did not warm the surface of the earth, make light shine upon the earth, and *then* there was evening and *then* there was morning, day one. God began this process in the dark (the warming of the surface of the earth) and He continued throughout the period when it was light, when God said, "Let light be." My point is, the final half of v. 5 does not describe *what happened next*; it summarizes the time frame from vv. 2b–5a. This is very common to Hebrew writing—a summary is often presented before or after the actual narrative.

It is a normal inclination to say, “It got dark, God stopped working; it got light, and God started back to work again.” However, that is *not* what is being said in this text. We know this for two reasons: Jews look at each day as beginning at night and going until the evening of the next day. This is because it parallels creation, which began when the earth was enshrouded in darkness (and in ice), and then there was light—evening first and then light, one day. The Jews looked at each day in this way, because they were closely tied to the creation of the earth by their knowledge of Scripture.

The second reason we understand the final half of v. 5 to be a summary of time, because it reads: *And so the evening is, and so the morning is—Day One*. We do not have, *then it was evening, and then it is morning, day one ends and day two begins*. Nor do we have, *and then it was evening, so ending day one; and then it is morning, the beginning of day two*. Throughout this chapter, each creative period ends with the statement, *And then it was evening and then it was morning, day ____*. The simple numbering of the day always looks back to the day which has just passed.

Also, in approximately 360 instances of days being associated with numbers in the Bible, the sense is, nearly always, a particular day in time rather than a long duration of time (Hosea 6:2 *may* be the lone exception to this; examples: Gen. 27:45 30:32 34:25 40:20). Unless you have strong reasons for interpreting *day X* in Genesis as referring to more than a 24 hour period of time—a strong literary reason—then you do not get to impose your idea of how long it should take for God to do this or that.

In the Bible, in both the Greek and the Hebrew, the word *day* does not always refer to a 24-hour period of time.

How Long is a Day?	
Length of Time	Examples
Less than 24 hours	<p>In Gen. 1:16, God made the sun to rule over the day, which would be a 12 hour period of time.</p> <p>Adam is warned about eating from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, because the <i>day</i> in which he eats from this tree, <i>dying, he would die</i> (Gen. 2:17b). Adam died spiritually the instant that he ate the fruit that Eve offered him. Satan speaks of the <i>day</i> in which the fruit of this tree is eaten, and this would be an instantaneous result.</p> <p>God walking in the breeze of the day in the Garden of Eden would be during a 12 hour period of time (Gen. 3:8). See also Gen. 8:22. In Gen. 18:1, the <i>heat of the day</i> refers to a particular time of the day, which would refer to a period of several hours. The emphasis is not upon any duration of time, but more to a time-window, during which, God came to Abraham.</p>

How Long is a Day?

Length of Time	Examples
<p>More than 24 hours.</p>	<p>Adam died physically about 930 years after eating from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. That means that in one verse (Gen. 2:17), we have <i>day</i> referring to an instant and, at the same time, to 930 years.</p> <p>A passage often quoted is 2Peter 3:8, which reads: But, beloved, do not forget this one thing, that with the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The context is patience, waiting on the Lord for His coming. God is waiting for all to come to a change of mind about Him. What this does not mean is, anytime we feel like it, we can say that this or that <i>day</i> in Scripture suddenly represents 1000 years. That is a complete misapplication of 2Peter 3:8.</p>
<p>24-hour day</p>	<p>Gen. 1:5: God calls the darkness night, the light day; there is an evening and there is morning, day one. You will note the first use of this word is actually a 12-hour period of time; the second is a 24-hour period of time.</p> <p>The Sabbath day is always seen as a 24-hour period of time, beginning at sunset on Friday evening and continuing until sunset of Saturday evening (Gen. 2:3). It is important to recognize that the Sabbath day is first related to the 6 days of creation, which further suggests that these are all 24 hour periods of time.</p> <p>When a day is numbered, we are either referring to that specific day or to that 24 hour period. Generally speaking, when a day is numbered, the emphasis is not upon the 24 hours, but upon that specific day in time.</p>
<p>Reference to a specific day in time</p>	<p>The exact time that the rain began to fall to begin the great flood of Noah is noted in Gen. 7:11. On that day, Noah and his family entered into the ark (Gen. 7:13). See also Gen. 8:4, 14 21:8 24:42 25:31, 33. The emphasis in these passages is not upon a specific period of time, but upon a particular date in time. Even though that particular date in time might be considered a 24 hour period of time, the emphasis is not upon the duration of that day, but upon its actual date. That seems to be general use when a day is numbered.</p>

How Long is a Day?

Length of Time	Examples
An undetermined period of time	Gen. 2:4 reads: <i>These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created in the day that Jehovah God was making earth and heavens.</i> This actually is the beginning of Gen. 2, and some details are given which relate to the creation of the earth, the restoration of the earth, and some things which took place. Given what follows, <i>day</i> here refers to a very long period of time.

If you have looked at any of these references, we find that most of the time that *day* is used, we are speaking not of a 24 hour duration of time but more often to a marker in time. Using the word *day* to refer to some lengthy duration of time does occur, but it is the rare exception and not the rule. Furthermore, such a use is often modified in some way (for instance, *the Day of the Lord*) and not found in conjunction with the words *evening* and *morning*, which are used in Gen. 1 to mark specific occurrences within a 24 hour day.

Although we may see ourselves as living during a period of God's rest, during His Sabbath (see Heb. 4:3–4), that is not enough to require the *creative days* of Genesis to be longer than 24 hours.

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/nab/could-god-have-created-in-six-days> is a good resource for further reading on this particular topic.

As I previously mentioned, some like to take these days in the first chapter of Genesis and speak of them as *creative periods of time*; so that each creative day in the Bible might stand for a million years or so. The problem is, the text speaks of one evening and one morning and classifies *that* as a day. This simply does not sound like 1000 days and 1000 nights or like 300 million days and 300 million nights, it sounds just like one 24-hour period of time. Suggesting that *and so evening is and so morning is—day one*, really means, 300 million days and 300 million nights have transpired, violates the text, and is an imposition of your preconceived notions upon the text.

Some might assert, *but this is poetic language*. As a matter of fact, it is poetic language. However, simply because this is poetic language does not mean that we can twist the words to mean whatever we want them to mean.

When justifying the Sabbath, we find a reference to the 6 days during which the Lord made the heavens and the earth and all that is in them. Ex. 20:8–11. Again, there is no reason in the context of that passage to see these as anything other than 24-hour days.

I have read many opinions on this matter, including one where the author suggests better ways that God could have said that these were 24-hour days. However, we do not find the verse, *from evening to evening, exactly 24 hours passed, and within that exact time frame, God did* thus and so. However, we do have two markers, two words which describe day

turning dark (*evening*) and night turning light (*morning*). Given these two words along with the numbering of the days, the most reasonable conclusion is, we are speaking of 24-hour days. No other interpretation really makes sense.

Dr. James Barr (Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford University), who himself does not believe Genesis is true history, nonetheless admitted as far as the language of Genesis 1 is concerned that, *So far as I know, there is no professor of Hebrew or Old Testament at any world-class university who does not believe that the writer(s) of Gen. 1-11 intended to convey to their readers the ideas that creation took place in a series of six days which were the same as the days of 24 hours we now experience.*⁴

There are a few things I am not positive about, e.g., the source of the light on this first day (the ultimate source, of course, is God); but that we are speaking of 24-hour days here seems as if there is no doubt. Or, in the alternative, this is exactly one rotation of the earth, given some concentrated light source. Once the sun and moon are created, which are used to mark days and years (Gen. 1:14), then we are speaking of 24-hour days.

Personally, I would never break fellowship with someone who believes that these are creative periods of time, where there are many days and many nights for each creative period of time. However, I would have the following concern: if such a one attempts to stretch these verses in order to fit with his pre-conceived notions, then where else will he compromise the clear reading of Scripture?

There are things which are difficult to understand in the Bible, and I can understand how two intelligent men can come to two different conclusions in some areas. However, there are fundamentals which can really have no other reasonable interpretation. That we are speaking of one rotation of the earth is one of those things. Whether you choose to believe it or not is another thing; but that is what faith is—it is a choice.

Lesson 9: Genesis 1:6–13

Days 2–3 of the Restoration of the Earth

God created the heavens and the earth (v. 1); the earth becomes a waste area (v. 2a); God warms the earth and provides light for it—day one of the restoration of the earth (vv. 2b–5). All of the earth needed to be warmed, so God the Holy Spirit brooded over all the earth, as the earth rotated on its axis. This takes us to day two.

Day Two:

On day two, God produces the atmosphere for the earth.

⁴ From <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/nab/could-god-have-created-in-six-days> accessed November 13, 2008; originally from J. Barr, in a personal letter to David Watson, April 23, 1984.

Gen 1:6 Then God said, "Let there be an atmosphere in the middle of the waters in order to separate the waters."

The word "waters" can refer to water in any form—ice, vapor or water. There became a separation between the surface water and the vapor in the air (clouds), which is the atmosphere.

What occurred at the very beginning was, the ice encasing the earth was suddenly warmed, which caused water vapor to rise and fill the surface above the earth. This water vapor does not simply float out into space, because the earth has gravity and the earth holds these clouds in place. The earth was encased in a huge cloud of water vapor, which began right at the surface of the earth. Essentially, we are talking about fog—a thick, dense fog. On day two, God separated this fog from the earth's surface, so that there would be an atmosphere between the seas and the very thick clouds.

One thing which ought to strike you about v. 6 is the stated necessity for atmosphere. It is something which we take for granted, something which ancient man would never have thought to include in some creation myth, but something which God spent an entire day making. This is the second very untypical thing in creation. First, we have *light* but no mention of the sun; and now we have God creating an atmosphere. If a man were to write this, we would expect the sun to play a prominent, first-day role, and for the creation of the atmosphere to be ignored. Why would some ancient cave man or even some Greek philosopher look up into the sky and distinguish between the earth's atmosphere and the deep, empty space beyond? We understand that concept, because we have been taught this from grade school on; but ancient man had no reason to specify that the earth needed to have an atmosphere.

You may think that I am making too big of a deal out of the earth's atmosphere, but, bear in mind, God spent one entire day on it. God spend one creative/restorative day making something that ancient man did not appreciate. Here, we are, maybe 5000 years later, and we appreciate and understand, to some extent, our atmosphere; and obviously, its absolute necessity. The Bible makes further reference to the atmosphere in Isa. 40:21–22: *Have you not known? Have you not heard? Has it not been told you from the beginning? Have you not understood from the foundations of the earth? It is He [God] who sits above the sphere of the earth, and its people are like grasshoppers; [it is God] who stretches out the heavens like a curtain, and spreads them out like a tent to dwell in.* God surrounds the earth with an atmosphere, which is like a tent for us to live in. As we know now, the earth's atmosphere is absolutely necessary for our survival.

Gen 1:7 So God made the atmosphere and separated the water above and below the atmosphere. And so it was.

You may recall the 4 verbs of creation, and this 4th verb is 'âsâh (אָשָׂה) [pronounced *gaw-SAWH*]. It means *to do, to make, to construct, to fashion, to form, to prepare, to manufacture*. Some say this means *to make something out of something else*. So God is taking the materials at hand and using them to make the atmosphere.

So, on the first day, God warmed the waters of the earth, as the earth was packed in ice. This caused a great deal of steam to rise. This covered the earth in a great fog, which fog was lifted on the 2nd day. The air still had humidity, but God separated the water on the earth from the clouds filled with water vapor above. God took the chemicals which were at His disposal (nitrogen, hydrogen, and oxygen) and made our atmosphere from these gases. Obviously the hydrogen and oxygen are taken out of the water. However, most of the atmosphere is made out of nitrogen, which is commonly found in decayed plant matter.

Given the amount of water versus the amount of prehistoric plant life, the natural result, it would seem to me, would be to have more oxygen and hydrogen in the air than nitrogen—if left to natural processes. However, here we have God *making* the atmosphere so God is making use of the chemicals He had originally created in order to make the atmosphere. Generally speaking, the verb here means *to make something out of something else*.

I have an interesting proposition. Oil is said to have an organic source, so, is it possible that the extraction of the nitrogen from rotted matter would have resulted in a huge amount of oil? Crude oil is a complex mixture of compounds composed of (mainly) carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and sulfur (notice, no nitrogen). So, if the earth has all of this plant and animal matter, which has been destroyed and is rotting (prehistoric life, apart from angels), and if God extracts the nitrogen out of this for the atmosphere, what remains? Since we are a carbon-based life form, that leaves carbon; since we are 70% water, that would leave oxygen and hydrogen. Sulfur is also an essential component of all living cells. So if God removes the Nitrogen from all this vegetable and animal remains, that would leave behind Carbon, Hydrogen, Oxygen and Sulfur, the primary components of oil. This is just a theory.

Gen 1:8 God named the atmosphere "sky" [lit., (two) skies]. There was evening, then morning—a second day.

On the second day, God made the atmosphere, where there was water on the earth and water (steam, fog and clouds) in the sky; and that there was a division between the earth and the clouds, which is the atmosphere. Above our atmosphere is space, and the words in Hebrew used to refer to the *sky* or to *heaven* is typically dual nouns. Today, we may understand this to refer to our atmosphere and space.

This is the third great oddity of Biblical creation. Why would the Hebrews look up in the sky and name it *two skies*? You and I, after a proper schooling, look up in the sky, and we understand that there is the atmosphere wrapped around the earth, held by gravity; and then, above that, is space. However, *why* would ancient man think that? So far, the 3 oddities of Biblical creation make sense if creationism is true and this information came from God; and they make very little sense if this is just some made-up myth.

We finish vv. 6–8 with the backward-looking refrain, **And so evening** [literally, *day turning dark*] **is and so morning** [lit., *night turning light*] **is, day two**. This again summarizes the time frame.

Day Three:

Gen 1:9 Then God said, "Let the water under the sky come together in one area, and let the dry land appear." And so it was.

As the water began to evaporate, this revealed some dry land. There were probably volcanic eruptions and earth quakes, which caused land to separate, land to rise, and volcanic activity. This resulted in land coming to the surface. Whatever kind of sculpting of the land which God did, is not told to us. Given that this takes place in the space of a day suggests that these are not all natural processes, although they may approximate natural processes to some extent.

Gen 1:10 God named the dry land *earth*. The water which came together he named *sea*. God saw that it was good.

Again, God develops a working vocabulary to accompany that which He has created. God also recognizes that what He did was accomplished, complete, and the end result was exactly what He had desired to make.

One of the things which has concerned me, and has been at the back of my mind, is, *what about all the salt in salt water? Won't that essentially destroy the land in terms of growing crops?* When the water was frozen solid over the earth, this is probably (and reasonably) salt water. However, for it to go from being suddenly frozen to suddenly melted and turned to steam, in the period of one day, would not really allow for saturation of the soil by the salt water. Now, could part of the creation process involve pulling some of the sodium chloride out of the earth and placing huge chunks of salt here and there? Possibly. We just do not have a detailed description here of everything which God did when it comes to separating land from sea.

Speaking of odd theories: there has always been this theory out there that the land masses of the earth used to all be one. There is nothing in the Bible which necessarily contradicts this. In fact, if anything, these few verses seem to support such a theory. If the seas are gathered into one place and dry land appears, this sounds more like one great ocean than several oceans and several land masses. It is possible and reasonable that the original land was one continent, which became several continents during the flood of Noah. This is not something which is spoken of in the Bible. However, it is always fun to speculate.

Gen 1:11 Then God said, "Let the earth produce vegetation: plants bearing seeds, each according to its own type, and fruit trees bearing fruit with seeds, each according to its own type." And so it was.

Now that there was dry land, there would be vegetation (plants and trees). It is unclear whether the seeds were there already and God allowed them to grow, or whether He simply covered the land with plants and trees. In the Garden of Eden (where God will meet with Adam and the woman), it is clear that we have fully grown vegetation, including trees.

As we will find out, outside of the Garden of Eden, it is clear that fruit-bearing trees as well as other produce-vegetation will require some cultivation.

Gen 1:12 The earth produced vegetation: plants bearing seeds, each according to its own type, and trees bearing fruit with seeds, each according to its own type. God saw that they were good.

Each seed, no matter how small and no matter how it looks, is genetically predisposed to produce a specific type of plant or tree. What sort of a plant or tree it is, is hard-wired into the seed itself. Trees are designed to produce some sort of a seed and God will design a number of ways for these seeds to be distributed.

We have all of the basic ingredients here for flora growth. There is light, water and soil, as well as a proper temperature. There are some things which ought to cause you to ask—did plants and trees sprout up immediately? Why has God not yet made the sun? Isn't this a good argument for each day lasting hundreds or thousands of years?

Here's the deal: something has to come first, the chicken or the egg; the plant or the seed; the man or the baby. On the one hand, it would seem logical for prehistoric land to emerge from under the seas, for time to pass, and for the seeds of previous plants to begin to grow. Quite obviously, when left to natural conditions (which is not unheard of in the plan of God), land emergence followed by plants growing might require several thousand years (there is the problem of salt water here, which God may have taken care of on day 2).

On the other hand, once God caused the dry land to appear, He could have immediately caused plants and trees to grow to full size within one day, just as He created man and animals (He creates the chicken before the egg). On the other hand, we define a day as one rotation of the earth about its axis. Without a sun, there is no reason to assume that this is a 24-hour period of time. However, when the sun is created, then we are locked into a 24-hour day. However, we are reasonably locked into whatever time frame the rotation of the earth takes, whether this has always been a 24 hour occurrence or whether God is starting this process at Day One.

Gen 1:13 There was evening, then morning—a third day.

This should become a familiar refrain by now.

There is an odd order here, which I quite frankly do not follow. Thinking as a man, I would have created the sun, stars and planets on day one, begun to defrost the earth on day two (which would require more than the sun could provide), and made the atmosphere on day three. At that point, the earth would be ready for life, and plants, animal life and man would be my next 3 days. Do you see the beauty and logic in my approach? Get the earth ready for life in the first 3 days, and then populate the earth with life on days 4–6.

However, God did not seek my counsel for the order in which things ought to be done. Had some ancient man been writing this, he might have come up with the same order,

except that I doubt that any man would have thought to make the atmosphere. I know there is a reason why God did things this way, however, all I can come up with at this time is, God is making it clear that He, and not the sun, is the Creator and Maker of all life. Let me suggest one more reason: most men would have re-ordered these days as well. There are a lot of skeptics who think the Bible was worked and reworked and worked again by various religious types over the ages. There is a lot of evidence that this did *not* occur, and these days of restoration is the first bit of evidence: if religious types rewrote and reworked the Bible, why didn't they change the order of restoration?

There is another theory of creation and restoration which I did not present earlier because, insofar as I know, no one has ever considered this theory until now. The more I have thought about the order in which God did things, the more I tried to wrap my brain around *why did God do things in this order?* God is not arbitrary; God is not random. However, we have the creation of the sun, moon and stars on day four, and these are given to man for *signs, and for seasons, and for days and years*. Man will use the sun and the moon to mark *days and years*; so just what has been happening until now on days 1–3? I will discuss this further when we come to day four.

Lesson 10: Genesis 1

Evolution, Creationism and Divine Design

I have presented several theories about our beginnings, including the literal 6-Day Creation, the Day-Age Theory and the Gap Theory. To review, some believe that the first 2 chapters of Genesis describe how God created the world in 6 literal days. Those who believe in the Day-Age theory take the language of Genesis to be poetic (which it is, but they take that to mean that they can distort it in any way that they want), and that each *day* really stands for a creative period of time (a thousand years or more). Those who like being correct in their thinking, believe the Gap Theory, which maintains that the heavens and the earth were created at one time by God, probably for angelic creation to live in, and that, because the angels fell, the earth became a waste area, devoid of life. Then, God, in 6 literal days, restores the earth.

It is very possible that you have read much of this so far, and have decided that this examination of the book of Genesis is decidedly unscientific. All scientists believe in evolution; that is the only sensible explanation for how we have come about; and that is the only theory for which there is any actual scientific evidence. So, you may be thinking, *if Genesis chapters 1 and 2 are going to make any sense, they will need to somehow line up with evolution.*

Let me introduce 3 new terms: evolution, Creationism and Intelligent Design. Evolution believes that, somehow, matter began (or always was); and that somewhere on earth, a mixture of chemicals and outside forces (lightning?) turned non-living matter into living matter. This living matter, a single cell, joined with other single cells to form a many-celled living thing, which eventually, after millions of years, evolved into man. The evolutionist may or may not believe in God (I suspect that most modern evolutionary *scientists* do not believe in a personal God). However, evolutionists tend to make a god out of time and

nature. Given enough time, and given nature, anything can happen. A fish can roll up on shore, decide, "I need to grow me some lungs" and, after a million years, this happens, and that fish becomes the first reptile (evolutionists really believe this). A million years later, a reptile looks up in the air and thinks, "Hell, I'd like to fly." His scales turn into feathers and he flies. These things do not occur suddenly, of course, but, given a million years and the marvels of nature, throw in a little survival of the fittest, and these things happen (in the estimation of the evolutionist). Long periods of time to the evolutionist make *anything* possible.

Some evolutionists liken evolution and time to a 1000 monkeys pounding on keyboards for 1000's of years. Of course, most of them will produce nothing but gibberish and some might even eat the keyboards; but, there will be that lone monkey who types out the first chapter of Genesis on his keyboard—given enough time. Time is the magic ingredient for the evolutionist. We can stick 1000 monkeys in a room and watch them, and when none of them type anything which makes sense, the evolutionist says, "You need more time. We need a million years." The creationist says, *balderdash! 1000 monkeys typing for a million years will not produce the first chapter of Genesis, and a fish, after a million years, will not develop lungs.*

The creationist believes in the first chapter of Genesis. He believes that God created the heavens and the earth. Some creationists even believe in evolution or that God used evolution in order to bring about His creative purposes. Some creationists believe that God *created* the heavens and the earth in 6 literal days; some believe that these represent creative periods of time; and some believe that God first created the heavens and the earth, and then restored the earth in 6 days (or 6 creative periods). Whatever the creationist believes, he does not believe in random evolution. Some believe in evolution, but they believe that God directed it, and they believe that there are creative aspects to it (e.g., the soul of man).

A person who believes in Intelligent Design believes that there is a great Designer who designed our bodies, designed the bodies of animals, and designed the interactions which would occur between various life and non-life forms.

There can be overlap here. A person can believe in Creationism, Intelligent Design and Evolution, all at the same time. However, logically, all Creationists would have to believe in Intelligent Design. Many people who believe in Intelligent Design believe in Creationism, but it is very possible and reasonable to believe in Intelligent Design and to be an evolutionist, and yet, not believe in Creationism. Any evolutionist who believes in God is, almost by definition, a person who believes in Intelligent Design (however, it is possible for a person to believe in God, but to believe that we have no relationship to Him, either by creation or any other personal connection). My point is, we do not have 3 distinct camps or 2 distinct camps.

However, for the most part, people will divide themselves into two camps: on one side, there are the godless Evolutionists and on the other side, the Creationists and believers

in Intelligent Design. People do not have to be on one side or the other, but most who have thought about it in any detail, generally place themselves on one side or the other.

Like many people who believe in Creationism and Intelligent Design, I originally believed strongly in evolution, because I was taught this early on in school. It was a fundamental belief which public schools attempt to inculcate, and even more so, for me, once I got to college (evolution was taught to me in several non-science courses). So when I was young on up to age 21 or so, I believed the whole evolution thing, despite having gone to church on many occasions in my youth. When I believed in Jesus Christ, then, like almost every new believer, I adjusted Genesis to reflect the *reality* of evolution. So, for awhile, I believed in the Day-Age Theory, thinking that I personally had cleverly found how Creationism and Evolution could intersect in a mutually agreeable way. I have since found out that many believers have come to that same conclusion; they have been taught from their youth up that the only scientific explanation for things is evolution; and when they are told that the Bible is the Word of God (after they believe in Jesus Christ), then they strive to find some sort of agreement between evolution and the Bible. The result is, a huge number of believers still believe in evolution; they simply believe that it was God-directed and that Genesis is allegorical or poetic, so, in their minds, Genesis can mean pretty much anything that they want it to mean.

Now, in case you did not know this, most people who reject the theory of evolution outright, do not do so because their parents beat creationism into their brains from age 3 on up. Most believers who reject evolution do not simply walk into a church, are brainwashed by Christian doctrine, and then, like some kind of a pod-person, say, "The Bible says it, so I believe it; so I reject evolution." Most believers who reject evolution, do so because they have been convinced that evolution is a false theory.

As I began to read, as a young believer, I found that there were those who actually did not believe in evolution, and I found their tracts and writings interesting. I did not think that I was reading arguments from *flat-earthers*, who essentially argue for debate's sake; but from people who had *scientific* reasons to reject evolution, rather than *theological* reasons. Because I believed in evolution, I found this topic quite interesting. For a very long time, I never heard the argument, "Here is what the Bible says; so it must be true." In fact, only one book that I read, argued for Creationism and against evolution based upon the Bible. Their argument was much more complex than, *the Bible says it, so I believe it*; however, when I first read this book, I admit its approach surprised me, as almost all other books on creationism versus evolution argue from a scientific standpoint.

Creationism, Intelligent Design and Evolution have become very emotionally charged issues. When the movie *Expelled!* came out (a movie about Intelligent Design), you should have seen the message boards online (most of them are still posted). Before the movie came out, there were bitter arguments and angry epithets being thrown about. People who had never prayed before, were praying that this movie fail, and fail big. Roger Ebert, the film critic, refused to even review the movie (and posted a review-sized column explaining why). Roeper and the other guy on Ebert and Roeper's *At the Movies* would not review *Expelled!* on television, not wanting to give this movie any advertising whatsoever. Movie

critics who reviewed *Expelled!*, blasted it as one of the worst movies ever made. However, the new kids now on *At the Movies* would not even include this movie in their Top Ten Worst films of 2008, not wanting to give it any sort of publicity. This is how emotional this issue is. Those who reviewed this movie, almost universally panned the movie, and on RottenTomatoes or on MetaCritic (where the reviews of dozens of reviewers are averaged), *Expelled!* received one of the lowest overall ratings of all time (not just this year).

Expelled! did not necessarily tout Intelligent Design as the only valid belief system, but asked a few questions about I.D. and evolution, and showed what happened to educators and scientists who made reference to Intelligent Design. It also tied Hitler's concept of a super race to survival of the fittest, a Darwinian axiom (and Darwin's actual theories as related to race would surprise you). To anyone but a radical Muslim, the idea of Hitler helping survival of the fittest along by killing off the inferior Jewish race was quite distasteful. The evolutionist is fine if nature kills off the unfit in favor of the fit; but when man begins to do this (making judgments of who is or is not fit), that is a whole different thing. Many believers in evolution (i.e., almost all of the movie critics) were so offended by this relationship that they did everything that they could to bury this movie.

However, there was nothing about the movie's production, pacing, and subject matter which would make this a bad movie. Most people watching this movie become thoroughly engaged in it, even if they disagree vehemently with it. However, the message is so strong, that those who disagree with some of the things which are presented in the movie fault the movie because their disagreements are so visceral.

My point: Intelligent Design, evolution and creationism are very emotional issues. When it comes to anything to do with I.D. or creationism, many evolutionists become extremely angry to the point of unreasonable hostility in many cases.

When I became interested in the Creation versus Evolution debate, the battle was raging, and various groups of scientists and/or theologians would battle out this issue on many a college campus. I missed the debate at the university that I went to, but I asked an archeological professor how she thought it went. She admitted that the creationists won the debate, but that they still know better.

I want to caution you about what I will present next—I will present some *scientific* arguments against evolution. I am not arguing for argument's sake. I am not taking the position of a person who believes the earth is flat (something which is *not* taught in the Bible) and arguing simply to see how well I can debate the issue. These are some arguments which question the scientific validity of evolution.

I do not want to spend a lot of time on this particular topic, even though this is one which I enjoy reading about and discussing (hundreds of books have been written about this topic).

Some of the Arguments Against Evolution

1. From the standpoint of population growth:
 - 1) Scientists can and do make predictions on the growth of various populations.
 - 2) All human and animal populations approximately grow according to an exponential equation, called the growth curve. Even though there is war, famine, disease and death, the growth of the world population always will approximate this growth curve, which is found in nearly every Pre-Calculus and Calculus book written (at one time, this used to be found in every Algebra II book as well). There are slightly different forms of this exponential equation, which vary according to the base used (2, e or 10), but these equations produce the exact same results.
 - 3) When I was a math teacher, I would teach my students how to deal with population growth equations and how to solve them; then I would take my students to the library and tell them to take the world population figures (or estimates) from any two periods of time, and use this population growth equation to extrapolate backwards in time to when there were 10 people (or 100 people). I reminded my students that they have been taught in their science classes that modern man is 1,000,000 years old. For that reason, we should expect the population growth equation to take us back that far in time. I reminded them that this was all approximate, so that they might come up with 1.3 million years or 800,000 years or something like that. What happened? Every single student, no matter where he got his data from, came up with man's age to be anywhere from 1000 years to 25,000 years old. According to their calculations, this is the age of man. The largest number still differs from evolutionary theory by a factor of 40. What this means is, the population of the world would have to build up to present-day sizes, and then disappear or be dwindled down to essentially nothing—and that this would have to occur about 40 times in order for evolutionary theory to match mathematical modeling (the mathematical modeling presented in every single Pre-Calculus and Calculus book used in America).
 - 4) Although most evolutionary theorists might allow for a handful of such world-wide population decimations, none posit that there have been 40 of them.
 - 5) Based upon the data available to us, mathematically speaking, it is logical for man to be 6000–10,000 years old, which completely squares with the Bible. On the other hand, it is mathematically illogical to assert that man is 1 million years old.
2. Arguing from the standpoint of the location of human and pre-human fossils in time:
 - 1) Evolutionary theory teaches that, first there was homo habilis, then there was homo erectus and then there was homo sapiens, each specie of man living for approximately 1 million years each.
 - 2) For each change of specie, one would crowd out and replace the other.

Some of the Arguments Against Evolution

- This is known as survival of the fittest.
- 3) Another teacher (Martin Lubenow) would give his students the names of well-known and lesser-known human fossils and he would ask his students to research their fossils (they drew the names of fossils out of a hat). Once a person found two different scientists who agreed on the age of that fossil, then they would place that fossil in time and classify it as to what kind of a human it was.
 - 4) What we would expect is, almost all of the homo habilis fossils would be located in time between 2 and 3 mya (million years ago); almost all of the homo erectus fossils would be found 1 to 2 mya; and all of the homo sapiens fossils would be found to be no more than 1 million years old. That is what evolution would predict, although there may be, of course, some mixing and overlap around the transition points.
 - 5) The end result was quite different. These fossils were scattered evenly and randomly throughout time (according to the figures of evolution scientists). Some of the very oldest human fossils in existence are homo sapiens, which is the opposite of what evolution would posit.
 - 6) So, even using the data and figures provided by evolutionists (which can be called into question), human fossils are not found in the time period in which they are supposed to be found.
3. There are two things which we would expect evolutionists, as scientists: we would expect them to have published a book and set up website which list all of the various human and pre-human fossils.
- 1) Such a book or website ought to include: where the fossil was found, who discovered the fossil, who has possession of the fossil, how much of the fossil exists, photographs of the fossil if possible, what kind of research has been done on the fossil, what is the age of the fossil, how was this age determined, and what is the proper classification of the fossil. Furthermore, are there any disputes within these areas, and what is the dispute about? We would also expect there to be charts as to where these fossils are found in the earth and when they are found in a timeline. Given the fact that we can go to the internet and find every television show which has been on tv, a list of the cast and characters, the plots and subplots, and a pile of minutia, why don't red-blooded, dedicated evolutionists do the same for their cause?
 - 2) The problem with such a site or such a book is, it would not reveal a clear-cut evolution of man, as is pounded into the brains of school children everywhere. The unlearned would look at this and recognize that there is a problem with evolution—that their own data does not line up with their theory.
4. The geological layers:
- 1) Related to evolution are the geological layers, and most of us have seen them: at the very bottom is the Pre-Cambrian era, with the Cambrian era on top of that, with the Devonian layer above that, the Mississippian layer

Some of the Arguments Against Evolution

- above that, etc.
- 2) There is one place where we can find all of the geological layers where they ought to be in the correct order, and that is in a textbook. Some do allege that there are several places on this earth where these layers exist in the same order. However, in 95% of the earth, these geological layers are scattered randomly. You are led to believe that human fossils come from the higher strata and that dinosaurs and prehistoric plants are found in the lowest strata, but that is simply not true.
 - 3) How do evolutionists explain this? They develop more theories to prop up their theory of evolution and geology. So, one of the additional propositions we must buy into is, over the millions of years, there have been huge geological shifts, where one entire layer of earth somehow slips in between two other layers, or one layer somehow sinks to the very bottom. Now, I might buy into this theory if this were the case here or there; but the location of these various strata is just random. Such theories should explain why maybe 5% of the time, there is deviation from what we would expect. However, such wild theories should not explain why geological layers are randomly scattered 95% of the time.
 - 4) Secondly, it is decidedly unscientific to *prove* a theory with another theory. When a theory does not match the evidence, then addition theories do not logically prop up the original theory. At some point in time, there needs to be some kind of evidence which fits the theories and supports the theories. One unsubstantiated theory logically cannot be used to prop up another unsubstantiated theory.
 - 5) What this means is, the oldest fossils are not found in the bottom layer, and as we go up to the next layer up, we find newer fossils. Not at all. The evolutionist finds the fossil, he determines what the fossil is and where it belongs in time, and then he decides how to classify that strata. So, it is not unusual for a dig to be looking at Cambrian fossils which also turn out to be the top layer or the second layer of dirt.
5. One of the things taught by evolution is how simple the single cell is, and how that is the beginning of life. To be fair, this is more implied than anything else. We get the impression that the single cell is a very simple and basic thing, and that we should not be surprised if this life just occurred spontaneously. Frank Salisbury, an evolutionary scientist, admits: *"Now we know that the cell itself is far more complex than we had imagined. It includes thousands of functioning enzymes, each one of them a complex machine in itself. Furthermore, each enzyme comes into being in response to a gene, a strand of DNA. The information content of the gene (it's complexity) must be as great as that of the enzyme it controls. A medium protein might include about 300 amino acids. The DNA gene controlling this would have about 1,000 nucleotides in its chain, one consisting of a 1,000 links could exist in 4^{1000} different forms. Using a little algebra (logarithms) we can see that $4^{1000} = 10^{600}$. Ten multiplied by itself 600 times gives us the figure '1' followed by 600 zeros! This number is completely beyond our*

Some of the Arguments Against Evolution

comprehension." The simplest life form that we are aware of is far more complex than we could have ever imagined, and not likely something which would have just spontaneously occurred in some mix of primordial ooze.

6. There are many other arguments. Just being taken through the various human fossils, finding out how much of that fossil exists, and what is really true about it and what is not, is a fascinating study in itself.

Obviously, I believe strongly in Creationism and Intelligent Design. Does this mean that I want to invade all of our public schools and have these things taught? Not necessarily. I would be happy if evolution was simply presented fairly and honestly, with the *scientific* arguments for and against the theory presented. High school and college students are never made aware that there are serious problems with the theory of evolution and that even evolutionists disagree about *everything* except for, the *fact* of evolution.

A teacher who would allow various students to research and debate this issue would be fantastic, in my opinion. Students would learn research, debate technique and evolution, all within one unit (which would be quite interdisciplinary, which is all the rage in education, last time I looked). This might even cause some students to become quite interested in science. The problem is, most evolutionists want children to believe in evolution, so they never present evidence which is to the contrary; they never reveal long-standing arguments between evolutionary scientists. They present a very orderly, sterile, unquestioning view of evolution, and act as if all science believes in it.

High school and college students need to hear what evolutionists themselves say: Professor Jerome Lejeune, an Internationally recognized geneticist, at a lecture given in Paris "*We have no acceptable theory of evolution at the present time. There is none; and I cannot accept the theory that I teach to my students each year. Let me explain: I teach the synthetic theory known as the neo-Darwinian one, for one reason only; not because it's good, we know it is bad, but because there isn't any other. Whilst waiting to find something better you are taught something which is known to be inexact, which is a first approximation.*"

Here is a statement that many scientists signed onto:

"I am skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life. Careful examination of the evidence for Darwinian theory should be encouraged."

Henry F. Schaefer: Director, Center for Computational Quantum Chemistry: U. of Georgia • Fred Sigworth: Prof. of Cellular & Molecular Physiology- Grad. School: Yale U. • Philip S. Skell: Emeritus Prof. Of Chemistry: NAS member • Frank Tipler: Prof. of Mathematical Physics: Tulane U. • Robert Kaita: Plasma Physics Lab: Princeton U. • Michael Behe: Prof. of Biological Science: Lehigh U. • Walter Hearn: PhD Biochemistry-U of Illinois • Tony Mega: Assoc. Prof. of Chemistry: Whitworth College • Dean Kenyon: Prof. Emeritus of Biology: San Francisco State U. • Marko Horb: Researcher, Dept. of Biology

& Biochemistry: U. of Bath, UK • Daniel Kubler: Asst. Prof. of Biology: Franciscan U. of Steubenville • David Keller: Assoc. Prof. of Chemistry: U. of New Mexico • James Keesling: Prof. of Mathematics: U. of Florida • Roland F. Hirsch: PhD Analytical Chemistry-U. of Michigan • Robert Newman: PhD Astrophysics-Cornell U. • Carl Koval: Prof., Chemistry & Biochemistry: U. of Colorado, Boulder • Tony Jelsma: Prof. of Biology: Dordt College • William A. Dembski: PhD Mathematics-U. of Chicago • George Lebo: Assoc. Prof. of Astronomy: U. of Florida • Timothy G. Standish: PhD Environmental Biology-George Mason U. • James Keener: Prof. of Mathematics & Adjunct of Bioengineering: U. of Utah • Robert J. Marks: Prof. of Signal & Image Processing: U. of Washington • Carl Poppe: Senior Fellow: Lawrence Livermore Laboratories • Siegfried Scherer: Prof. of Microbial Ecology: Technische Universitaet Muenchen • Gregory Shearer: Internal Medicine, Research: U. of California, Davis • Joseph Atkinson: PhD Organic Chemistry-M.I.T.: American Chemical Society, member • Lawrence H. Johnston: Emeritus Prof. of Physics: U. of Idaho • Scott Minnich: Prof., Dept of Microbiology, Molecular Biology & Biochem: U. of Idaho • David A. DeWitt: PhD Neuroscience-Case Western U. • Theodor Liss: PhD Chemistry-M.I.T. • Braxton Alfred: Emeritus Prof. of Anthropology: U. of British Columbia • Walter Bradley: Prof. Emeritus of Mechanical Engineering: Texas A & M • Paul D. Brown: Asst. Prof. of Environmental Studies: Trinity Western U. (Canada) • Marvin Fritzler: Prof. of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology: U. of Calgary, Medical School • Theodore Saito: Project Manager: Lawrence Livermore Laboratories • Muzaffar Iqbal: PhD Chemistry-U. of Saskatchewan: Center for Theology the Natural Sciences • William S. Pelletier: Emeritus Distinguished Prof. of Chemistry: U. of Georgia, Athens • Keith Delaplane: Prof. of Entomology: U. of Georgia • Ken Smith: Prof. of Mathematics: Central Michigan U. • Clarence Fouche: Prof. of Biology: Virginia Intermont College • Thomas Milner: Asst. Prof. of Biomedical Engineering: U. of Texas, Austin • Brian J. Miller: PhD Physics-Duke U. • Paul Nesselrode: Assoc. Prof. of Psychology: Simpson College • Donald F. Calbreath: Prof. of Chemistry: Whitworth College • William P. Purcell: PhD Physical Chemistry-Princeton U. • Wesley Allen: Prof. of Computational Quantum Chemistry: U. of Georgia • Jeanne Drisko: Asst. Prof., Kansas Medical Center: U. of Kansas, School of Medicine • Chris Grace: Assoc. Prof. of Psychology: Biola U. • Wolfgang Smith: Prof. Emeritus-Mathematics: Oregon State U. • Rosalind Picard: Assoc. Prof. Computer Science: M.I.T. • Garrick Little: Senior Scientist, Li-Cor: Li-Cor • John L. Omdahl: Prof. of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology: U. of New Mexico • Martin Poenie: Assoc. Prof. of Molecular Cell & Developmental Bio: U. of Texas, Austin • Russell W. Carlson: Prof. of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology: U. of Georgia • Hugh Nutley: Prof. Emeritus of Physics & Engineering: Seattle Pacific U. • David Berlinski: PhD Philosophy-Princeton: Mathematician, Author • Neil Broom: Assoc. Prof., Chemical & Materials Engineering: U. of Auckland • John Bloom: Assoc. Prof., Physics: Biola U. • James Graham: Professional Geologist, Sr. Program Manager: National Environmental Consulting Firm • John Baumgardner: Technical Staff, Theoretical Division: Los Alamos National Laboratory • Fred Skiff: Prof. of Physics: U. of Iowa • Paul Kuld: Assoc. Prof., Biological Science: Biola U. • Yongsoo Park: Senior Research Scientist: St. Luke's Hospital, Kansas City • Moorad Alexanian: Prof. of Physics: U. of North Carolina, Wilmington • Donald Ewert: Director of Research Administration: Wistar Institute • Joseph W. Francis: Assoc. Prof. of Biology: Cedarville U. • Thomas Saleska: Prof. of Biology: Concordia U. • Ralph W. Seelke: Prof. & Chair

of Dept. of Biology & Earth Sciences: U. of Wisconsin, Superior • James G. Harman: Assoc. Chair, Dept. of Chemistry & Biochemistry: Texas Tech U. • Lennart Moller: Prof. of Environmental Medicine, Karolinska Institute: U. of Stockholm • Raymond G. Bohlin: PhD Molecular & Cell Biology-U. of Texas: • Fazale R. Rana: PhD Chemistry-Ohio U. • Michael Atchison: Prof. of Biochemistry: U. of Pennsylvania, Vet School • William S. Harris: Prof. of Basic Medical Sciences: U. of Missouri, Kansas City • Rebecca W. Keller: Research Prof., Dept. of Chemistry: U. of New Mexico • Terry Morrison: PhD Chemistry-Syracuse U. • Robert F. DeHaan: PhD Human Development-U. of Chicago • Matti Lesola: Prof., Laboratory of Bioprocess Engineering: Helsinki U. of Technology • Bruce Evans: Assoc. Prof. of Biology: Huntington College • Jim Gibson: PhD Biology-Loma Linda U. • David Ness: PhD Anthropology-Temple U. • Bijan Nemati: Senior Engineer: Jet Propulsion Lab (NASA) • Edward T. Peltzer: Senior Research Specialist: Monterey Bay Research Institute • Stan E. Lennard: Clinical Assoc. Prof. of Surgery: U. of Washington • Rafe Payne: Prof. & Chair, Biola Dept. of Biological Sciences: Biola U. • Phillip Savage: Prof. of Chemical Engineering: U. of Michigan • Pattle Pun: Prof. of Biology: Wheaton College • Jed Macosko: Postdoctoral Researcher-Molecular Biology: U. of California, Berkeley • Daniel Dix: Assoc. Prof. of Mathematics: U. of South Carolina • Ed Karlow: Chair, Dept. of Physics: LaSierra U. • James Harbrecht: Clinical Assoc. Prof.: U. of Kansas Medical Center • Robert W. Smith: Prof. of Chemistry: U. of Nebraska, Omaha • Robert DiSilvestro: PhD Biochemistry-Texas A & M U., Professor, Human Nutrition, Ohio State University • David Prentice: Prof., Dept. of Life Sciences: Indiana State U. • Walt Stangl: Assoc. Prof. of Mathematics: Biola U. • Jonathan Wells: PhD Molecular & Cell Biology-U. of California, Berkeley: • James Tour: Chao Prof. of Chemistry: Rice U. • Todd Watson: Asst. Prof. of Urban & Community Forestry: Texas A & M U. • Robert Waltzer: Assoc. Prof. of Biology: Belhaven College • Vincente Villa: Prof. of Biology: Southwestern U. • Richard Sternberg: Pstdoctoral Fellow, Invertebrate Biology: Smithsonian Institute • James Tumlin: Assoc. Prof. of Medicine: Emory U. Charles Thaxton: PhD Physical Chemistry-Iowa State U.

From: <http://www.creationevolution.net/>

My point is, if you do not believe in evolution, you are not alone and you are not anti-science.

Debate and disagreements are good things. Many evolutionists do not care to have these debates because, too often, they are defeated. There was a class in a southern California university where the classes were split roughly 50-50 between a creationist teaching what they believe in and an evolutionist teaching what they believe in. Surveys were taken before and after this class to see if anyone had a change of mind. At the end of the course, more people believed in creation than did at the beginning of the course. This was very disconcerting, so the time the creationists were given was cut every single year until they had only 2 class periods to present their arguments. What was the end result? More people believed in creationism at the end of the course than at the beginning. To the best of my knowledge, this course no longer exists.

For me, this is a fascinating topic. If you have also developed an interest, may I suggest Lubenow's book *Bones of Contention*. The evidence for evolution is a lot less compelling than you have been led to believe.

There are also a number of internet sites which deal with Creationism and Intelligent Design:

<http://www.rae.org/revevlnk.html> is a list of creationist websites.

<http://www.evolutionisdead.com/quotes.php?search=rate> is a list of quotes from scientists (most of them, believers in evolution), who say things which may surprise you.

<http://www.icr.org/article/bible-believing-scientists-past/> is a list of scientists from the past who believed in Jesus Christ and that God created the heavens and the earth. The idea that the Bible is anti-science is a myth perpetrated by those who simply hate the Bible.

Lesson 11: Genesis 1:14–18

Day 4 of the Restoration of the Earth

Here is where we resume our study:

Day Four:

Because there are at least two basic theories about Day 4, it will be a good idea to get a literal translation of these next several verses.

Gen. 1:14–18 And so says Elohim, "Let [there] [continue to] be lights in [the] firmament of the heavens to distinguish between the day and the night, and they are [lit., *have been*] for signs [or, *remembrances*] and for seasons [or, *specific times*] and for days and years [or, *measures of time*]. And they are [lit., *have been*] for lights in the expanse [= *firmament*] of the heavens to shine upon the earth. And so it is so. And so makes [or, *produces, prepares; ordains*] Elohim two of the lights, the great ones—the light the great to rule the day and the light the small to rule the night—and the stars. And so gives them Elohim in [the] expanse of the heavens to shine upon the earth and to reign in the day and in the night and to distinguish between the light and the dark. And so sees Elohim and it was good.

That is my literal translation; let me also give you the Concordant Literal Version:

Gen 1:14–18 And saying is the Elohim, "Become shall luminaries in the atmosphere of the heavens, to give light on the earth, to separate between the day and the night. And they come to be for signs and for appointments, and for days and years. And there come to be luminaries in the atmosphere of the heavens to give light on the earth. And coming is it to be so. And making is the Elohim two great luminaries, the greater luminary for ruling the day, and the smaller luminary for ruling the night, and the stars. And bestowing them is the Elohim in the atmosphere of the heavens to give light on the earth, and to rule in the day

and in the night, and to separate between the light and the darkness. And seeing is the Elohim that it is good.

Or an updated Young's translation: Gen. 1:14–18: And God says, "Let luminaries be in the expanse of the heavens, to make a separation between the day and the night, then they have been for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years, and they have been for luminaries in the expanse of the heavens to give light upon the earth." And it is so. And God makes the two great luminaries, the great luminary for the rule of the day, and the small luminary—and the stars—for the rule of the night; and God gives them in the expanse of the heavens to give light upon the earth, and to rule over day and over night, and to make a separation between the light and the darkness; and God sees that it is good.

A literal translation does not always solve every disagreement, but it is a good place to start. This particular literal rendering may serve to help solve our theories concerning the creation of the sun.

Literally:

Gen. 1:14 And so says Elohim, "Let [there] [continue to] be lights in [the] firmament of the heavens to distinguish between the day and the night, and they are [lit., *have been*] for signs [or, *remembrances*] and for seasons [or, *specific times*] and for days and years [or, *measures of time*].

Less literally:

Gen 1:14 Then God said, "Let there be lights in the sky to separate the day from the night. They will be signs and will mark religious festivals, days, and years.

There are two basic theories here: (1) the sun, moon and stars were always there, but could not be seen from the land before. The idea is, first the land was packed in ice and under the ice. Then, after God melted the ice, the earth was covered in fog (water vapor) so one could see the light, but not discern the stars or the sun or the moon. This would mean that, on the 4th day, God essentially clears up the earth's atmosphere to the point where, these previously created luminaries become visible. Or, (2) the original light of Day One was God; and God then created the stars and the moons and the sun on the 4th day. (3) A third theory is, these luminaries already existed, but it was God's light which originally heated the earth.

Let's look at these theories and follow them out logically:

Theory One: When God had created the heavens and the earth, the stars, sun, planets, moon, etc. were all a part of this package. However, from the earth, these things could not be seen, as the earth had been covered first with ice and then with a thick fog. They were all there, but, for 3 days, one could not actually see the sun or the moon. On this 4th day, God makes them all specifically visible upon the earth. The problem with this theory is,

God's primary focus on Day Four would not be the sun, moon and stars, but cleaning up the atmosphere and gathering the waters of the skies into clouds, so that there is some open sky, through which these heavenly bodies could be perceived. Now, although I could make some reasonable arguments about the language of these verses which would allow for these verses to mean this, but, we are missing in these 5 verses *what God actually did on Day Four*. If all the stars, planets and moons are already there, in motion, with the laws of the universe in play, then God gathers the waters over the earth into clouds, so that the sun could be seen where there are no clouds. However, not word one is said about God doing anything with the atmosphere of the earth. If you were to argue God making the atmosphere on Day Two, that, by Day Four, there is enough open sky to allow for the sun to be seen, we have several problems: (1) There is nothing said about just what God is actually doing on Day Four. (2) God is not really doing very much in this 4th day, compared to the other days. He is moving clouds around. (3) What God is *not* doing is that which the Bible speaks of. That is, it sounds as if God is making the sun, moon and stars; but, if they already existed, then God is not really doing that. Even if we use the argument that this is taking place with regards to the perspective of a person on the earth, those 3 objections still hold. The strongest argument for this position is, the verb tenses found in Gen. 1:14–18 are fully in line with this theory.

Theory Two: the original light over the earth was God Himself; and God actually created all of the stars, planets, moons and the sun on Day Four. This is a game changer. If the earth was there, previously lighted by God and now presently lighted by God; and suddenly, there are all of these luminaries in space; then we have a whole new set of planetary laws which all come into play on this 4th day. Although this is not stated, when God creates the planets and stars, He must also create a whole new set of physical laws (unless the earth is rotating about God). Even if the earth is rotating around God as a light and heat source, there are still a great many physical laws which would be reasonably created with the sun, moon and stars.

With the second theory, there are other considerations—if God creating the heavens and the earth is equivalent to the Big Bang Theory, then how exactly is heaven expanding if there are no stars or planets? Or, is this day, Day Four, equivalent to the Big Bang Theory, where a whole new universe is created, in essence, around the earth?

In many ways, this second theory sheds some light upon [Job 38:4–7](#) *Where were you when I founded the earth [notice that the verb *create* is not used]? Tell if you know with understanding. Who determined its measurements—for surely you know! Or who stretched out a tape upon it? On what were its sockets sunk? Or who directed its cornerstone in place, when the stars of the morning jubilated together, and all the sons of Elohim shouted with joy?* God is setting up the physical laws for the earth, and the angels of God are there, but man is not. This would allow for God to have created the heavens and the earth, and to then create the angels. After all of this, God changes things (some of the physical laws), and makes the heavens into a vast ever-expanding universe with a whole new set of laws, spoken of in the Job passage.

There is another consideration with respect to Theory Two: at what point did the earth begin to rotate and to spin on its axis? Let me submit to you that this begins on the 1st day, even before the creation of the sun. God begins the spinning of the earth in orbit around Himself as the light and heat source on day one—which He will replace with the sun on day four.

Theory Three: is a hybrid of these previous theories, where God is the light of the earth for the first 3 days, but that, the planets, stars and sun already exist. The problem with this approach is identical to the problems cited under the first theory. God is doing very little on day 4, and what He does is actually not even spoken of on day 4.

Learning the Word of God should never turn your mind to mush. Although it is fine to affirm, “God said it, so I believe it;” this does not mean that you turn your mind off; this does not mean that you no longer consider logic. God designed our minds to think, to observe and also to believe. Although our salvation is dependent upon our faith in Jesus Christ, that faith should not turn us into mental zombies.

Before we proceed further, let me propose a related question: *why would God create the heavens and the earth and then pack it in ice for thousands or millions of years?* The most logical answer is, God created the heavens and the earth for angelic creation (which would logically be created *after* the earth was created). There are a number of passages which suggest that there is another set of beings of angels and demons (fallen angels). When the Bible does mention both angels and demons, they seem to always be in existence. When they are spoken of, their existence is just taken for granted. I will come back to this question later in this lesson.

There are other things which have been rattling around in my brain for the past several weeks. The order in which God works was not logical to me at first. Why not get the planet ready for life (days 1–3) and then fill it with plants, animals and man (days 4–6)? Why do we have plants on day 3 and then the sun (et al) on day 4? Why is that order not reversed? Surely, had a human written this, or planned it out, even, preparing the earth would have been the first half of the project and then populating the earth would have been the second half of the project. And, as I have argued before, why not create the sun on day one? This seems to be the most logical thing to do, from a human perspective. Let me suggest to you a theory which you have not heard before, which may help to explain the order in which God has done things.

First of all, let me make it clear that this is simply a theory, but it seems to make sense of the order in which God did things.

A New Theory of Creation and Restoration

1. Let me first state this theory briefly, and then I will elaborate: God created the heavens, the earth and the angels; the angels fell; God froze the earth, and then God restored the earth, with the angels in observance. Days 1–3 are unspecified periods of time; Days 4–6 are 24 hour days.

A New Theory of Creation and Restoration

2. Now, let's go through this bit by bit.
3. God created the heavens and the earth in eternity past, and He was the light of the earth.
4. God then created all angels, with free will, and He allowed the angels to enjoy the earth, until Satan sinned and took a third of the angels with him.
5. When the angels sinned, God called them all in for a convocation and sentenced the fallen angels to eternal separation from God, as well as the punishment of the Lake of Fire.
6. Satan appealed the sentence. This is important because $\frac{2}{3}$ ^{rds} of the angels have not yet sinned. God has two choices: He can entertain Satan's objections and appeal, or He can cast a third of His creation into a Lake of Fire. Obviously, this is going to have an impact on the angels who have not sinned, as casting the fallen angels into the Lake of Fire would seem to negate that God is love.
7. God froze the fallen angels in place on earth.
8. This implies that something takes place between the freezing and the thawing of the earth. May I suggest a convocation of the elect angels, which would include a question and answer session? A portion of what life is about probably addresses questions and concerns of both fallen and elect angels.
9. God later unfroze the earth (Day One). Since there was no sun or moon (at least as we know them), we are not within a specific 24-hour time frame on Day One (or 2 or 3). God also provided light for the earth, so that the angels could observe what God was doing (both fallen and elect angels). God also began to rotate the earth and put it into orbit about Himself, as He provided light and began to heat the earth.
10. On Day Two, also an unspecified period of time, God provided the atmosphere for the earth, which was made up of materials which were already in abundance upon the earth. I have already suggested where the chemicals in the atmosphere come from (nitrogen from rotting animals and vegetation, hydrogen and oxygen from all of the water vapor). There is at least one other reference to the importance of the earth's atmosphere in Isa. 40:21–22: **Have you not known? Have you not heard? Has it not been told you from the beginning? Have you not understood from the foundations of the earth? It is He [God] who sits above the sphere of the earth, and its people are like grasshoppers; [it is God] Who stretches out the heavens [atmosphere] like a curtain, and spreads them out like a tent to dwell in.** The atmosphere of the earth is analogous to living in a tent. It is a covering for the earth and it provides protection—hardly something which an ancient scientist would have taken note of.
11. On Day Three, God causes the dry land to appear. Because there had been life on the earth previous to that, because there was soil and water, and because there was light, plants began to sprout up and grow. Again, there is no sun and moon by which to keep time, so God allowed this natural process to take place.
 - 1) **And God said, Let the waters under the heavens be gathered together to one place, and let the dry land appear; and it was so. And God called the dry land, Earth. And He called the gathering together of the waters, Seas.**

A New Theory of Creation and Restoration

And God saw that it was good. And God said, Let the earth bring forth tender sprouts (the herb seeding seed and the fruit tree producing fruit after its kind, whose seed is in itself) upon the earth; and it was so. And the earth brought forth tender sprouts, the herb yielding seed after its kind, and the tree producing fruit after its kind, whose seed was in itself. And God saw that it was good. And the evening and the morning were the third day (Gen. 1:9–13).

- 2) You will note that the language here sounds very much as if these plants are sprouting and growing, rather than being suddenly created. I submit that all of these days represent a gradual process, which include putting into place many of the physical laws of matter.
 - 3) God is allowing a great deal of time to take place while the angels observe all that He does.
 - 4) As we will find out, God did cause the Garden of Eden to grow, but for the land around the Garden of Eden, there was limited plant growth (Gen. 2:5).
 - 5) Now, in case you are concerned that these plants must therefore endure a very, very long night after they have grown, which would kill most of them, let me explain why this is not the case.
 - (1) Remember, in original creation, night comes first, and then day.
 - (2) Therefore, we have first night #3 and then day #3 (both possibly lengthy) followed by night #4 (12 hours long).
 - (3) So, Day Three, where there is daylight for an extended period of time, provided by God, is followed by a normal length night.
12. On Day Four, God creates the stars, the sun, the moon, the planets, and He does this almost instantaneously. Most of our physical laws were also put into place at this time. A slight alternative to this is, these things, as matter, were always in place, but God lights up the sun and the stars—that is, they suddenly burst into great flames (for lack of a more accurate expression).
- 1) And God said, Let there be lights in the expanse of the heavens to divide between the day and the night. And let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years. And let them be for lights in the expanse of the heavens to give light upon the earth. And it was so. And God made two great lights: the greater light to rule the day and the smaller light to rule the night, and the stars also. And God set them in the expanse of the heavens to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night; and to divide between the light and the darkness. And God saw that it was good. And the evening and the morning were the fourth day (Gen. 1:14–19).
 - 2) At this point in time, we move into a 24-hour day. God instantaneously creates most of what we consider to be the universe, with all of the physical laws of light and gravity, etc.
 - 3) Or, God instantly lights up the skies with the sun and stars, which were there before, but caused by God to suddenly become great light sources.

A New Theory of Creation and Restoration

- 4) Quite obviously, the law of the speed of light would have to be put into place after the sun and stars are made (or after they have been turned on, as one turns on a lamp).
- 5) This sudden creation of the universal bodies reveals to the angels God's omnipotence.
13. Days 5 and 6 are also 24-hour days.
14. This helps to explain why Day Three seems to indicate that there is the sprouting of plants from the ground. This also helps to explain why God restored the earth in the odd order that He did, making plants to sprout first, and then providing the sun and the universe, almost instantaneously. Let me suggest that the earth rotated slowly on days 1–3 as it orbits the light of God, perhaps even increasing in speed.
15. This also is in line with the order of creation. The measurement of a day as a 24-hour period of time would come into play when there is a sun and the earth is rotating on its axis once every 24 hours, beginning with Day Four (which begins with night #4).
16. Obviously, given the language of the Bible, the rotation of the earth could have taken place over a much longer period of time in days 1–3, as we have *light turning dark* and *dark turning light*.

I do not claim that this is the end-all, be-all of creation/restoration theories. The order in which God restored the earth did not make much sense to me, and this theory seems to answer those concerns.

There are certain things which we must take away from Gen. 1, no matter which theory is correct: God is omnipotent, which means He is in charge. It is His ball, His playing field, so we play by His rules. All physical laws are subject to Him and all moral laws are in agreement with His perfect character. God is fair and just and righteous, which makes all of His laws, physical and moral, reasonable and in line with His perfect character.

Personally, most of the time, I know when I have failed; I know when I do not make God's standards. That is, I know my failures and I know my sins. However, God is gracious and He has graciously allowed me a great deal of blessing, despite my many shortcomings. My point is, in the place where we find ourselves today, God is fair with us. We are born with a sin nature, and we may protest all that we want about that; but God is fair. This will be what we take away from these first few chapters of Genesis. God is omnipotent, He has a plan, and He is fair, just and righteous. These various theories are fascinating to me, and looking at them critically is enjoyable to me; but we also must focus on what is actually here.

Up to this point, we have covered several theories of creation and restoration, so it might be beneficial to summarize them.

Creation Theories		
Theory	Arguments For	Arguments Against
<p>God created the heavens and the earth in 6 literal days.</p>	<p>This has been the traditional Christian interpretation for many centuries. This is the understanding most would come to if reading Gen. 1 in the English for the first time.</p>	<p>This requires that God create an imperfect earth to begin with, an earth which He needs to then work on to fix. This approach ignores the creation of angels, the fall of Satan and some of the language in Gen. 1 (as well as other passages which indicate that God did not form the earth a waste area).</p>
<p>The Day-Age Theory: God created the heavens and the earth in 6 creative periods of time.</p>	<p>This theory allows for Gen. 1 and evolution to be both true. This is known as theistic evolution, where God guides the process of evolution.</p> <p>Since most Christians were first taught to believe in evolution and to think that evolution is the correct scientific explanation, many believers take this position.</p>	<p>This theory, when combined with the theory of evolution, means that it took God millions of years to get anything right. Death and suffering would have preceded Adam and Eve and original sin. In the alternative, the Adam and Eve history becomes an even greater (and more inexplicable) allegory. What is the fall? Logically, man evolves with a sin nature.</p> <p>The language used (<i>light turning dark and dark turning light</i>) suggests a normal day as opposed to hundreds, thousands or millions of days.</p>
<p>Gap Theory I: God created the heavens and the earth, and He then restored the earth over a 6-day period of time.</p>	<p>This theory is perfectly consistent with the language found in Gen. 1. This theory allows for the creation of angels before the creation of man and provides reasonable explanations for their fall in relation to history. This theory is also consistent with the rest of the Bible.</p>	<p>This theory was proposed long after the time of the Apostles (however, I do not know when).</p>

Creation Theories

Theory	Arguments For	Arguments Against
Gap Theory II: God created the heavens and the earth, and then He restored them in 6 creative periods of time.	The same strong points as with the Day-Age theory.	The same weak points as with the Day-Age theory. I do not know anyone who actually takes this position. I only propose it by prove logical alternatives.
Gap Theory III: God created the heavens and the earth and then restored them. From Day 4 on are literal 24-hour days.	The sun and moon are not given until Day 4, and they are given, in part, to mark <i>days and years</i> . God's creative process does not require a great deal of time; He simply chooses to take a long period of time with Days 1-3. However, each day is one rotation of the earth, probably around God.	These days are not uniform. When speaking of the Sabbath, the Bible looks back on these 6 <i>days</i> of restoration for justification. This is a new theory.

Although I lean toward Gap theory #3, I have no problems with Gap Theory #1.

I do not feel as if I have addressed the order of creation in such a way as to explain it fully. If most of us were told that we were going to order the 6 days of restoration, similar to the Bible, it would have been: (Day One) Sun, moon and stars. (Day Two) The melting of the ice. (Day Three) The making of the atmosphere and dry land appears. (Day Four) Plants. (Day Five) Animals. (Day Six) Man. God prepares the earth on days 1-3 and then populates it on days 4-6. However, God did not restore the earth in that order, and Gap Theory III more or less addresses this.

None of the theories above deal sufficiently with the creation of the sun. Therefore, we also have several theories as to when the sun was created.

The Sun Theories		
Theory	Arguments For	Arguments Against
The sun was created on Day Four:	This seems to fit in best with the simple reading of the text. It is possible that the sun, stars and planets were made of existing material in space (space would not have really been space—lacking in matter).	The verb <i>to create</i> is not used. The law of the speed of light must be overruled.
The sun was created when the heavens and the earth were created, but not made visible until Day Four.	The verb tenses perfectly allow for this.	The biggest problem is, what God would have to be doing during this time—clearing up the atmosphere of the earth in order for the sun to be visible—is not spoken of. What God does not do—making the sun, moon and stars—is the focal point (if not the entirety) of this section.
The sun was created when the heavens and the earth were created, but it was not turned on until Day Four.	The sun and stars could have been on for angels and then turned off, when the earth is packed in ice. God turns them on, as we turn on a light in a room.	The speed of light must be overruled. Can turning on a light in a room really be a good analogy for the sun to suddenly go on? The word <i>made</i> is used here, which is not compatible with the idea of turning something on. Also, insofar as I know, this is a new theory.

Although I lean toward the first theory, I am still struggling between these 3.

Now, back to our text:

Literally:

Gen. 1:14 And so says Elohim, “Let [there] [continue to] be lights in [the] firmament of the heavens to distinguish between the day and the night, and they are [lit., *have been*] for signs [or, *remembrances*] and for seasons [or, *specific times*] and for days and years [i.e., *measures of time*].

Less literally:

Gen 1:14 Then God said, "Let there be lights in the sky to separate the day from the night. They will be signs and will mark religious festivals, days, and years.

So, although we may disagree as to specifics, on Day Four, the sun, moon and stars became visible to anyone on earth. They will be used by man to mark time with.

Literally:

Gen. 1:15 And they are [lit., *have been*] for lights in the expanse [= *firmament*] of the heavens to shine upon the earth. And so it is so.

Less literally:

Gen 1:15 They will be lights in the sky to shine on the earth." And so it was.

There is a verb which is often used to create something out of nothing. That verb is not used in this passage about the 4th day.

Lesson 13: Genesis 1:14–19 Day 4 of the Restoration of the Earth continued

Here is what we have so far:

Gen 1:14 Then God said, "Let there be lights in the sky to separate the day from the night. They will be signs and will mark religious festivals, days, and years.

Gen 1:15 They will be lights in the sky to shine on the earth." And so it was.

Whether we believe that the sun had been created when God created the heavens and the earth, and therefore, had always been there; or if we believe that God, in this passage, created the sun, the sun continues to be a picture of God.

How the Sun is Analogous to God

The Sun	God
The sun provides light	God is light.
The sun provides for our very life.	God is our life—He has given us life, and He provides for its continuance.
The sun gives us an abundance of energy	We are energized by the life which God has breathed into us.
The sun is always there providing us sustenance, even if we cannot see it	God is always there sustaining us, even if we cannot see Him.

How the Sun is Analogous to God

The Sun	God
We cannot look directly at the sun without burning out our retinas, nor can we move to a planet closer to the sun without having the liquids within us instantly vaporized.	In this same way—just as we cannot have a direct, hands-on relationship with the sun—we cannot have a direct, hands-on relationship with God. Relative righteousness (the state of man) cannot have fellowship with perfect righteousness (the state of God).
The sun is necessary for our life, but we cannot have direct contact with it.	Even though God is necessary for our very lives, direct contact with God would vaporize us, so to speak, as He is perfect righteousness and justice and we are not.
The sun is made up of material and has certain qualities which precludes us from even being close to it.	God is perfect righteousness and justice and we are not. Direct contact with God, in our fallen state, would destroy us, as we are not righteous. God would be forced to apply His justice and righteousness to us, which requires that we be judged, sentenced and condemned to the Lake of Fire. So, even though God is necessary for our life, we cannot have direct contact with Him.
<p>It is quite important that God, in this life, has provided us with an abundance of parallel situations and illustrations of eternal truths. This is one way in which God communicates with us. As we go through the Bible, it will become apparent that there are people and various actions and situations which represent Jesus Christ dying for our sins as our substitute (Gen. 22) or God's provision of salvation for us in His Son (Ex. 17:1–7).</p> <p>Furthermore, since God has always communicated with us in such parallel illustrations, it is only to be expected that His Son would also speak to us in parables as well. Parables are illustrations from life which teach us eternal truths.</p> <p>Given these things, it is quite reasonable to draw analogies between that which sustains us physically (the sun) and He Who sustains us in all respects (God).</p>	

Quite obviously, if God creates the sun, moon and stars on Day Four, He also has to make provision for light to reach us from these heavenly luminaries to occur immediately. Given the speed of light, if God created the stars 6000–10,000 years ago, we would be unable to see most of them because the light would not reach us yet. So God creates these things and makes them visible at once. The grand laws of the universe are set in motion by God (including the speed of light) and are subject to God's purpose. God is not bound by the laws of the universe.

The phrase *scientific laws* is a misnomer, since science did not originate these laws nor does science enforce these laws. What we call scientific laws are really God's laws, as

they originate with Him and He enforces them, and, now and again, He overrides these laws (e.g., turning water into wine). **Christ Jesus is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn [or, preeminent] of all creation. For by Him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities—all things were created through Him and for Him. And He is before all things, and in Him all things held together** (Col. 1:15–17). One of the things amazing about this statement, is the *holding of all things together*. Ancient man did not really appreciate or understand gravity, nor the idea as to how and why molecules bond. However, as we begin to understand more about science, we develop more and more of an appreciation for many of these concepts, which actually enhance that which we read in the Bible.

Back to Day Four:

Gen 1:16 God made the two bright lights: the larger light to rule the day and the smaller light to rule the night. He also made the stars.

Or, literally:

Gen 1:16 God makes the two bright [great] lights: [He makes] the larger [great] light to rule the day and [He makes] the smaller light to rule the night. And [He makes] the stars.

We have the verb *ʿâsâh* (עָשָׂה) [pronounced *gaw-SAWH*], which means *to do, to make, to construct, to fashion, to form, to prepare, to manufacture*. This verb was used in v. 7 when the atmosphere of the earth was made. Even though this verb is only found once in this verse, it is properly applied 3 more times. In the Hebrew, there is the sign of the direct object, which is never translated—it is an actual Hebrew word. Before *the greater light, the lesser light* and *the stars* we have the sign of the direct object, which means that a verb must act upon these three things. Logically, in the Hebrew, we simply go back to the last verb used (along with its tense and morphology) and apply it to these three things. You see *He makes* 3 times in brackets. More accurately, this ought to be *God makes*. And, even though that phrase does not occur 4 times in this verse, it is applied 4 times because of the Hebrew syntax and the untranslated particle found 4 times in this verse indicating a direct object. .

This verb can also mean *to do; to prepare; to make (an offering); to attend to, put in order; to observe, celebrate; to acquire (property); to appoint, ordain, institute; to bring about; to use; to spend, pass*. Quite obviously, the sun and the moon are made by God on this 4th day or made visible on the 4th day. This verb allows for the idea that God *made* the sun and the moon; but it also allows for God to *ordain* an existing sun and moon to have dominion over the day and the night, respectively.

Gen 1:17 God gave them in the sky to give light to the earth,...

Some translations read: **God put them in the sky to give light to the earth,...** However, the verb used here does not mean that they were in one place, and then God put them in another. The verb used here means *to give, to grant*. So the sun and moon were given

by God in order to provide light upon the earth. The idea here is, God gave these for specific reasons, which are herein enumerated.

Gen 1:18 ...to dominate the day and the night, and to separate the light from the darkness. God saw that it was good.

God set up the sun, the earth and the moon so that there would be day and night on a 24-hour cycle, and that the sun and the moon would mark day and night. This is a logical conclusion, since the sun and moon are given to mark days, years and seasons.

As stated before, the biggest problem with the idea that God did *not* create the sun, moon and stars on Day four is, *just what is God really doing on this 4th day?* If God does not create the sun, moon and stars on the 4th day (which is what it sounds like in v. 16), but merely reveals them, by clearing up the atmosphere or moving aside and allowing the sun to shine through, there is nothing in vv. 14–19 which says this. There is language which could have been used to indicate that God *revealed* the sun, moon and stars on the 4th day; there is language which could have been used to indicate that God moved aside the clouds, so that the sun and moon could be seen on day 4; there is language which could have been used to indicate that God *moved aside*, allowing the sun and moon to be seen. However, no language like that is found on this 4th day. God *makes* the sun, moon and stars; God calls for these things to be; and the purpose is for them to be given to man to mark time with. For this reason, I have to agree with those who believe that God waited until the 4th day before creating the sun, moon, and all other celestial entities.

Now, how do I reconcile God creating the heavens and the earth in v. 1, but not creating the sun, moon and stars until the 4th day of restoration? God created the earth and all matter in the very beginning. However, He then took the available matter on day 4 and then used it to make the sun, moon and stars.

It should become apparent that even these simple words found in the first few chapters of Genesis allow for a great deal of discussion, theorizing, and thinking.

I want you to recognize that this is all a teaching moment for angels. They are observing this, and God takes their former stomping grounds (the earth) and begins to restore it by warming it, creating an atmosphere, bringing land to the surface and then growing plants, trees and grasses. However, Day Four is rather dramatic, in that, God creates all that we see in the heavens (and even more that we do not see), almost instantly. It is not that God is less creative on days 1–3, but He demonstrates a creative power on Day Four which is staggering. Our human brains are unable to even conceive of the size of the various luminaries and planets which God conceived, let alone, their vast numbers or the distances between them, or the idea of an ever-expanding universe; yet, God does this almost instantly.

To me, one of the great proofs of God is, no matter which direction that you go in, whether it is out into space to contemplate the vastness of it all, or to the smallest building blocks of this earth, the protons, neutrons and electrons, all that is associated with either the

greatest or the smallest parts of God's creation is beyond our ability to fully comprehend. The single cell, once thought to be an incredibly simple, basic living creature, turns out to be quite complex, with each cell being unique, carrying out a vast number of functions, some of which we slightly understand, others of which, we observe, but are almost clueless about. Then, the idea that, these cells are made up of millions of molecules, which, under other circumstances, do not have life, is also a conundrum for man. Science is only beginning to understand the mysteries of what God has put before us, and do not expect man to ever fully understand even the simple living cell. However, as we find out again and again in science, nothing is random. There are laws which matter, organic and inorganic, all adhere to. Even though evolutionists try to present the evolution of life as being some sort of a random process, everything which we know about life, indicates quite the opposite, that there are laws that, when understood, explain how we go from point A to point B (cause and effect).

Bear in mind, angels, although vastly superior to us, are created beings. They are struggling (if that is the proper word for it) with the essence of God, the concept of free will, the laws of the universe, and their place in the universe. God has sentenced a third of the angels to eternal damnation. This is quite a remarkable thing for them to wrap their minds around. So, they learn by observation just as they do from God's Word.

Given that God's audience consists of angels and demons at this point, what do they get from what they have observed?

What is God Teaching the Angels?

1. God has the power over His creation. He can choose to freeze or to warm the earth, according to His purposes. Think of a sculptor and his lump of clay—he has the power to bring from this lump anything that he so chooses.
2. Life comes directly from God. Life is not an accidental byproduct of the other things which God made, but it comes directly from God. Therefore, God made the plants before He made the sun.
3. God's power is awesome—in one day, He makes the sun, moon and stars.
4. Because we have the verb *to make* rather than *to create*, God is able to take that which is there and to refashion it so that it is something entirely different. God takes the matter in space and fashions from it the sun, stars, moon and planets.
5. It is not unreasonable for Day 3—the growing of the plants—to take some time, and then for Day 4 to be almost instantaneous.
6. We, as men, also learn by carefully examining these days of creation and restoration.

Again, think of the lump of clay and the sculptor (or, more amazingly, a block of granite and a sculptor). This is what God has done with the universe which was probably trashed by Satan and his demon corps.

Gen 1:19 There was evening, then morning—a fourth day.

By the 4th day, we have land and sea, an atmosphere around the earth, and lights in the sky (the sun, moon and stars). The way I understand this passage is, God created the heavens and the earth, which creation probably included material later used to make the stars, planets and moons. The earth was originally created to be inhabited, but it was packed in ice, probably in judgment, by God (as discussed earlier, the earth was probably inhabited by angels at one point in history). In the first 3 days of restoration, God Himself provided the warmth and the light. Now, for Day 4, God provides a different source fo light and heat.

Lesson 14: Genesis 1:20–23 A Summary of Creation and Restoration and Day 5

Let’s take a look at all that we have covered, and what is coming up:

Summary of Creation and the Days of Restoration

Time	Commentary	Scripture
<p>The Pre-historic Past:</p>	<p>God creates the heavens and the earth; and God creates angels. What appears to be the proper order here is, God created the heavens and the earth, then He created angels. When a third of the angels sinned, God withdrew His light, freezing the earth solid, and possibly imprisoned the fallen angels.</p>	<p>Gen 1:1–2a In a beginning God created the [two] heavens and the earth. But the earth became a wasteland and empty, and darkness covered the deep water.</p> <p>Ezek 28:15 “You [Satan] were perfect in your ways from the day that you were created, until iniquity was found in you.”</p> <p>Isa. 45:18 For thus says Yahweh who created the heavens, the God who formed the earth and made it, who established it and didn't create it a waste, who formed it to be inhabited: “I am Yahweh; and there is no one else.”</p> <p>Jer 4:23 I looked on the earth, and, lo, it was without form and void; and the heavens, and they had no light.</p>

Summary of Creation and the Days of Restoration

Time	Commentary	Scripture
Days One and Two:	Then God began to retrofit the earth for man, which we call the restoration of the earth. God made it light so that angels could observe what He was doing. In warming the earth, the fallen angels were given some freedom of movement as well (although probably all angelic creation was transfixed, watching the restoration of the earth).	Job 38:4–11 [God is speaking to Job, and, essentially, to all mankind]: "Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth? Tell me, if you have understanding. Who determined its measurements--surely you know! Or who stretched the line upon it? On what were its bases sunk, or who laid its cornerstone, when the morning stars [angels] sang together and all the sons of God [angels] shouted for joy? Or who shut in the sea with doors [the oceans were frozen solid] when it burst out from the womb [God began to heat the surface of the earth], when I made clouds its garment and thick darkness its swaddling band, and prescribed limits for it and set bars and doors, and said, 'Thus far shall you come, and no farther, and here shall your proud waves be stayed'?" God makes the atmosphere for the earth.
Day One:	God brings light to the earth and distinguishes between light and darkness. One condition on earth is called day and the other is called night. What appears to have happened is, God warmed the frozen surface of the earth and caused great vapor clouds to rise.	<p>Gen 1:2b–5 And the Spirit of God was hovering [as a mother hen] over the surface of the waters. Then God said, "Let there be light!" So there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good, and God distinguished between light and darkness. God called the light, Day and He called the darkness, Night. And there was evening, and there was morning the first day.</p> <p>Amos 5:8b Seek Him...Who turned the deep darkness into the morning and He darkened the day into night.</p>

Summary of Creation and the Days of Restoration

Time	Commentary	Scripture
<p>Day Two:</p>	<p>God makes an atmosphere between the waters of the sky (thick clouds which surrounded the earth) and the waters of the sea.</p>	<p>Gen 1:6–8: And God said, Let an expanse be in the midst of the waters, and let it be dividing between the waters and the waters. And God made the expanse, and He separated between the waters which were under the expanse and the waters which were above the expanse. And it was so. And God called the expanse, Heavens. And there was evening, and there was morning the second day.</p> <p>Isa. 40:21–22: Have you not known? Have you not heard? Has it not been told you from the beginning? Have you not understood from the foundations of the earth? It is He [God] who sits above the sphere of the earth, and its people are like grasshoppers; [it is God] Who stretches out the heavens [atmosphere] like a curtain, and spreads them out like a tent to dwell in.</p> <p>Isa 42:5a So says Jehovah God, He who created the heavens and stretched them out, spreading out over the earth and its offspring [all that is living on the earth].</p>
<p>Day Three:</p>	<p>God brings forth dry land, and causes plants and trees to sprout from the ground.</p>	<p>Gen 1:9–13: And God said, Let the waters under the heavens be collected to one place, and let the dry land appear. And it was so. And God called the dry land, Earth. And He called the collection of the waters, Seas. And God saw that it was good. And God said, Let the earth sprout tender sprouts, the plant seeding seed, the fruit tree producing fruit according to its kind, whichever seed is in it on the earth. And it was so. And the earth bore tender sprouts, the plant seeding seed according to its kind, and the fruit tree producing fruit according to its kind, whichever seed is in it. And God saw that it was good. And there was evening, and there was morning the third day.</p>

Summary of Creation and the Days of Restoration

Time	Commentary	Scripture
Day Four:	<p>God makes the sun, moon and stars (as well as all of the other heavenly bodies). In order to make them all visible to the earth, God had to overrule the speed of light.</p>	<p>Gen. 1:14–19 And God said, "Let there be lights in the expanse of the heavens to separate the day from the night. And let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days and years, and let them be lights in the expanse of the heavens to give light upon the earth." And it was so. And God made the two great lights--the greater light to rule the day and the lesser light to rule the night--and the stars. And God set them in the expanse of the heavens to give light on the earth, to rule over the day and over the night, and to separate the light from the darkness. And God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, the fourth day.</p> <p>Isa 40:26 Lift up your eyes on high, and behold, who has created these [the heavenly bodies], who brings out their host by number? He calls them all by names by the greatness of His might, for He is strong in power; not one is lacking.</p> <p>Amos 5:8a Seek Him who created the Pleiades and Orion.</p>
Day Five:	<p>On Day 5 of God's restoration of the earth, God fills the skies with birds and He fills the waters with sea creatures.</p>	<p>Gen. 1:20–23 And God said, "Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth across the expanse of the heavens." So God created the great sea creatures and every living creature that moves, with which the waters swarm, according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to its kind. And God saw that it was good. And God blessed them, saying, "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth." And there was evening and there was morning, the fifth day.</p>
Day Six, Part I	<p>God creates land animals.</p>	<p>Gen. 1:24–31 And God said, "Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kinds--livestock and creeping things and beasts of the earth according to their kinds." And it was so. And God made the beasts of the earth according to their kinds and the livestock according to their kinds, and everything that creeps on the ground according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.</p>

Summary of Creation and the Days of Restoration

Time	Commentary	Scripture
Day Six Part II	God creates man.	<p style="color: blue;">Gen. 1:26–31 Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth." So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. And God blessed them. And God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth." And God said, "Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is on the face of all the earth, and every tree with seed in its fruit. You shall have them for food. And to every beast of the earth and to every bird of the heavens and to everything that creeps on the earth, everything that has the breath of life, I have given every green plant for food." And it was so. And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day.</p>

We will, of course, go back to day 6 and fill in the blanks as we continue our study.

Now we begin Day Five:

Gen 1:20 And God said, "Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth across the expanse of the heavens."

It appears as though God did not create a pair of this and a pair of that, and let them continue from there; He apparently created a great many creatures of the sea and creatures of the air.

Gen 1:21 So God created the great sea creatures and every living creature that moves, with which the waters swarm, according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.

The *great sea creatures* would refer to sharks and whales, primarily. God filled the seas with an incredible abundance of marine life. The animals were all created to interact and to be interdependent. At this point in time, animals did not eat other animals. They all ate plants. Furthermore, there is no indication that animals died. When Adam sins, death will

be brought into the world, and thereafter, the consumption of animals as food. We ascertain this from examining the Millennium and the New Heavens and the New Earth. Ferocity between animals is eliminated (the lion will lie down with the lamb—Isa. 11:6 65:25) as is sorrow and death (And God will wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there will be no more death, nor mourning, nor crying out, nor will there be any more pain; for the first things passed away—Rev. 21:4). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that, under perfect environment before the fall, the same conditions existed. God will, after the flood, authorize the eating of meat by man (Gen. 9:3).

Gen 1:22 And God blessed them, saying, "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth."

Prior to the fall, God apparently made it possible for birds of the air and the creatures of the sea to multiply, which means they could procreate. However, one might argue that they are given this potential to procreate which will not kick in until Adam sins.

There are several things which stand out in v. 22: first of all, God blesses this aspect of creation and then He speaks to them. God is not said to bless anything until this point in time. *To bless* is found here in the Piel stem, imperfect tense. The Piel stem in the Hebrew generally denotes intensity; however, it is also used to indicate an accomplished state of being without regard to the process. When God is doing the blessing, this often means *to prosper* in the Hebrew. The imperfect tense often refers to something which is ongoing or continuous. God prospering animal life could be seen as an intensive, ongoing process, but without focusing on the process itself.

We also find the first imperative mood of the Bible, and God directs this imperative mood toward animal life in the skies and seas. This indicates that God is setting something into motion here; in this case, it is procreation. This would be reasonably seen as sexual function between animals, which would be a part of their nature, even prior to actually having offspring.

The alternative approach is, animals do procreate in perfect environment. Reasonably assuming three things—that animals procreate and they do not die and they do not eat one another—these things seem to indicate that God knows there is a timer on perfect environment. We know this by God's attribute of omniscience, but we also know this by the first 3 chapters of Genesis. If there is no death among animals, how fast would they multiply? I would assume that there are insects as well at this time. Could they be given as food, allowing for death in the insect world? I have no idea, myself, although I doubt it, as they are part of the animal kingdom as well. We are given limited information about perfect environment.

Personally, I would assume that there is no procreation among animals until the fall; although the potential for procreation is there (this is true of Adam and the woman, who bear no children until after the fall). The verbiage found here (And God blessed them, saying, "Be fruitful and multiply...") is found almost word-for-word after man is created (Gen. 1:28).

We are given precious few details of man and animals under perfect environment. Direct statements, like, *and neither man nor animals bore offspring*, are not found. Therefore, we examine the options and determine which seems most likely (did animals produce offspring or not?).

Gen 1:23 And there was evening and there was morning, the fifth day.

Lesson 15: Genesis 1:24–1:27

Day 6 of the Restoration

Day Six:

On the 6th day, God creates land animals, which are principally mammals and reptiles. Then He creates man.

Gen 1:24 And God said, "Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kinds--livestock and creeping things and beasts of the earth according to their kinds." And it was so.

In an instant, God created a great many species of animals, and within each group, God allowed for a great deal of sub-species (I don't know if I am using these terms correctly). God may have created 1,000,000 dogs, but within this group of dogs, certain traits may be brought to the forefront and certain traits may be removed from a sub-species of dog (which seems to have taken place principally over this past millennium).

Gen 1:25 And God made the beasts of the earth according to their kinds and the livestock according to their kinds, and everything that creeps on the ground according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.

God created animals so that they could not breed outside of their species. He created animals so that those of the same kind could breed. He made things so that, for instance, when two cows breed, the result is a calf and not a lamb.

Gen 1:26 Then God said, "Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth."

This statement of Genesis is quite remarkable. There are 3 things for us to note: (1) God is not alone in this creation process; (2) God made man to have authority over the earth; (3) man is created in God's image, which is qualified with a plural suffix (*Our image, Our likeness*).

God is a plural noun (*Elohim*) and we find this exact same noun in other places translated *gods*. However, in places like this, *Elohim* takes a singular verb. This, in fact, is what tells us that we are speaking of the God Who created us. However, suddenly, here, God is

speaking to someone else, someone Who is a part of the creative process. God says that *We* are going to create man and that man will be in God's image and likeness.

The first thing that we need to know is, Who is with God? Now, I have capitalized the nouns and pronouns, but, in the Hebrew language (the original language) there are no capital letters. Capitalizing letters of names and pronouns which refer to God is a tradition in our society, a tradition which, unfortunately, is not followed in all Bible translations.

We have another account of creation in John 1:1–4, 14, 17: *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made through Him, and without Him was not any thing made that was made. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men. And the Word became flesh and lived among us, and we have seen His glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father, full of grace and truth. For the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ.*

So the Person with God is Jesus Christ, called here, *the Word*. *All things were made by means of Him and nothing was made without Him.* In the fullness of time (at the proper time, according to God's plan), *the Word became flesh and lived among us*; He is *full of grace and truth*, and this *grace and truth came through Jesus Christ*.

From the very beginning, God is more than One person, even though He is One in essence. You may have some familiarity with the Bible and you know that, Deut. 6:4 reads: *Listen, O Israel: Jehovah [is] our God [Elohim], the Jehovah [is] one.* The word for *one* used here is not used to refer to absolute singularity. We find the exact same word used in Gen. 2:24: *Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh.* The singularity here refers to unity between the man and the woman. They remain two separate personalities, but they form (for lack of a better term) a corporate unity in marriage. Similarly, the Godhead or the Trinity is *one* in essence, yet plural in person and function.

The Spirit of God is mentioned back in Gen. 1:2 and Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit are mentioned here in Gen. 1:26. We confirm this by looking at John 1.

I have mentioned the division of labor, and what is required in order to make anything. You need a plan, someone who will do the actual work, and the energy involved to make whatever is being made. God the Father planned it all; God the Son executed the plan, and this was all done in the power (energy) of God the Holy Spirit. 3 different persons, 3 difference functions, yet one in essence and purpose.

Item #2 from this verse is the fact that God gave man authority over the earth. Throughout man's history, there have been those who worship the earth. The current environmental movement has morphed into what has essentially become a cult-worship of the earth. At one time, the environmental movement had some fairly reasonable members, who petitioned in a variety of ways for cleaner air, cleaner water and cleaner land. Although a balance must be struck between man and nature, this balance is always in man's favor,

because God has given man dominion over the earth. Man should never be seen as subservient to the earth or to any part of the earth. Nor should man be seen as some sort of an aberration of nature or as some sort of a destructive, anti-nature force. Man is not an intruder in nature nor is man a destructive force, destroying nature. God gave man the authority over the earth, which means authority over all nature.

Man has done several things when it comes to subduing the earth: (1) we grow crops and breed animals for our own specific needs; (2) we build homes to live in and buildings to work in; (3) we build roads to go from point A to point B; (4) we build water supplies. These 4 things have been with us since time immemorial, and these are 4 ways in which we subdue the earth.

Is it a good thing to preserve clean air and water? Of course, because we as man breathe that air and drink that water. Are there national parks which we should preserve? Of course, because there are many people who want to visit these parks and camp out in them. This is a part of subduing the earth. In this, we strike a balance between a pristine area and an area accessible to man. I have been to several beaches where the intention is to keep these beaches as pristine as possible. However, there are roads and trails which lead us to these beaches. The preservation and the access both fall under man's authority over the earth.

However, it is quite another thing to preserve a plot of ground that no one goes to and that no one has a desire to go to. That sort of thing falls into more of a cult-worship of the earth. We have a place called the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) in Alaska. There are very few animals in this area and even fewer people. There is probably not a better place on this earth to drill for oil, because no one will ever see these oil derricks. If anything, animal life would increase in these areas, as they did along the great oil pipeline which was laid back in the 1970's and 1980's. This is also a part of man's authority over the earth.

The key is, God has given man dominion over the earth, and man gets to decide what to do with it. If China follows the United States and its economic evolution, there will be a point at which the Chinese will decide that, cleaner air to breath and rivers which cannot catch on fire to be priorities.

There are those who like to commune more closely with nature and see less of mankind, and I can fully sympathize with such an approach to life, man being what he is. If such a person has the wherewithal, they can purchase a substantial plot of land and live there, isolated, to some degree, from other people. However, no matter how *in tune with nature* such a one sees himself, he is going to make changes to portions of this land in order to live. That is, he may clear away a place to live, cut down trees for fuel or for shelter, and perform a number of other things which substantially changes the environment. There is nothing wrong with this, and even the most ardent environmentalist will change the environment around him to suit his own taste. Being man, we get to decide how to subdue the earth. This includes the environment in which we live. The key is a balance between man and nature and between man and society. This means that, if you want to have

complete control and authority over your own environment, then you need to buy that huge plot of land and do with it what you believe is a proper balance between you and nature, because, 99% of the time, our concept of how the environment ought to be has to be tempered by the opinions of others who share the same environment as you.

Gen 1:27 So God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.

Item #3: the Bible tells us that man is made in God's image. What does this mean? Man has a reflected essence or a shadow essence which is an image of God's essence. Jesus will later tell us that, "God is Spirit; and those who worship Him must worship in Spirit and in Truth" (John 4:24). So, when it comes to being made in the image of God, this does not mean that God has 2 eyes, a nose, a mouth, etc. God is immaterial and the immaterial part of us is a shadow-image of God.

Man, the Shadow Image of God	
<u>God</u>	<u>Man</u>
Traits in Evidence (so far in the first chapter of Genesis):	
Created the earth and the universe	Man is a creative being
God is powerful (He created the universe)	Man has strength; man produces energy
God is sovereign (He chose to create the universe)	Man has volition. Man is given authority over the earth.
<u>God</u>	<u>Man</u>
Traits to be Revealed Later:	
God is love	Man is capable of personal and impersonal love
God is righteousness	Man has a sense of right and wrong
God is justice	Man seeks to right injustices; it is in man's nature to seek justice.
God is omniscient	Man has 5 senses by which he perceives the world and a mind with which to think. Man's mind is hard-wired for language.
God is omnipresent	Man exists somewhere in a specific place and time
God is perfect	Man was created perfect

<u>God</u>	<u>Man</u>
Traits to be Revealed Later:	
God is eternal	Man is created to live forever
God is immutable	Man's essence is fixed. We do not mutate a new essence while on this earth.
God is absolute truth	Man can understand and appreciate truth and the need for truth.

As perfect creatures (we were created in perfection), we are a reflection of God; we are created in His image and likeness.

Lesson 16: Genesis 1:26–1:31 **Day 6 of the Restoration (continued)**

Gen. 1:26–27: Then God said, "Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth." So God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.

This previous passage speaks of God creating man in the image of God; and then it speaks of God creating man and woman. As we will find out, this was not simply a process of God saying, "Let there be man" and man came to be. However, we are given few details here. The details of the creation of man will be given in the next chapter.

Providing the details after a few general statements is common in the Hebrew Bible (the Old Testament). In a narrative, sometimes basic occurrences are stated first, and then details are given afterward. We tend to think chronologically. We're born, we live and then we die. Things happen in a chronological order. Now, although the Hebrews do not ignore chronology, they will often list some general statements first, and then they will expand on those general statements. Think of this as analogous to an introductory paragraph, a preface or a table of contents. You are given a brief outline of what is to come, and then the author launches into the details.

I mention this simply because, critics of the Bible claim that there are two creation stories here; Gen. 1 and Gen. 2. Not true. Gen. 2:4–25 gives us some more details which are not given in Gen. 1:1–2:3. In Gen. 1, we are simply told that God created man in His Own image; and that God created man as male and female. Gen. 2 gives us more specifics as to how God created man and how God created man as male and female.

We have a problem here: when did God make the woman? Most understand this passage to mean that God created the man and the woman on this 6th day, which makes this a very

eventful day. God creates the land animals and then Adam, and has Adam name all of these animals (along with the birds), and then, later on, that same day, God will form the woman out of Adam's rib (Gen. 2:18–25). That is a lot to happen on one day. However, that is not an impossible task for one day.

This text (along with the following verse), makes it sound as if God certainly did create the man and the woman on the 6th day and that God speaks to *them* and tells *them to be fruitful and multiply*—hardly the sort of thing that God would say to Adam alone.

Gen 1:28 And God blessed them. And God said to them [the man and the woman], "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue [conquer, subjugate] it and exercise dominion over [rule over, subjugate] the fish of the sea, the birds of the heavens and every living thing that moves on the earth."

We have parallels between v. 22 and v. 28. In both verses, God blesses *them* (animals of the sea and air; and man), and, God tells *them* to be fruitful and to multiply.

That man is to *subdue* the earth is an imperative mood. This is the first mandate given by God to man. The Qal stem of this verb means *to bring into bondage, make subservient; to subdue, force, violate; to subdue, dominate, tread down*. In the Hebrew, this imperative mood is addressed to the 2nd person plural. That means that this is an order from God issued to both the man and the woman.

God gives man dominion over the earth. God is specific: he tells man to be fruitful and multiply (that is, to have a lot of children) and to fill the earth and to subdue it, and to have and exercise authority and power over all animal life.

God gives man dominion over all animal creatures, and this is the imperative mood again; God requires man *to rule, to subjugate, to have dominion over* all of the animals.

Gen 1:29 And God said, "Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is on the face of all the earth, and every tree with seed in its fruit. You will have them for food.

God gives man plants which produce food; and man is to eat from these. Interestingly enough, man is created as a vegetarian. Even though God gives man authority over the animal kingdom, this does not yet mean that man can barbeque and eat the animals. God will allow for that, but not under perfect environment. God will allow man to eat animals after the flood (see Gen. 9:3).

This introduces a problem: do all plants originally grow from seeds? Did God cause some plants to grow super-fast? Did God create some plants fully grown? In Gen. 1:11–12 2:5, 8–9, it sounds as though plants grow naturally, beginning just as sprouts from seeds on the 3rd day. In this verse, if we understand plants to grow naturally from seed, then what God describes herein is potential. We have discussed previously that the first 3 days may have been longer than 24 hours, as there was no sun and moon by which to measure time; and we will later find out that God places Adam and the women in a garden, so to speak, where

food will be available from the trees and plants. Whether God allowed for a normal growth cycle or whether God grew the Garden of Eden in a 24 hour period, we do not know. However, we will find out later, that outside of the garden, there are fewer plants (Gen. 2:5—I should warn you, by the way, that your translation of this verse may be incorrect).

Our original bodies, uncorrupted by sin, were probably far more phenomenal than we realize. We should recall that Jesus fasted for 40 days and was still able to resist Satan. Jesus was also subject to the most horrendous beating a man could be subjected to, then placed on a cross, and then He was judged for our sins in His own body on the cross—and yet, at the end, He had to dismiss His own spirit in order to die. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that, in perfect environment, that man had perpetual life and that our bodies were virtually indestructible. Under sin, our bodies grow old; apart from sin, our bodies are phenomenal in what they can do and what they can achieve. Our bodies are designed to regenerate every 7 years (if my memory of this aspect of biology is correct). Whether God build this into the human body as a potential for after the fall or whether this has always been a part of man's biological being, I could not say.

In any case, even in this fallen environment with our corrupted bodies, we regenerate a great deal. Over my years as a child, I have had broken arms, black eyes, bruises and a myriad of cuts, as well as 2nd and 3rd degree burns. You cannot identify where 99% of those things were. In fact, it has only been since I have become an adult where some cuts and bruises have left any scarring. So, our uncorrupted bodies must have been quite phenomenal.

Gen 1:30 And to every beast of the earth and to every bird of the heavens and to everything that creeps on the earth, everything that has the breath of life, I have given every green plant for food." And it was so.

God also gives plants to the animals for food as well. Animals were not created originally to eat one another, nor were they created originally for us to consume (although God, whose omniscience extends to all things future, realized that man would eventually eat animals for food).

It is unclear whether food was a requirement of mankind at this time, or simply a pleasure. From all the information available, I assume that it was the latter.

Gen 1:31 And God saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day.

This sets up a time frame for much of the next chapter. Most of the next chapter will center in on God's creation of man, and we know that this all occurred on the 6th day.

There are several theories in this world concerning the creation account of Genesis. Some dismiss the Genesis record out of hand, believing that science has clearly shown evolution

to be a natural process and our true means of origin. Some would further state that our evolution occurs without God being involved in the process.

The approach of Darwinists is, *science* tells us that man evolved. Somehow—we do not know how—there was the earth, the sun and the universe. On earth, there was something—we don't know exactly what—and some process—we don't know exactly what, which resulted in inorganic material becoming organic. Some goo of unknown origin went through a sudden, almost miraculous transformation, from non-living matter to life. One moment, everything is lifeless; and the next, there is a living cell.

At one time, the single cell was thought to be relatively simple. I mean, hell, you could barely see the thing with a microscope, so it had to be simple. Today, as science discovers more about the single cell, the more we recognize how little we actually know about it. It has such processes as: mitosis, meiosis, endocytosis, phagocytosis, pinocytosis, and exocytosis. We can find crude models of any of these processes on the internet. There are a great variety of cells, and if one scientist was to take one cell and spend his entire lifetime studying that one cell (or that particular type of cell), he could never fully plumb the depths of the complexity of that cell. And yet, one moment, on earth, according to the Darwinist, there was nothing living; and the next moment, *poof*, a thing so complex that the world's greatest scientist today could not understand everything that there is to know about it.

The world's greatest mind could take just one living cell and he could spend his entire life studying and writing scientific exposition about this single cell, and after a lifetime, no genius would fully understand everything there is to know about this single cell. At this point, we are able to describe certain processes for a cell, but we do not fully understand all of them.

Apparently—and I am not sure exactly how this happened according to evolutionists—this live cell must have morphed into a variety of different kinds of cells, some of which decided to team up and form a gang, giving us our first multicellular living thing. Eventually, this morphed into a fish (remember, millions of years are involved here, so anything is possible to the evolutionist), and, over the course of time, this fish decided that it wanted to live on land, so it landed on the shore, grew lungs and arms and legs, and turned into a reptile (of course, this happened gradually over millions of years, and whenever you add the phrase *gradually, over millions of years*, then this no longer sounds foolish). This reptile, over time, sprouted wings and flew, its heavy scales turning into ultra-light feathers (again, this is made believable because we assume that this took place over millions of years).

That is one theory, and one which many scientists prefer to call the *scientific theory of evolution*. This is a theory which requires a tremendous amount of faith, far more than I am able to sum up. Any one change (like a fish developing lungs from their gills) would be quite miraculous on its own and require phenomenal faith to believe in. Evolutionists believe in millions of such changes and their faith is strong. I have argued in vain with many evolutionists, and it is almost impossible to rattle their faith, regardless of their

knowledge of evolution (some know a lot and some know very little; but they have stronger faith than do most Christians in what they believe).

There is a second theory is called the *Day-Age Theory*. Here, each *day* in Genesis is seen as a period of time. In fact, some theologians who believe this, remark how well this matches up to the creation process in evolution. Throughout the Bible, *day* does not always refer to a 24-hour period or a 12–13 hour period of daylight. Sometimes it can refer to just a point in time and sometimes it can refer to a longer period of time (longer than a 24 hour day). Therefore, those who believe in this theory, would argue that we are speaking of long periods of time here which are called *days*, and that such an opinion is not inconsistent with the use of *day* elsewhere in the Bible. Essentially, this point of view is taken by someone who has been convinced both that evolution as described above is the only reasonable explanation for the origin of life; and that the Bible contains some truth as well. Therefore, in their mind, this theory allows for both to be true.

My own personal opinion here is, the author of this chapter seems to be trying very hard to indicate that these are 24-hour time periods (at least from Day 4 on). We have the creation process followed by, *and so there is an evening, and so there is a morning, the sixth day*. If this was a long period of time, the author instead would have written something like, *and so was the day of the creation of the land animals*.

I am trying to keep this study fairly simple; therefore, I am not going to go into the concept of evolution in any great depth (I covered it to some degree in lesson #10). I was brought up to believe in evolution, and I believed in it firmly into my early 20's. At age 21, I believed in Jesus Christ and was saved. When I began to study the Bible, I also developed an interest in evolution. Now, no pastor and no church told me, *you cannot believe in evolution and be a Christian*. In fact, early on, I pretty much adopted the *Day-Age Theory* in my thinking (which is a very common view among Christians), but then I began to read books critical of evolution, and found out that there is more scientific evidence against evolution than there is for evolution. The solid evidence for evolution is not near as solid as some would have you believe. On my own web page, I examine some specifics of evolution (www.kukis.org/page14.html), and I refer you to that if you have an interest. Also, if you are to read just one book on this topic (and there are hundreds), I suggest Lubenow's *Bones of Contention*.

The way Genesis 1 is written, days 1–6 indicate the rotation of the earth for at least days 4–6.

Lesson 17: The Bible

Creation Throughout the Bible

Before we move into day 7, it may be instructive to see what the rest of the Bible has to say about creation. Does the Bible say anything at all about God creating the heavens and the earth? Does the Bible say anything about God creating man? Does the Bible look back on this first chapter of Genesis as allegorical? Does the Bible move forever without looking back one way or the other?

As we examine the passages which deal with creation in the Bible, bear in mind that the creation and restoration of the earth involved the entire Godhead. God the Father was the Architect—He designed and planned out all that would happen (which includes free will in His creatures). God the Son, the Revealed Member of the Trinity, did the actual building and creating. God the Holy Spirit provided the power or the energy. All that man creates involves these 3 things: a plan, someone to execute the plan, and the energy involved in executing the plan. Whether one builds a doghouse, a road or a symphony, there needs to be a plan, the energy to execute the plan and someone who executes the plan. All things created by man contain those three components. I mention the triune function of the Godhead because this is essential to our lives as believers in Jesus Christ.

A literal 6-day creation/restoration:

But the seventh day is the Sabbath of Jehovah your God. You will not do any work [on this day]—not you, your son, your daughter, your manservant, your maidservant, your cattle, or the stranger within your gates. This is because Jehovah made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them in six days, and rested the seventh day. Therefore Jehovah blessed the Sabbath day, and sanctified it (Ex. 20:10–11). The word *made* here is the verb *ʿâsâh* (עָשָׂה) [pronounced *gaw-SAWH*], which means *to do, to make, to construct, to fashion, to form, to prepare, to manufacture*. This verb was used in v. 7 when the atmosphere of the earth was made. It is difficult to interpret this in any other way than, 6 periods of daylight and 6 periods of night.

God *made* the heavens and the earth:

When Hezekiah prayed to God, he said, “You alone...made the heavens and the earth.” (2Kings 19:15).

My help comes from Jehovah, the Maker of the heavens and the earth (Psalm 121:2).

May Jehovah bless you out of Zion, He Who made the heavens and earth (Psalm 134:3).

God created and made all that is on the earth:

So the LORD said, "I will blot out man whom I have created from the face of the land, man and animals and creeping things and birds of the heavens, for I am sorry that I have made them." (Gen. 6:7). There is creation factor and a making factor. *Making* means, out of the materials which exist, these things were made. *Creating* refers to giving life to something which had no life.

God *created* and *made* the heavens and the earth and all that is in them:

A prayer in the book of Nehemiah includes the lines: "You are the LORD, You alone. You have made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth and all that is on it, the seas and all that is in them; and You preserve all of them; and the host of heaven [angelic creation] worships You." (Neh. 9:6).

By the word of the LORD the heavens were made, and by the breath of His mouth all their host [all of angelic creation and the stars and planets] (Psalm 33:6).

The heavens are Yours; the earth also is Yours; the world and all that is in it, You have founded them (Psalm 89:11).

Praise the LORD! Praise the LORD from the heavens; praise Him in the heights! Praise Him, all His angels; praise Him, all His hosts! Praise Him, sun and moon, praise Him, all you shining stars! Praise Him, you highest heavens, and you waters above the heavens! Let them praise the name of the LORD! For He commanded and they were created. And He established them forever and ever; He gave a decree, and it shall not pass away (Psalm 148:1–6).

Do you not know? Have you not heard, that the everlasting God, Jehovah, the Creator of the ends of the earth, does not grow weak or weary? There is no limit to His understanding (Isa. 40:28).

I will open rivers on the bare heights, and fountains in the midst of the valleys. I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water. I will put in the wilderness the cedar, the acacia, the myrtle, and the olive. I will set in the desert the cypress, the plane and the pine together, that they may see and know, may consider and understand together, that the hand of the LORD has done this, the Holy One of Israel has created it (Isa. 41:18–20).

Thus says God, the LORD, who created the heavens and stretched them out, who spread out the earth and what comes from it, who gives breath to the people on it and spirit to those who walk in it..." (Isa. 42:5).

"I have made the earth, and created man on it; I, with My hands, have stretched out the heavens; and all their host [the stars and all other celestial things] have I commanded." (Isa. 45:12).

I have made the earth, man, and the animals on the face of the earth, by My great power and by My outstretched arm, and have given it to whom it seemed right to Me (Jer. 27:5).

Inspired, people listening to John and Peter, stood up and said [to God], "Lord, You are the God who made the heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that is in them." (Acts 4:24b).

Paul writes to the Ephesian church: To me, though I am the very least of all the saints, this grace was given, to preach to the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to bring to light for everyone what is the plan of the mystery hidden for ages in God who created all things, so that through the church the manifold wisdom of God might now be made known to the rulers and authorities in the heavenly places (Eph. 3:8–10).

For every house is built by someone, but He who built all things is God (Heb. 3:4).

By faith we understand that the ages were framed by the Word of God, so that the things being seen not to have come into being out of the things that appear (Heb. 11:3).

God's incredible creation glorifies Him:

The psalmist is amazed that, given all that God has created, that He gives any thought to man: When I look at Your heavens, the work of Your fingers, the moon and the stars, which You have set in place, what is man that You are mindful of him, and the son of man that You care for him? (Psalm 8:3–4).

The heavens declare the glory of God, and the sky above proclaims His handiwork. Day to day pours out speech, and night to night reveals knowledge. There is no speech, nor are there words, whose voice is not heard. Their voice goes out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them He has set a tent for the sun, which comes out like a bridegroom leaving his chamber, and, like a strong man, runs its course with joy. Its rising is from the end of the heavens, and its circuit to the end of them, and there is nothing hidden from its heat (Psalm 19:1–6).

“To whom then will you compare Me, that I should be like anyone else?” says the Holy One. “Lift up your eyes on high and see: who created these? He who brings out their host [the stars and planets] by number, calling them all by name, by the greatness of his might, and because He is strong in power not one is missing.” (Isa. 40:25–26).

“O Lord, You are worthy to receive glory and honor and power, because You created all things, and for Your will they are and were created.” (Rev. 4:11).

And I saw another angel flying in mid-heaven, having the everlasting gospel to proclaim to those dwelling on the earth, even to every nation and kindred and tongue and people, saying with a great voice, Fear God and give glory to Him! For the hour of His judgment has come. And worship Him who made the heaven and the earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters (Rev. 14:6–7).

God created heavens and earth, but He is not confined by or to the heavens and earth:

Of old, You laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Your hands. They will perish, but you will remain; they will all wear out like a garment. You will change them like a robe, and they will pass away, but You are the same, and Your years have no end (Psalm 102:25–27). This is the first time that it is suggested that the heavens and earth would pass away, becoming old like a garment.

God is far greater than His creation and is not confined to His creation: But, the Most High does not dwell in temples made with hands, as the prophet says, "Heaven is My throne and earth is My footstool. What house will you build Me, says the Lord, or what is the place of My rest? Has not My hand made all these things?" (Acts 7:48–50). The Jews, from the

earliest times, understood that their God was not One Who could be confined to a particular place, nor could He be made with human hands (as an idol could be).

Paul explains to some heathen God's nature: **The God who made the world and all things in it, since He is Lord of Heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made with hands, nor is served with men's hands, as though He needed anything, since He gives life and breath and all things to all.**" (Acts 17:24–25).

God created the earth to be occupied:

For so says Jehovah the Creator of the heavens—He is God, forming the earth and making it; He establishes it, not creating it empty [a wasteland], but forming it to be inhabited—, "I am Jehovah, and there is no other." (Isa. 45:18). God created the earth for the purpose of being inhabited. From the beginning, the earth was designed to be inhabited.

God set up specific laws and measures by which all things interact and function:

[God is speaking to Job, and, essentially, to all mankind]: "Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth? Tell me, if you have a full understanding [of what I did]. Who determined its measurements--surely you know! Or who stretched the line upon it? On what were its bases sunk, or who laid its cornerstone, when the morning stars [angels] sang together and all the sons of God [angels] shouted for joy? Or who shut in the sea with doors [the oceans were frozen solid] when it burst out from the womb [God began to heat the surface of the earth], when I made clouds its garment [the earth was covered by clouds] and thick darkness its swaddling band, and prescribed limits for it and set bars and doors, and said, 'Thus far shall you come, and no farther, and here shall your proud waves be stayed'?" (Job 38:4–11). In another life, I did some basic auto mechanics, and every part of an automobile is designed to interact with the rest of the automobile. There are specific measures, specific temperatures, and specific materials which must be used, matched, and designed to interact together. It is the same for the laws of this universe. Slight changes in our atmosphere, our earth, the sun, the orbit, etc. would cause cataclysmic changes in life here on earth. Not only did God set up specific measures, laws and interactions, but He also designed stabilization factors as well. The oceans stabilize the temperatures of the earth; the winds and the atmosphere keep the air clean and fresh; the water cycle is designed to cleanse and purify as well. The gravity of the moon, pulling the oceans as the moon orbits the earth, keeps our oceans from becoming stagnant. There is an amazing interaction between millions of factors, all of which have specific measures, specific temperatures and are designed out of specific materials, so that they interact in such a way as to put the earth through a series of interdependent cycles.

O Jehovah, how many are Your works! You have made all of them in wisdom; the earth is full of Your riches. This is the sea, great and wide on both hands; there are creeping things even without number; living things, small and great (Psalm 104:24–25).

Bless the LORD, O my soul! O LORD my God, you are very great! You are clothed with splendor and majesty, covering Yourself with light as with a garment, stretching out the

heavens like a tent. He lays the beams of His chambers on the waters; He makes the clouds His chariot; He rides on the wings of the wind; He makes his messengers winds, His ministers a flaming fire. He set the earth on its foundations, so that it should never be shaken [*caused to totter*] (Psalm 104:1–5). God stretched out the atmosphere around the earth, so that it is like a tent for us to live in. He sets up the laws of science so that the earth remains in its orbit without being shaken or dislodged from this orbit.

The LORD by wisdom founded [*established, began*] the earth; by understanding He established the heavens; by His knowledge the deeps broke open, and the clouds drop down the dew (Prov. 3:19–20). There is a complex set of laws of solar bodies put into motion by God.

Who has measured the waters in the hollow of His hand, and measured out the heavens with a span? And who has shut up the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance? Who has directed the Spirit of Jehovah, and what man taught Him counsel? With whom did He take counsel, and who instructed Him and taught Him in the path of judgment, and taught Him knowledge, and made known the way of understanding to Him? Behold, the nations are like a drop in a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the scales; behold, He takes up the coastlands as a very little thing (Isa. 40:12–15).

“I form light and create darkness, I make well-being and create calamity, I am the LORD, who does all these things. Shower, O heavens, from above, and let the clouds rain down righteousness; let the earth open, that salvation and righteousness may bear fruit; let the earth cause them both to sprout; I the LORD have created it.” (Isa. 45:7–8).

My hand also has laid the foundation of the earth, and My right hand has stretched out the heavens. I called; they stood up together (Isa. 48:13). God designed the earth and its atmosphere as a contiguous whole, to function together.

I, even I, am He who comforts you. Who are you, that you should fear a man. He will die, or from the son of man? He will be made as grass? And you forget Jehovah your Maker, who has stretched out the heavens and laid the foundations of the earth (Isa. 51:12–13a). God is the Creator of man and the heavens and earth.

He has made the earth by His power; He has established the world by His wisdom, and has stretched out the heavens by His judgment (Jer. 10:21). The heavens and earth were made by God’s omnipotence and His perfect knowledge.

He has made the earth by His power; He has established the world by His wisdom, and has stretched out the heavens by His understanding. When He utters His voice, there is a multitude of waters in the heavens; and He causes the mists to ascend from the ends of the earth. He makes lightnings with rain and brings forth the wind out of His treasures (Jer. 51:15–16). By God’s power and knowledge, He made the earth, and established the laws for it (e.g., the water cycle, referred to here).

Seek Him who created the Pleiades and Orion, and who turned the deep darkness into the morning and He darkened the day into night. Seek Him who calls for the waters of the sea, and pours them out on the face of the earth; Jehovah is His name (Amos 5:8). The God Who created the great constellations also created the water cycle, which is essential to life on this earth.

The earth is out in space, circular, and hanging upon nothing:

He stretches out the north over the void and hangs the earth on nothing. He binds up the waters in his thick clouds, and the cloud is not split open under them. He covers the face of the full moon and spreads over it his cloud. He has inscribed a circle on [*encircled, encompassed*] the face [surface] of the waters at the boundary between light and darkness.” Job speaking to his friends in Job 26:7–10. The first sentence is quite remarkable, that God hangs the earth upon nothing. The final sentence is also quite interesting. There is some sort of curvature ascribed to the ocean’s surface, as well as this great boundary between light and darkness (which is quite obvious from an aerial view, but not quite so obvious from the ground).

God has made the earth to orbit the sun:

Say among the peoples [or, *the Gentiles*], “Y^ehowah reigns [over all]; furthermore, the [entire] earth is firmly established [by Him]—it is not tottering [or, *it will not be dislodged; it will not be thrown into disarray*]—He judges [all] the peoples with righteous decisions. (Psalm 96:10). The verb used here makes perfect sense if speaking about the earth in motion and on a particular path. The psalmist continues: *The heavens rejoice and the earth goes in a circle [in joy]; the sea and its fulness roar [like thunder].*” (Psalm 96:11). The verb used here means *to dance in a circle in joy*.

God both *made* and *created* man:

When God created man, He made him in the likeness of God. Male and female He created them, and He blessed them and named them Man when they were created. (Gen. 5:1b–2b).

"For ask now of the days that are past, which were before you, since the day that God created man on the earth, and ask from one end of heaven to the other, whether such a great thing as this has ever happened or was ever heard of. Did any people ever hear the voice of a god speaking out of the midst of the fire, as you have heard, and still live? Or has any god ever attempted to go and take a nation for himself from the midst of another nation, by trials, by signs, by wonders, and by war, by a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, and by great deeds of terror, all of which the LORD your God did for you in Egypt before your eyes?" (Deut. 4:32–34). The point of this paragraph is about God taking the Jews out of Egypt with great signs and wonders. However, God’s *creation* of man is alluded to. Here, the verb used is *bârâ’* (אָבַר) [pronounced *baw-RAW*], which means *to create (always with God as subject); to shape, to fashion; possibly to create out of nothing*.

“The Spirit of God made me, and the breath of the Almighty gives me life.” (Job 33:4).

Remember how short my time is! For what vanity you have created all the children of man! (Psalm 89:47). This is rather an amazing psalm; the psalmist is asking, what good is the Davidic Covenant (a contract which God made with David) if man simply dies out from generation to generation, and God fulfills this covenant thousands of years later.

The hearing ear and the seeing eye, Jehovah has even made both of them (Prov. 20:12). Our very senses are from God.

So says Jehovah, your Redeemer, and He who formed you from the womb, I am Jehovah Who makes all things; who stretches out the heavens alone; who spreads out the earth; who was with Me? (Isa. 44:24).

I have made the earth, and created man on it; I with My hands have stretched out the heavens; and all their host have I commanded (Isa. 45:12).

God knew us from eternity past: Before I formed you in the belly I knew you; and before you came forth out of the womb I consecrated you, and I ordained you [Jeremiah] a prophet to the nations (Jer. 1:5).

The burden of the Word of Jehovah for Israel, says Jehovah, who stretches forth the heavens, and lays the foundation of the earth, and forms the spirit of man within him (Zech. 12:1). Not only did God create and found the earth, but He formed the spirit [the immaterial part] of man.

Is there not one Father to us all? Has not one God created us? (Mal. 2:10a).

In answering a question posed by the pharisees, Jesus said, “Have you not read that He who created them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, 'Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two will become one flesh'?” (Matt. 19:4–5; Gen. 2:24).

We are likened to a lump of clay formed into a living being by God:

“Your hands fashioned and made me, and now you have destroyed me altogether. Remember that You have made me like clay; and will You return me to the dust?” Job is speaking to God in Job 10:8–9.

You turn things upside down! Is the potter be made equal to the clay? Should the thing made should say of its maker, "He did not make me"; or the thing formed say of him who formed it, "He has no understanding"? (Isa. 29:16). The Maker and the Creator is superior to that which they make, and what they make is for their pleasure.

Woe to him who fights with the One who formed him, a potsherd among the potsherds of the earth! Ought the clay say to its maker, What are you making? Or your work, He has no hands? (Isa. 45:9).

But now, O Jehovah, You are our Father; we are the clay, and You are our Former; and we all are the work of Your hand (Isa. 64:8).

God created Satan:

“You were in Eden, the garden of God; every precious stone was your covering, sardius, topaz, and diamond, beryl, onyx, and jasper, sapphire, emerald, and carbuncle; and crafted in gold were your settings and your engravings. On the day that you were created they were prepared. You were an anointed guardian cherub. I placed you; you were on the holy mountain of God; in the midst of the stones of fire you walked. You were blameless in your ways from the day you were created, till unrighteousness was found in you. In the abundance of your trade you were filled with violence in your midst, and you sinned; so I cast you as a profane thing from the mountain of God, and I destroyed you, O guardian cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire. Your heart was proud because of your beauty; you corrupted your wisdom for the sake of your splendor. I cast you to the ground; I exposed you before kings, to feast their eyes on you.” (Ezek. 28:13–17). In a future lesson, we will examine in more depth Satan’s intrusion into the Garden of Eden.

All life is from God:

“But ask the beasts, and they will teach you; the birds of the heavens, and they will tell you; or the bushes of the earth, and they will teach you; and the fish of the sea will declare to you. Who among all these does not know that the hand of the LORD has done this? In his hand is the life of every living thing and the breath of all mankind.” Job speaking to his friends in Job 12:7–10.

“The Spirit of God made me, and the breath of the Almighty gives me life.” (Job 33:4).

Jesus Christ is the Creator of all things:

Blessed is he who has the God of Jacob in his help; his hope is on Jehovah his God, Who made the heavens and the earth, the seas and all that is in them (Psalm 146:5–6a). The God of Jacob, Jehovah his [Jacob’s] God is the one who made the heavens and the earth. Notice what comes next: [Jehovah] Who keeps truth forever; Who executes judgment for the oppressed; who gives food to the hungry; Jehovah sets free the prisoners; Jehovah opens the eyes of the blind; Jehovah raises those bowed down; Jehovah loves the righteous (Psalm 146:6b–8). During Jesus’ ministry, John the Baptizer will send messengers asking Him, “Are you the One we are looking for [the Messiah], or should we look for another?” Jesus answers by quoting this verse, in part: “Go and tell John what you hear and see: the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good news [the gospel]

proclaimed to them. And blessed is the one who is not offended by Me.” (Matt. 11:4b–6). In this way, Jesus is not merely connected to the Creator of all things, but He makes Himself the Creator of the heavens and the earth.

In the beginning was the Word [Jesus Christ], and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things came into being through Him, and without Him not even one thing came into being that has come into being. He was in the world, and the world came into being through Him, and the world did not know Him. (John 1:1–3, 10).

For all things were created in Him [Jesus Christ], the things in the heavens, and the things on the earth, the visible and the invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers, all things were created through Him and for Him (Col. 1:16).

God, who at many times and in many ways spoke in time past to the fathers by the prophets, has in these last days spoken to us by His Son, Whom He has appointed heir of all things, by Whom also He made the worlds, Who being the shining splendor of His glory, and the express image of His essence, and upholding all things by the word of His power, through Himself cleansing of our sins, He sat down on the right of the Majesty on high, being made so much better than the angels, as He has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they (Heb. 1:1–4).

The 24 elders fall down before Jesus on the throne, and say, “Worthy are You, our Lord and God, to receive glory and honor and power, for You created all things, and by Your will they existed and were created.” (Rev. 4:11).

And the angel whom I saw standing on the sea and on the land raised his right hand to heaven and swore by him who lives forever and ever, who created heaven and what is in it, the earth and what is in it, and the sea and what is in it,... (Rev. 10:5–6).

God will create a new heavens and a new earth:

Of old You laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Your hands. They will perish, but you will remain; they will all wear out like a garment. You will change them like a robe, and they will pass away, but You are the same, and Your years have no end (Psalm 102:25–27). This is the first time that it is suggested that the heavens and earth would pass away, becoming old like a garment.

“For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth, and the former things will not be remembered or come into mind.” (Isa. 65:7).

“For as the new heavens and the new earth that I make shall remain before me, says the LORD, so shall your offspring and your name remain. From new moon to new moon, and from Sabbath to Sabbath, all flesh shall come to worship before me, declares the LORD.” (Isa. 66:22–23).

But the day of the Lord will come like a thief, and then the heavens will pass away with a roar, and the heavenly bodies will be burned up and dissolved, and the earth and the works that are done on it will be exposed. Since all these things are thus to be dissolved, what sort of people ought you to be in lives of holiness and godliness, waiting for and hastening the coming of the day of God, because of which the heavens will be set on fire and dissolved, and the heavenly bodies will melt as they burn! But according to his promise we are waiting for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells. Therefore, beloved, since you are waiting for these, be diligent to be found by him without spot or blemish, and at peace (2Peter 3:10–14).

Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and the sea was no more (Rev. 21:1).

And allow me to add these bonus Scriptures:

In us, as believers, God has created a new thing:

Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me (Psalm 51:10).

So that if any one is in Christ, that one is a new creation; old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new (2Cor. 5:21).

For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision has any strength, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation (Gal. 6:15).

For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus to good works, which God has before ordained that we should walk in them (Eph. 2:10).

And you should put on the new man, who according to God was created in righteousness and true holiness (Eph. 4:24).

One of the points I am making here is, the book of Genesis—specifically the first two chapters—do not present some creation fable or parable which is clarified or straightened out elsewhere in the Bible. God’s creation of the earth and all that is in it is portrayed from beginning to end in the Bible.

Lesson 18: Genesis 2:1–2:3

Day 7—the Sabbath

As we begin Gen. 2, let me point out that, chapter and verse divisions were imposed on the Bible until much later in the Bible’s history. Originally, the Hebrew had only consonant letters, one written after the other, without spaces, without periods or commas, and without chapter, verse or word divisions. In order to help us with the pronunciations, the Masoretes inserted what are called vowel points—this was hundreds of years later; and these vowels tell us what is happening between the consonants (that is, how to pronounce the words). Since the Jews, for hundreds of years, read the Scriptures aloud, they knew what these

words were and how to pronounce them (with the exception of the name *Jehovah*), so inserting vowels was not a difficult thing to do. However, at the time of the Masorites, the Hebrew had become a dead language, and fewer and fewer people could read from such a manuscript. These vowels which the Masorites added are called vowel points because they were inserted above and below the consonants to help with the pronunciation, and so that they did not interfere with the text as it has been handed down (if you ignore the vowel points, which are small jots and tiddles above and below the consonants, then what remains is the text as it was originally written down. Today, if you take a contemporary Hebrew manuscript of the Bible, and block out the spaces and the markings above and below the letters, you are seeing the Hebrew text just as it has stood for over 2000–3000 years. The reason that these vowel points are above and below the text is so that the text is preserved letter for letter from the original text.

Chapter and verse divisions were imposed on the Old Testament hundreds of years after it was written, so it is not uncommon to find a verse whose thought continues in the next verse; and it is also not uncommon to find a chapter which comes to an end, but shouldn't. This is one of the places where that has occurred. Gen. 2:1–3 are properly a part of Gen. 1.

Gen 2:1 Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.

In the 6 days of restoration, God went back to the earth, which had been packed in ice (we refer to this as the Ice Age), and He thawed the earth and, in a matter of 6 literal days, restored the earth.

Gen 2:2 And on the seventh day God finished His work that He had done, and He rested on the seventh day from all His work that He had done.

God did not rest because He was tired; but God rested (stopped working) because He had completed what He chose to do.

The word translated *to rest* is the word *shâbath* (שַׁבָּת) [pronounced *shaw-BAHTH*], which means *to rest, to keep a day of rest, to celebrate the Sabbath; to sit down [still]; to cease, to desist, to leave off, to discontinue*. Strong's #7673 BDB #992. Quite obviously, this word is the origin of the English word *Sabbath*, which is a transliteration of the Hebrew word *shâbbath* (שַׁבָּת) [pronounced *shawb-BAHTH*], whose exact meaning has been lost, but, given the verb, it likely means *a ceasing, a leaving off, a discontinuation; a rest*. Strong's #7676 BDB #992. Quite obviously, we have held onto this word since the 7th day of creation.

What the Bible appears to assert is that human history on this earth is 6000–10,000 years, and that our time on this earth is quite recent. The earth itself may be millions if not billions of years old, but man, descended from a literal Adam and Eve, has not been here for very long. Population growth is studied today, and we have mathematical equations to approximate the population of man growing. These population equation models are consistent with man being on this earth for 6000–10,000 years. These models are *not*

consistent with man living on this earth for 1,000,000 years, as evolution supposes. These models are not at all consistent with the idea that each type of man (*homo habilis*, *homo erectus*, and *homo sapiens*) lived on the earth for approximately 1,000,000 years each. In fact, there is no animal on earth whose population is consistent with being on this earth for a million years.

Gen 2:3 So God blessed the seventh day and made it holy, because on it God rested from all His work that He had done in creation.

The Sabbath is a fascinating human event. I should point out, from the outset, that the Jews rightfully recognize Saturday as being the 7th day of the week, as the historic Sabbath; and most calendars are set up that way as well (with Sunday as the 1st day of the week).

What is more fascinating is, virtually every civilized society, with any sort of a history, has operated on the 7-day week for as long as we know. Since a year is 365 days, a 5 day week would be logical, as 365 is divisible by 5. Or, because the number 6 is considered in mathematics to be a perfect number, and it is divisible by 2 and 3, 6 would be a nice period of time to be designated as a *week*. The number 8 is a great number: it is the cube of 2 and it is divisible by 2 and 4 (which is 2 squared). 5, 6 and 8 all divide evenly into 360, which is a lunar year, and how years were marked in many cultures (including in the Jewish culture). However, societies do not operate on 6-day or 8-day weeks. But, the Bible tells us that, from the very beginning, God established a 7-day week, and that is virtually universal on this earth.

Human traditions die hard. If some nation had a 5 or 6 or 8 day week, and if they functioned under this week for hundreds of years, then it would be quite difficult for them to change their traditions. You may say, "But, we live in a world economy; they have to have a 7 day week just like us." Our world-wide economy is actually a relatively recent event in human history. There is nothing which requires some other nation to follow a 7-day week simply because England and the US have a 7-day week. For instance, if business really needed to match up, why aren't our stock markets all open during the precise same hours? Stock markets are open during working hours in each country where they reside, including the United States. Japan has some holidays peculiar to their culture which are holidays for the stock market there; and we have holidays in this country which are not celebrated elsewhere, and our markets our markets and closed then. I've been to Thailand, a country which is about 95% Buddhist, and they operate on a 7-day week. I am unaware of some recent point in time where they changed their culture from a 6-day week or an 8-day week. Their present-day calendar was adopted in 1888, which is associated with the *Buddhist Era* (2009 A.D. = 2552BE). Today, many Thais use the western calendar for business purposes, but both calendars are based upon 7-day weeks. What about the Hindu calendar? 7-day weeks. Now, there are marked differences as to the months, as to how and when leap year began to become considered; they are different with regards to their starting point; but these are all 7-day a week calendars. Wherever we go on this earth, most nations have the 7-day week standard. This is almost hard-wired into the souls

of men. That is because, from the very beginning, God restored the earth in 6 days and rested on the 7th; and then, from the very beginning, promoted this.

Critics do not get to have things both ways. Critics will argue that Israel is this small nation with an overblown history; and yet, somehow, some try to argue that Israel caused the entire world to function on a 7-day week? In fact, it is exactly the opposite. Israel was a small nation but with a very important history during a specific time period. However, there is no way that Israel, in itself, could have exported the 7-day week throughout the world, even at its peak as a nation.

Let's look at the Sabbath day in Scripture:

The Sabbath

1. The word *Sabbath* is not used until Ex. 16:23.
2. However, there is obviously something important about the 7th day, as God is said *to bless* the 7th day here in Gen. 2:3, whereas, He had not blessed any previous day (he blessed man and animals, but He only blessed one day).
3. Prior to God marking the Sabbath day in the Law, there are a couple of passages which suggest that man operated on a 7-day week (Gen. 7:4, 10 8:10, 12 31:23 50:10 Ex. 7:25 12:15–16, 19), but none of these verses are definitive. However, the Jews were enjoined *to remember* the Sabbath day in the Ten Commandments; this suggests that they had some prior knowledge or association with the Sabbath day from the past (you cannot *remember* something which was never in your thinking before). Ex. 20:8
4. Our first, unequivocal exposure to the Sabbath is when God provides manna for the children of Israel in the desert. They would collect this manna from the ground 6 days. On the 6th day, they were to gather up a double-portion. On the 7th day, called a *Sabbath* (in Ex. 16:23), they were not to gather any manna, but to eat the extra gathered the day before.
5. The Sabbath was codified in the Ten Commandments. God reminds the Jews how He restored the world in 6 days, and rested on the 7th. For that reason, the Jews were to observe the 7th day, the Sabbath Day, as separate from all the other days of the week. Ex. 20:8–11
6. Setting aside a day to God is important. It is easy in our lives to become so involved with our lives that we just do not have time to consider why we are here and what our purpose is on this earth. It is too easy to become so involved with our work, our family, our pleasures, our chosen methods of relaxation, that we fill up every waking hour with thinking unrelated to God. Therefore, observing the Sabbath was all about setting aside all of those other concerns and focusing our thinking upon God. [God is speaking] “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days you will labor, and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the LORD your God. On it you will not do any work, you, or your son, or your daughter, your male or female slaves, or your livestock, or the immigrant who is within your gates. For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day. Therefore the LORD

The Sabbath

blessed the Sabbath day and set it apart [from all other days]." (Ex. 20:8–11). Notice, also, that the Jews were not to push their work onto their own slaves either. Everyone was to stop on the 7th day and to think about Who and What God is.

7. With the Law, the Sabbath became solely identified with the nation Israel, as God would work through this nation in particular. [God is speaking] "So I took them out of the land of Egypt and brought them into the wilderness. And I gave them My statutes and informed them of My ordinances, by which, if a man observes them, he will live. **And I also gave them My Sabbaths to be a sign between Me and them**, that they might know that I am Y^ehowah Who sanctifies them." (Ezek. 20:10–12).
8. In the Church Age, the only day which has some unusual significance attached to it is the first day of the week. However, it does not supplant the Sabbath day (the 7th day of the week), it is just a day which has prominence in the Church Age, as Christ rose on the 1st day of the week.
9. What happened to the Sabbath when we moved from the Age of Israel to the Church Age? The Sabbath was a memorial to what God had done at creation and was a sign of what God would do on our behalf. We can only take what He has done for us—we cannot add to it and we cannot work for it. In the Church Age, the Sabbath is the rest that we enter into at salvation—we have entered into His rest; we have rested from our works. The whole key to salvation is resting from one's works. The original Sabbath looked forward to this rest as well as backward to the rest commanded by God. God's rest in the Church Age is believing in Jesus Christ, depending upon His work on the cross and resting from our own works. **So then, there remains a Sabbath rest for the people of God, for whoever has entered God's rest has also rested from his works as God did from His. Let us therefore strive to enter that rest** (Heb. 4:9–11a). In this way, the Sabbath teaches us grace; it teaches us that God has provided all that we need (Gen. 2:2–3).
10. We do not retain the literal Sabbath day in the Church Age; i.e., as a day of worship and of no work. **Therefore, let not one act as your judge in regard to food or drink or in respect to a festival or a new moon or a Sabbath day; [These are] things which are a shadow of what is to come; but the substance [or, reality] belongs to Christ** (Col. 2:16–17). Believers in the Church Age are not required to keep the Sabbath, nor has the Sabbath day (Saturday) been somehow changed into Sunday in the Church Age. This is because, in the Church Age, we are no longer under the Mosaic Law (Gal. 2:16, 21). Again, the Sabbath is a shadow of what is to come (as were the various feast days); and it represents the resting from our works and trusting in the work of God (Heb. 4:9–11).
11. Now, the general concept of a 6-day work week with a day off is reasonable for all men and practiced throughout the world. Just as our bodies require rest at night, they require rest from work once a week as well. This simply allows us to recharge our batteries.
12. So that there is no confusion about this, God did not rest on the 7th day because

The Sabbath

He was tired; He *rested* on the 7th day because He was done. He had provided everything that man would need under perfect environment.

In the next lesson, we go back to Day 6 and see all that occurred on that day.

Lesson 19: Genesis 2:4–6 Genealogies, Plant Life and Amazing Statements

Gen. 1:1–2:3 should have been chapter 1 of Genesis. This gives us the time frame during which all things were made and/or created, followed by the 7th day of rest.

At this point, we go back and take a closer look at Day 6, when God created man. This is not some internal contradiction in the Bible, but something which is found throughout the Hebrew Scriptures. An outline or a heading is first given (Gen. 1:26–31), and then the author goes back and fills in the details Gen. 2:7–25).

In Gen. 2:4–14, we are told in some detail about the environment into which man was brought.

Gen 2:4 These are the generations [results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history] of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens.

We find this introductory statement (*These are the generations of...*) in Gen. 2:4 5:1 6:9 10:1, 32 11:10, 27 25:12, 19 36:1, 9 37:2. Most of the time that we find this statement, what follows is a genealogy. It may be a long or a short genealogy. These also appear to be markers throughout the book of Genesis, and may even point to a new author each time, or a new source.

Also, in v. 4, we have the first occurrence of the proper name for God, which is found as LORD, *Jehovah* or *Yahweh*. Literally, this is *Jehovah Elohim*, or, possibly, *Jehovah of the Elohim*; or, *Jehovah of the Gods* (or, *Godhead*). Interestingly enough, we find this title throughout Gen. 2–3, once in Gen. 9 and then scattered from Gen. 14 to the end of Genesis 16 times.

In Gen. 2–3, we have direct and continual contact between *Jehovah of the Godhead* and man; but after the fall of man, there will be sporadic contact between Jehovah Elohim and man.

When we come to v. 7, I will explain what I believe the pronunciation of His name actually is.

There is an apparent but not real problem with Gen. 2:5. There are times when we run into a verse or a passage which sounds like a contradiction. My English Standard Version

reads: [Gen 2:5](#) When no bush of the field was yet in the land and no small plant of the field had yet sprung up--for the LORD God had not caused it to rain on the land, and there was no man to work the ground,... Several other prominent translations are quite similar (e.g., A Conservative Version, the Bible in Basic English, the CEV, the NASB and even the Exegesis Companion Bible). When I first read this, I thought back to Day 3 and how God had all of these plants growing, and here we are, in what will soon become Day 6 (see Gen. 2:7), and there are no plants at all. Although this is a legitimate reading of the Hebrew, the more literal rendering follows:

[Gen 2:5-6](#) And every shrub of the field was not yet on the earth, and every plant of the field had not yet sprung up; for Jehovah God had not sent rain on the earth, and there was no man to till the ground, and a mist was going up from the land and was watering the whole face of the ground--...

We twice have a very common word here, kôl (כֹּל) [pronounced *kohl*], which means *every, each, all of, all; any of, any*. You will note that this word is found in the more accurate translation directly above. We also have negative adverb *not yet*, which is properly applied to the verbs rather than to the nouns. I have correctly applied *every* to the two nouns it precedes and have correctly applied the adverb to the two verbs it precedes (as is found in the Modern KJV, Green's Literal Translation and the Literal Translation of the Holy Bible).

As an aside, you may wonder, *how do I know which Bible is accurate?* There are a number of very good and accurate Bibles out there (The Amplified Bible, NKJV, NASB, MKJV, AKJV, Green's Literal Translation, ESV, the Literal Translation of the Holy Bible) and these Bibles are quite accurate about 98% of the time. However, now and again, we come across a verse which is not translated as well as it should be. This is one reason that every believer ought to be under the authority of a pastor-teacher who knows the original Greek and Hebrew of the Bible so that he can reasonably interpret and explain problems such as we have in this verse. Knowing the Hebrew here quickly and simply explains what appears to be a contradiction.

Now, what appears to be the case is, there is this oasis, this garden, where Adam and the woman will be placed, but outside of this area, we have some vegetation, but not everything necessary for man's subsistence. So, the Garden of Eden had everything necessary for man's subsistence; and outside of the Garden of Eden, we have a limited amount of flora, and man is going to have to work in order to provide for his own life. Every plant in the field had not yet sprouted. Some have.

If you have had the experience of moving into a brand new house on a lot just zoned residential, then you may have had the experience of planting your lawn or planting a few shrubs and trees. The house might look great, but not every exterior plant, tree and/or grass has sprouted so that the outside of your house looks as you think it ought to look. This is the world outside of the Garden of Eden.

We do not know is the size of the Garden of Eden. My guess is that it is several hundred square miles at least. It is not is just an acre or two of foliage.

Another thing which we do not know is, if there are continents or if there is just one continent. The idea that land could rise or fall in just a generation seems quite radical; however, the flood which will come (Gen. 7–8) will be unprecedented. In any case, this is not an issue brought up in Scripture. Was there a continental drift because of the flood (Gen. 9) or was there a continental drift because of the ice age and the breaking up of the ice? It is interesting to theorize about, but we do not know.

There is another thing which stands out here: the writer of this passage tells us how the earth is watered—this is a very unusual touch. Most people have a very difficult time with history. As I have heard one person say, *history begins, for most people, the day that they are born*, and they have a difficult time with what came before (which is why a nation can change direction in one generation). However, the writer of this portion of Genesis describes the way the earth was watered in an unusual way—a mist arose from the ground, and that there was no rain. Given how the earth began and what steps God took to restore the earth (the melting of the ice), the earth in general would have been very similar to a greenhouse with a high humidity throughout. In any case, had someone wrote down these words in 3000 B.C. or 1400 B.C., it would be quite unusual for them to make mention of such an environment, let alone, even conceive of such an environment.

In just 1½ chapters, we have a number of very unusual statements which have been made already:

Ten Amazing Statements from Genesis 1:1–2:7

Scripture	Text/Commentary
In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth (Gen. 1:1).	The universe and the earth had a specific beginning point. There is no weirdness here, e.g., a tear drop of a turtle falling down, splashing on the earth, making the oceans. It is a very matter-of-fact statement. It is my understanding that most scientists—those who believe in God and those who do not—believe that the universe had a beginning; that time had a beginning. This is actually a fairly recent development in scientific theory and it is called <i>the Big Bang Theory</i> .

Ten Amazing Statements from Genesis 1:1–2:7

Scripture	Text/Commentary
<p>The earth became a chaos and a desolate place, and darkness was over the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters (Gen. 1:2).</p>	<p>We are introduced to the Spirit of God here, and He hovers over the earth as a mother hen hovers over eggs, to warm them. One may reasonably understand this to mean that the earth is packed in ice (i.e., it is undergoing an ice age). If this were the case, and the Holy Spirit is warming the earth, we would expect a great deal of steam to rise, creating a greenhouse affect, which is described later in Gen. 1:6 and 2:5.</p>
<p>And God said, "Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters." And God made the expanse and separated the waters that were under the expanse from the waters that were above the expanse. And it was so. And God called the expanse Heaven (Gen. 1:6–8).</p>	<p>The last thing in the world we would expect an ancient writer to describe is the making of the atmosphere of the earth; it was not until Galileo in the 1600's that anyone realized that air actually had weight.</p>
<p>[Day 3] And God said, "Let the earth sprout vegetation, plants yielding seed, and fruit trees bearing fruit in which is their seed, each according to its kind, on the earth." And it was so (Gen. 1:11).</p>	<p>On its face, this verse does not seem to be unusual. However, this occurs after the light came to be, but before the sun.</p>
<p>[Day 4] And God said, "Let there be lights in the expanse of the heavens to separate the day from the night. And let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days and years." (Gen. 1:14).</p>	<p>Most of us would have assumed the sun was made on the 1st day, as almost every ancient civilization has evidence of men worshiping the sun. An ancient religious man would reasonably make the sun before vegetation.</p>
<p>Then God said, "Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth." (Gen. 1:26).</p>	<p>In a book where monotheism is touted, how do we have God making man in <i>Our image</i>?</p>

Ten Amazing Statements from Genesis 1:1–2:7

Scripture	Text/Commentary
And on the seventh day God finished his work that he had done, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work that he had done. So God blessed the seventh day and made it holy, because on it God rested from all his work that he had done in creation (Gen. 2:2–3).	It is quite odd that a 7-day week is almost universal among mankind. Logically, one could argue for a 5, 6 or 8-day week; and yet mankind seems to have decided, as a whole, that a 7-day week is what we ought to live with.
When no bush of the field was yet in the land and no small plant of the field had yet sprung up—for the LORD God had not caused it to rain on the land, and there was no man to work the ground, and a mist was going up from the land and was watering the whole face of the ground (Gen. 2:5–6).	We would not expect a writer of Scripture to describe an environment which is fundamentally different from the environment in which he himself lives. For some reason, there is no rain, but everything is watered with a mist which rises from the ground.
In the next lesson, we will study Gen. 2:7:	
Then the LORD God formed the man of dust from the ground... (Gen. 2:7).	What ancient writer would ever suggest that our bodies are made out of the same chemicals which are found in the earth? Yet, the writer of Genesis tells us this.
...and God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living creature (Gen. 2:7b).	The writer notes that there must be something additional given from God—breath—in order for us to be alive. Science can figure out when life is gone (our brain stops sending out electrical signals), but they do not know how we got it in the first place or where it goes when it goes.
Individually, we might be able to ignore these 10 statements, but when taken as a whole, they are quite amazing. There is no parallel to this in any ancient literature.	

You need to ask yourself, *is it possible that some random ancient guy just wrote this stuff down? Is it possible that some semi-primitive man just made this stuff up because it sounded good?* You may not realize it, but for several centuries, many ancient historians even questioned that man was even able to *write* in 1400 B.C. and yet, not only do we have someone writing before this time, but about the events at the beginning of time, saying things which would take 3000–5000 years before they would be fully appreciated. Today, we know about the Big Bang theory, about the atmosphere of the earth, about the chemical composition of man, and yet here, in the first chapter and a half of Genesis, with words which could be 4000 or even 5000 years old, we find these concepts. In case you have any doubts, you ought to consider that maybe—just maybe—this book thought to be the Word of God by millions of people throughout time—is the Word of God.

Gen. 2:7 will be discussed in greater detail in the next lesson.

Lesson 20: Genesis 2:7–9

God Makes Adam/God's Name

In Gen. 1:1–2:3, we examined God creating and making the earth and the universe, and most of this process was laid out for a 7-day period of time. All of the events were placed into a particular time slot. The rest of chapter 2 is going to deal with some specifics here and there, without setting up any sort of a sequence of events. The sequence of events was already laid out; so that does not have to be repeated. The subject matter of each passage will indicate the day we are speaking of. Since this is subject matter which is arranged topically, some subjects will extend beyond the 6 days of restoration.

We do this kind of thing all of the time. Our life occurs as a series of chronological events. However, if you tell someone about the flat tire that you had to fix on the way to work, you don't backtrack and tell him when you bought this car and whether this particular tire came with the car or not; and, if not, when you purchased it. The fixing of your flat tire incorporates within the narrative a number of things which occurred on various days in previous years, and these events are not enumerated when you tell this story. However, if the flat tire was a tire which you bought 2 months ago, and the problem was the construction of the tire itself, well then, you are going to go back and incorporate that little bit of news into your story. When telling others about your flat tire, you do not recount every single detail every single time, and recount every detail in chronological order. You walk into work late, you have grease and grime on your arms or on your clothes, and you tell your boss, "Sorry I am late; I had a flat tire on the I-10 when driving in to work today. I'm going to clean up." Here, you speak first of the present (*I am late*), of the past (*I had a flat tire*) and then of the future (*I am going to clean up*). In other words, even though your life is a series of chronological events, that does not mean that, every time you speak of this or that event, that you always put that event into a chronological sequence. That is all that is happening here. The writer knows about Adam's original environment and about these first few days (logically, this is Adam speaking to one of his sons, who passes this information to his sons), and, at some point, a writer writes this stuff down. This does not mean that information is necessarily lost or inserted, but that we recall portions of our lives

chronologically and other portions of our lives topically, without much thought given to chronology.

In v. 4, we are told that this is an account of the heavens and the earth. In vv. 5–6, we are told about the plant life (that there was not much of it) and how it was watered. In v. 7, God makes man:

Gen 2:7 Then the LORD God formed the man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives, and the man became a living creature.

This is a fantastic statement which is consistent with known science. Simply put: we are made out of the chemicals of the earth with life breathed into us by God. Being constructed of the chemicals of the earth is not something which ancient man would have automatically figured out. In fact, only since we mid-1800's have we had a periodic chart. I have no idea at what point science figured out that man is made up of the same kinds of chemicals as are found in the earth. Obviously, it would have been after the mid-1800's. But here, in a document written thousands of years ago, God uses the chemicals found in the earth to form man.

In the Hebrew, we have the verb *yâtsar* (יָצַר) [pronounced *yaw-TSAR*] which means, *to form, to mold, to sculpt, to fashion; to destine, to predestine, to foreordain; to form in the mind, to devise, to plan*. Strong's #3335 BDB #427. This verb is often used of a potter working with clay (this is the verb which actually means *potter* when found as a Qal active participle). What is fascinating is, this verb is found in the imperfect tense, which can either refer to action in the future or continuous action. At the very least, this refers to an extensive process. At the most, this refers to an ongoing process. In case you were unaware of this, your body is constantly renewing itself, and, if memory serves, we essentially have a completely new physical body every 7 years, as cells replicate and die off.

Allow me to admit two things—when I first began to study the Bible, there were two things which I initially doubted—the ages of Adam and his progeny (measured in hundreds of years) and Jesus fasting for 40 days. Both seemed a little fantastic. However, with what we know of the human body today, it is somewhat of a curiosity why we only live 60–100 years. Our bodies are constantly replicating individual cells and constantly throwing off dead cells. There is a regeneration mechanism in place on the cellular level which is quite fantastic. We have all had bumps and bruises. As a very young boy, I had a foot covered with 2nd and 3rd degree burns. A year later, you could not even see a scar. Psalm 139:14: **I praise you, for I am reverently and distinctly made. Your works are extraordinary; my soul knows it very well.** Our bodies as originally made were quite incredible. Sin affects both our moral choices and our physical bodies. When Adam is corrupted by sin, his body is so well-made that it will take over 900 years for it die. Passing along the sin nature reduced our life expectancy. However, Jesus was born without a sin nature. His body was uncorrupted by sin, and therefore was able to endure extraordinary abuse, including a 40 day fast.

Gen 2:7 Then the LORD God formed the man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives, and the man became a living creature.

In the Hebrew, the word for *dust* is ʿâphâr (אֶפֶר) [pronounced *gaw-FAWR*], and it means *dry earth, dust, powder, ashes, earth, ground, mortar, rubbish; dry or loose earth; debris; mortar; ore*. Strong's #6083 BDB #779. Pretty much, it is anything which one might find in the ground.

The idea that we come from the *dust of the earth* is not some lucky, one-shot statement which some imaginative author of thousands of years ago penned. We find this same sentiment expressed throughout Scripture. After the man sins, God tells him, “By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread, until you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; for you are dust, and to dust you shall return.” (Gen. 3:19). Abraham, when speaking to God, understood what he was: “Listen, I have undertaken to speak to the Lord, I who am but dust and ashes.” (Gen. 18:27). Job, when praying to God before his friends, said, “Your hands fashioned and made me, and now you have destroyed me altogether. Remember that you have made me like clay; and will you return me to the dust?” (Job 10:8–9). Elihu, who spoke for God, told Job, “If God should set His heart to it and gather to Himself His spirit and His breath, all flesh would perish together, and man would return to dust.” (Job 34:14–15). Once God removes His breath, man no longer exists in this mortal body. The body *returns to the dust from where it came* (see also Psalm 90:3 104:29 Eccles. 3:20 12:7). God knows what we are and He remembers that we are but dust (Psalm 103:14). And more than a thousand years later, Paul writes: **The first man [Adam] was from the earth, a man of dust; the second Man [Jesus Christ] is from heaven. As was the man of dust, so also are those who are of the dust, and as is the man of heaven, so also are those who are of heaven. Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the Man of heaven** (1Cor. 15:47–49).

We find many things begun in Genesis, which theme continues throughout the rest of the Bible.

Gen 2:7 Then the LORD God formed the man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives, and the man became a living creature.

Whereas, the idea that man came from the chemicals of the earth was later shown by science to be true, the second aspect of this verse has just the opposite historical perspective. Men for centuries have believed that God gave life to man; or that life is something which is placed into or thrust upon our human bodies. As of late, there are some who assert that our thinking is simply a jumble of chemicals jostling around in our brains, set off by electrical current. Many scientist would have you believe that we are just advanced monkeys (okay, primates) with a slightly more developed brain, which is somehow capable of abstract philosophy, moral concepts, love, duty, patriotism and self-justification—but a brain which is only a little better than that of a primate.

Science really has no clue exactly what life is or when it begins in man. No scientist is able to say, with any certainty, when human life begins. In fact, this is where evolutionists who allow for abortion are extremely inconsistent. If life is merely the firing of electrical synapses and chemicals sloshing around in the brain—if life is simply a biological process, having nothing to do with the divine spark—these same biological processes are also

present in fetuses. Therefore, it is unscientific and inconsistent for an evolutionist to arbitrarily assign birth as the moment life begins, as all of these brain processes are already in place long before a child is born (if memory serves, these electrical signals in the brain can be measured in a 3 week old fetus). Therefore, a scientist who believes that human life is important can only be consistent if he believes that fetal life is equally important. After all, if there is no intervening divine spark—no breath of lives given by God—then birth is not an accurate place to draw the line between unimportant human life and important human life. It is arbitrary, unscientific, theological line. How can a scientist who does not believe in the breath of lives from God make any distinction between the human fetus, 1 second before birth and 1 second after birth? If a baby who is born is fully human, then no scientist or doctor can suggest that what is inside the womb a few seconds earlier is somehow different and not fully human. If a woman has the right to choose, why should she have to choose before giving birth? Why not give her an additional year or two after giving birth to decide whether she wants this child to live? This is no less logical or scientific than saying the woman has the right to terminate any life which is in her womb.

My point is, if we want to remove theology from science and ignore all revealed truth in the Bible, then we cannot view a fetus as substantively different from a child who is born. They are both entirely dependent upon their mother for continued life. Apart from the revealed truth of the Bible, the scientific differences between a fetus and a child with regards to humanity do not exist. They both have electrical impulses running through their brains. If this is considered a sign of life by science (which it is; lack of electrical signals from the brain indicates death), then a scientist who does not want to give any consideration to things theological cannot consider a fetus, whose brain controls a whole host of physical functions, as something other than human. If it has human DNA and if it has brain wave activity, and if left unperturbed, will turn into a living, breathing, talking and thinking human being; then science has no basis for distinguishing a fetus from a born-child, apart from a few minor characteristics; which characteristics cannot be tied to humanity without inserting morality, theology or philosophy into the picture. Human life is human life, and if it is considered to be important after one is born, then there can be no scientific argument against its importance prior to birth.

On the other hand, if a scientist cavalierly considers no life to be important or meaningful, then believing in abortion is completely consistent with his philosophy, as is genocide, euthanasia, and child sacrifice. However, this takes us into theology and/or philosophy and not science. What such a philosophy logically leads to is making judgments on quality of life, convincing, say, old people that it is their duty to mankind, to remove themselves from this earth when they are no longer of value to society. If life in the womb is not seen as valuable, and if embryonic stem cell research is seen as valuable, then we are making philosophical judgments concerning the sanctity of life.

We have not gone so far as for some to suggest that a recently born child is okay to experiment on or to take various parts from for other people. However, if a scientist can justify experimenting on embryos and can also justify older people removing themselves from society when they are no longer productive, how long will it be before someone decides that a crack baby has no real future and is therefore a candidate for

experimentation which benefits others, but not the child? I may be pushing this, but when you take theology, philosophy and morality out of the picture, then there is no real reason to make distinctions between a born child and a child not quite yet born.

What many Christians believe is, life actually begins when God breathes the breath of lives into each person as they are born; in fact, the idea that true human life begins at conception is only a recent theological position. The historical position of the church is that life begins at birth. This does not automatically mean that abortion is okay; birth is simply the beginning of full and complete human life. One may reasonably argue that, if God is spending 9 months preparing a body to be born into the world, then we ought not to disrespect that process and treat it as if it is nothing more than a sub-human or non-human growth.

Let's go back a few verses now:

Gen 2:4 These are the generations [results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history] of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the **LORD** God made the earth and the heavens.

Gen 2:5–6 And every shrub of the field was not yet on the earth, and every plant of the field had not yet sprung up; for **Jehovah** God had not sent rain on the earth, and there was no man to till the ground, and a mist was going up from the land and was watering the whole face of the ground--...

Gen 2:7 Then the **LORD** God formed the man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives, and the man became a living creature.

The Pronunciation of *Jehovah*

Back in v. 4, a new name for God was given: in some Bibles, this is LORD (written in small caps); in other Bibles, this is *Jehovah*; and in other Bibles, this is *Yahweh*. What is going on here? Why do we have 3 different names for this same Hebrew word? In the Hebrew, the noun is YHWH (יהוה) and you may recall that I told you that there are no vowels in the original Hebrew manuscripts. They read and reread the Scriptures aloud for centuries, so they knew how to pronounce these words without having vowels to guide them. However, the Jews, at some point in time, decided that it was not right for the holy name of God to pass through their sinful lips when reading the Bible aloud, so they began to use the noun 'ādôwn (אָדוֹן) [pronounced *aw-DOHN*] or 'ădônây (אֲדֹנָי) [pronounced *uh-doh-NAY*] instead of YHWH. What was in the text was YHWH; but what they said aloud was *uh-doh-NAY*. This tradition continued for hundreds of years until the pronunciation of YHWH was lost to us. After this time, the Masorites (insofar as we know) developed a system of vowel points which left the original text unchanged, but they added dots and dashes and tiny markings above and below the various consonants so both that the pronunciation and the original text would both be preserved. What was not preserved was the pronunciation of *YHWH*.

As a result of this, we know the consonants of God's name, but we do not know the vowels in between the consonants. *Jehovah* takes the vowels from 'ădônây and places them in the middle of YHWH, giving us the modern-day transliteration *Jehovah*. (there is no *j* in Hebrew, but we often use a *j* when transliterating a *y*; and some call the Hebrew *w* *wâw* and others *vâv*; which accounts for the use of the *v* in *Jehovah*).

Some theologians have settled on *Yahweh* [pronounced *YAW-way*] as being the proper way to say YHWH. Personally, I believe that the proper pronunciation of YHWH (*Jehovah*) is *Y^ohowah* [the pronunciation being *y^ohoh-WAH*]. I come by this pronunciation in two ways: there are many proper Hebrew names which use YHWH (or a portion of this name) affixed to a verb or an adjective, like *Joshua*. I take the vowel points from those names and arrive at *Y^ohowah* [pronounced *y^ohoh-WAH*]. The second reason for taking this position is, this is an onomatopoeic word, which sounds like an exhaled breath, and would, in this way, be the most personal connection between man and God. God breathes life into man.

The pronunciation of God's proper name makes more sense to explain after we have studied that God breathes lives into man.

God breathing life into man is consistent with the fact that men and women universally like to kiss.

Lesson 21: Genesis 2:8–14

The Garden of Eden (Part I)

Gen 2:8 And the LORD God planted a garden in Eden, in the east, and there he put the man whom He had formed.

The growing of the Garden of Eden appears to be a more gradual process. God does not appear to have created the Garden of Eden fully grown, and then thrown man into the midst of it. We do not have the verb for *create* or the verb for *make*, we have, instead, a verb which means *to plant*. Most of us have had a garden or planted a few plants here and there, and we know what that is all about. You go down to your local home and garden place, you choose a few potted plants and you bring them back and *plant* them. Although God could have created this garden fully grown or He could have *made* this garden out of the elements of the soil, we have a verb here which suggests more that God collected plants from here and there and planted them in a particular geographical location.

Into this geographical location, God placed man, *whom He had formed*. Again, in the Hebrew, we have the verb *yâtsar* (יצר) [pronounced *yaw-TSAR*] which means, *to form, to mold, to sculpt, to fashion; to destine, to predestine, to foreordain; to form in the mind, to devise, to plan*. Strong's #3335 BDB #427. So, we have man, who has been *formed and sculpted* placed into a garden which God had planted. This garden appears to be fully grown, as the next verse indicates.

Gen 2:9 And out of the ground the LORD God caused to spring up every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food. The tree of life was in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

In the Hebrew, we have the Hiphil imperfect of the verb *tsâmach* (צָמַח) [pronounced *tsaw-MAHKH*], which means, *to cause [make] to sprout [up, forth]; to cause [deliverance] to exist or to spring up*. Strong's #6779 BDB #855. We do not find the words *to create* or *to make* here. So God did not just create plant life; He did not use the chemicals of the ground to make plant life.

In the Hebrew, we have the perfect tense and the imperfect tense. The perfect tense is used for a past action or for a completed action (it can also be used of a certain action in the prophetic future). The imperfect is used for a future action and/or for a continuous action. We also have the Hiphil stem, which is the causative stem. Often, you can take the meaning of the Qal stem, affix to that meaning *caused to* and you have what the verb means in the Hiphil. In other words, the verbiage found here means *God caused trees to spring up, to sprout up*. Furthermore, this was a process; this was a continuous action. God did not say, "Plants be" and plants were suddenly all there.

Gen 2:9 And out of the ground the LORD God caused to spring up every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food. The tree of life was in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

We have 4 categories of trees here. The first are trees which are pleasing to the soul—they are pleasant to look at. The second category are trees which produce food. Eating was as much for pleasure as for sustenance, and Adam had trees with fruit that were pleasurable to eat. Think back to that third day—there was no sun; God provided the light. Then God devised a way to take His energy, put it into the plant life on earth, and when we eat the resultant fruits, we receive this energy from God. It is an amazing process which we take for granted. The first two categories of trees were for the soul and body of Adam.

The 3rd category of tree is the Tree of Life. This tree is associated with man's spirit. Whereas the soul allows for us to interact with other people and with our environment, our spirit is the basis for our interaction with God.

The tree of life is found more times in the Bible than one might expect. The tree of life is found in 3 books: Genesis, Proverbs and Revelation.

The Tree of Life

1. When Adam and the woman fall, they will be kept from the tree of life, so that they do not live forever in a fallen state (Gen. 3:22, 24).
 2. In Prov. 3, God's wisdom (Bible doctrine) is the topic, and wisdom (Bible doctrine) is like the *tree of life* to us, providing us with eternal sustenance (Prov. 3:18).
 3. The tree of life is associated with the gospel (the good news of Jesus Christ) in
-

The Tree of Life

Prov. 11:30, where the one who captures souls is spoken of as *wise* (the application of Bible doctrine). The entire verse reads: **The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life, and whoever captures souls is wise.** Proverbs is built around couplets, as we have here. **The fruit, or production of the righteous is a tree of life;** that is, the production of a mature believer (= the fruit of the righteous) is everlasting. Closely associated with this thought (the other half of the couplet), is the person who *captures, takes, acquires, seizes* souls is wise. How does one *capture* a soul? He gives them the gospel and the person responds to the gospel. He tells someone that Jesus Christ is their Savior, Who died for their sins, and if they believe this, they receive eternal life and he has *captured* their soul, so to speak. This just happens to be the production of the righteous (which includes much more than evangelization).

4. The church of Ephesus faced some apostasy within the church at the end of the 1st century and Jesus promised to those who overcame this apostasy within their own church would be given fruit from the tree of life from the paradise of God (which simply refers to eternal life with great rewards). Recovery from apostasy and reversionism (falling away from God and reverting back to our old habits) is a rewardable act. Rev. 2:1–7
5. In the final state, there is the river of life flowing out from the throne of God, and on either side is the tree of life (I would assume thousands of trees along side of the river), each with 12 fruits. This speaks of our everlasting life with God. Rev. 22:1–2
6. There are rewards for believers for what we have done on this earth. Those who have *washed their robes have the right to the tree of life and may enter the new Jerusalem.* Washing one's robe refers to naming your sins and being restored to fellowship; the result is, one then produces divine good, and that good is rewardable in heaven. Rev. 22:12–14.
7. There are those who, as believers and unbelievers, will rebel against the Word of God, and do what they can to distort, remove from, or add to the Word of God. For the unbeliever, this means no life with God (they do not have access to the tree of life); and for the believer, this means a lack of reward. Rev. 22:18–19

So the tree of life is associated with Bible doctrine, eternal life, and with divine good production. So, whereas some trees appeal to the soul of man and others to the body; the tree of life appealed to the spirit of man

The fourth category of trees is the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and it is related to volition, sin, the sin nature and the Angelic Conflict. Eating from this tree was the only prohibition in the garden. We will examine it in greater detail in v. 17.

Gen 2:9 And out of the ground the LORD God caused to spring up every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food. The tree of life was in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

Again, plant and tree growth appear to be a natural process; the trees and the plants of the Garden of Eden appear to be growing up out of the ground, rather than to be suddenly formed. In exegeting this passage, I have two areas of difficulty: did all trees and plants grow naturally or did God create some fully grown? At what point was the woman built? Was she constructed on the 6th day or was she made much later?

The plant and tree growth here appear to be normal, as opposed to God creating the flora of His garden suddenly. There are two reasons for this. Again, let's look at the verb. The verb means *to sprout, to grow, to spring up*. This verb is in the Hiphil stem, which is the causative stem in the Hebrew, which means that God did not necessarily do this directly, but He *caused* these plants and trees *to grow, to sprout, to spring up*. This is the imperfect tense in the Hebrew, indicating a continuous action rather than a completed action. Back in Gen. 1:11, God called for the earth to bring plants forth and here, God is said *to cause these plants and trees to spring up and to grow*. The verbiage is quite different than we find for animals or man, which are both *created and/or made* by God directly (Qal stem). Although we could allow for God to have done this almost instantaneously (plants and trees to spring up like time-lapse photography), there is nothing in Gen. 1–2 which suggests that God did that.

As has been discussed earlier, it would not contradict Scripture for Day 3, when plants were grown, including those in the Garden of Eden, to occur over a more lengthy period of time. Days 4–6 occur after the sun, moon and stars, which mark time, making Days 4–6 24 hour days; Days 1–3 occur before there were such things to mark time. All we have for these first 3 days is *and dusk and morning, day ____*.

In any case, there were plants and trees in existence, ready for man and animal life, which came along on days 5 and 6.

Gen 2:8–9 And the LORD God planted a garden in Eden, in the east, and there he put the man whom He had formed. And out of the ground the LORD God made to spring up every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food. The tree of life was in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.


Now, there is no reason to see Gen. 2:4–9 as a strict chronology. That is, God did not necessarily put man into an open field, and then start growing the trees while man sat around and watched. The chronology was given to us in Gen. 1:1–2:3. The days and events of each day were clicked off, one by one. We have God growing things on Day 3. Vv. 8–9 are consistent with this, as long as we do not require v. 8 to occur first and then for v. 9 to occur next. Gen. 1:1–2:3 proceeds in a clear, chronological way; however, since we are going back to plants growing and man being created and made, all we need to do is to place these events into the time slots which has already been laid out for us. Plants and trees growing begins on Day 3; man is made and created on Day 6. We already know this. Also, plants continued to grow on Day 4, Day 5, and on and on. So there is no reason for vv. 8–9 to indicate a different chronological order than is found in Gen. 1. Throughout the Hebrew Old Testament, it is going to become clear that not everything is laid out in a chronological order. Many times, the order will be arranged according to the

thinking of the author, who does not always think chronologically. As I have pointed out earlier, we think, speak and write in this way as well. In the previous lesson, I gave the example of getting a flat tire on the way to work, walking into the office and saying, “Boss, sorry I am late but I had a flat tire. I need to go wash up before I start working.” We have a present event followed by a past event followed by a future event. Your boss does not look at your grimy hands and ask, “Now, what happened first?” We have the ability to process information which is not given in a chronological order without being confused.

Gen 2:10–14: A river flowed out of Eden to water the garden, and there it divided and became four rivers. The name of the first is the Pishon. It is the one that flowed around the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold. And the gold of that land is good; bdellium and onyx stone are there. The name of the second river is the Gihon. It is the one that flowed around the whole land of Cush. And the name of the third river is the Tigris, which flows east of Assyria. And the fourth river is the Euphrates.

God set up an irrigation system for His Garden, and here we have 4 rivers which the primary river breaks down into.

This is the pre-deluvian era (before the flood). Some of what we find here is possibly known to us, such as the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, which area was once known as the fertile crescent, and today is modern-day Iraq, thought of as anything but fertile. Cush and Havilah are roughly



http://www.yorku.ca/kdenning/images/civilizations%20images/Near%20East%20Museum_ANE_Map.gif


equivalent to the present-day Egypt and the Sudan, and there are two rivers which flow throughout those two areas in this pre-deluvian world. These areas are fairly far apart, and if connected together by a river out of Eden, it would be difficult to identify that river or its origins (remember, the earth has just been formed and there is no rain), and that a flood

unlike anything we could ever imagine will change this landscape forever. Could this river flowing out of Eden be the Jordan River or connected to what is now the Red Sea? At this point, we can only speculate. However, it is not out of the question to possibly connect the Garden of Eden with the Middle East, understanding full well that a flood of unimaginable proportions has radically changed this area as well.

There has been a great deal of speculation as to where these rivers are. Since there are modern locations for the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, and since they are not far from the Arafat Mountains, those same mountains are thought by some to be the location of the origin of the 4 rivers, 2 of which no longer exist. Another theory is that there are fault lines near the Persian Gulf, making that the origin of these 4 rivers.



[http://www.jonchristianryter.com/IMAGE/FourRivers\(I\).jpg](http://www.jonchristianryter.com/IMAGE/FourRivers(I).jpg)



<http://www.jonchristianryter.com/IMAGE/fig3.jpg>

There is also the possibility that these names from a pre-deluvian world were later given to rivers and lands of a post-deluvian world, as the sons of Noah would have all been familiar with these names from their era.

In any case, it is fascinating that a writer from thousands of years ago had a map in his head from which he describes lands and rivers which existed before the great flood.

Lesson 22: Genesis 2:15

The Garden of Eden (Part II)

So far, God has planted a garden with 4 categories of trees in this garden. God also set up an irrigation system for this garden. Although these 4 rivers had names in the pre-deluvian (pre-flood) era, it is not clear whether these bear any resemblance to the rivers with the same names after the flood.

Gen 2:15 The LORD God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to work it and keep it.

The Garden of Eden was not just a self-sustaining thing. This was not Palm Springs for Adam to go to, retire, and get a little golf in. God put man in this garden to work it and to keep it. Understand that, under perfect environment, physical work was not a burden. If you have children, and you let them run around and be active, they will do this naturally. Trying to make your children sit still is unnatural. They want to run about and to use their muscles.

I personally go to the gym, and, most of the time, I am less than enthusiastic about working out, but I do it. However, once in a great while, it feels really good to work my muscles. I've done moderate physical labor in my life, and once and awhile, when I am working outside, and the temperature is cool but not too cold, it feels really good to work my muscles. Under perfect environment, as man was originally designed, work was enjoyable; using one's muscles felt good. Adam loved to wake up in the morning and go out to the garden, and to feel the rich soil in his hands, and to plant and prune and arrange these plants to his liking (or whatever man did as a part of his gardening chores).

The Hebrew word for *Eden* means *pleasure*, and being in the garden and working the garden was very pleasurable for Adam.

So that you understand the narrative, this is not completely chronological; we are going to double back and God will build the woman. This is the first few months if not years or centuries of man's life (with the woman) and how God dealt with them.

Apart from the first 3 chapters of Genesis (and Gen. 13:10), the Garden of Eden (or the Garden of God) is only mentioned in 5 passages in Scripture:

The Garden of Eden in Scripture

Scripture	Text/Commentary
Ezek. 28:12b–19	<p>Thus says the Lord GOD: "You were the signet of perfection, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty. You were in Eden, the garden of God; every precious stone was your covering, sardius, topaz, and diamond, beryl, onyx, and jasper, sapphire, emerald, and carbuncle; and crafted in gold were your settings and your engravings. On the day that you were created they were prepared. You were an anointed guardian cherub. I placed you; you were on the holy mountain of God; in the midst of the stones of fire you walked. You were blameless in your ways from the day you were created, till unrighteousness was found in you. In the abundance of your trade you were filled with violence in your midst, and you sinned; so I cast you as a profane thing from the mountain of God, and I destroyed you, O guardian cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire. Your heart was proud because of your beauty; you corrupted your wisdom for the sake of your splendor. I cast you to the ground; I exposed you before kings, to feast their eyes on you. By the multitude of your iniquities, in the unrighteousness of your trade you profaned your sanctuaries; so I brought fire out from your midst; it consumed you, and I turned you to ashes on the earth in the sight of all who saw you. All who know you among the peoples are appalled at you; you have come to a dreadful end and shall be no more forever." This is all about Satan who fell from grace when he sinned; yet once was in the Garden of Eden. Satan will return to this garden in Gen. 3.</p>
Isa. 51:3	<p>For the LORD comforts Zion; He comforts all her waste places and makes her desert wilderness like Eden, her desert like the garden of the LORD; joy and gladness will be found in her, thanksgiving and the voice of song. Zion is the name for one of the mountains that Jerusalem is on. As you may be aware, Israel, although somewhat of a garden compared to the rest of the Middle East, still lacks enough rainfall to make it truly lush. God will, in the Millennium, transform Israel so that it is like the Garden of Eden.</p>

The Garden of Eden in Scripture

Scripture	Text/Commentary
Ezek. 31:2–12	<p>Son of man, say to Pharaoh king of Egypt and to his multitude: “Whom are you like in your greatness? Behold, Assyria was a cedar in Lebanon, with beautiful branches and forest shade, and of towering height, its top among the clouds. The waters nourished it; the deep made it grow tall, making its rivers flow around the place of its planting, sending forth its streams to all the trees of the field. So it towered high above all the trees of the field; its boughs grew large and its branches long from abundant water in its shoots. All the birds of the heavens made their nests in its boughs; under its branches all the beasts of the field gave birth to their young, and under its shadow lived all great nations. It was beautiful in its greatness, in the length of its branches; for its roots went down to abundant waters. The cedars in the garden of God could not rival it, nor the fir trees equal its boughs; neither were the chestnut trees like its branches; no tree in the garden of God was its equal in beauty. I made it beautiful in the mass of its branches, and all the trees of Eden envied it, that were in the garden of God. Therefore, thus says the Lord GOD: Because it towered high and set its top among the clouds, and its heart was proud of its height, I will give it into the hand of a mighty one of the nations. He shall surely deal with it as its wickedness deserves. I have cast it out. Foreigners, the most ruthless of nations, have cut it down and left it. On the mountains and in all the valleys its branches have fallen, and its boughs have been broken in all the ravines of the land, and all the peoples of the earth have gone away from its shadow and left it.” The beauty and majesty of Assyria was like that of a massive tree in the Garden of God, envied by all of the other trees (nations). However, because of its pride, Assyria will be delivered into the hands of another nation.</p> <p>We discussed the location of the Garden of Eden in the previous lesson. It is interesting to note that Assyria is associated here with the Garden of God, as the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers run through Assyria (along with several other rivers). However, I should be quick to point out, what we have here is an analogy, calling <i>Assyria</i> a <i>great tree in the garden of God</i>.</p>

The Garden of Eden in Scripture

Scripture	Text/Commentary
Joel 2:1–3	Blow a trumpet in Zion; sound an alarm on my holy mountain! Let all the inhabitants of the land tremble, for the day of the LORD is coming; it is near, a day of darkness and gloom, a day of clouds and thick darkness! Like blackness there is spread upon the mountains a great and powerful people; their like has never been before, nor will be again after them through the years of all generations. Fire devours before them, and behind them a flame burns. The land is like the garden of Eden before them, but behind them a desolate desert wilderness, and nothing escapes them. This warns of the coming of the great and terrible Day of the Lord in the Tribulation. In the future, this land will be like the Garden of Eden, but that past and the Tribulation will be like a desolate desert wilderness.
Ezek. 36:33–36	"Thus says the Lord GOD: On the day that I cleanse you from all your iniquities, I will cause the cities to be inhabited, and the desolate places shall be rebuilt. And the land that was desolate shall be tilled, instead of being the desolation that it was in the sight of all who passed by. And they will say, 'This land that was desolate has become like the garden of Eden , and the waste and desolate and ruined cities are now fortified and inhabited.' Then the nations that are left all around you shall know that I am the LORD; I have rebuilt the ruined places and replanted that which was desolate. I am the LORD; I have spoken, and I will do it." God will make Israel like the Garden of Eden once again.

There is never a call in Scripture for man to make the earth back into the Garden of Eden. That is the gospel according to Joni Mitchell or Arlo Guthrie.

Gen 2:15 The LORD God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to work it and keep it.

Man is clearly fully formed and alive; and it appears as if the Garden of Eden is a going concern as well. The other implication is, there is no woman yet on the scene. We have God, man and the Garden of Eden.

God placed the man in the Garden of Eden, and man was to work in this garden. The word often translated *work* is the Qal infinitive construct of 'âbad (עָבַד) [pronounced *gaw^b-VAHD*], which means *to work, to serve, to labor; to be a slave to*. Strong's #5647 BDB #712. In the Qal form of this verb, Adam is to *work, serve or be a slave to* her (the Garden of Eden). The word *slave* comes from this verb.

Adam is also supposed *to keep, to guard, to protect, to watch, to preserve* her (the Garden). This is also a fascinating verb to find here—Adam is both the caretaker and the

security guard for the Garden of Eden. This is a fascinating verb to find here because, in this perfect environment, what is there to guard the garden from? What is out there, somewhere, is Satan and the fallen angels, who are observing what God is doing here. The earth was theirs at one time, and then it was packed in ice. Now the beautiful earth is being restored, and elect and fallen angels are watching this process with great interest.

What is not mentioned here is tools, interestingly enough. When I work in my yard, I like to have a shovel, a rake and a lawn mower, at the very least. It is not clear what Adam had to work with, if anything. However, I think that Adam's relationship to the soil is closer to that of a lifetime farmer more than it might be to our relationship to the soil. We get our hands dirty and we want to immediately wash them off. However, Adam was formed out of the soil and from the soil grows all of the trees around him, so soil may have felt wonderful in his hands (if you have a garden, you may feel the same way about the soil).

It is also unclear as to exactly what Adam did in the garden. Did he move plants around to his liking? Did he make hiking trails throughout the Garden of Eden. Did he bring water in some way from the rivers to these plants? It would seem that decay was probably not a part of garden activity because Adam had not yet sinned (Adam's sin will affect all things, including the earth). Did he feed animals in the garden? Adam's exact duties, beyond *working and guarding* the Garden of Eden are a matter of speculation.

In any case, this gives us a general view of Adam's life, which may account for many years. However, we will now need to go back to that first day (the first day of Adam's life), and God's commands to Adam.

Because this is not chronological, we do not know if we are simply studying man and his life in the garden, and whether this actually takes us past when Eve was built. What was described in his one verse is Adam's responsibilities with respect to the Garden of Eden.

There was a period of time when there was only Adam and not the woman. Whether this was for a few hours or for a considerable amount of time, I don't know. Although it is interesting to ponder Adam on earth alone for many years, the plain language of Gen. 1:27 ([He created them male and female](#)) suggests that Eve was created on the 6th day along with Adam (that God *rests* on the 7th day suggests this as well).

It appears as though these are whether man's duties and life in the garden which are given here and establish a pattern for man over a period of time, apart from the woman. That does not mean that the advent of the woman changed these duties. For instance, you might describe your own life, and how you were hired at a particular company where you worked for 20 years, and you might specify your duties. During this period of 20 years, you might meet a woman and marry her and that might be a part of your story that you double-back and tell about. My point is, these duties are assigned to the man and we do not know how long he attended to these duties. Obviously, he continued this way until the fall, but we do not know how long that time was nor do we know when the woman came on the scene (although, it does appear that she was built on the 6th day).

Gen 2:15 The LORD God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to work it and keep it.

We are created in the image of God. I recall that, when I was quite young, I had a lot of toy soldiers, which I would play with incessantly. Part of this involved creating an elaborate environment for them (hills, rivers, trees). So, even though I knew little or nothing about the Bible at this point in time, when I played with my soldiers, I also tried to set up an environment for them as well. Now, my soldiers were much more involved in shooting one another and fighting, than they were in gardening and building bridges; but the general idea was, I would develop an environment and then take my toy soldiers and put them into this environment. This was inherent in my nature, as I am made in the shadow-image of God. It is my understanding that little girls do the same thing with dolls and doll houses, although, from what I have heard, their dolls tend to do less fighting and killing.

Lesson 23: Genesis 2:16–17

The Garden of Eden (Part III)

We are in Gen. 2, where we go back and look at some particulars of the creation and restoration of the earth. Gen. 2:4–25 is not chronological, although portions of it are. So far, we have gone back to look at God and man in the Garden of Eden. We are still in the Garden of Eden and God will give man one prohibition by which to test his free will.

Gen 2:16–17 And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, "You may surely eat from every tree of the garden, but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you will not eat, for in the day that you eat of it, [in] dying, you will die."

I have mentioned earlier that chapter and verse divisions were all imposed upon the given text of the Bible, and this is another case where the division of this thought into two verses is artificial and unwarranted. Vv. 16–17 express one entire thought and should not be separated.

God sets up one tree in the garden and that tree is to test the volition of man. For man to have free will, there has to be the ability to make a free will choice against God. There is one tree in the garden, and, in innocence, the only way man can sin is by eating from that one tree. In a world of sin, far from the Garden of Eden, we also face one tree which tests our free will—the cross on which Christ died. Our attitude toward that *tree* determines our eternity. Man could choose one tree in the Garden of Eden to express negative volition toward God; man outside of the garden can choose one tree to express positive volition toward God. Adam's eventual choice to eat from this tree will result in a condemnation upon all mankind; our choice to trust in the tree (the cross) of Christ will result in eternal justification.

The words here are identical. The first translation of a book from one language to another was the Greek Bible, which translated the Hebrew Old Testament into the Greek language sometime between 300–100 B.C. It was known as the Septuagint (the LXX), referring to the number of translators involved in this project. In this verse, they used the Greek word

xulon (ξύλον) [pronounced *XOO-lohn*], which means 1) *wood*; 1a) *that which is made of wood*; 2) *a tree*. These are some of the Thayer definitions. Strong's #3586. We find this exact same word used in 1Peter 2:24 (which quotes, in part, Isa. 53): **He himself bore our sins in His body on the tree, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness. By His wounds you have been healed.** This exact same word is used in several other New Testament passages to refer to the cross upon which our Lord died (Acts 5:30 10:39 13:29 Gal. 3:13).

In our lives, we make a decision relative to a tree (the cross) to determine our eternal destiny; and Adam was faced with a tree as well, which would determine his eternal destiny. The Tree of the Knowledge of good and evil is that tree. The implication is, Adam lives in a world where there is no good and evil in the realm of his perception. He does not know that it exists. Furthermore, Adam is incapable of doing good or evil in this state. Apart from eating from this tree, Adam cannot sin.

We can partially relate to Adam's innocence through our young children (God has provided a myriad of real life illustrations in order to teach us spiritual realities and interactions). We often protect our children from the outside world, and, as long as possible, we try to preserve their childhoods—their blessed innocence, if you will—for them. In fact, this is why most parents are concerned about what a child sees and hears; and why many parents are concerned about what is on tv or what public education wants to foist upon their children. We are, in effect, protecting the innocence of our children. There are a lot of things a child does not need to know about early on in life. Let me give you a specific example. Most parents are fine with their grammar school kids reading books and seeing movies about mom and dad and their children. Where many parents begin to become uncomfortable is when the school wants to explain to the children exactly where they came from; or the school wants to expose the child to a non-traditional family (such as, a family with two men as partners). This intrudes upon the innocence of the child. Now, quite obviously, some parents could care less; but most parents have some sensitivity when it comes to what their children are exposed to. This is not confined to traditional, Christian families. I have a high school friend who is gay and lives in the very liberal Berkeley, California. When we were in our 20's or 30's and walking around Berkeley, he told me that he did not like all of the massage parlors and the various sexually-oriented businesses which were put their advertising right out there on the street for all to see. Now it wasn't that this guy was personally offended and that it bothered him to see this stuff; he simply did not like the idea that young kids walking by these storefronts and were exposed to this type of thing. In his own mind, he believed in retaining the innocence of the child was important. There are words and images which many parents would like to keep from our children as long as possible.

Obviously, children do understand right and wrong and are capable of moral choices, but we shield them as much as possible from the gross sin and evil of the outside world. The typical 5-year old boy has no idea what it is really like out in the world—just absolutely how evil some individuals can be—and we want to perpetuate that innocence for as long as we can. This is all analogous to God and Adam in innocence. Satan was there; demons were there—but they were outside of man's perception. The moral choice before man in

innocence was quite simple—there was one prohibition, and that was of eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. God, in this way, protected the innocence and joy of man, and still preserved man's free will.

Why is there a volitional test? God is sovereign, and we, as a shadow image of God, therefore, must have free will. God did not create human robots to just do His bidding; man in innocence has volition and fallen man has volition. This is one of the many ways in which we are made in the image of God. We do not have free will unless there exists some sort of real choice. God equipped man with a perfectly functioning free will. This means man can choose for or against God. Man's free will was not hindered, controlled or coerced by God. Today, our free will is exactly the same. God does not hinder, control or coerce our free will. Within the constraints of our environment, we have real and actual free will.

There has been a lot made of this topic of free will throughout the history of theology, and there are even some who, even today, deny that we have free will (and these can include unbelievers as well as believers). Let me assure you that we all have free will, and that predictability does not contradict the existence of free will. Let's use the example of your own 5-year old son: by age 5 (and long before that), you recognized that he has free will. You can place him in a set of circumstances and then predict his behavior. For some boys, you can say, "Don't touch the stove burner" and you know, as soon as he can move a stool over to the stove, he is going to stand on that stool and touch the burner to confirm what you have told him. That is how his free will functions, and you know it. This does not mean that he lacks free will or that you, because you know in advance what he is going to do, control his free will. You simply know your own child and how his free will functions during certain situations. Our relationship with God is quite similar. God knows us completely and He knows all the choices which we will make. That does not negate us having free will; it simply means that God knows in advance the choices that we will make, as He knows us perfectly.

Understanding that we have true free will and that God knows us perfectly, so as to be able to know what our behavior will be, actually clears up a lot of difficult theological issues related to free will and predestination.

Free will does not mean that you can do anything you want. You cannot choose to fly unassisted by a plane. I personally cannot make the free will choice to bench press 200 lbs, although I see other guys do this in the gym. Our free will with regards to God and moral choice is always functioning; our free will with regards to other things is more limited.

[Gen 2:16–17](#) And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, "You may surely eat of every tree of the garden, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you will not eat, for in the day that you eat of it [in] dying, you will die."

It is interesting that God commands the man here and not the man and the woman. This simply suggests to me that, when this command was given, there was God and man and there was no woman. If the woman was in existence at this time, then the concept could

have been authority; the man had authority over the woman and he would later tell the woman about this prohibition. I believe that both concepts are involved here; only man is around and, once the woman is built, man will fill her in as the authority over her.

I mentioned earlier angelic creation. Although we do not know the exact time period, I am going to assume that angels, at one point in time, lived on the earth, until Satan and a third of the angels *fell* (Rev. 12:4). The only details we are given about this are in Isa. 14:13–14 and Ezek. 28:12–15. That they lived on the earth at one time is not stated outright, but it is the only reasonable conclusion we can draw. If the earth was *not* originally created by God as void and formless (Isa. 45:18), then He would have had a purpose for creating it, not unlike His purpose for restoration of the earth. **For thus says Y^ehowah Who created the heavens, the God who formed the earth and made it, Who established it and did not create it a waste [and empty], Who formed it to be inhabited:** “I am Y^ehowah and there is **no one else.**” (Isa. 45:18). God created the earth originally to be inhabited, and the creatures which existed before us when God first created the earth were angels. As we studied in the first chapter of Genesis, **the earth became a wasteland and empty** (Gen. 1:2).

The word we find in Gen. 1:2 and Isa. 45:18 is *tôhûw* (תֹהוּ) [pronounced *TOE-hoo*], which means *desolate, an empty waste, chaos, trashed, formlessness, confusion, unreality, vain, nothingness, emptiness*. Strong’s #8414 BDB #1062. God did *not* create the earth *tôhûw* (Isa. 45:18); it *became* *tôhûw* (Gen. 1:2). God formed the earth to be inhabited. When you put this together, God formed the earth to be inhabited and not a waste and He created the angels as well. Therefore, it is only logical that this earth was originally formed for them to live on.

With regards to man and the woman, here are some alternative theories:

Timelines of the Creation of Man and the Woman	
View	Theory
Traditional View	Man and woman were both created [separately] on the 6 th day. God placed them into the Garden of Eden, some of which had fully grown at this point. Everything else in this garden and around the garden would grow by natural processes.

Implications: God created the land animals, He created man, man named all of the animals, God put Adam into a deep sleep and built the woman, all on the same day. At least the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil was probably full grown at this time and, most likely, a number of other trees and plants.

Problems: There is a lot which occurs on this final day of creation and restoration. It appears as those some trees were supernaturally grown, suddenly, if all days are seen as 24 hour periods of time.

Timelines of the Creation of Man and the Woman

View	Theory
Alternate View	Although the Bible says that God created man and woman on the 6 th day, God created man only with the potential of making a woman from man, which was done sometime later. All of the plants just grew normally. It is possible that the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil was fully grown at the very beginning, but that does not have to be the case.

Implications: God gave man some time to view the world and the animals before building a woman from Adam's rib. This would allow for a natural growth of plants and trees.

Problems: Although God has completed His creation and restoration by the 6th day, there are important considerations which are dealt with at a later time: the building of the woman and the volitional test of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. If plants grew normally, then this test was not available to man from day one. Secondly, God rests on the 7th day, but sometime later, builds the woman.

Alternate View #2	As has been discussed before, there was not a way of keeping and marking time until Day 4, when God made the sun, moon and stars. The first 3 days of restoration could have taken place over longer than a 24-hour period, which would allow for plants to grow at a normal rate. If you are thinking, <i>well, if that 3rd day is 5 years, isn't the 3rd night the same length of time, thus killing off all the vegetation?</i> And that would be true, except the night comes <i>before</i> its corresponding day. A 12-hour Day 4 would have been preceded by a 12-hour night 4; a year-long Day 3 would have been preceded by a year-long night 3 (when vegetation began to grow), but followed by a 12-hour night 4.
--------------------------	---

Implications: God presented man with a fully grown Garden of Eden, with fewer plants growing outside of the garden. There would have been time for them to grow naturally. Whether the woman was made on Day 6 or not is a separate topic.

Problems: We are going from a very long first, second and third days to suddenly 24-hour days, which could possibly require God to place the earth in orbit around the sun. However, the spinning of the earth with God being where the sun is, providing light, could allow for a gradual increase of the rotation of the earth (increasing the rotation of the earth on days 1–3; increasing the rotation of the earth could have even occurred on days 4–6). Whether the earth began in an orbit or not, obviously introduces a host of questions of physics.

No matter what sort of a timeline one sets up, one is left with some confusion about plant growth, the rotation of the earth, the orbit of the earth, and the actual length of time of days 1–3 (and perhaps of days 4–6). On the one hand, I do not have any difficulties with supernatural plant growth, as, quite obviously, what is done here involves great power. On the other hand, I have no problems with Days 1–3 being fairly lengthy either.

In this study, I am trying to avoid minutiae; however, I do not want to lay out a timeline which I present as accurate, when there is an equally valid but different timeline.

Gen 2:16–17 And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, "You may surely eat of every tree of the garden, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you will not eat, for in the day that you eat of it [in] dying, you will die."

There is one more thing—you will note that the verb *to die* is repeated. We have a Qal infinitive absolute followed by a Qal imperfect. The Qal is the normal stem of a word. A verb repeated in this way can express *certainty* or *decisiveness*. Because of the imperfect (continuous) tense, *continuous* action can be implied or even emphasized by this construction. However, we can also just take this literally—in the day that you eat of it, dying, you will die. Since we will continue to talk about Adam and his children for several chapters after he takes and eats the fruit of this tree, this means that Adam did not physically die the moment that he ate of the fruit of this tree. However, eating of this tree led to his eventual physical death (*dying* in a continuous sense). The death which Adam experienced immediately was a spiritual death. It is clear (in the chapters to follow) that God communed with Adam daily in the garden. However, when he and the woman eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, they will hide from God. God has to seek them out in spiritual death (setting another precedent); they do not seek out God. We will discuss this in greater detail when man falls.

Gen 2:16–17 And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, "You may surely eat of every tree of the garden, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you will not eat, for in the day that you eat of it [in a state of] dying, you will die."

This is an alternate way to read these two verses. When Adam eats of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, that will place him into a state of dying or a state of death (spiritual death). In the future (imperfect tense, which generally connotes either continuous or future action), he will die physically.

Lesson 24: Genesis 2:18–25

God Makes Adam's Partner

Adam has been created and he is in the garden. The garden has 4 kinds of trees in it: one category of trees appeals to Adam's soul, another to his body (it is good for food); a 3rd tree is related to everlasting life; and a 4th tree is related to a knowledge of good and evil. They are allowed to partake of the first 3 classifications of trees. They can look at and enjoy the first set of trees, and they are allowed to eat from the 2nd and 3rd set of trees (there appears to be only one tree which makes up this 3rd set).

God places man in this garden to work the garden and to guard it.

Gen 2:18 Also the LORD God said, "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a helper fit for him."

At some point in time, whether the 6th day, or much later, God looked at man and decided to make for man a companion of his own kind (to be theologically accurate, God made this decision in eternity past before He created man).

There are actually several words which describe what God is going to make. We first of all have the Hebrew word *‘ezer* (עֲזָרָה) [pronounced *ĠAY-zer*] [this *Ġ* is a guttural sound coming from the back of the mouth above the tongue], and Brown, Driver and Briggs offer up the meanings *a help, succor* and Strong suggests *aid* as another of the various meanings for the word *helper* found here. Let me also suggest the words *counterpart* and *ally*. What follows is the preposition *like, as* and the multi-use word *neged* (נֶגֶד) [pronounced *NEH-ged*], which can be found used as a preposition, adverb or substantive. It means *what is conspicuous* when it is a substantive and, as a preposition, *in front of, in the sight of, opposite to, before* (in the sense of being *in front of*). Strong's #5048 BDB #617. Affixed to *neged* is the 3rd person masculine singular suffix, which refers to Adam, and identifies *neged* as a preposition. We may translate this second sentence in a myriad of ways: *I will make for him a helper as opposite him. Or, I will make for him an ally as his counterpart. Or, I will make for him a helper corresponding to him.*

Here is how others have translated this line:

What God will Make for Adam	
Translation	Text
Contemporary English Version	I need to make a suitable partner for him.
Concordant Literal Version	Make for him will I a helper as his complement.
Easy-to-Read Version	I will make a person like him to help him.
Good News Bible	I will make a suitable companion to help him.
Holman Christian Standard Bible	I will make a helper who is like him.
The Judaica Press Complete Tanach	I shall make him a helpmate opposite him.
KJV 2000	I will make him a helper suitable for him.
The NET Bible	I will make a companion for him who corresponds to him.

What God will Make for Adam

Translation	Text
Rotherham's Emphasized Bible	I will make for him a helper as his counterpart.
R. B. Thieme Jr.	I will manufacture for him an associate responding to him.
A Voice in the Wilderness	I will make him a helper to complement him.

Most of the translations above are available for E-sword (for those you use the free program E-sword on your computer). The lighter translations above are prone to paraphrase and the darker ones tend to translate as accurately as possible.

E-sword and some Bible modules are found at www.e-sword.net (I recommend this program highly); and go to <http://www.davidcox.com.mx/e-swordmodules/bibles.html> for additional modules. Another excellent site is <http://e-sword-users.org> but you will have to set up a sign-in name here (it is completely free).

It may seem, with the next few verses, that the narrative is going astray, but this is all related. We develop a narrative at this point, leading to God building the woman for the man.

Gen 2:19 Now out of the ground the LORD God had formed every beast of the field and every bird of the heavens and brought them to the man to see what he would call them. And whatever the man called every living creature, that was its name.

Again, as we studied before with Adam in Gen. 1, animals are made out of the chemicals of the earth—a statement which we understand fully today, but a statement which is amazing in that it was written 3000 years ago or more.

We know that, from one man and one woman, we got a very diverse population. We also know that, in the realm of dog breeding, the breeds we find today are relative recent, and so bred over the past millennium or so. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that there was less of a variety of animals during the time of Adam's creation. There were not 400 breeds of dogs, but one generic dog/wolf/coyote/hyena (actually, there were at least two—a male and a female). There may have been as few as a pair of primates; or there may have been 3 or 4 types at the most. My point being, there were a lot fewer animals to name at this point in time, and animals had a rich genetic potential, as did man.

In order for Adam to name these animals, he must have language. A human child is born with a brain hard-wired for language, and we have seen, if this is stunted (i.e., there is no stimulation of a person's language), their entire mental and emotional growth is also stunted. Developing a language is directly related not just to our mental growth, but to our emotional growth as well. A child kept from language stimulation up to age 10 or so will be forever stunted in his intellectual and emotional growth. We know from studies of wild

children that, after a certain period of time, developing a vocabulary is nearly impossible. There are cases of wild children developing vocabularies of fewer than 20 words, if their formative years had no language stimulation or development (wild children are children raised in the wild without human parents; or kept in cages or in closets during their formative years—obviously, no scientist would do this purposely in order to determine these things about a child). Such wild children never catch up; stunting their language development and stunting their interaction with their environment and with other humans destroys their chances at a normal, human development.

As we all know, there is a time of readiness in each child for hundreds, if not thousands, of developmental stages, and a parent tries to reach that child as he develops with the proper stimulation. I have been inside homes with children where there is no reading material of any kind (no books, no magazines, no comics) and nothing to write with. Many of these children enter school with a very weak concept of written language, and they struggle their entire lives and never catch up, because their concept of a written language was not stimulated until they entered school (children can associate the written word with the spoken word before age 3).

As an aside, I wonder if children do not provide us with some sort of clue as to Adam and the woman in the garden. They have energy which is phenomenal. You look at these children, and it is as if they have been supercharged to run nonstop for hours. I've played with my nieces and nephews and they generally make me tired in about 5 or 10 minutes, and they are just getting started. Children do have sin natures, of course, but the power, energy and strength of their bodies should be a clue as to how man originally was created.

I would assume that Adam was created fully grown as an adult. If we assume that his body was fully developed, then it is reasonable to assume that his brain was fully developed with a vocabulary. If not, God had to stimulate this part of the brain by talking to Adam and teaching him a vocabulary.

In any case, when Adam had the animals brought to him, he had enough of a vocabulary to name them, and these names very likely had to do with the animal's appearance or the sounds which it made. One of the reasons which makes me suggest that maybe Adam's solitary existence on earth went on for some time is, if everything occurs on Day 6, that would include Adam's vocabulary as well (if all of this occurs on Day 6, then Adam must have been created with a fully functioning vocabulary).

[Gen 2:20](#) The man gave names to all livestock and to the birds of the heavens and to every beast of the field. But for Adam there was not found a helper for him.

Here is why God brought the animals to Adam—after naming hundreds if not thousands of animals, Adam recognizes that there is no animal designed for him. Even without a mirror, Adam can at least observe his own body, and no animal is his size and has his body type. No animal is attractive to him. At no time, does Adam look at an animal and determine, “I really want to get to know this fellow a lot better and spend a lot more time with him.”

Adam sees animal after animal after animal, it is obvious that from among these animals, there are none which look like him and none which have his language capabilities. There are no animals with whom he can have a conversation. None of them appear to be his counterpart; none can he see as his ally. They are interesting creatures, cute and furry; but none of them are a match for Adam.

It is not clear as to what form God took in the Garden, but Adam was able to communicate with God, but he did not recognize God as his *helper* or *counterpart*. This is what God wanted; God wanted for Adam to recognize that, in all of his periphery, there was no animal which was his proper counterpart, although he had a chance to see the entire animal kingdom, as he named the animals.

Gen 2:21 So then, the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and while he slept, He took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh.

This is quite fascinating, as only most recently, has it become apparent that cloning could become a scientific reality. God, from the rib, built a woman, rather than constructing the woman from scratch from the chemicals of the ground. The idea is, this was a woman designed for Adam and for Adam only. She had been an integral part of Adam and she belonged with Adam. She was not some randomly created woman who just physically appealed to Adam. This sets up a precedent which some people have called right man/right woman.

What we also have here is the idea of an medical operation when someone is under anesthesia. There is a state that we can be in which disconnects us from the pain which would be normally felt.

The removal of Adam's rib means that the man is now incomplete.

Gen 2:22 And the rib that the LORD God had taken from the man He built into a woman and brought her to the man.

The verb *to build* here is *bânâh* (בָּנָה) [pronounced *baw-NAWH*], and it means *to build, to rebuild, to restore*. Strong's #1129 BDB #124. It is in the imperfect tense, so there was a process involved. This process may have only taken a split second, but there was construction or building involved. God had the rib of the man and used this genetic code (remember that our DNA, found throughout our bodies, are a veritable set of blueprints for the building of our entire body). God made some obvious changes to the DNA code—some might even think some improvements were made (I must admit, it is a lot easier to look at a woman than it is to look at a man).

One of the amazing things about man and animals is, we carry within us the blueprints for our design. Essentially, someone could take most any cell from our body and find in this cell the blueprints for making us (assuming that this someone can read the blueprints). In this creation, we have all 3 members of the Trinity at work. God the Father designed the blueprints for man; the 2nd Person of the Trinity built man (and then He build the woman);

and the 3rd Person of the Trinity provided the energy—which would reasonably include the energy which powers our bodies.

It is nice when you plan to do some work on your own house and you are able to go to a closet or up in the attic, and there are the blueprints, so that you can use these blueprints to work from (to figure out where your electrical wiring is, or where your load-bearing walls are). Jesus Christ can take a part of man, and in any cell of man's body, there are the blueprints for man's construction.

There are a lot of people out there in this world who do not believe in God. They think matter just happened; they think that life just happened, and they think that man just evolved. Only recently has man discovered our genetic code, our DNA. When arguing with a person about whether man evolved or not is like arguing with this person about a house and whether this house just happened to end up this way naturally or whether someone actually constructed it. You might even turn to the blueprints for this house and show them to this debater and say, "Look, these are the blueprints; this tells you just how this house was to be built. It was no accident." In the same way, those who believe that we evolved can be taken to man's DNA and shown, "These are the blueprints; this proves that man was designed. This shows you that man did not just happen, but that man was actually designed." It may not convince them, but our DNA proves to the open-minded agnostic that we are designed to specifications so precise, complex and intricate that science, even today, is unable to decode all of the information which is in these plans. Whether you know it or not, your car is a very precise instrument. It is designed to function at a specific temperature. There are parts which are designed out of a variety of materials which interact to yield a variety of functions. You cannot vary some part of your automobile by as little as an 8th of an inch without that change causing great discord in your motor. Even though a car is designed to very exact specifications, this cannot even compare to the interactions of the parts of a human body. All of this is coded in our DNA.

Gen 2:7 Then the LORD God formed the man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives, and the man became a living creature.

Gen 2:21 So then, the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and while he slept, He took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh.

Gen 2:22 And the rib that the LORD God had taken from the man He built into a woman and brought her to the man.

In Gen. 2:7 and 21–22, we have 3 marvelous concepts: (1) man was created from the chemicals found in the ground; (2) the cloning of a human being; (3) the concept of a medical operation involving anesthesia. Today, these notions make sense. 3000 years ago, when these words were first written, these ideas just did not exist in the realm of science; but they were still written down in the Word of God. God understood these concepts, and therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that He inspired these words to be written.

Gen 2:22 And the rib that the LORD God had taken from the man He built into a woman and brought her to the man.

What is being done here is a precedent. God brings the woman to the man. God did not bring some miscellaneous woman to Adam; He did not bring two women to Adam nor did God bring a man to Adam. There is one man, and God provides him with exactly one woman—a woman designed exactly for Adam, an exact counterpart for Adam—and God does the bringing. This woman is Adam's natural counterpart, as she came from Adam.

Gen 2:23 Then the man said, "This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she will be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man."

Adam is a genius and he recognizes that this woman is taken from him and built from his genetic code. In the Hebrew, *Adam* is *Ish*; and *woman* is *Ishshah*. Adam immediately recognizes and names the woman. It should be pointed out that, when one thing names another, the first thing has authority over the thing which it names.

Gen 2:24 Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and they will become one flesh.

This is also a fascinating observation, because there are no parents at this time. Now, it is possible that this is a gloss—a verse which is legitimately added at a later date (I believe that Genesis was written by several authors, passed down either verbally or in written form, and edited into its final form around 3000 B.C.). In any case, this is setting a precedent—it is the normal order of things for a man and a woman to become one flesh—a corporate entity—and to leave their parents and to become their own corporate unit. Throughout human history, there have been a tremendous number of various configurations tried: extended families, where everyone continues to live together; polygamy, where a man marries more than one woman; various configurations of men and women; communes, homosexual unions; and, no matter what is tried, the most successful and enduring and natural corporate unit appears to be between one man and one woman with or without children. You can go to any culture and any area in the world, and this will be the basic family unit and the most common family unit. We can certainly find this or that tribe or culture where some different configuration is common; but most households in this world are going to be the family unit with one husband, one wife, and x amount of children.

Gen 2:25 And the man and his wife were both naked and were not ashamed.

At this point in time, the man and the woman existed without having a concept of good and evil, moral or immoral. Nudity was not an issue to Adam and the woman.

Their general attitude is described with the Hithpolel (a rare stem of Hebrew verbs which corresponds to the Hithpael) imperfect of the verb *bôwsh* (שוב) [pronounced *bôsh*], which means *to blush, to be ashamed [disconcerted, disappointed] [in front of one another]*. Strong's #954 BDB #101. The Hithpolel verb is used as a reflexive verb (**they were not ashamed of themselves**), as a reciprocal verb (**they were not ashamed of one another**) and

as an iterative verb (*they were not continually ashamed*). The first two are applicable. Adam was not ashamed, confused, disconcerted or disappointed by being with the woman and their both being naked. There was no shame or confusion on his part nor did he perceive or feel shame or confusion for the woman or on behalf of the woman.

Interestingly enough, we have no idea how long this time of innocence lasted. Whether Adam and the woman lived in innocence for a few days or a few millennium is not revealed to us.

Lesson 25: Genesis 3:1

Satan

At this point, we introduce Satan. He comes to the woman in the form of a serpent (snake).

Gen 3:1a The snake was more clever than all the wild animals the LORD God had made.

This chapter of the Bible is about the temptation of Eve and the fall of man. What we find in this chapter is a serpent (snake) which confuses and deceives Eve, deceiving her, thus causing her to eat from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. Since Satan is herein introduced, we need to have an idea of who Satan is.

Satan

1. It is important to note that, Satan is a real person. Although he is not human, he has thoughts, personality, and emotion. The Bible always presents Satan as a real entity and never as some sort of impersonal force. Gen. 3:1–15 Matt. 4
2. Our first introduction to Satan directly is in Gen. 3:1–15, where he will deceive the woman and get her to eat from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. Satan was indirectly introduced between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2, where the earth *became empty and a waste-place*. This had to happen in some way, and certainly, Satan and the fallen angels were involved; however, we are not given any details at that point as to what exactly took place. If you allowed some teenagers to party in your house, unsupervised, the way that your house would look the next day is not unlike what Satan and other fallen angels did to the earth.
3. Satan is called *Lucifer* in Isa. 14:12, which means *morning star, shining one; light bearer*. Angels are associated with light (they are sometimes called *stars*), and Satan was apparently the grandest angel of them all. *Oh shining star [Lucifer], son of the morning, how you have fallen from the heavens! You, who weakens the nations, you are cut down to the ground. For you have said In your heart, "I will go up to the heavens; I will raise my throne above the stars of God, and I will sit in the mount of meeting, in the sides of the north. I will rise over the heights of the clouds; I will be compared to the Most High." Yet you will go down to Sheol, to the sides of the Pit (Isa. 14:12–15). This is Satan's fall, and it is his sin of arrogance which seems to be the reason for his fall.*
 - 1) Lucifer is associated with the stars and the heavens, from which he has

Satan

- fallen.
- 2) Notice how Lucifer is described: *you, who weakens the nations...* Satan is the father of internationalism. It is God Who separates us into nations (we will see this in Gen. 11).
 - 3) Satan exalts himself over all of the other angels (the *stars of God*) and compares himself to God.
 - 4) However, Satan has been judged.
4. He is called *Satan* in Job 1–2 and elsewhere. *Satan* means *adversary, accuser*; and it is not a far leap to understand his name to mean *attorney*. His actions in the courtroom of God in that passage reveals the mind of an attorney.
 5. Satan's fall is also mentioned in Ezek. 28:12–19, a passage which begins as a lament for the king of Tyre, but morphs into a lament for Satan: *Son of man, lift up a lament over the king of Tyre, and say to him, So says the Lord Jehovah: You seal the measure, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty. You have been in Eden, the garden of God. Every precious stone was your covering; the ruby, the topaz, and the jasper, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the turquoise, and the carbuncle, and gold; the workmanship of your tambourines and of your flutes in you. In the day you were created, they were prepared. You were the anointed cherub that covers, and I had put you in the holy heights of God, where you were. You walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. You were perfect in your ways from the day you were created, until iniquity was found in you. By the multitude of your trade, they filled your midst with violence, and you sinned. So I cast you defiled from the height of God, and I destroyed you, O covering cherub, from among the stones of fire. Your heart was lifted up because of your beauty; you corrupted your wisdom because of your splendor. I have cast you to the ground. I will put you before kings, that they may see you. By the host of your iniquities, by the iniquity of your trade, you have defiled your holy places. So I brought a fire from your midst and it shall devour you, and I will give you for ashes on the earth in the sight of all who see you. All who know you among the peoples shall be appalled at you. You shall be terrors, and you will not be forever.*
 - 1) We are told that Satan had been in the Garden of Eden. This is the narrative we are about to study.
 - 2) He was an anointed cherub (another Biblical name for angels; it is probably a certain classification of angels).
 - 3) Satan is a created being.
 - 4) He was created perfect, which perfection was maintained until iniquity was found in him.
 - 5) His sin was arrogance, because of his great beauty; and this arrogance corrupted his great intelligence.
6. The argument might be made, *so what if some people sin; so what if some angels sin; it is a big universe; just give them a place to hang out and sin*. We do not know a lot about Satan's life before he fell and after he fell, apart from these two passages, but it will be clear in Gen. 3 that he is unable to leave well enough alone. Here is Adam and his woman in perfect environment, and Satan's gut-

Satan

reaction is to become involved and to mess it up.

- 1) Life is filled with parallel situations. When a person begins using drugs, this is rarely a choice that he makes in a vacuum. Invariably, he has friends or associates who coax him to take drugs. Rarely does he talk to a friend, and his friend tells him, "Look, even though drugs make me feel great, they have screwed up my life royally. I cannot concentrate in school, I cannot hold down a job, I cannot maintain a decent relationship, and I spend much of my life thinking about getting high. All the people I know who use drugs tend to screw up their lives more and more. I strongly recommend that you do not ever even try drugs." Most of the time, their *friend* makes drugs available. Then the person who is hooked goes out and evangelizes others to join him in taking drugs. My point is, Satan was not able to just sin, and then walk away to some corner of the universe and continue sinning to his heart's delight. He had to entice others to his lifestyle and to his way of thinking.
 - 2) Atheists cannot leave well enough alone. They become overly concerned about a manger scene at Christmas time in a capitol building; or they walk into a store, and call management because the employees are all wearing green or red and they tell the customers, "Have a merry Christmas!" The sin nature is powerful, and often, such a one will take time from their busy lives to complain to someone. I've been in Thailand, and I have been in the palaces with the ubiquitous statues of Buddha, and to various shrines with Buddha—many of which are state-sponsored (I assume). It did not make me upset. I did not ponder as to the morality of this nation, which is a poor but developing nation, spending money on Buddha stuff. It never occurred to me to try to locate someone in authority and to lodge my complaint. There are Christian evangelists within Thailand. I doubt that any of them try to convince their converts to remove Buddhism and Buddha statues from Thailand. In fact, I suspect that none of them ever even considered such a thing.
 - 3) Like the atheist, Satan is unable to just let things be.
7. We find out a great deal more about Satan in Job 1–2, a narrative which takes place probably before the time of Abraham and probably after the flood. Satan apparently has access to both the earth and the throne room of God (I would assume with permission, he has this access). Satan has some power over what happens here on earth, according to these first couple chapters of Genesis, as long as God grants him this power. His primary inclination is to destroy the life of Job in any way that he can, in order to prove a point. The suffering which Job endures is simply a bonus to Satan.
- 1) Let me draw another parallel. Satan is willing to inflict the worst and most painful punishment upon Job—a man who has nothing to do with Satan—in order to make a point. Along these lines, we have the Satanically-inspired radical Islam today, and they will kill innocent people in order to make a religious and/or political point of some sort. In fact,

Satan

- most of the time, these radical Muslims kill more fellow Muslims than anyone else, simply because these Muslims are not radical enough, in their estimation.
- 2) When I was in Thailand, I recall that an older farmer was captured and beheaded by some Islamic radicals. I suspect that, like most people, this man was just providing for his family. However, somehow, by taking this man hostage and then beheading him, something of value was accomplished in the eyes of the Muslims who did this.
 - 3) This is how Satan thinks and acts; and this is one of the reasons we understand Islam to be of Satan.
8. This is who the serpent is, speaking to Eve in the Garden of Eden. This is how the serpent thinks. Satan has fallen; God has restored the earth, and Satan is going to become involved. Satan cannot leave Adam and the woman alone. Although we all have a sin nature now, Satan is still unable to leave well enough alone. He helped to corrupt this earth, but he cannot just let that be—his involvement in this world continues.
9. Satan is found in Rev. 12:4, in which context he is called the *great dragon*: **His tail swept down a third of the stars of heaven and cast them to the earth. And the dragon stood before the woman who was about to give birth, so that when she bore her child he might devour it.**
- 1) The dragon's tail which swept down a third of the stars of heaven refers to Satan influencing a third of the angels to sin, and follow him. It is these angels who are cast down to earth.
 - 2) It is Satan who desired to destroy Jesus Christ when He was born of a woman, as an expression of his intense hatred for God.
10. So that there is no confusion, Satan is equated with the devil, with the great dragon and with the serpent of old in Rev. 12:9. This is all the same angelic being.
11. Today, Satan attacks our thinking.
- 1) This has always been the case. In Gen. 3, with the woman, his attack will be on her thinking, and her actions will follow suit.
 - 2) In John 13:2, we are told: **the devil had already put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him.** Judas was an unbeliever, and Satan was able to, in some way, influence his thinking. The exact mechanics of this are difficult to elucidate.
12. Satan tempts us to sin. Gen. 3:1–6 Matt. 4:3
13. Satan is the father of religion.
- 1) When speaking to some Jews in the Temple (which would have been those steeped in Judaism and included scribes and pharisees), Jesus told them, **“You are of your father the devil, and your will is to do your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning, and has nothing to do with the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks out of his own character, for he is a liar and the father of lies.”** (John 8:44). Their eventual response was, **they picked up stones to throw at Him, but**

Satan

- Jesus hid Himself and went out of the temple** (John 8:59).
- 2) Sometimes it is obvious that a religion is Satanic, as it is with Islam (a good place to confirm this is www.thereligionofpeace.com); and sometimes, it is not quite as obvious, as with Buddhism and many forms of Catholicism and Pentecostalism.
 - 3) Jesus calls many of the religious men in the Temple sons of the devil, because they did not recognize Who Jesus was. John 8:41–44
14. Satan is the ruler of this world.
- 1) Jesus calls him **the ruler of this world** in John 12:31 14:30 16:11.
 - 2) Paul calls Satan **the god of this world** in 2Cor. 4:4 and **the prince of the power of the air** in Eph. 2:2.
 - 3) John tells us that **the whole world lies in the power of the evil one** (1John 5:19).
15. The conflict that we are involved with is against Satan in the realm of the Angelic Conflict: **For we do not wrestle against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the cosmic powers over this present darkness, against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places** (Eph. 6:12). Satan is our adversary (1Peter 5:8).
16. Satan has the power of death (if granted by God). Heb. 2:14 compared with Job 2:3–6.
17. We are to resist Satan and his thinking. 1Peter 5:8–9 James 4:7
18. The human race is broken down into two categories:
- 1) The sons of God: **you are all sons of God, through faith (in Christ Jesus)** (Gal. 3:26 compared with 3:22). See also Rom. 8:14 Gal. 4:6 1John 3:10.
 - 2) The sons of the devil: Matt. 13:38 John 8:44 1John 3:10.
19. Satan does have the ability to deceive us with false signs and wonders. 2Thess. 2:9–10
20. Satan's power is limited. He is not God; he does not have the attributes of God; and God specifically limits his power and actions. Job 1:9-12 2:4-6 Matt. 8:30–32
21. Satan has been judged and he will spend eternity in the Lake of Fire. Matt. 25:41 John 12:31 Rev. 20:10, 14

This is by no means a complete examination of Satan. It is just enough information, so that you realize that, Satan was created by God; Satan fell because of his choice to sin against God; and that this all occurred prior to the restoration of the earth. At this point, we find Satan in the garden, with the intention of causing trouble. It is a large universe; given that Satan can travel instantly between the throne room of God and the earth, this would suggest that he could have located himself to any planet or any place in the universe at this time. He chose to go to the earth, to deal with God's newest creation, a creation which did not sin and was not involved in good and evil.

Although most of this doctrine was original (although based upon my many years at Berachah Church), some came from: <http://www.biblicalproportions.com/modules/wfsection/article.php?articleid=4652&page=0>

This is Satan's first attack against mankind. He will tempt Adam and the woman to sin.

Gen 3:1 The snake was more clever than all the wild animals the LORD God had made. He asked the woman, "Did God really say, 'You must never eat the fruit of any tree in the garden'?"

The name of the serpent is quite fascinating: it is nâchâsh (נָחָשׁ) [pronounced *naw-KHAWSH*], which means *serpent*. Strong's #5175 BDB #638. You can hear the hissing of the snake when you pronounce this word. This is very closely related to the verb nâchash (נָחַשׁ) [pronounced *naw-KHAHSH*], which means *to practice divination, to divine; to communicate with demons; to whisper*. Strong's #5172 BDB #638. I would guess that the noun came first, and the verb was based upon this noun.

The adjective used to describe the serpent here is 'ârûwm (עָרוּם) [pronounced *gaw-ROOM*], which means; *sensible, prudent, forethoughtful, farsighted, insightful, sagacious, prepared*. Strong's #6175 (& 6191) BDB #791. The serpent is called more clever than all of the life forms because Satan indwelt this snake. This is why the serpent was more shrewd and devious than the other animals. God did not create snakes with a greater intellectual capacity than other animals; but this snake, under Satan's control, was extremely intelligent.

Satan's question is not just clever, but he already knows the answer he will get, which we will examine next time.

Lesson 26: Genesis 3:1–4

The Temptation of Eve—Part I

Apparently, Satan, who indwelt the serpent, waited until the woman was alone, and then he spoke to her. As we studied last time, Satan, who was created as the greatest of all angels, had fallen from grace, becoming arrogant because of his own beauty and intelligence.

Gen 3:1 The snake was more clever [= *crafty, insidious, devious, shrewd*] than all the wild animals the LORD God had made. He asked the woman, "Did God really say, 'You must never eat the fruit of any tree in the garden'?"

None of the animals had ever talked to Adam or the woman before. However, the woman does not appear to be startled or taken aback by this. Now, I don't know if you can recall back to your youth, but there was a time when you were young when almost anything seemed possible. For the first couple years of your life, anything that you wanted was just given to you. You learned how to do that. Your wants were rather limited, but whatever it was, your parents seemed to figure out what it was and took care of you. A few years past this, and life's possibilities seemed infinite. We do not know how long Adam and the woman had lived on this earth; and they certainly did not know what was possible and what was not. So, even though this serpent began to speak to the woman, it did not shock or

surprise her. Furthermore, the woman was incapable of fear. There is nothing which would happen which would cause the woman to fear.

We don't know where Adam is at this point in time, but the Garden of Eden was huge, and he was probably several miles away at this time engaged in some project. Adam looked forward to working in this garden each day. Adam and the woman are both quite intelligent, so it is even likely that they even built tools to work with by this time.

Notice how Satan speaks to the woman; he poses a question to which he already knows the answer. "God didn't really tell you that you could not eat from any tree in the garden?" This is what a lawyer does. A lawyer will ask a series of questions leading to a set of answers which he wants to hear. Here, Satan wants to lead the woman and her thinking in a particular direction. This is how all false systems of thinking begin—religions, philosophies, world-views—with a distortion of the Word of God.

When speaking of God, Satan uses the word *Elohim*, but he does not use the personal name *Jehovah* (*Y^ehowah*). Satan no longer has the relationship with God which we as believers have. When we believed in Jesus Christ, we were saved and saved forever. We cannot lose our salvation. We may get out of fellowship from time to time, but we do not lose our personal relationship with Him. Satan has no such personal relationship with God; Satan has been condemned by God. The amount of evil which Satan is willing to do will be laid out throughout all human history.

Islamic terrorists give us a contemporary clue as to how much evil Satan is willing to commit. Since newspapers and television news seem reluctant to bring to you all that radical Muslims are actually doing every single day, let me suggest www.thereligionofpeace.com. The actions of the Nazis in their hatred of the Jews and their desire to destroy the Jews give us an historical perspective as to how far Satan is willing to take things. Their willingness to destroy the lives of millions of Jews as if their lives are meaningless give us an idea of just how far Satan is willing to go when it comes to inflicting pain and misery upon the human race. What we observe here in the garden may seem fairly academic and bloodless, but the end result is going to be a mountain of suffering inflicted upon the human race, which can all be traced back to Satan.

Gen 3:1b He asked the woman, "Did God really say, 'You must never eat the fruit of any tree in the garden'?"

In the English, our 2nd person masculine singular pronoun is identical to our 3rd person masculine singular pronoun. Those in the south have sought to correct it with *you'all* and those in the north offer up the weaker *youse guys*, but in literary English there is no difference. The Hebrew differentiates between these. Throughout these first several verses, even though Satan is talking to just the woman, he includes Adam in all that he said. Literally, Satan asked the woman, "Indeed, did God say, 'You [both] will not eat from every tree of the garden'?"

Gen 3:2 The woman answered the snake, "We're allowed to eat the fruit from any tree in the garden."

The snake knows this. Ever since God created the man and the woman, Satan has been watching with intent interest. He knows what the prohibition is, and he wants to confuse the woman as to what is true and what is not.

Satan added a very specific question: "Did God really say, 'You must never eat the fruit of any tree in the garden'?" The woman sticks up for God. She tells Satan that she can eat the fruit of any fruit-bearing tree in the garden but one.

Gen 3:2–3 The woman answered the snake, "We're allowed to eat the fruit from any tree in the garden except the tree in the middle of the garden. God said, 'You must never eat it or touch it. If you do, you will die!'"

This was exactly what Satan was looking for. He needed for the woman to express an incorrect understanding of the Word of God. This would give Satan an opening which he could exploit.

Adam and the woman had been given one prohibition to test their volition. There was the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil in the midst of the garden, and they were told not to eat from it. God told them, "But you must never eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil because when you eat from it, in dying, you will die." This means that they would die two deaths--they would die spiritually—they would be separated from God right then and there—and they would also eventually die physically, as a result of their spiritual death. In addition to this, God would no longer allow them near the Tree of Life so that they did not perpetuate their lives separated from God.

God gave the man and the woman free will, so there must be some choice offered to them to test their free will with respect to God. They have to have some way to choose against God from a state of perfection, or, otherwise, they do not have true free will.

Now, you will note that the woman did not listen very carefully to Jesus (the Revealed Member of the Trinity) teaching them in the garden. To be fair, it may have been Adam who taught this to the woman, as he was her authority. They were only prohibited from eating the fruit of that tree; God never said anything about touching it. She made that up on her own (or, perhaps, Adam added, "It is better that you do not even touch that tree or its fruit"). In any case, someone had added to the Word of God.

The last words she says are interesting as well: "You [plural] will die." She is only quoting a portion of what was told to her. She was told, "Dying, you [plural] will die." In this way, she was taking away from the Word of God.

Gen 3:4 "You certainly won't die!" the snake told the woman.

Satan lies to the woman. Literally what he says is, “Not dying, you will die.” The negative may be reasonably applied to the repetition of this verb: “Not dying, you will [not] die.” The serpent actually corrects her at this point. He gives her a direct quote (but with the negative), which I am sure she recognizes. When she hears the doubling of the verb, as God spoke originally, she recognized that this Serpent was quite clever and must know what he is talking about.

Have you ever known someone who could speak with authority and he sounded extremely intelligent and charming, and you simply wanted to believe whatever he told you? Some people just have that natural charisma. Satan is the most beautiful creature in the universe (although the woman cannot see that) and he is the most intelligent creature in the universe. He is charismatic and interesting to talk to.

We do not completely know the thinking of Satan. Does he fully realize that pain and anguish that this will cause? Does he think in his own soul this is the best thing to do? I gave the example before, when one child offers his best friend drugs, he is not thinking, “I really want for you to screw up your life.” That is where this can lead, but that is not necessarily the intention of the friend. How far forward is Satan able to look? This man and woman are a brand new thing on this earth. As a chess player, how many moves in advance is Satan able to see? In any case, Satan does this for his own self-interest. He may justify that he is doing this for the other angels that fell, but Satan caused them to fall through his charm, beauty and intelligence, and specifically for his own ends, to make a point.

What is that point? “God, You design corruptible creatures; therefore, You ought to allow us all to live.” Satan is under judgment, which we have discussed earlier. He and the fallen angels have already been condemned to the Lake of Fire, where they will burn forever. Since that sentence has not been carried out, Satan has obviously appealed this verdict.

The idea that Satan appeals his sentence to God is based upon the fact that Satan has already been judged, but God has not yet carried out the sentence against him. Furthermore, given the almost courtroom-type atmosphere found in Job 1:6–12 2:1–6, and Satan’s ability to object to God’s testimony, it is not a great leap to suggest that Satan objected to his sentence, appealed to God, and God granted him his appeal, which appeal is played out in human history.

Although we have covered these before, I have listed below some of Satan’s appeals (there were probably many specific appeals as well, as well as a much longer list than I have been able to come up with).

The Basis of Satan’s Appeals

1. How can a loving God cast any of His creatures into a Lake of Fire?
2. Satan to God: “God, You made me this way. I am not responsible for Your creation.” God is at fault for not making a perfect creation. If Satan is imperfect, then it must mean that God is imperfect.

The Basis of Satan's Appeals

3. "The creatures You have designed, God, are all prone to sin. This indicates a faulty design. Since You, God, made all creatures this way, You ought to allow them free expression and You ought to allow all Your creatures to live."
4. Satan's sin is originally one of pride, which was discovered by God; how can a hidden sin like this deserve eternal death? How is this just?
5. Can't a God of love forgive His creatures?
6. Let's accept the premise that Satan and the fallen angels have sinned. Why not just give Satan some little space in the universe and let him and the other fallen angels hang out there?
7. Elect angels have chosen this path simply because God rewards them for their choice.
8. Essentially, Satan's objections call into question God's actions in comparison to His character and essence. God has to be consistent, as He is immutable. God is righteous and just, so His judgment has to be righteous and just. God is love, so His actions should reflect His love.
9. There are inherent contradictions in God's character (creating beings which will suffer forever in the Lake of Fire does not demonstrate love or righteousness). Therefore, the inherent defects in Satan's character cannot be judged by Someone with inherent defects. In other words, if Satan is imperfect, then God is imperfect. God is unable to demonstrate perfect character in all respects at all times (that is the argument of Satan).
10. Right and wrong are relative concepts; there really is no such thing as absolute standards of right and wrong. The acts of Satan and those angels who fell are not inherently wrong, because there is no such thing as inherent wrong.
11. Right and wrong, good and bad, are simply arbitrary standards, set up by God.
12. God is incapable of creating creatures with free will who will not, at some point in time, disobey Him.
13. When Adam and Eve fell, there was a change in the environment; Satan may have alleged that the problem is with the environment as much as it is with anything else.
14. Finally, Satan, in a sense, alleges, "I could do a better job than God with this earth and with His creatures." He said, "I will be like the Most High." (Isa. 14:14b).

In this chapter, Satan will show that His creatures all sin, indicating that he, Satan, ought to be running things. Bear in mind that Satan has never created any living creature before, he has never had authority over these new creatures, and yet he proposes that he is able to be equal to God.

Let me make an application here: maybe you have been drawn to a person because they were charming, attractive and intelligent? Maybe you wanted to date someone like that. Maybe you have observed people like that and you wanted to be their friend. Maybe you have voted for a person with those qualities. Maybe you have followed a religious leader with these qualities. These are qualities which Satan possesses. These qualities alone will not make someone a good friend, a good husband (or wife), or even a good president.

What is lacking? Character. Personal integrity. Quite obviously, in this world of sin, no person is perfect. However, if you are able to recognize true personal integrity in another person, this is far more important than charm, attractiveness and intelligence.

As has been pointed out, Satan is extremely intelligent, and, like an excellent chess player, he might be able to look forward to many possible permutations of moves. However, his foresight is limited. God, on the other hand, knows the end from the beginning (Isa. 46:10). He knows the result of every free will choice that every single person and creature will make. And God has perfect integrity. His character is made up of truth, love, justice and righteousness.

The most intelligent, charming, and personable creature in the universe (apart from God) will now lie to the woman.

Gen 3:4 "You certainly won't die!" the snake told the woman.

Satan also includes Adam in this statement. The word *you* comes from the 2nd person masculine plural, Qal imperfect of the verb *to die*. Literally, what Satan says is, “**Not dying, you [both you and Adam] will [not] die.**” His every word is carefully crafted. He needs for the woman to think in terms of herself and Adam. He wants Adam to make a clear, unadulterated, free will choice against God. Satan is intentionally deceiving the woman; but he needs for Adam to choose against God without being deceived.

Here, Satan denies that there is a relationship between sin—disobeying God—and dying. This carries over today, but in a slightly different form. We are all fallen creatures now. We are born with a sin nature. It is a part of our genetic code. We will all die physically. Today, Satan does not want us to pay attention or to think about the results of sin. “If you are good you go to heaven and if you are bad you go to hell,” is a lie from Satan. When we sin, there are always negative results, but going to hell is not one of them. Faith in Christ eliminates hell (the Lake of Fire) from your future; no believer will be under eternal judgment. However, every believer or unbeliever who sins will have a negative affect upon himself and upon those around him.

Satan is charming; he is incredibly intelligent; and he is the most beautiful creature in the universe. However, as fallen, Satan lacks integrity. He cannot leave Adam and the woman alone; he attacks the woman, the weaker vessel; and he lies to her. If you can think of a person who is extremely intelligent, very attractive and extraordinarily charming—and if this person has lied right to your face—he has looked you straight in the eye, and with great sincerity and charm, has flat out lied to you—told you things which he knew were flat out false—then you have an idea of what Satan is like. You may still like that person. You may be enamored of that person. But without integrity, that person ought not to be your friend, your spouse, your pastor or your political representative at any level. He or she will just use you to get whatever it is that they want.

Gen 3:1 The snake was more clever [= *crafty, insidious, devious, shrewd*] than all the wild animals the LORD God had made. He asked the woman, "Did God really say, 'You [and Adam] must never eat the fruit of any tree in the garden'?"

Although Satan begins by speaking to the woman, he intends for Adam to make a free will choice against God, without being deceived.

Gen 3:2–3 The woman answered the snake, "We're allowed to eat the fruit from any tree in the garden except the tree in the middle of the garden. God said, 'You must never eat it or touch it. If you do, you will die!'"

For whatever reason, the woman has two problems in her understanding here: God never said anything about touching the tree, and God warned her, "Dying, you will die." She both adds to the Word of God and she takes from the Word of God. Here is where Satan sees his opening. He says:

Gen 3:4 "Not dying, you [and Adam] will not die!" the snake told the woman.

The woman recognizes this phrase, except Satan adds the negative. It sounds as if Satan knows what he is talking about, as he uses the verb twice, just as God and Adam had.

Gen 3:5 "God knows that when you eat it your eyes will be opened. You will be like God, knowing good and evil."

Your Bible may read, "You will be like the gods." The word here is 'Ēlôhîym (אֱלֹהִים) [pronounced *el-o-HEEM*], which means *God; gods, foreign gods, god; rulers, judges; superhuman ones, angels*; and it is often transliterated *Elohim*. Strong's #430 BDB #43. This is the exact same word as we found in Gen. 3:1 as well as at the beginning of this verse. At no time in the Bible previous to this is *Elohim* used to mean *gods*. Therefore, we are reasonably speaking about *God* and not about angels or heathen gods. In fact, there is no indication that Adam and Eve know anything about angelic creation.

Even Satan appears to Eve as a lowly snake, not in all of his own beauty. She has no clue as to how beautiful Satan is; nor does she have any clue as to how vicious and evil Satan is. As a serpent, he appears quite harmless to her. After all, she has dominion over the animals.

Lies are far more effective when the truth is mixed in. You cannot tell a story where everything is a lie. You slip in a little truth here and there—particularly truth which the hearer knows about—and interweave that with lies. This tree is called the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. So, whatever good and evil are, this tree is related to that. So, what Satan says here is accurate; when the man and the woman eat of this tree, their eyes will be opened; they will go from innocence to knowing good and evil, as God does. Satan mixes in a little truth with the lies.

One of the things hidden in the Hebrew is, the 2nd person suffixes here are all plural. So that we understand this in the English, we might better understand Satan to say:

Gen 3:5 "God knows that when you [both] eat it your eyes [the eyes of Adam and Eve] will be opened. You will [both] be like God, knowing good and evil."

Satan implants into this woman's brain that she will eat from this tree and then Adam will eat from this tree. This is a psychological ploy to get the woman to think beyond just herself eating from the tree. The entire human race will be affected here. We will all be able to distinguish good and evil. What Satan is saying here is truthful.

Sin is insidious. It takes a little truth and mixes in some lies, and presents it to us. Sin is persistent. Satan has access to a universe so huge that our minds are unable to comprehend its size, yet Satan focuses his energies right here in this garden on earth with the woman who is innocent. Evil cannot just let innocence be.

One of the reasons that child molestation is viewed with such contempt—even by criminals—is, the attack is made against a child who is innocent. It is an affront to our sensibilities. Most everyone can relate back to that time of innocence as a child, and it is particularly heinous to take that away from a child. This is exactly what Satan did to the woman. She was perfectly innocent; he was corrupt; and he corrupted her innocence. If you need to understand how evil this is, think of this as the rape of an innocent child. In essence, that is what Satan is doing. He is going to take away the innocence of this woman.

Gen 3:5 "God knows that when you [both] eat it your eyes [the eyes of Adam and Eve] will be opened. You will [both] be like God, knowing good and evil."

Satan refers to both Adam and the woman, as this will be a choice that they will both make. He is not so much trying to get the woman to offer the fruit to Adam after she eats from the tree (as she will do), but for her to see this as something which she and Adam do as a couple. Satan knows that once the woman eats, Adam will have to eat. His emotions will overwhelm him. He loves this woman more than anything else in the world, and he is not willing to let her go. Adam knows that there is no one else in the world meant for him. He will be willing to join her in disobeying God.

We also have the phrase here, "Your eyes will be opened." The idea is, the woman would have the knowledge that God has. She is not blind, but she is deficient in her knowledge—or so Satan tells her. Eating from the fruit of this tree will give her a greater understanding than she now has; she will be like God, and she and Adam *will be discerners of good and evil* (this is literally what Satan said), *just like God*. This is appealing and it sounds greatly empowering.

Gen 3:6a The woman saw that the tree [had fruit that] was good to eat, pleasant to look at, and desirable for making someone wise.

Now the woman carefully examines the tree. I get the impression that she had never done this before. She has never moved in close to the tree before. The tree was off-limits, whether God told her this or Adam, as her immediate superior. She added to what was told her (or Adam added to what was told him). “Don’t eat of the tree—don’t even touch the tree—or you will die.” It is possible that she and Adam avoided this tree altogether; that they did not go near to it, they did not look at it, and, most of the time, they did not think about it. Now the woman looks at the tree carefully, up close, and she thinks about it. She looks at the fruit of the tree, and it looks good to her. It is clear from looking at it that this fruit would be *good for food* (the exact wording of the Hebrew).

What we find here is actually called a *metonym*. It is one word which stands in for another word. She observes that *the tree [is] good for food*. Now, she is not thinking about taking off a branch and chewing on that branch, she is thinking of the fruit of the tree. *Tree* here is a metonym for the *fruit of the tree*. We find this in literature and common speech all of the time. I mention this because the Bible is filled with figures of speech.

Let me give you some examples of a metonym: when your wife is in a bad mood and you think poetically, you might say, “A pall of gloom was cast over the house.” However, the difficulties have nothing to do with your house, it has to do with the mood of your wife. When a nearby area was about to be annexed and the people did not want to be, a newspaper headline might say, *The City is Up in Arms*. However, the city itself cannot do anything which is organic or thoughtful; it is the *citizens of the city* who are up in arms (another figure of speech). The Bible is filled with common figures of speech, and they are quite easy to recognize. Most people when reading this passage would have in their minds the *fruit of the tree being good for food*, even though the word *fruit* is not found in this verse.

When we read and study the Bible, we get the gist of what is being said by reading it as any other sort of literature. We first interpret a passage, for the most part, according to the common understanding of reading the same thing in some other literary work. We read a common figure of speech as we would in any other form of literature. The Bible was written by men who use figures of speech, and they are found in their writings.

This does not mean that we take a non-literal interpretation of the Bible. We take the Bible and circumstances and words literally, unless there is a reason not to. When the Bible tells us that the woman sees that the *tree is good for food*, without thinking, we understand that she is looking at the *fruit* of the tree and thinking that the *fruit* of the tree is good for food.

Along the same lines, when we study the words of Jesus, there are some things which are clearly parables (in many translations, they might begin with the words *a certain man...*). But, likewise, there are stories which Jesus tells, and some people are given names (e.g., Lazarus in the story of Lazarus and the rich man—in Luke 16:19–31); which story is a recounting of a true experience.

When it comes to interpreting the Bible—even though I believe in a literal interpretation—the way language is normally employed, with figures of speech, must be

taken into account. As a matter of fact, there is a 1000 page book by Bullinger which examines all of the figures of speech found in the Bible (and still misses many of them). The table of contents alone is 25 pages (which lists all the types of figures of speech found in the Bible).

Gen 3:6a The woman saw that the tree [had fruit that] was good for food, pleasant to look at, and desirable for making someone wise.

The woman examines the tree and decides that this fruit is something which is **desirable to the eyes**. Although we would expect an adjective here or the participle of a verb, we get a noun instead, which means *desire, wish, longings of one's heart; lust, appetite, covetousness (bad sense); thing desired, object of desire*. The tree does not just look pleasant; the woman desires this tree. Again, we are not really speaking of the *tree*, but the *fruit of the tree* as well as that which eating the fruit purports to give her.

The third thing which the woman observes is, **the tree was desirable to make one wise**. Literally, it reads: **...and desirable the tree to be wise [insightful, prudent]**. It is not the *tree* which is **desirable to make one wise**, but the act of eating the *fruit of the tree* which is **desirable to make one wise**; again, a metonym.

Let me reveal a secret here: do you know what sorts of people are gullible? Honest people. An honest person means what they say and they tell you is what they believe to be true; and, for this reason, they tend to believe what you say as well. Unless there is good reason not to, an honest person will believe most of what you tell them, until they find it not to be true (or they understand that you have a faulty character). The woman is now thinking about eating from this tree; she has been told that she will not die and that she will be given great insights into life if she eats from the tree. She is believing Satan at this point.

There is a simple pecking order in this world, and God always sets up authorities. The Second Person of the Trinity is the ultimate authority over those on earth. Below Him is Adam. Below Adam is the woman. Below the woman are the animals and all that is on the earth. The serpent, who should be under the woman's authority, tells her that she ought to eat from the fruit of this tree because this would make her as wise as God, which would change up the pecking order. If she is wise as God, she is then in authority over Adam. However, she is considering advice from someone under her who is telling her to do something that her authorities (God and Adam) have told her not to do. There is only one prohibition which the woman has heard, and that has to do with eating from the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. And now her mind is racing, thinking about actually doing this, not considering the prohibitions of the authorities over her, but considering the words of this serpent, who is under her authority.

As a general rule of thumb, if someone under your authority suggests that you disobey someone in authority over you, it is probably a bad idea.

So this is where we will leave the woman, having just had a conversation with Satan, and contemplating eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

Lesson 28: Genesis 3:1–7a

The Fall of Man

Here is where we last left the woman in the garden:

Gen 3:1 The snake was more devious and subtle than all the animals of the field the LORD God had made. He asked the woman, "Did God really say, 'You must never eat the fruit of any tree in the garden?'"

Satan begins his attack on the Word of God by asking a simple question: "You both cannot eat fruit from every tree in the garden?" The implication is, God is being unfair; here are all of these trees right in front of them, and God prohibits them from eating fruit from every tree. *What is God hiding? What is God keeping from you?*

Gen 3:2–3 The woman answered the snake, "We're allowed to eat the fruit from any tree in the garden except the tree in the middle of the garden. God said, 'You must never eat it or touch it. If you do, you will die!'"

In the woman's answer, she both adds to the Word of God and she takes from the Word of God. God did not prohibit her from touching this tree (she added to the Word of God); and God warned the woman that "in dying, you will die" (she took from the Word of God).

Gen 3:4–5: "Emphatically, you will not die!" the snake told the woman. God knows that when you [both] eat it your eyes [the eyes of Adam and Eve] will be opened. You will [both] be like God, knowing good and evil."

Satan not only implants the idea of the woman eating from this tree, but the idea that Adam will eat from the tree as well. Even though he is talking to the woman alone, the serpent makes it clear that eating from this tree will be done by both Adam and the woman.

Now the woman does something which she had not done up until this time—she carefully examines the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. She examines it carefully and she thinks about it.

Gen 3:6a The woman saw that the tree had fruit that was good to eat, pleasant to look at, and desirable for making someone wise. So she took some of the fruit and ate it.

Satan deceived the woman. He convinced her that she would not die and he references the name of the tree, saying that she would be just like God, knowing good and evil. The woman believes that she will achieve some sort of equality with God, knowing good and evil as He does. Therefore, the woman, being deceived, eats the fruit.

Gen 3:6b She also gave some [of the fruit] to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it.

When the woman gives some of the fruit to her husband, Adam sins knowingly. He understood that he was making a choice between Jesus in the garden (the revealed member of the Trinity) or the woman whom he loved. He chose the woman over God. This was not a matter of being deceived; this was a matter of Adam making a clear choice: he chose what God had given him over God. He was choosing to disobey God. Paul wrote, **Adam was not deceived. It was the woman who was deceived and sinned** (1Tim. 2:14).

With this act, man essentially hands rulership of the world over to Satan. The woman thought that this would affect her standing in the world, making her equal with God (and therefore being above Adam, at least for a short time). Authority did change, but not in the way she expected it to.

The Shifting Authority

1. God originally gave man authority over the earth and the animals of the earth. Gen. 1:28: **And God blessed them. And God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth."** Man was to subdue the earth (do whatever he chose to make the earth to his liking); and man had authority over all that was on the earth.
2. When the woman was made, she was second in command to Adam. She was made as a helper to Adam.
3. This gives us a simple hierarchy: God|man|woman|the animals and the earth.
4. However, as we have already studied, the woman submitted to the authority of a creature (the serpent) and then the man submitted to the authority of the woman, both of them disobeying God, Who is their authority (Gen. 3:1–6). The woman submitted to the authority of the serpent, disobeying God; and the man then submitted to the authority of the woman, disobeying God.
5. The end result is, Satan rules over this earth.
 - 1) Jesus says, in John 12:31: **Now is the judgment of this world; now will the ruler of this world be cast out [or, driven out, sent away].**
 - 2) In John 16:8–11, Jesus speaks of sending the Holy Spirit to us: **And when He [God the Holy Spirit] comes, He will convict the world concerning sin and righteousness and judgment: concerning sin, because they do not believe in Me; concerning righteousness, because I go to the Father, and you will see Me no longer; concerning judgment, because the ruler of this world has been judged [in the past with results which continue into the future].**
 - 3) Paul writes the Corinthians, saying: **And even if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled only to those who are perishing. In their case, the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, Who is the image of**

The Shifting Authority

God (2Cor. 4:3–4).

6. This is the reason that we are told on several occasions that we *are in the world, but not of the world* (John 15:19 16:33 17:11–16 1John 2:16 4:4). We as believers are not to submit ourselves to the thinking (and therefore authority) of Satan, who rules over this world.
7. This will change. After the Tribulation, Satan will be put into chains for most of the Millennium. This will be a period of perfect environment during which weapons will be beaten into plowshares because there will be no more war; and the lion will lie down with the lamb (Isa. 2:3–4 11:6–16 65:25 Micah 4:1–7). During this time period, Jesus Christ will reign over the earth from Jerusalem.
8. Satan will be allowed access to the earth once more at the end of the Millennium, at which time he will actually turn the minds and hearts of some against God, even after they have lived in perfect environment under a perfect ruler. Satan will lead a rebellion against Jesus Christ after 1000 years of perfect environment. In the end, Satan and his angels will be thrown into the lake of fire. Rev. 20:1–3, 7–10. This will end Satan's hold over the earth and over man. This should give you an idea as to just how smart Satan is. He will be able to organize a revolution against God with people who are living in perfect environment.

The theological consistency of the Bible is a marvel to behold. How a book on such controversial topics as sin, salvation, God and the Messiah to come could hold together so well, despite the fact that the Bible was written over a period of at least 2000 years by about 40 different authors is an amazing thing to behold.

Gen 3:6 The woman saw that the tree [had fruit that] was good to eat, pleasant to look at, and desirable for making someone wise. So she took some of the fruit and ate it. She also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it.

There is a difference between the sins of Adam and the woman, as 1Tim. 2:14 points out (**Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression**). This difference results in a divergence of the roles of man and woman in human history. The woman sinned because she disobeyed God; however, she was deceived. The man sinned knowingly—he was not deceived or confused. There was no question in his mind about what he was doing. Although their sins were different, the man and the woman were both completely and totally culpable. The difference of their sins will result in a difference of judgment and penalty; however, both the man and the woman sinned, and as God promised both of them, **in dying, they will die**.

One of the chief differences which we will study is, the sin nature will be genetically passed down by the male and not by the female. Affixed to this sin nature is Adam's original sin (we are on the hook, as human beings, as sons of Adam for his sin—that is another topic, but, it is actually a good thing that we all have Adam's original sin imputed to us at birth). The reason for the virgin birth of Jesus Christ is more than simply being a sign (Isa. 7:14); the virgin birth of Jesus Christ is important because, our Lord cannot be born with a sin

nature. He cannot be born with Adam's original sin imputed to Him. The only way for anyone to be born without a sin nature is to be born apart from the contribution of the man. The virgin birth bypasses the contribution from the male. Again, it is the sin nature and Adam's original sin which are passed down through the male because Adam sinned intentionally and knowingly. Jesus Christ must be born of a woman (Gal. 4:4), bypassing Adam altogether, in order to be free of these two things.

Much of human history is wrapped up in Rev. 12:4: **And the tail of the dragon [Satan] drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born.** Satan brought down a 3rd of the angels with him when he sinned, and then he determined to destroy the Child born of a woman the moment He was born.

In Gen. 3:7, we come to the immediate affects of sin on the man and the woman:

Gen 3:7a Then their eyes were opened, and they both kept on knowing that they were naked.

Even though I take the Bible literally, there are times when we understand that we should not take the Bible literally, such as with the first part of v. 7. Adam and the woman were not blind, and we know this because concerning the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, we just read: **the woman observed that it was a delight to the eyes [or, it was pleasant to look at].** (Gen. 3:6). So, obviously, the woman could see. She was not blind. However, the eyes of her soul were opened, and she saw things differently now. She had knowledge of good and evil.

Parents, with every child, enjoy a time of innocence with their child. There is a time period, sometimes for many years, where the parent can shield his or her child from the gross evil of the world. The child knows the love of his parents, of playing, of imagination, of the excitement of each new day. We enjoy the innocence of the child, and, in many ways, share this innocence with the child.

In sin, our eyes are closed in a different way. For many years, we do not understand the gospel of Jesus Christ (no one is born a Christian). Many in Israel, when Jesus came to them, did not know He was the Messiah. Jesus once explained of the Jews who rejected Him, **"Because of this, I speak to them in parables, because seeing they do not see, and hearing they do not hear, nor do they understand. And the prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled on them, which says, In hearing you will hear and in no way understand, and seeing you will see yet in no way perceive. For the heart of this people has grown fat [lazy], and they heard heavily with the ears, and they have closed their eyes, that they not see with the eyes, or hear with the ears, and understand with the heart, and be converted, and I heal them."** (Matt. 13:13 Isa. 6:9–10).

In any case, my original point is, eating from this fruit did not change Adam and the woman from being blind to being able to see; they now were able to perceive the gross evil in the

world, which was outside of their perception before. In fact, they were able to perceive good and evil from this point on.

Gen 3:7a Then their eyes were opened, and they both kept on knowing that they were naked.

Under the original perfect environment, the man and the woman were both naked and comfortable with that. Being naked when one lacks a sin nature is not an issue. They are now making judgments about what is proper and what is not; about what is moral and what is not. Now that they had some understanding of evil and human good, they realize that they are naked, and this concerns them both.

Again, let's go back to the illustration of the parent and the child. During bathing and potty training, nakedness is not an issue between a child and the parent. However, gradually, a child is trained to be covered at all times and that it is normal for his parents to be covered. For Adam and the woman, this is sudden, and it concerns them both immediately. Their solution will be the first act of human good in man's history.

Lesson 29: Genesis 3:4–7

Human Good and Morality

The woman in the garden was approached by the snake, a creature under her authority, and the snake initiated a conversation with her (the snake having been indwelt by Satan). He deceived the woman and made her think that she could instantly increase her knowledge by eating the fruit of the tree which God had forbidden her to eat. She says why she cannot eat from the tree or even touch it (**you will die**), and the snake tells her:

Gen 3:4–5: "Emphatically, **you will not die!**" the snake told the woman. God knows that when you [both] eat it your eyes [the eyes of Adam and Eve] will be opened. You will [both] be like God, knowing good and evil."

Satan wants the woman to eat from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil; but, more importantly, he wants her to offer this fruit to Adam.

There are two underlying aspects to Genesis, both of which are in play here. Genesis is a very subtle book. It does not beat you over the head with this or that truth. Secondly, the seeds of every doctrine of the Bible, pretty much, are found in Genesis.

Here, we have the seeds of several doctrines: the abominable sins of Satan, the character of Satan and the truth of God.

In Prov. 6:16–19, God lists the most abominable sins: **There are six things that the LORD hates, even seven that are disgusting to him: (1) arrogance, (2) a lying tongue, (3) hands that shed innocent blood, (4) a mind that devising wicked plans, (5) feet that are eager to run to evil, (6) a lying witness who gives false testimony, and (7) a person who spreads conflict among friends [literally, brothers].** Remember Satan's first sin? *Arrogance*. "I will

be like the Most High.” *A lying tongue; giving false testimony*: Satan tells the woman “Emphatically, you will not die!” *Feet that are eager to run to evil*: Satan could not leave well enough alone. The universe is larger than we can imagine; the extent of the universe is beyond man’s ability to understand. Yet, in this tiny corner of the universe, Adam and the woman are enjoying the garden, and Satan quickly runs here to do evil. He cannot let them alone. *A mind that devises wicked plans*: Satan has determined that He will impugn the character of God, and He begins by engineering the fall of Adam and the woman.

Secondly, we see the character of Satan in this passage. Notice one of Satan’s sins: he distorts the truth. As Jesus said, “You [referring to the religious types of His era] are of your father the devil, and your will is to do your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning, and has nothing to do with the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks out of his own character, for he is a liar and the father of lies.” (John 8:44).

The character of God is brought out in this. Jehovah is twice called the God of truth in Isa. 65:16. Jesus, speaking to God the Father in prayer, said, “Your Word is truth.” (John 17:17b). And Jesus said, “I am the way, the truth and the life; no one comes to the Father but through Me.”

Are you beginning to see just how much is packed into this book of Genesis (we are only in chapter 3)? Do you see how subtle it is? Furthermore, do you recognize how important the Bible is now? “Your Word is truth.” We have that one source of truth here on earth: the Bible. This is why the Bible far outsells any other book, month after month, year after year. This is why the Bible is attacked and ridiculed as no other book. This is why many nations go so far as to ban the Bible. This is why men fight to remove the Bible from the classroom and to remove any reference to it from the public square. It is God’s truth.

Back to our narrative.

Gen 3:6 The woman saw that the tree had fruit that was good to eat, pleasant to look at, and desirable for making someone wise. So she took some of the fruit and ate it. She also gave some [of the fruit] to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it.

This is what Satan wanted. He never spoke to the man. He never deceived the man. When Adam arrived on the scene, he probably did not even notice the snake, who apparently fell silent when Adam returned to the woman. The man simply looked at the woman, whom he loved, with the forbidden fruit in her hand, and he made a decision wherein he intentionally disobeyed God. The man was not confused or deceived; the choice to him was clear: either the woman whom he loved with all of his heart outside of the garden or Jesus Christ in the garden. Adam made his choice.

Adam took the fruit from the woman’s hand and ate from it.

Gen 3:7 Then their eyes were opened, and they both kept on knowing that they were naked. Therefore, they sewed fig leaves together and made a covering [or, belt, loin-cloth, kilt] for themselves.

As discussed last time, the man and the woman were not blind; they were simply unaware of good and evil. For the first time, they can see good and evil in the world around them.

Adam and the woman have a solution: they cover themselves with fig leaves. This is the first act of human good. This is not an act of sinfulness; it is an act of good; but it is meaningless insofar as the plan of God is concerned (which is why it is called human good). All acts of good which are outside of the plan of God are designated as human good. All acts of good outside of the plan of God, although they impact human history, have no permanence in the plan of God.

A lot of believers really have no idea what human good is or what it is all about.

The Doctrine of Human Good

1. Human good is the good that unbelievers do and the good that believers do when not filled with the Holy Spirit.
 - 1) This can include some of the great works of philanthropy. In some cases, the glorification of man is obvious. *60 Minutes* often does segments on rich people who give their money away to various philanthropic causes. One such segment had one of these men putting his name to various buildings to immortalize his own philanthropy.¹
 - 2) Believers do the same thing. Believers who are not filled with the Spirit or do not know how to be filled with the Spirit often do good things, like giving to the church, working in a soup kitchen, seeing a touching cause on television and sending in money. These are all good things, but not eternal in the plan of God. 1Cor. 3:10–15
2. Because human good is dead within the plan of God; it is called dead works in Heb. 6:1.
3. All human good is repulsive to God. God does not appreciate, accept, encourage or condone human good. Isa. 64:6 (**All of our righteousness acts are as filthy rags in His sight**) Gen. 4:4
4. Human good has no value in the plan of God. 2Tim. 1:9: **Our Lord saved us and called us to a holy calling, not because of our works but because of His own purpose and grace, which He gave us in Christ Jesus before the ages began.**
5. Human good is not the same as legitimate morality under the Laws of Divine Establishment. Rom. 13:1–7
 - 1) A society must be moral in order to survive.
 - 2) A society which is immoral but filled with human good could easily self-destruct. This describes a significant portion of the culture of the United States today.
6. No amount of good works (human good) will save man. Titus 3:5 Eph. 2:8–9
7. at the Judgment Seat of Christ, the human good of believer will be both revealed

The Doctrine of Human Good

- and destroyed. 1Cor.3:10–16
8. In the final judgement of Rev. 20:12–15 (which is not the same as the Judgment Seat of Christ), the basis of the indictment against unbelievers will be human good. Sin has been paid for on the cross, which means that God does not punish the unbeliever for his sins. Just as it would violate God's justice to ignore sin, it would also violate His justice to judge sin twice. The only sin in play, is the sin of rejecting Jesus Christ as Savior. John 3:36 Rom. 2:6–8
 9. The production of human good will not save man. Eph. 2:8–9 Titus 3:5
 10. Human good often results in human glorification. Rom. 4:2 Eph. 2:9
 11. Human good is the good the believer produces when he is not filled with the Spirit. This can include things that believers associate with divine good, e.g., giving money to a church, visiting the sick, missionary activity, etc. If you are not filled with the Holy Spirit, then whatever you do will not have eternal impact, but it will be burned at the Judgment Seat of Christ. 1Cor. 3:11–16
 12. Human good is also the good which unbelievers produce. This may include any of the activities listed above (unbelievers do go to church) or things like, picking up a piece of trash, buying compact fluorescent bulbs for your house to save the environment, being nice to someone they do not like, etc.
 13. We believers remain on this earth, after salvation, to produce divine good, which glorifies God and is represented by *gold, silver and precious stones* in 1Cor. 3:12. Eph. 2:10

¹ <http://www.cbsnews.com/video/watch/?id=7363716n>

See also <http://www.versebyverse.org/doctrine/humangood.html> which doctrine was originally taught by R. B. Thieme Jr.

<http://www.gracedoctrine.org/word/Doctrines/humangood.htm>

<http://www.gbible.org/files/pdf/022700.pdf>

You will notice the focus of this act of human good in Gen. 3:7: the man and the woman are trying to resolve the differences between themselves, but without a thought to God. There are many atheists who think in exactly this way. One argument which I have heard on several occasions from different atheists is, *if my acts of morality are no different from the moral acts of a Christian, then why do I need a Bible or a God to tell me what to do?* This argument works in their minds because they think like Adam and the woman after they sinned: “We are naked; we can look at each other and tell that; therefore, we need to solve the immorality of this nakedness problem and things will be okay.” This is how the natural man thinks—resolve human conflict, resolve human problems, fix the interaction between people, and that will solve everything. However, the true conflict and the real problem is the lack of peace between man and God; not between man and man. In a world of sin, we will never fully resolve conflicts between men. We are at enmity with God. We will never achieve complete morality between people.

This is one of the reasons that we have so many human solutions out there: preserve the environment, at all costs; or restore the environment to what we believe it should be. When man's iniquity seems to be too great, take from those with too much and give to

those with too little. It is impossible for society to function without government guiding and controlling its direction; we need an overall body to control and manage the affairs of man and business. It is fair to make certain that every man receives the same as his brother. Private property is wrong. Private property is good. Large corporations are, by their very nature, evil. Large corporations are the key to a nation's success. The only sure way to peace is for all countries to disarm, and for the United States to lead the way. The only sure way to peace is to be armed to the teeth. Surely you have heard of many of these ideas and solutions, and none of them truly involve God. Now, some may make reference to God. There are churches which tout economic and social justice, for instance, and teach that Jesus did the same thing (He did not). There are environmentalists who say, "God gave us this planet, and it is our responsibility to keep it as pristine as possible." God did originally put the earth under man's authority, and man passed this authority over to Satan. In any case, the ideas herein described are systems of human good. There is nothing wrong about having clean air to breathe or clean water to swim or fish in. This does not mean that it is wrong for a person with money to give to those who are in need. However, these things are not to be our focus. These different ideas—some good, some bad, some taken to an extreme—are the modern-day equivalent of sewing fig leaves together to cover ourselves. They are man trying to solve man's problems with man's solutions.

I have mentioned both morality and human good. These concepts are not the same. Therefore, before we go any further, let's look at the concept of human morality.

The Doctrine of Morality

1. One of the areas of confusion for believers is the concept of morality. Many believers and unbelievers think that morality is the spiritual life. You first get saved and then you start acting moral. However, the Christian way of life is growing **in grace and the knowledge of Jesus Christ** (2Peter 3:18). As a new believer, you must first learn how to get back into fellowship (after you sin, you name that sin to God; or, after you commit a variety of sins, you name them to God—1John 1:9). At the point of salvation, we are given the grace assets by which we may grow spiritually (a human spirit, the filling of the Holy Spirit, and the ability to understand, categorize and store doctrine). As we begin to grow spiritually, we will begin producing divine good, which is not the same as human good and is not the same as human morality.
2. God designed morality for the human race as morality protects and perpetuates the human race.
3. God has ordained 5 divine institutions: the individual person (or soul), employment, marriage, family and nation. There is a moral code for each of these divine institutions. These are institutions which will continually be under satanic attack.
4. Take marriage, for instance: infidelity, spousal abuse, lack of commitment are acts or attitudes which destroy a marriage, and, in turn, impact a family (if there are children involved; and divorce within a family often affect the siblings of those who divorced¹). The result could be the dissolution of the marriage, and children

The Doctrine of Morality

raised by a single parent are much more likely to be involved in drugs, underage drinking, teen pregnancy and crime, all of which negatively impact the nation. This is applicable to believer and unbeliever alike. The family is the key to the stability of a national entity; destroy the family and it will destroy the nation from within.

5. Commandments 4–10 of the Ten Commandments (found in Ex. 20) are an example of a basic moral code, which can be applied to believers and unbelievers alike in any nation. This is why it is appropriate to have the Ten Commandments displayed in any courtroom and classroom.
 - 1) Commandment 4: **Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days you will labor, and do all your work; but the seventh day is a Sabbath to Yahweh your God: you will not do any work.** Although the Sabbath was given to the Jews of Israel specifically, there are aspects of it which are important to all men. Man needs a day off; he needs to recharge his batteries. Ideally speaking, man ought to turn toward God as well on a regular basis. Because creation is fundamental to all mankind, the 7-day work week is a part of almost every culture. Interestingly enough, providing more and more time off does not make a people any happier (as has been shown in Europe).
 - 2) Commandment 5: **Honor your father and your mother, that your days may be long in the land which Yahweh your God gives you.** Again, even though this was specifically given to the Jews of Israel (this prepared them for establishing the nation Israel), this commandment is fundamental to all societies. A child may have some pretty lousy parents, but even lousy parents tend to have more wisdom than their own children. A child who listens to and obeys his parents is going to be a happier, more well-adjusted child, and society will benefit from this. Furthermore, in most cases a normal parent wants to raise his own children well.
 - (1) This concept is constantly under satanic attack. Some examples are:
 - (2) The anti-capitalism, pro-socialism indoctrination which has found its way into our public school system.
 - (3) Politicians, political activists, and propagandists often appeal to children, suggesting that they are wiser than their parents and know things which their parents do not.²
 - (4) Schools are continually introducing materials into the youngest grades possible which are contrary to the concept of family.³
 - 3) Commandment 6: **You will not murder.** The Bible is very clear on the sin of murder; this is not the same as executing a criminal nor is this the same as killing in war (also covered in the book of Exodus). This is intentional murder of another person, whether done during a crime or to eliminate this person from your life. You remove this person from this life when you murder them, which is the first divine institution. A society cannot be run by vigilantes or by criminal organizations. When using the oft-quoted

The Doctrine of Morality

- phrase **An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth**, the Bible is referencing a system of organized justice, and not justifying vigilantism.
- 4) Commandment 7: **You will not commit adultery**. The 2nd divine institution, marriage, must be protected. It does not matter that a male's normal inclination is *to wander*; there are boundaries to the institution of marriage, and sexual fidelity is a fundamental boundary.
 - 5) Commandment 8: **You will not steal**. Men (and women) are allowed to accumulate wealth, possessions and land. This commandment protects property rights. Individuals should not steal from others nor should the government steal from its citizens.
 - 6) Commandment 9: **You will not bear false witness against your fellow man**. You do not lie about someone else. Lying, as we have seen, is what led man to sin.
 - 7) Commandment 10: **Never desire to take your neighbor's household away from him. Never desire to take your neighbor's wife, his male or female slave, his ox, his donkey, or anything else that belongs to him**. Having an intense desire for the things which belong to your neighbor is a sin which plagues mankind, and today, in the United States, this is rampant. Some people actually believe that they have the right to determine how much income is too much and how this income ought to be used. At this point in time (2009), it is this very sin which threatens to undo the economy of the United States. Rather than being satisfied with what he has, Charlie Brown thinks that it is the government's job to take a large chunk of hedge-fund trader Lucy's wealth and to properly distribute it to those who deserve it (this is called *redistribution of wealth, spreading the wealth around, or economic justice*). What is most disconcerting is, there are actually churches which teach this.
6. A nation depends upon its citizenry as a whole to exhibit some reasonable amount of morality. If murder, stealing, and lying are rampant, that nation will destroy itself from within. A nation cannot simply survive based upon Christians alone exhibiting morality (however, mature believers in a nation will positively impact that nation).
 7. The unbeliever who goes from immorality to morality will have a better life, and sometimes people are confused by this. Let me explain: a person may become a Jehovah Witness, a scientologist or a Buddhist, and their lives may improve, and their family and friends must grudgingly admit their lives have improved. It is not because these organizations are good organizations; it is because the person involved is now engaging in moral behavior rather than immoral behavior.
 8. In the end, morality will make for better volitional choices, a better family life, and a more stable nation, but morality will not save. No one is moral enough to be saved. Luke 18:18–23 Titus 3:5 Eph. 2:8–9

The Bible also speaks to the care and provision of the *helpless* and the Bible speaks of legitimate taxation in both the Old and New Testaments. All of this must be taken in balance.

¹ Statistically, there is a greater chance for a couple to divorce if one of their siblings has also divorced.

² Two examples of many: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XhCobR5QI_k
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RbXxFUjDMiE>

³ <http://takeyourkidsoutofpublicschool.com/2009/06/and-tango-makes-three-%E2%80%93-a-long-way-from-dick-and-jane/>

Therefore, a nation ought to be moral and a nation must establish law within its borders, as the human race is preserved (and even protected from itself) by laws and morality. However, the ultimate conflict, since the fall of man, is between man and God. Nothing is quite right until this conflict is resolved. The key is first to resolve man's sinfulness before God.

Let me give you an example of how human good is used to attack morality, to better help you distinguish between the two. Communism is a form of human good. It strives to guide and direct an economy and its own population so that there is economic justice (this is a term developed by liberation theology, designed to distort the Bible and to promote socialism). Communism strives to reduce the inequities between men. Communism attacks and destroys human volition. Those who are not on board with a nation embracing communism are sent to reeducation camps or put in places where it is difficult to live. Often, intellectuals, recalcitrants and religious types are killed, jailed, isolated and/or reeducated. Communism is responsible for the deaths of more people than any other system in mankind's history—and these are the deaths of their own citizens. Communism will persecute and imprison those who evangelize, as that is illegal in most communist countries. The Bible is not freely distributed in communist countries, it has to be smuggled in. A person standing on a street corner handing out free Bibles would be arrested in a communist country.⁵ Communism, a form of human good, attacks volition, which morality seeks to preserve.

Usually, the attacks of human good are far more subtle. For instance, sex education belongs within the family unit. Even though explaining the bird and the bees to one's own child could potentially be the most embarrassing thing a parent can do with their own child, it is also potentially a rewarding experience, for both the parent and the child. The child learns about sex in the context of his own family, as related to his own person (as the child is a result of the sexual union—an act of love—between his two parents). When parents abdicate this responsibility to the school system, they remove sex from morality and from its familial context. In the end, the human good solution of sex education in our schools attacks both marriage and the family unit.

⁵ Even in the United States, a person can be arrested for reading the Bible out loud to people waiting in line for the DMV: <http://www.theblaze.com/stories/man-arrested-outside-calif-dmv-for-reading-his-bible-out-loud/>

Let me give you another example of human good in the United States. We are mandated, in the United States, by the year 2014, to use compact fluorescent bulbs within our homes (I believe that incandescent bulbs will be no longer sold). These bulbs each contain 5 mg of mercury, enough to contaminate 6000 gallons of water. Those in Congress who favored this, believe that they are doing good. This is human good. In their minds, they are saving the environment. That is debatable. However, what they are introducing into millions of homes will be a toxin which can attack the brain, lungs and kidneys of those in the house exposed to mercury (if the bulb is broken at any time). Children and pregnant women are particularly susceptible to mercury poisoning. Again, this act of human good, where there was no malice intended, could result in harming a person's volition (if that person dies or suffers physical debilitation) or that person's family. Again, another example of where human good attacks what morality is intended to preserve. In a parallel universe, the exact same Congress would have voted to outright ban compact fluorescent bulbs, due to their toxicity.

Lesson 30: Genesis 3:6–7

How the Spiritual Impacts a Nation

Last time, we examined the doctrines of human good and morality, and how this is related to a national entity. Morality preserves a nation; human good does not. We got into this topic because the first act of Adam and the woman was an act of human good and morality both.

Gen 3:6–7 The woman saw that the tree had fruit that was good to eat, pleasant to look at, and desirable for making someone wise. So she took some of the fruit and ate it. She also gave some [of the fruit] to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it. Then their eyes were opened, and they both kept on knowing that they were naked. Therefore, they sewed fig leaves together and made a covering [or, *belt, loin-cloth, kilt*] for themselves.

There is no thought of God. The man and the woman have both just disobeyed God, and now they are standing there, looking at one another, and it simultaneously occurs to them that they are naked. They decide to solve this problem by covering themselves up. They are not concerned about what God thinks, or what God might do. Their thinking is strictly about solving the problems between one another, which is one form of human good.

Last time, we distinguished between human good and morality. Morality is essential for the preservation of a nation. The laws of a nation encapsulate the morality of the nation, and these laws enforce morality. A nation where morality is not enforced becomes degenerate and a nation where a false morality is imposed becomes oppressive.

What is most important to a nation is the number of believers in that nation and their spiritual growth. We find historical proof of this all around us. What is the greatest nation in the world and where in the world is the best place to live? The United States. This is because there are more believers per capita in the United States than anywhere else in the world. There is more Bible teaching in the United States than anywhere else. There are more missionaries which go out of the United States than anywhere else. Now, where would be the worse place in the world to live? In Arab nations where Christianity is illegal;

or in Communist nations where Christianity is illegal or strictly controlled (where proselytizing is illegal). We have thousands of people who will hop on anything which floats and risk their lives to go from what could potentially be an island paradise in Cuba and float to the United States. We do not have any reverse traffic. Even though Michael Moore did a film touting the medical system in Cuba, he did not renounce his American citizenship and move to Cuba. We had a handful of Congressmen go to Cuba this past year (2009) and praise Fidel Castro, whom they met personally; yet not one of them looked into the possibility of moving to Cuba permanently.

Now, you may have formed a counter-argument in your mind, and you are thinking, *what about Mexico? Mexicans flock to America in droves, yet isn't Mexico as Christian as the United States?* It is not. In this Bible study, I have avoided the discussion of various branches of *Christianity*, and for the most part, I will continue to do so. However, Satan can disguise himself as an angel of light and there are those who present themselves as apostles of Christ, yet are not. 2Cor. 11:13–15 speaks of false teachers in the church: **For such ones are false apostles, deceitful workers transforming themselves into apostles of Christ. And did not Satan marvelously transform himself into an angel of light? It is not a dramatic thing, then, if also his ministers transform themselves into ministers of righteousness, whose end will be according to their works.**

There are two places at which Satan attempts to attack mankind: he first wants to blind us to the gospel and he secondly wants to destroy the spiritual life of—and therefore the spiritual impact of—the believer in time (2Cor. 4:4 11:13–15 1John 1:8–10). Catholicism contributes to both of these attacks.

If you ask the average Catholic how to be saved, he or she is going to give you a lengthy list of things which must be done (believing in Christ, being baptized, joining the Catholic church, partaking in Communion). There are a few Catholics who are more or less squared away in this area, and they will tell you that all you need to do is to believe in Jesus Christ. A Catholic who believes that they are saved by faith alone in Christ alone is saved; but not all Catholics believe this (to be fair, neither do some Protestant groups, who disparagingly call this *easy-believism*). Our salvation is based upon Christ's work on the cross, not upon our own works. Faith is a non-meritorious system of perception. Everyone has faith. Everyone has a set of things in which they believe. In fact, it is estimated that 70–95% of everything we know is based upon faith. The other two systems of perception—empiricism and rationalism—require experiences and thinking, and are therefore, meritorious systems of perception. We simply choose to believe in this or to not believe in that. So, our contribution toward our own salvation is nothing, as faith requires absolutely no effort on our part and no inherent good can be attributed to us because we have faith. So, when we believe that Jesus died for our sins, our Lord has done 100% of the work and we are depending 100% upon His work.

No matter what a person has done, no matter how they were brought up, no matter what church they go to or do not go to, if they exercise faith alone in Christ alone, they are saved. Therefore, there are saved Catholics, and there are some Catholic churches which (presumably) teach the gospel moderately well. However, many Catholic churches throw

in all of the sacraments and tie this to salvation, and *that* is Satanic. A priest or bishop who teaches that salvation requires anything more than faith alone in Christ alone is an apostle of Satan and an apostle of deceit, who presents himself as an apostle of light (regardless of the denomination).

The Catholic also believes in what is called *infused grace* rather than *imputed grace* (although most Catholics and Protestants are unaware of these terms, even though these terms are fundamental in defining the difference between these two groups). To the Catholic, a person who has truly believed in Jesus Christ will join the Catholic Church; they will go to Mass and to Confession; they will be baptized. Faith in Christ, according to many Catholics, will result in an *infusion* of the Christ-nature. In other words, the true Christian will exhibit Christian behavior (some Protestants believe this as well). If you suggest that someone can believe in Christ and then go out and murder and commit adultery, bestiality or any other sexual sin you can imagine; and cheat and lie in business, this will not compute in the mind of the Catholic. They cannot separate Christian faith from the actions of the believer, even if they themselves are guilty of these sins. As a result, people can be raised in the Catholic Church from age 0 up and yet never exercise faith alone in Christ alone for their salvation. They learn to be moral but they never exercise faith alone in Christ alone. They have built their house upon sand, and it will not endure. Even if a person is a devout Catholic all of their lives, but never exercises faith alone in Christ alone, they are not saved and they will spend eternity in the Lake of Fire. Jesus will say, “**I never knew you.**”

To put it in a different way, you can be raised from birth to be a Catholic, a Muslim, a Buddhist or a Jew; but you cannot be raised from birth as a Christian. Every person must make for themselves a decision to believe in Christ, and this decision can occur at the earliest sometimes between ages 4 and 6; and as late as on one’s deathbed—but no one is saved unless they exercise faith alone in Christ alone.

And so that there is no misunderstanding, anyone can believe in Jesus Christ. They can be Catholic, Muslim, Buddhist or of the Jewish faith—if they, at any point in their lives, exercise faith alone in Christ alone, they are eternally saved at that point, no matter what. They might even return to their false religion, but they are still saved. **If we** [believers in Jesus Christ; Paul was a believer writing to Timothy, who was a believer] **are faithless, He remains faithful, for He cannot deny Himself** (2Tim. 2:13). Our salvation rests upon what Christ did, not upon anything which we do. Once we have been saved, God cannot go back and change His mind about us, because **He cannot deny Himself**.

The second problem with the Catholic Church lines up with Satan’s attack on believers: the Catholic Church (and many other churches, for that matter) neutralize the believer’s impact in this life; it neutralizes the Christian’s daily walk, which is what Satan wants. If Satan cannot blind a person to the gospel, then he desires that the individual believer has absolutely no spiritual impact. Some people do attend Catholic churches all of their lives and yet they still believe in Jesus Christ, and the faith they exercise is conscious and directed toward only Christ. However, the Catholic Church then attacks their Christian life. The end result—and again, let me emphasize this applies to many *Protestant Christian*

churches as well, not just to Catholic churches—is we have believers who are stunted in spiritual growth and in spiritual production. Believers become moral and they learn to hide the parts of their personality which those in the church would not like, but they do not grow spiritually and they do not produce divine good.

There are two things a believer needs to learn after salvation: (1) when we get out of fellowship by sinning, we can only get back into fellowship by naming our sins to God (silently and apart from the church or clergy or anything else). **If we acknowledge our sins [to God], He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness** (1John 1:9). This takes us from being out of fellowship to being in fellowship; from quenching or grieving the Spirit to being filled with the Spirit. No man is able to forgive sins, so we do not go to a priest now and again to ask for forgiveness of sins (or for a list of things we must do or feel in order to be forgiven of our sins). A believer who is out of fellowship for all of his life has absolutely no contribution to the plan of God. If you think that your sins are forgiven by going to a priest, and then by doing a series of acts of contrition afterwards, then you are never back in fellowship, which means you have no spiritual impact whatsoever (which is Satan's goal). (2) Secondly, we grow in grace and knowledge of the Word of God (2Peter 3:18). If the Bible is taught incorrectly (or not taught at all) and if believers think that they must confess their sins to a priest in order to be forgiven, then the function of the growth of believers in the church is short-circuited because no one is in fellowship or learning the Word of God (you cannot learn the Word of God if you are not in fellowship). This is every bit as evil as taking a child at age 3 and locking him in a closet until age 10. He will emerge permanently undeveloped with limited mental facilities (these are called wild children). Doing such a thing to a child is the epitome of evil. The Catholic church does this to those who believe in Jesus. It stunts their spiritual growth, substituting for it, morality and rituals. Again, to be fair, many Protestant churches today, do exactly the same thing. The end result is, a congregation of people who are generally moral (which is a good thing to the nation), but who have absolutely no spiritual impact (which is bad for a nation).

How is this bad? In one generation—overnight, insofar as a nation is concerned—you can raise up a generation of children who do not believe in Jesus Christ. You can have on your hands one complete generation of those who have not placed their trust in Christ, and this dramatically changes the character of a nation, virtually overnight.

The key to a nation's prosperity is: (1) people are evangelized accurately and without legal restrictions, and that many of them respond to this evangelization. (2) Churches accurately teach the Word of God and teach it often (daily is best way for doctrine to be learned; no one can learn the Christian life by going to church once a week). (3) A nation sends out missionaries who accurately teach the gospel. (4) Also, a nation's relationship to the Jews in its own land and to Jews elsewhere (including the nation Israel) is a factor. Even though many Jews are unbelievers, they are still God's people and God will use them in the end times. No nation should promote anti-Semitism in any form (e.g., teach that there are great world-wide conspiracies controlled by Jews; or that there is some sort of moral equivalency between the nation Israel and the Palestinians). The more closely a nation follows these 4 principles, the greater God will bless that nation. In the United States, there are tens of

thousands of churches which correctly present the gospel of Jesus Christ. There are thousands of missionaries sent out which properly teach the gospel of Jesus Christ. There are many churches which teach the spiritual life in the United States. We also have, in general, a good attitude toward the Jews and toward the nation Israel. It is this relationship between man and God which is the key to the great success of the United States. The more people who see their relationship with God as being the most important aspect of their lives, the better off a nation is. People who look first to solving the fundamental problem between man and God; rather than making vain attempts to solve problems between men, preserve a nation. Adam and the woman looked to solve problems between one another. God was not in their thinking.

What about a Muslim nation where their relationship with God is foremost? The problem here is, they have developed a relationship with Satan, and not with God. Jesus Christ said, **"I am the way, the truth and the life; no man comes to the Father but through Me."** (John 14:6). Being a religious nation is not the same as being a nation where many or most of the people believe in Jesus Christ. Again, there are problems with any nation where its focus is on anything rather than Jesus Christ. A nation which places its hope in a man (Buddha, Mohammed, its president or prime minister) or in some system of government (socialism or communism), that nation will never be great and prosperous. In Europe, the governments tax a great deal, but they provide quite a safety net for their people, in terms of medical benefits, unemployment and sustenance. However, the happiness rate of these people, determined simply by asking them if they are happy or satisfied with their lives, is much lower than it is in, say, the United States. Their problem is, they are focused on solving problems which exist between men, just as Adam and the woman focused on solving the problems between one another. This approach solves nothing.

I realize that I have gone far afield here, but let me remind you of where we started and how we got here: the key to human interaction is not solving moral problems between people but breaking down the wall of enmity between man and God. To illustrate the importance of man first dealing with his relationship to God, I used the United States. We live in the greatest nation at any period of time because we were founded as a nation based upon man's relationship to God; and the United States continues to be a great nation because many people in the United States see their relationship to God as being their most fundamental relationship. For this reason, God has greatly blessed the United States.

Adam and the woman looked at each other and decided that, in order to solve their problems, they needed to adjust to one another, which they did by wearing fig leaves. However, the key to our problems and solving them is our relationship with God, not with each other. Putting on fig leaves, an act of human good, did not improve anything between Adam and the woman.

Then, because it is a related topic, we needed to examine morality. Adam and the woman were fixing a moral problem with an act of human good and morality (human good and morality can overlap and they can be in opposition to one another). Therefore, we

examined human good and then we examined morality, which are different things. Also, related to this was, morality is important to preserve the divine institutions. Human good can be quite problematic, but morality is important to a nation; yet morality is not the Christian way of life.

Then we took this one step further, and looked at nations. The people of a nation can be first concerned with their relationship to God or they can be concerned primarily with the relationship between one another. We can see the end results of this focus by observing nations where evangelism and Christian growth are an inherent part of that nation; and then comparing them to nations where Christianity is outlawed or carefully moderated or strictly controlled by the government.

Because we went down this road, I had to differentiate between *Christian* religions, some of which distort the gospel and distort the spiritual life and some of which do not. This explains why, for instance, life is so good in the United States and yet so bleak in Mexico (as an example). It should be even more obvious when we compare the United States to Communist or socialist nations, which are at enmity with the Word of God (to various degrees) and to Muslim nations, where Satan is worshiped.

Adam and the woman's problem was not that they were both naked; their problem was, that they had disobeyed the Word of God. Their problem was not with each other, but with God. The solution to their problem was not putting on fig leaves to cover themselves, but they would have to look to God to solve this problem.

Lesson 31: Genesis 3:6–11 God Comes into the Garden after the Fall of Man

We last left Adam and the woman in the garden. The woman had been deceived by Satan (the serpent), and she took of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil and ate that fruit. Her sin was real and permanent, but her sin was a result of her being deceived. However, Adam, when he returned from work to the woman, was not deceived. The woman simply handed him the fruit and he ate the fruit which God had forbidden him to eat. His sin was one of cognizance. He clearly understood that he was disobeying God in order to stay with the woman, whom he loved. Adam could reasonably say, "There is no one else for me on this entire earth."

Gen 3:6 The woman saw that the tree had fruit that was good to eat, pleasant to look at, and desirable for making one wise. So she took some of the fruit and ate it. She also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it.

The first act of the man and woman was an act of human good because of a perceived moral problem, as they now have a knowledge of good and evil. So, they covered up their nakedness with fig leaves.

Gen 3:7 Then their eyes were opened, and they both kept on knowing that they were naked. Therefore, they sewed fig leaves together and made a covering [or, *belt, loin-cloth, kilt*] for themselves.

The response of the man and the woman to this situation was to try to improve things between one another. They gave no thought to God. Neither one said, "We have disobeyed Jehovah Elohim; what shall we do?" Their first thought was to each other and their nakedness, and how that problem ought to be resolved.

Interestingly enough, the man and the woman had the wherewithal to sew together fig leaves. I have suggested previously that not only were these two geniuses, but that they probably had developed tools to work with. In a very short amount of time, they figured out a way to attach the leaves together and to attach these leaves to their own bodies.

Adam and the woman had souls, but they did not have human spirits anymore. They had been warned, "In dying, you will die." The death which they experienced immediately was spiritual death. What separates man from animals is the soul. It is the soul which allows for us think and to relate to one another. Man's soul is made up of his mentality, memory, vocabulary, emotion, conscience (norms and standards), volition and self-consciousness. The study of wild children reveals to us that soul development can be permanently arrested by limiting the stimulation of the soul throughout the developing years.

The human spirit is that immaterial part of man which allows man to interact with God. Adam and the woman had their human spirits shut down when they ate the fruit. Therefore, they gave no thought to God.

Gen 3:8 In the cool [literally, *in the spirit*] of the evening, the man and his woman heard the LORD God [Y^ehowah Elohim] walking around in the garden. So they hid from the LORD God among the trees in the garden.

We need to look at the Trinity again. There is God the Father, Who planned everything. He designed us, and these blueprints of His design are our genetic code (just as you may have blueprints to your house in the attic, we carry around the blueprints for us in most of the cells of our body). God the Father is a Spirit and He must be worshiped by means of the filling of the Spirit and in the truth of the Word of God (John 4:24). We are unable to see God the Father (John 1:18 6:46). The 3rd member of the Trinity is God the Holy Spirit, Who provides the power, the energy, the life for all things. The Holy Spirit does not speak from Himself but according to the plan of God (John 16:13). The second member of the Trinity is God the Son, the *revealed* member of the Trinity. Throughout the Old Testament, God will appear to various people in a variety of ways. These are called *theophanies*. It is He Who will be born of the woman. So, the LORD God here (Y^ehowah Elohim) is the 2nd person of the Trinity. **Long ago, at many times and in many ways, God spoke to our fathers by the prophets, but in these last days He has spoken to us by His Son, whom He [God the Father, the Planner] appointed the Heir of all things, through [= by means of] Whom also He created the world. He [Jesus Christ] is the radiance of the glory of God [i.e., the essence and character of God] and the exact imprint of His nature [Jesus Christ**

is God], and He upholds the universe by the word of His power. After making purification for sins, He sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high (Heb. 1:1–3).

Most often when we find the name *Y^ehowah Elohim* in the Old Testament, we are referring to the revealed member of the Trinity. Whatever form God chooses to take—whether a burning bush, a cloud, or a form similar to ours—this form is called a *theophany*. In the New Testament, there will be no more theophanies, because He reveals Himself as Jesus Christ. This is a true metamorphism. God the Son will undergo an actual change in becoming the God-man. At this point in human history, God the Son does not simply take the form of a man—as a temporary manifestation—but He actually becomes man, born of a woman, the Seed of the woman, Who will crush the head of Satan (Gen. 3:15). **In the fullness of time, God sent forth His Son, having come into being out from a woman** (Gal. 4:4a).

Properly, in the Old Testament, when God makes Himself known to this or that person, this is *Jehovah Elohim*, the 2nd person of the Trinity. *How* He reveals Himself is a temporary physical manifestation. However, when Jesus is born of a woman, this will reflect a real and eternal change. This is God the Son's eternal form from this point in history on. There is no need to sing the song, [What if God was one of us](#); He is one of us. God the Son entered into human history—He entered into time—and was eternally changed by becoming man.

Gen 3:8a In the cool [literally, *spiritual*] of the day, the man and his woman heard the LORD God walking around in the garden.

Now Jesus Christ (Jehovah Elohim) came to Adam and the woman every day in the *cool* of the day, to teach them Bible doctrine. The word that most Bibles translate as *cool* is *rûwach* (רוּחַ) [pronounced *ROO-ahkh*], which means *wind, breath, spirit, apparition*. Strong's #7307 BDB #924. We have found this word once already in the book of Genesis, back in Gen. 1:2: **The earth was without form and void, and darkness was over the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters.**

Adam and the woman did not think about God or talk about God after they sinned. They sinned and the first thing they did was cover themselves with fig leaves, an act of human good and human morality. They do not say to one another, “What will we say when Y^ehowah comes into the garden? How will we explain this to Him?” God had warned them, **“In dying, you will die.”** When they ate of the forbidden fruit, they immediately died spiritually. They looked at one another and tried to solve that problem of nakedness, but they did not think about God. They each had a human soul, so that they could relate to one another, but their human spirits had been shut down.

Y^ehowah coming to them during the *spirit of the day* was, apparently, a daily occurrence. We learn two things by this. There is a time daily in which we ought to commune with God. That is, there is time which ought to be devoted in each day to the study of God's Word. I studied the Bible an hour a day for about 25 years and I have studied the Bible for 2–4 hours a day for the past 5 years, and have come to realize that there is so much more for

me to learn. The Bible is not a book which can be mastered after 10 years of intense study.

The second thing that we learn from this verse is, we have time off as well. It is important for us to know what God has for us to learn; but God also gives us free time; He lets us have recess. There is a balance in our lives. In fact, we have far more time off than we have time where we are to have fellowship with God through His Word. I mentioned that I study the Bible from 2–4 hours daily. That is not normal and that is not expected of every believer in Jesus Christ. Certain believers with specific gifts might spend that time or even longer studying the Word (R. B. Thieme Jr. used to claim to study 10–12 hours a day and the quality of his teaching reflected this).

Notice how the time in their day was spent: Adam was off working in the garden and the woman was in the garden (on this day, being deceived by the serpent). Adam returns—there is no indication that the woman went to find him—and the woman hands him the fruit. Adam understands that eating this fruit is disobedience to God, and he eats the fruit, and they both enter into a fallen state. Then Y^ehowah comes walking in the garden. Much of this narrative suggests that there was an order in which things were done each day: Adam worked, the woman hung out with the animals, and then Adam returned from work; and then Jehovah came to them during the *spirit of the day*, which would be when He would teach them the Word of God. Obviously, whatever the 2nd member of the Trinity said to them during the spiritual part of the day would be truth, which is equivalent to Bible teaching today. We do not know what was taught, although we can surmise that God taught Adam and the woman at least 3 sets of doctrines: (1) how the world was created and restored; (2) how man and the woman were created; and (3) the one prohibition.

God has allowed us, through numerous analogous situations, to understand Him. Much of our lives are parables from which we can learn. What does a parent teach his child? He teaches his child about the world, he often will tell the child about the day he or she was born, and he will lay out a set of prohibitions. Do we as parents do this once? Of course not! We repeat and repeat. We as parents are like God to our children. Our training and teaching a child sticks with that child often for his entire life. As a teacher, I had dealings with thousands of students, and now and again, I would think to myself, “What is wrong with you, kid?” Then, in a parent-teacher conference, I would meet the parents, and often this would answer this question for me.

In any case, for days and possibly years, Jesus Christ came into the garden and spoke to Adam and the woman, and taught them. However, when they sinned, Adam and the woman gave no thought to God. They only thought about one another and about their nakedness. However, as soon as they heard God’s voice, they responded—they hid from Him in a forested part of the garden.

Gen 3:8 In the spirit [or, *spiritual part*] of the day, the man and his wife heard the Y^ehowah Elohim [the LORD God] walking around in the garden. So they hid from Y^ehowah Elohim among the trees in the garden.

The man and the woman have spent some time in the garden after they sinned working on their aprons. Then they heard Jesus Christ, the 2nd person of the Trinity, walking in the garden. Now, they think of God and what they have done. The automatic response of someone who is spiritually dead is, they hide from God. The revealed member of the Trinity comes to talk with them during the spiritual part of the day, and their first thought is to hide.

Adam and the woman had both sinned. Before God, they were fallen creatures. They understood their predicament. They were filthy before a holy God.

Gen 3:9 The LORD God called to the man and asked him, "Where [are] you?"

Jesus Christ is omniscient and He knew exactly where Adam and the woman were. It is important to note that God always makes the first move in our relationship with Him (again, setting a precedent). Adam and the woman did not have to go looking for God; God came to them. In the Hebrew, Jehovah Elohim utters one word, the adverb *where*, affixed to which is the 2nd person masculine singular suffix.

Interestingly enough, God calls out to Adam, and not to Adam and the woman. In the Hebrew, God calls to *unto the Adam*. The 2nd person masculine singular suffix can refer only to the man. There is a strict order of authority. God is the authority over the man and the man is the authority over the woman. Since Adam is in charge, and since it is obvious that Adam and the woman are hiding, God calls out to Adam, the one in authority.

Let me remind you that when Satan spoke to the woman, he continually said, "You all." It was not that Satan is a southerner, but when speaking to only the woman, he included Adam in everything that he said. Here, God calls out to Adam and Adam only.

The fact that God called out to Adam does not mean that God had no idea where he was. God knew in eternity past that Adam and the woman would sin and then hide in the forest of the garden. However, this sets up a precedent. Adam and the woman have sinned. They are now under eternal condemnation from God, even though this may seem like a trivial sin to you and me. However, when they hear the voice of God, they both know Who it is and they both believe in Him (if they did not believe in Him, then it would make no sense to hide from Him). What we find here is the gospel being laid out, even though it is not specifically stated. The book of Genesis is very subtle. The seed of every major doctrine is found in the pages of Genesis, but often, it is just a seed (however, about a third of the way through Genesis, it will be clear that we are saved by faith in Jehovah Elohim in Gen. 15:6).

The Spirit is involved and God speaks to man; man does not go looking for God. Adam hears Jehovah Elohim and the woman hears Jehovah Elohim, and they do respond, believing that He is there. They know Who He is, and they believe in Him. This does not mean that, when we are called, we hear an audible voice—in fact, that would be highly unlikely if not psychotic.

Adam answers God.

Gen 3:10 He answered, "I heard You in the garden. I was afraid because I was naked, so I hid."

Adam now has the knowledge of evil and human good. Furthermore, he has developed a superficial code of human morality. Now note, Adam does not reveal the true reason why he is hiding. He doesn't say, "I have sinned and ate from the fruit of the tree." He says he is hiding because he is naked. Adam is no longer naked; he is wearing fig leaves. So the idea that he is concerned that God will see him naked is ridiculous. However, this is Adam's first attempt at lying, so he is not very good at it. He recognizes that this act of morality did not fix the problem between himself and God. The real problem is, Adam ate from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, disobeying God. So, his automatic response, without thinking, is to lie, albeit, a poorly conceived lie. "I was afraid because I was naked, so I hid." He isn't naked. He is wearing an apron of fig leaves. He is obviously flustered, however.

Gen 3:11 God asked, "Who told you that you were naked? Did you eat fruit from the tree I commanded you not to eat from?"

God knows that the real problem was not that they were naked, but that they disobeyed Him in the only test of their volition. God deals directly with the problem. He ties what Adam said to Adam's sin. "Who told you that you were naked?" This is a very slick question. "You just told Me that you were naked; so who told you that you were naked?" Adam and the woman were created in innocence. They do not know that they are naked any more than a 1 or 2 year old child knows that he is naked. A child in innocence has no concept of nakedness, because he is still in innocence, so to speak, and some parents are forever running after their naked 2 year old with a handful of clothes. But we are eventually civilized, and in public (and mostly in private as well), we wear clothes. We were taught this from an early age by our parents. Adam and the woman knew they were naked, yet an hour ago, as with the 2 year old child, this was a non-issue. So, while Adam and the woman are quickly trying to come up with a person's name who told them they were naked, God goes to the real issue: "Did you eat fruit from the tree I commanded you not to eat from?"

Lesson 32: Genesis 3:8–11

God Speaks to Adam after the Fall

Adam and the woman have sinned. God told them not to eat from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, and yet they did. Satan first deceived the woman, and she ate; but when she handed the fruit to Adam, he ate with full cognizance, understanding that he was disobeying God's explicit command. He was not confused or deceived; he knew that he was making a choice between the fallen woman and Jehovah Elohim. Although it is difficult to determine a person's motivation when it is not explicitly stated, the woman stood before Adam with the forbidden fruit in her hand. No conversation between Adam

and the woman is recorded. No other motivation seems reasonable, other than Adam knew that he was choosing the fallen woman over Jehovah Elohim.

After they sinned, Jehovah Elohim came to speak to them in what appears to be a daily session of teaching.

Gen 3:8 In the spirit [or, *spiritual part*] of the day, the man and his wife heard the Y^ehowah Elohim [the LORD God] walking around in the garden. So they hid from Y^ehowah Elohim among the trees in the garden.

In order for the man and the woman to hide from Jehovah Elohim, they had to first believe that He is.

Gen 3:9 The LORD God called to the man and asked him, "Where [are] you?"

Is it possible that God came into the Garden of Eden and taught Adam only? As we have studied, God calls out to Adam alone, calling out with just one word: "Where [you]?"

Gen 3:10 He answered, "I heard You in the garden. I was afraid because I was naked, so I hid."

As we have already studied, Adam's first communication with God was his first attempt at a lie, and Adam was not very good at it. He explains that he is hiding because he is naked; but he is not naked—he is wearing a fig-leaf apron. Adam now clearly has a sin nature because he lies to God. Lying is his first and automatic response to God.

Almost everyone has their own idea of the worst sins that they can commit. However, apart from the fall itself, note that Satan lied to the woman and note that Adam is lying to God. By way of contrast, the Word of God is truth (Psalm 119:34 John 17:17 2Tim. 2:15) and God is truth (Psalm 31:5 Isa. 65:16).

One of the worst sins found in the Bible is that of *lying*. *Lying* is fundamentally opposed to all that God is. It is exactly opposed to His very character in every way.

The Doctrine of Truth and Lies

1. First we need to understand that God is the truth, and because of that, all falsehood is abhorrent to Him. David, in Psalm 31:5, writes, in anticipation of the cross: **Into Your hand I commit my spirit; You have redeemed me, O Jehovah, the God of truth.** See also Ex. 34:6 Isa. 65:16
2. God never lies. Titus 1:2
3. Furthermore, God's Word is truth; the Bible is truth. Jesus Christ, speaking to God the Father in prayer, said, **"Your Word is truth."** (John 17:17b). See also Psalm 119:34 2Tim. 2:15
4. Truth and lies are mutually exclusive. That is, if the truth is corrupted by falsehood, then it is no longer the truth. **You know that no lie is of the truth**

The Doctrine of Truth and Lies

- (1John 2:21b).
5. Jesus bore witness to the truth. When Pilate asked Jesus if He is the King of the Jews, Jesus answered him, **“You say that I am a king. To this end I was born, and for this cause I came into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth.”** (John 18:37). John 8:45
 - 1) As an aside, one of the most illogical positions a person can take is that, Jesus was a great teacher and a great religious leader, but He was not God. As many have pointed out, there are only 3 logical positions which a man can take with regards to the Person of Jesus Christ: (1) Either He is a liar of the greatest magnitude, leading thousands of people astray in His time, claiming Deity which He did not possess; (2) He was a crazed man, who insanely believe that He was God (and before you take this option, remember all that He said and did—were these the actions and words of a crazy person?); or, (3) Jesus is the Son of God, just as He claimed throughout His ministry. *Not a son of God but the Son of God.*
 - 2) It makes little sense for a man to do and say what Jesus did and said, and for this to be nothing more than a charade.
 6. God desires for all to be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth. 1Tim. 2:4
 7. Jesus Christ told His disciples, **“I am the way, the truth and the life; no man comes to the Father but by Me.”** (John 14:6).
 8. We do not know how Satan tempted a third of the angels to rebel against God, but it is reasonable to assume that this was done by lying to some or all of them. Rev. 12:4
 9. Satan employed dishonesty when tempting the woman. When Satan, in the form of a serpent, spoke to the woman, he lied to her. **“You certainly will not die!”** And he promised the woman, **“[If you eat from the tree,] you [and Adam] will be like God, knowing good and evil.”** Implied here is a better and greater existence, which will come to pass by disobeying God. Gen. 3:1–4
 10. Jesus calls Satan the father of lies (He said this when calling the religious men of His day, children of the Devil). John 8:44
 11. One of the Ten Commandments is, **You will not speak a false statement against an associate** (Ex. 20:16).
 12. There are 7 sins which are abhorrent to the soul of God, and two of these involve lying: *one who has a lying tongue* and *one who is a false witness*. Some teach that these are the worst sins that man can commit. Prov. 6:17, 19
 13. Lying is condemned throughout the New Testament as well. Eph. 4:25 Col. 3:9 1Tim. 1:10 Rev. 21:8
 14. Men, by their very nature, will attempt to suppress and subvert the truth. **For the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness, because the thing which may be known of God is clearly revealed within them, for God revealed it to them. For the unseen things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being realized by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, for them to be without excuse. Because, knowing God,**

The Doctrine of Truth and Lies

they did not glorify Him as God, neither were thankful. But they became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man, and birds, and four-footed animals, and creeping things. Therefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves. For they changed the truth of God into a lie, and they worshiped and served the created thing more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen (Rom. 1:18–25).

15. God's Word and the gospel are continually associated with truth or presented as the truth throughout the New Testament. John 17:17 2Cor. 4:2 6:7 11:10 Gal. 2:5, 14 4:16 Eph. 1:13 4:21

A couple lessons ago, I spoke of God blessing certain nations and cursing others. That which is truth, godless men will do everything in their power to suppress. In 1989, thousands of students gathered in Tiananmen Square in China to protest their government. Many were killed. Now, often the first time a Chinese student hears about this event is when he becomes a foreign-exchange student in the United States. This truth is blotted out of their history. As I write this, there are protestors in the streets of Iran, decrying the falsified results of their recent election. The government of Iran has begun to limit the foreign press and may even expel all members of the foreign press, because they do not want the truth to be seen. Just as many Iranians present the holocaust as an event whose historicity ought to be debated, there is a good possibility that, 20 years from now, this near-revolution will be distorted into rabble-rousing by a few. When you observe a politician intentionally misleading you, that should send off distress signals in your own head, regardless of your attitude toward that politician or his party.

Being a contentious sort, I sometimes will visit anti-Bible sites, and one of the first things which immediately strikes me is their intellectual dishonesty. Many of these sites will list *contradictions of the Bible*. There are some passages in the Bible which are difficult to reconcile with other passages; however, there are many apparent contradictions which are not problematic, and, for which, simple and effective explanations have been given. When an anti-Bible site continues to list *contradictions* or problems for which there are reasonable explanations for (e.g., the common question, *from where did Cain get his wife?*), then this site is being intellectually dishonest. They don't care if half or if 80% of their enumerated problems and contradictions have simple explanations; they want to discredit the Bible, and they will do so in any way possible. What is important to them is, can they peel someone away from the faith. If they can do that, then they are happy. The end justifies the means, and creating doubt in the mind of a believer is far more important to them than intellectual honesty. So, their approach is, if they throw enough crap up against the wall, if some of it sticks, then they are happy.

Surprisingly enough, there is at least one exception to the sinfulness of lying. A spy or someone who has joined themselves to a righteous army (as Rahab did when Joshua invaded Jericho) is allowed to lie. When John McCain was asked by his Viet Cong captors the names of his fellow soldiers in his platoon, he gave them the names of football players; this was an honorable act and not a sin.

Adam lies to God, and says that he was hiding from God because he was naked. God ignores Adam's lie and poses two questions to Adam:

Gen 3:11 God asked, "Who told you that you were naked? Did you eat fruit from the tree I commanded you not to eat from?"

God asks Adam—who, because he was created in innocence, ought not to have any concept of nakedness— "Who told you that you were naked?" Literally, God says to Adam, "Who revealed to you [2nd masculine singular suffix] that naked you [2nd person masculine singular pronoun] [are]?" Adam is the authority in the garden, and God speaks to Adam and to Adam only. This sentence ends with the pausal form of the 2nd person masculine singular pronoun, so God waits for a moment for Adam to answer. Adam has already lied to God once; now, he searches his mind for the answer to this question. There is only one person who could tell Adam that he is naked, and that is the woman. But, how would she know? While Adam's mind races to explain, God asks (literally), "Did from the tree which I commanded you to not eat from it, [did] you eat?" Again, every *you* is a masculine singular; God speaks to Adam and Adam only.

The Hebrew has no punctuation. There are no commas, no periods, no spaces, no vowels. All divisions are done syntactically. All emphasis is done syntactically. When a word or phrase is to be emphasized, it is placed at the beginning of a sentence. *From the tree* is the focal point of God's second question.

Now, you may have been asking yourself, *what does any of this have to do with me? Why do I need to know any of this?* Your life is more than worrying about the food that you eat or the clothes that you will wear (Matt. 6:25–27), which is what most of us spent our days thinking about. We actually have a purpose on this earth; we are not just a random set of cells which just sort of evolved from nonliving matter (which is a far greater miracle than the idea of Satan indwelling a snake). In order to understand what life is about, what our place in this life is, we need to have some background information. We need to know where we came from. We need to know our origins. Furthermore, there ought to be some normal curiosity as to how all this life came about and what your life actually means.

Again, we see this in a child—this time in a child who is perhaps 4 or 5. All of a sudden, they have questions. They want to know everything. It is a normal phase every normal child goes through and we often combat this desire for knowledge by sending said child off to school. In any case, you ought to have some curiosity as to your origins and your purpose on this earth.

We have been studying the fall of man. We have studied how God created man and the woman, and more recently, how they sinned against God by eating from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. You might ask is, *isn't this just allegorical? Aren't these just stories and myths that man devised to explain things?* There are parables and stories found throughout the Bible, and they are used to teach certain principles of doctrine. The man with his little ewe lamb—a story which Nathan tells David—is just a story (2Sam. 12). Much of what Jesus taught were parables, which parables were illustrative of certain doctrines.⁶ However, these are always presented clearly as parables. We are generally able to deduce from a simple reading when a story is being told to explain a particular point of doctrine. In fact, often a precursory reading from any reasonable translation is enough to determine if this or that just a story (a parable) or if it is an historical event. There is no indication that this event of Adam and the woman's sin as being just a parable. When these events are referred to later, they are referred to as actual, historical incidents (for example, 1Cor. 15:45 2Cor. 11:3 1Tim. 2:13–14). Therefore, unless a narrative is clearly presented as a story or as a parable, we interpret it as being literal. What we find here is a very literal set of circumstances.

Last time, we took a quick look at *truth and lies*. You may have been told by a friend or an evangelist about Who Jesus is; and, for most of you, you know your life before you believed in Jesus Christ and you know your life after you have believed in Christ—and you know something *big* happened. For some of you, Jesus Christ has become the most fundamental aspect of your life; for others, Christ is important, but so are loved ones, food, shelter and clothing. In any case, on whatever scale of values you stand upon, Jesus Christ is high on that list, and for some of us, He is at the top of that list. From where, ultimately, did you hear about Jesus? It is from the Bible. It is from the Word of Truth. Take away the Word of Truth and there is no Jesus.

It may be worthwhile to go off on a tangent here, and examine just what does the Bible say about Itself?

What Does the Bible Claim for Itself?

1. Before there was a completed canon of Scripture, God spoke to men in a variety of ways.
 - 1) God spoke directly to Adam (Gen. 3).
 - 2) God spoke to Moses through the burning bush (as well as a number of other ways). Ex. 3
 - 3) We have the Word of God coming to Nathan at night (1Chron. 17:3) and to Shemaiah in some undisclosed way.

⁶ Strictly speaking, all of the parables are stories used to illustrate a point of doctrine; but Jesus spoke of some things which are clearly actual, but incorrectly identified as parables (e.g., the rich man and the beggar in Luke 16:19–31).

What Does the Bible Claim for Itself?

- 4) The Word of God came upon John the Baptizer when out in the desert wilderness. Luke 3:2
- 5) Heb. 1:1–2a: **In many ways and in various ways of old, God spoke to the fathers in the prophets; in these last days He spoke to us in the Son.**
2. Every Word of God is tested, refined, and the impurities are removed. Prov. 30:5 from the Hebrew.
3. Jesus referred to the Old Testament as the Word of God, when He told the Pharisees and scribes that they were hypocrites (actors wearing large masks), who followed their traditions rather than the Word of God. Mark 7:1–13
4. Jesus said the Word of God is as important to us as the very food that we eat (He was quoting Scripture). Luke 4:4 Deut. 8:3
5. The words which Jesus spoke was called the Word of God. Luke 5:1
6. When some woman tried to exalt Mary, Jesus' mother, for bearing Him, Jesus corrected her by saying, **"No; rather, blessed are those [who are continually] hearing the Word of God, and guarding [and preserving] it."** (Luke 11:28).
7. Jesus affirms that Scripture (referring to the Old Testament), cannot be *annulled, subverted; done away with, deprive of their authority; or declared unlawful*. The Greek of John 10:35
8. When the Apostles taught, they were speaking the Word of God (Acts 4:31 11:1 13:5, 46 18:11) and people came to them to specifically hear the Word of God (Acts 13:7, 44). Later, it is pastor-teachers who teach the Word of God to their congregations Heb. 13:7).
9. Our faith comes from hearing the Word of God. That is, we must have something real to place our faith in. Rom. 10:17
10. We are regenerated by means of the Word of God. 1Peter 2:23
11. The Word of God works within a person who believes it. 1Thess. 2:13
12. One of the keys to a healthy spiritual life is to have the Word of God indwell you. 1John 2:14
13. And, as I have heard on a myriad of occasions: **The Word of God is alive and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even so as to divide the soul and the spirit, the joints and the marrow, and is a critic of thoughts and intents of the heart** (Heb. 4:12).
14. And: **All Scripture is God-breathed and profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, so that the man of God may be completed, thoroughly furnished for all good works** (2Tim. 3:16–17).
15. What God says is called the Word of Truth. Psalm 119:43 2Cor. 6:7 Eph. 1:13 2Tim. 2:15 James 1:18
16. Jesus is called the Word of God. John 1:1–3, 14 Rev. 19:13
17. We are not to add to or to take from the Word of God. Rev. 22:18–19
18. In summation, the Bible which you hold in your hand is the Word of God; and, as we have seen in the previous lesson, God puts a premium on truth. Therefore, we ought to trust the Bible in what it says, both the Old and New Testaments.

What some people do is, they confine their faith to things that they have been indoctrinated with (like evolution or molecular theory; the first being false and the second being true); and then to things which they have seen or experienced. They look at the few years of their own meager existence and say to themselves, *this is the way things have always been and always will be* (Eccles. 1:9 2Peter 3:4). Many times, their faith in science or in their own experiences are the biggest factors in their lives. It is a big (but necessary) step for some to move from faith in Jesus Christ to faith in the Word of God.

There is a logic here, which is undeniable. Let's say that you want to ignore the unusual events of the Old Testament as merely stories made up by some imaginative saints. That leads you to at least two problems: (1) you are saying that God is unable to overrule His Own laws; and (2) Jesus is a liar for taking the Old Testament as authoritative and referring to various portions of the Old Testament as true and valid, though miraculous.

There is also the problem of Jesus Himself. We know of Jesus and His Person only through the Old and New Testaments. We may have been witnessed to and we may have read the Bible for ourselves, but the words are still the same: **Believe in Jesus Christ and you will be saved**. If you doubt the miracles and unusual occurrences in the Old Testament, what do you do with Jesus, Who not only affirms the Old Testament as accurate and authoritative, but also works far more and far greater miracles than are found in the Old Testament? If what He did, did not really happen; then how can you trust the rest of what Jesus said of Himself?

When studying *truth and lies* in the previous lesson, we found out that God is truth, that Jesus came to us as the truth, that it is impossible for God to lie, and that God's Word is truth. It is in His Word that we know about Jesus. There is historical evidence of a human being, Jesus; but His Words are not recorded in secular history. His words are recorded in the Bible, the Word of God, the Word of Truth, as well as in the writings of the many church fathers throughout human history. If you doubt what is in the Bible, you face somewhat of a personal conundrum: how is it possible that the Word of Truth is filled with all of these made-up stories and yet, it is from the Word of Truth that you know Who Jesus is—the **Way, the Truth and the Life**? How is it that the gospel of Jesus Christ is found in this 3rd chapter of Genesis (we are not there yet), but, at the same time, you believe that this is some made-up story or some parable of some sort?

One of the famous approaches to the Bible is the de-mythology approach: remove all of the weird stuff from the Bible, and what remains is truth. The idea that Jesus is our salvation, but that, various Bible writers just got carried away, over-enthusiastic, and they filled up much of the Bible with goofy stories about talking snakes and manna from heaven. People have tried to approach the Bible this way, and they have found that, once they demythologize it, only about 5% of the Bible remains. Now, if God is truth and if His Word is truth, and if Jesus is truth, why is His Word filled with so many lies? And, how does any one of us propose to be able to flip through the Word of Truth and pick and choose what is the truth and what is some made-up story?

If you understand the Bible, then you know that Jesus is more than just the central figure; the Bible is the written Word of God (Heb. 4:12 13:7 Rev. 1:9 6:9) and Jesus is the Living Word of God (John 1:1–3, 14 Rev. 19:13). We understand Who Jesus is only through the Word of God. Since most or all of us have never seen something which we can clearly identify as a miracle, we tend to discount things which appear to be miraculous in the Bible. This is problematic, because much of what Jesus did was miraculous or, at the very least, a sign. There are more miracles and signs per page in the gospels than anywhere else. Even though Paul and the other Apostles pull everything together, showing the correlation between the Old and New Testaments, if you are of a mind to reject what Jesus did (His miracles and great works), then what do you do with Jesus Himself?

To put this into an historical context, the ministry of Jesus was confined to 3 or 4 years, and to a very small geographical area. No other religious figure was ever so limited in his public ministry with respect to time and place. If Jesus is God and if He is our Savior, then how does He prove this with such a short public ministry? He proves this to those who meet Him with His works and with what He says. His works were quite remarkable: turning water into wine, curing people who were blind or lame since birth. And these works were written down in the gospels and distributed, some of which as early as 50 A.D. This history of Who Jesus was and what He did came out while thousands of eyewitnesses were still alive. The gospels came out at a time when the Romans and the Jews were still hostile toward Christianity. These gospels were published at a time when there was a lot of writing which was done; yet, in this time period, *no one* wrote anything which disputed the truth of the gospels—these gospels filled with miracles, these gospels which purported to be the truth, these gospels which revealed as accurately as possible the true history of Jesus (Luke 1:1–4). Typically, for an historical figure to become associated with myths, hundreds of years must pass first. Jesus could not be mythologized during the first century because too many eye witnesses were alive. There were just too many people out there who could have said, “No, it did not happen that way; here is what happened.” But we have nothing written which suggests this. Later Christian writers, from the 2nd and 3rd centuries, disputed false teaching which attempted to tie itself to Christianity (Gnosticism), but they never disputed the historicity of Jesus or His miracles—because there was nothing written which disputed these things.

My point is, if you want to casually reject some of the Old Testament, because there are unusual events in it (the creation of Adam and the woman, or a snake which is indwelt by Satan), then what do you do with the far more unusual events of the New Testament? Again, the written Word of God and the Living Word of God are so intertwined that you cannot have one without the other. Now, when I first believed in Jesus Christ, I did not think about or understand any of this. My memory of that time was, I did read the Word of God and believed in Jesus Christ based upon what I read in the book of John; but in terms of accepting the Bible as accurate and authoritative (subject to textual criticism), that came later.

There are a lot of things in my life which I cannot adequately explain, but that I believe in. I believe in television. Somehow, all of these signals are sent through the air with hundreds of channels, and they are beamed down to my television. I could not explain it,

reproduce it, and I doubt that I could ever fully understand it. But when I turn on my tv on in the evening, I really expect for it to come on, and for me to be able to choose from a number of different stations. I am equally amazed by airplanes, which weigh tons, and are filled with people, and yet, somehow, they manage to fly—5000 feet in the air—and then land again. As the saying goes, sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic.

I believe in a person’s soul, even though no one has ever seen a man’s soul. I know that there is an immaterial part to every person that I interact with, something which is far more than chemicals sloshing around in their brains and synapses firing off electrical current. And, even though we are very advanced, technologically speaking, man cannot come anywhere close to duplicating the human brain. Yet, I believe in man’s soul, which is far more amazing than anything that we have ever invented because, all of these inventions came out of our souls.

I believe in atoms and molecules—things which no man has ever seen—and when I find that scientists believe that they are made up of smaller particles which are also made up of even smaller particles, I am amazed, but I believe it.

It might be good for you to see how Adam and the woman are treated in the New Testament:

The Historicity of Adam, the Woman and the Fall	
Scripture	Text/Commentary
<p>And the Pharisees came to Jesus, testing Him and saying, “Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?”</p> <p>And He answered and said to them, “Have you not read that He Who made them at the beginning ‘made them male and female,’ and said, ‘For this cause a man shall leave father and mother and shall cling to his wife, and the two of them shall be one flesh?’ Therefore they are no longer two, but one flesh. Therefore what God has joined together, let not man separate.” (Matt. 19:3–6 Gen. 1:27 2:24).</p>	<p>Jesus is explaining to the Pharisees about the importance and sanctity of marriage, and goes back to the very beginning, where God created man—specifically, God created them <i>male and female</i> and they were designed to become <i>one flesh</i> (one unit or one corporation) forever.</p> <p>Adam and the woman are treated as real persons created at a specific place and time. Jesus uses their historicity in order to make a point.</p>

The Historicity of Adam, the Woman and the Fall

Scripture

Text/Commentary

[Our body, when placed into the ground at death] is sown a natural body; is raised up a spiritual body. If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual [body]. So also it is written, **The first man Adam became a living soul.** The last Adam [became] a life-giving spirit. Nevertheless that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; then that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, made of dust; the second man is of heaven. As is the earthly, such are they also who are earthly: and as is the heavenly, such are they also who are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthly, we will also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brothers, that flesh and blood can't inherit the kingdom of God; neither does corruption inherit incorruption (1Cor. 15:44–50 Gen. 2:7).

Paul, in 1Cor. 15, is explaining the resurrection. Adam is spoken of as a literal person, made from the dust of the earth. Paul's point is, our bodies are earthly, made from the dust of the ground, and that, like a seed, our bodies will be planted into the ground and they will spring up (the resurrection) as a spiritual body.

Paul references Adam as the first man, made of the earth; and Jesus Christ, Who is spiritual, of the heavenlies. First, the earthly and then the heavenly.

Paul could have used Adam alone in this illustration, that Adam was made of the earth first, and then God *breathed the breath of lives* into Adam. However, since our eternity is completely dependent upon Jesus Christ, He is used to illustrate the spiritual.

And now I am concerned about you. The serpent deceived Eve with his deviousness; what if your minds should be corrupted, and lose that innocence which is yours in Christ? If someone proclaims to you a different Christ, not the one we proclaimed to you; or if he brings you a spirit other than the spirit you had from us, or if he teaches a gospel other than the gospel you received from us; you might quietly endure [this false teaching] (2Cor. 11:3–4).

Paul was concerned that the Corinthians might be easily led astray by a teacher who teaches them *another Jesus, another gospel* or brings to them *another spirit*. He does not want them to have their thinking corrupted by such a one, as Eve was deceived by the serpent. The deception of the woman by the serpent is treated as a real, historical event.

During instruction, a woman should be quiet and respectful. I give no permission for a woman to teach or to have authority over a man. A woman ought to be quiet, because Adam was formed first and Eve afterwards, and it was not Adam who was led astray but the woman who was led astray and fell into sin (1Tim. 2:11–14).

In teaching Bible doctrine, the woman is not to have authority over the man, and Paul goes back to the fall in order to explain why. Again, Adam and the woman are treated as real people.

At no time does the Bible look back at Adam and Eve or to the fall of man and treat it as an allegory or as some sort of a parable.

Depending upon where you are in your own spiritual life, it may be more difficult to accept the Bible as the complete, coherent and authoritative Word of God. However, the more that you study it (and this should be by means of a pastor-teacher), the more that it all hangs together. One of the lessons which is coming up is, the gospel of Jesus Christ, as taught in Gen. 3.

Lesson 34: Genesis 3:6–13

Adam and the Woman Offer up Excuses

In Gen. 3:1–5, Satan, taking the form of a serpent, deceives the woman, causing her to focus on the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil.

Gen 3:6–7: So when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate, and she also gave some to her husband who was with her, and he ate. Then the eyes of both were opened, and they knew that they were naked. And they sewed fig leaves together and made themselves loincloths.

The man and he woman disobeyed God and ate from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. Their first act as sinners was not another act of sin, but an act of human good, making an attempt to adjust to one another. Most churches ignore this. Some churches may rail against sin (although that number seems to be fewer and fewer nowadays), but very few churches decry human good. In fact, 1000's of churches see their mission in this world as world reform of some sort or another. That is human good. Churches which use the words *economic or social justice* are churches devoted to human good. Churches which want to reform society as a whole in one way or another, believers and unbelievers alike, are involved in human good. Churches which focus upon politics are caught up in human good (politics is good to illustrate Biblical truths, but it is not the ultimate solution to anything). Churches which see their impact upon the environment as an important part of the thrust of their ministry are churches steeped in human good.

As we have studied, God's attitude toward human good is much different than ours. He sees our human good as being filthy (Isa. 64:6), as dead works which will be burned at the judgment seat of Christ (1Cor. 3:11–16), and as the basis for the judgment of the unbeliever at the last judgment (Rev. 20:12–15).

Adam and the woman say nothing about God and their relationship to God. When God came into the Garden of Eden during the spiritual part of the day (presumably to teach them the Word of God), they hide from Him.

Gen 3:8–9: And they heard the sound of the LORD God walking in the garden in the spirit of the day, and the man and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the LORD God

among the trees of the garden. But the LORD God called to the man and said to him, "Where are you?"

Adam's answer to God will be a lie, and not a very good one at that:

Gen 3:10: And he said, "I heard the sound of you in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked, and I hid myself."

God knew what they had done; He knew this in eternity past. He was asking for Adam to admit what he had done. For those of you who have raised children, you understand this process. Your child has done something wrong, and, in order to prevent that from happening again, in order to focus in on the problem, and to build upon this experience in a positive way, you first get your child to admit what he has done and to acknowledge that it was wrong.

Gen 3:11: [God] said, "Who told you that you were naked? Have you eaten of the tree of which I commanded you not to eat?"

If you have raised a child, and they have done wrong, logically, you start off with what they have done, and getting them to acknowledge what they have done. It is time for the man and the woman to take responsibility for their actions. It is time for them to be honest with God. However, in acknowledging what he has done, the man will blame the woman and also he will blame God for giving him the woman for what he did; and the woman will blame the serpent.

Gen 3:12 Then the man replied, "The woman *You gave to be with me—she gave me fruit from the tree, and I ate.*"

Recall the difference in the sins of Adam and the woman. These are important differences; the woman sinned because she was deceived. Adam sinned because he was in love with the woman, and made the conscious choice to sin against God by eating of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. He chose the woman over God; he chose the woman outside the garden versus fellowship with God inside the garden. He chose one of God's gifts instead of choosing God. He chose death over life, knowing that he wanted to be with this woman, whom he loved.

However, notice how much Adam's attitude has changed since the Fall. He now blames the woman and he blames God. "*You gave me this woman, God; and she gave me the fruit.*" Adam now has an old sin nature. God warned them, *In dying, you will die.* Adam's immediate death was spiritual. His entire soul and body became corrupted with a sin nature. With a sin nature, Adam blames God for this situation and he blames the woman. This is the same woman Adam was willing to die for.

Adam responds by blaming both God and the woman. The woman gave him the fruit and God gave the woman to Adam, so Adam tried to diminish his own culpability by blaming both of them. I hope that you can appreciate the 180° change which has taken place here.

God has given Adam everything. We studied 6 days where God redesigned the earth for man, and placed all things under him. Now Adam blames God for the decision which he, Adam, made. Adam is also so much in love with the woman that he chose to eat the forbidden fruit from her hand. On previous romantic nights, when Adam told the woman, "Dear, you are the only one in the world for me," he was stating an undeniable fact. Now Adam blames her and he blames God for giving the woman to him. This would be like you giving your 18-year-old a car to putt around in while in college, and he wrecks the car and then blames you for the accident.

God now turns to the woman and speaks to her for the first time after the fall, as she is the second-in-command.

Gen 3:13 So the LORD God asked the woman, "What [is] this you have done?" And the woman said, "It was the serpent. He deceived me, and I ate."

The very common interrogative particle used here means *what, why, for what purpose*. In the Hebrew, there are only 3 words which God utters: "What—this—you [the woman only] have done?"

The woman is brilliant and a quick study, follows Adam's lead here. Adam blamed her, so she blamed the serpent. However, this was semi-legitimate. Satan indwelt the serpent and used the serpent to tempt the woman to eat of the fruit. This does not mean that the woman is off the hook; this simply means that she was deceived. The woman is not less culpable nor is her sin nature better than the sin nature of men (although, many women may persuasively argue this point, giving as their first example the behavior of little boys and little girls).

There are those who want to let the woman off the hook here. The serpent lied to her—that is clear. However, her Maker, Jesus Christ (John 1:1–3, 14 Eph. 3:9 Col. 1:16), told her to never eat from that tree. From her own volition, she sinned against God. Not only did she sin against God, but she chose to involve Adam in her sin as well.

Let me deal with one minor detail here: did God ever directly tell the woman not to eat from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil? This prohibition is clearly given to Adam in Gen. 2:16–17. However, as we have already studied, God is coming to Adam (and the woman) in the spirit of the day. This suggests that God came into the Garden of Eden at a specific time each day, called the *spirit of the day*. Although God calls out to Adam alone when Adam is not out in the open, this does not mean that God spoke to Adam and Adam only at this particular time of the day. It simply means that, Adam and the woman are usually right there, to talk with God; and now they aren't, so God calls out for the one in charge—Adam. Secondly, the woman spoke of the one prohibition as coming directly from God. "God has said, 'You [all] will not eat from it or touch it, or you [all] will die.' " (Gen. 3:3b). Even though the woman gets this partially wrong, her use of the 1st person plural in v. 2 and the 2nd person plural in v. 3 suggests that God made this prohibition know to Adam and the woman together. So, even though we do not have a passage where God

speaks to the woman and the man both about the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, the preponderance of evidence is that He has.

In any case, as we have already studied, the woman is just as culpable for her sin as the man is.

What is coming up is both the judgment of God as well as the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Lesson 35: Genesis 3:14–15

God Judges Satan/the Gospel of Jesus Christ

We are about to study one of the most phenomenal passages in the Bible—God’s judgment of Adam, the woman and Satan, and the promise of Jesus Christ as our Savior. First, we need to recall what we have already studied:

Satan deceived the woman, and the woman ate from the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. She gave a piece of fruit to Adam, and he ate it, not being deceived, but facing the issue of disobeying God straight on. The man and the woman each died spiritually when eating the fruit, and their first act in their fallen state was one of human good and morality—they covered up their private parts with fig leaves.

Then God came into the garden and called out to them, and, when hearing His voice, they both believed in Him and hid from Him (the first act being implied by the second). When Adam responds to God, it is with a lie. He said, “I hid from you because I was naked.” As we have already studied, Adam had already covered himself, so he really wasn’t naked. However, since this was his first lie, he was not very good at it yet.

God next speaks to the serpent. God does not go to the serpent and demand to know *what* he did or *why* he did it. That is unnecessary. The man and the woman are redeemable; Satan is not. Satan has been judged eternally—he will be cast into the Lake of Fire for all time, separated from God and from God’s creation for all time (Rev. 20:10). God now goes to the serpent and to Satan to pronounce judgment. Satan is under eternal judgement, which has not been carried out yet. During Satan’s appeal trial (he is appealing this verdict, as we have already studied), he enjoys some modicum of freedom. God’s specific judgment of Satan will be prophetic, and it will become our hope.

God spoke to Adam and the woman in order of their respective authority. When pronouncing judgment, God will go in reverse order of authority, beginning with the serpent, then Satan, then the woman and then Adam. This implies that Satan had power over the serpent, which is logical, as Satan indwelt the serpent. God addresses both this species of animal and Satan, who is indwelling the animal.

Gen 3:14 Then the LORD God said to the serpent: Because you have done this, you are cursed more than any livestock and more than any wild animal. You will move on your belly and eat dust all the days of your life.

The judging of the snake is primarily symbolic. This is a real serpent; it really did have legs; and it was really indwelt by Satan. However, Satan has already been judged. As we have already studied, Satan sinned, God judged and sentenced Satan but Satan is out on appeal. Therefore, God judges the animal itself, and makes the animal legless and genetically changed so that its descendants would be legless as well.

God continues His judgment, but now He speaks to Satan, who is manifested as a serpent or who is indwelling the serpent:

Gen 3:15 I will put hostility between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed. He will crush your head, and you will bruise His heel.

Satan is already condemned to the Lake of Fire, despite his being out on appeal. However, his judgment in time is given now. God tells the snake [speaking to Satan] that there will be hostility between the serpent and the woman and hostility between his seed and her seed. The seed of the serpent are those who are fallen (both man and angels), those who reject God, those who crawl along the earth on their bellies without a relationship to God. These are fallen angels and unbelievers. The seed of the woman refers to Jesus Christ, and how there would be enmity between those who follow Satan and the person of Jesus Christ.

There can be great animosity between those who do not believe in Jesus Christ and those who do. We have numerous illustrations of this enmity. In any Communist or Muslim nation, people of faith can find themselves persecuted for their faith. The few rights that they have may be removed. In Communist country, believers may find themselves shipped off to reeducation camps; their meager property may be taken from them (If they own any, including any business which they might have established). In many Muslim countries, believers may be persecuted, jailed or even executed for their faith in Christ.

In the United States today, 77% of the people identify themselves as *Christians*; as a result of our founders, who were principally believers, and our continued heritage throughout the centuries, the United States has become the greatest nation in human history. More people would choose to live in the United States of America than any other nation in the world. Even though we do not have the highest per capita income, we have the highest standard of living in the world. Yet, atheists, who benefit greatly from living in a Christian nation (so to speak), are antagonistic toward the very ones who indirectly provide atheists with such great blessing. There are groups who are overly concerned about monuments and plaques with the Ten Commandments on them in and around courtrooms; they are overly concerned about Christmas hymns being sung in schools; and they are overly concerned about nativity scenes in schools or government buildings. Not only are a number of unbelievers concerned about these things, but many are outright antagonistic, and as their numbers grow, so does their antagonism and anger (e.g., in Seattle, WA). All of a sudden, monuments and plaques, some of which have been in existence for decades or even centuries, become an irritant to the unbeliever, and he will use phoney excuses to remove them (citing *the separation of church and state*, a phrase not found in our constitution).

Although, it is understandable that these unbelievers do not see the relationship between our great freedom and prosperity and Christianity; they are unable to look out into the world and recognize the simple empirical evidence that, the fewer Christians there are, the worse off a nation is. Nations with the highest population of atheists—Communist nations—are some of the very worst nations in the world to live in, where there is little freedom and little prosperity. This will always be the case; and this enmity will always exist, because Jesus promised “I will put hostility between you [Satan] and the woman, and between your seed and her seed.” Even though we live in a nation with is abundantly Christian, we continue to have hostility expressed by unbelievers. We find this in all other nations as well. Where there are many unbelievers who are live-and-let-live types, many, under the right circumstances, will show their hostility overtly.

There is a parallel meaning here, and *seed* is in the singular (although, this word can be used to refer to many, as in Gen. 9:9 12:7 16:10). This also refers to Jehovah Elohim—Jesus Christ—as the *Seed of the woman*. The gospels give us a chronicling of the animosity between unbelievers and Jesus Christ. Their anger was so great as to crucify a Man Who had never done anything wrong.

“He will crush your head,” means that Jesus will destroy Satan. *He* refers to the *Seed of the Woman*, who is Jesus Christ. God is speaking to Satan as indwelling the serpent, so *your head* refers to Satan. Jesus Christ will crush the head of the serpent, metaphorically speaking. This is the final judgment of Rev. 20. This is a deadly, permanent blow.

God also tells the serpent, “...and you will bruise His heel.” The verb found here is used twice in this verse, and it means *to bruise, to crush*. We take the meaning from the picture which is painted for us. The picture is of a man and a snake. Therefore, we translate the verb according to the picture that it paints for us. In the first case, the man *crushes* the head of the snake; in the second, the snake *bruises* the heel of the man. Same verb, but a slightly different meaning, appropriate to the picture painted for us.

The judgment here—“He will crush your head and you will bruise His heel”—is symbolic. The serpent will be crawling upon the ground and it strikes the heel of Jesus Christ. We are not speaking of the literal snake nor are we speaking of the literal heel of the Person of Jesus Christ. This communicates great pain and judgment—this is the cross our Lord will bear. His death on the cross is a fulfillment of this promise made to the serpent (“You will bruise His heel”). Our Lord will be wounded, He will fall to the ground, but He will rise up again; as a man struck in the heel by a snake. In the end, our Lord will crush the head of Satan.

What is happening here is, God is turning cursing into blessing. Adam and the woman are cursed for their disobedience; but by that disobedience will be born the Seed of the Woman, Who is our ultimate blessing.

“He will crush your head and you will bruise His heel” Notice how subtle this is, but how clear it is as well. Since those of you reading this know the gospel of Jesus Christ, and

how He died for our sins, taking upon Himself the sins of the world; and then, how He rose again—it is marvelous how all of this so neatly fits together.

A question which concerned me early in my Christian life is, *why is the gospel of Jesus Christ [Believe in Jesus Christ and you will be saved] so much clearer in the New Testament? It is clearly taught in the Old Testament, as in this passage, but not as clearly as John 3:16, 18, 36; why is that?* I have at least a partial answer, which you will not read anywhere else. Satan was part and parcel in getting Jesus Christ to the cross. He indwelt Judas, who betrayed Jesus Christ, and he inspired the hatred in the Jews and in the Romans, who crucified our Lord. If Satan knew this was our means of salvation; if Satan knew that the cross would be where the Lord would crush his head, quite obviously, he would not have participated. So our means of salvation is found in the Old Testament (faith in Christ, as in Gen. 15:6 Psalm 2:12); the cross is found in the Old Testament (Gen. 3:15 Gen. 22 Psalm 22 Isa. 53); and all of this is clear after the fact, and all who believed in Jehovah Elohim in the Old Testament were saved. However, before the cross, the most intelligent creature in the world—Satan—was unable to put it all together, to recognize that the crucifixion of Christ would be our salvation. Yet we can look back at these dramatic passages in the Bible and find it remarkable how well they present the crucifixion before it comes to pass.

So that there is no misunderstanding, what happened on the cross, first and foremost, was that our sins were paid for. Jesus took the penalty for our sins upon Himself. **He Himself bore our sins in his body on the tree, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness. By His wounds you have been healed** (1Peter 2:24; Isa. 53:3b). However, just as Jesus' very short ministry stands out (He had a very short public ministry in a very limited geographical area), so His death also stands out. Everyone in that area needed to know what happened—all of the Romans and all of the Jews; and this needed to be broadcast throughout the world from there. Jewish law and Roman law were two of the greatest systems of jurisprudence in history, and yet, their hatred of our perfect Lord overcame these two systems of law. They crucified the Lord of Glory, even though, by all accounts, He was innocent of all the charges brought against Him. When God walks among mankind, and we put our Lord on the cross, these is a testimony as to the great depravity of sin.

Furthermore, in the Angelic Conflict, this is a great witness against Satan, that he would be blinded so much by hatred, that he would simultaneously contribute to his own destruction and to our salvation by getting Jesus to the cross.

So, God has to clearly reveal to the gospel to all who would believe in the Old Testament (which was done by means of the Holy Spirit using various means to reveal Jehovah Elohim to the person who would believe—e.g., by an animal sacrifice); and yet, God has to simultaneously hide this from the most brilliant creature in the universe. The Jews, in Old Testament times, recognized which passages were Messianic, and believe in Him; yet, no one could have clearly explained in the Old Testament exactly what would happen; that is, they could not tell us that Jesus would come into this world for the purpose of dying on the cross and bearing out sins. Now, once He has done this—once Jesus dies on the

cross—these portions of the Old Testament become illuminated. All of a sudden, passages like Gen. 3:22, Psalm 22 and Isa. 53 all make perfect sense. It is right there in front of us, and we suddenly see what is there.

In other words, there is enough in the Old Testament for a person to believe in Jehovah Elohim, although an Old Testament believer could not clearly explain the God-ward side of the mechanics of his salvation (just as no New Testament believer can, moments after salvation, clearly explain expiation, reconciliation, propitiation or atonement). However, on the other hand, Satan, who knows the Old Testament better than any theologian, is unable to recognize what is coming, and he gleefully participates in the humiliation and violence against our Lord, and finally, in His crucifixion, the very thing which breaks Satan's back (or, more appropriate to this chapter, *crushes Satan's head*).

Satan's original sin ("I will be like the Most High") takes him to a place of such unimaginable hatred and viciousness, that he would do anything within his power to harm our Lord. In our present study, Satan has plotted against Adam and the woman, successfully luring them into sin, without any provocation from either Adam or the woman.

Just as a child molester is hated, even by fellow criminals, because he assaults the innocence of a child, something that strikes almost a universal chord in all of us; so is Satan's attack upon the first Adam and the last Adam.

Lesson 36: Genesis 3:14–15

The Seed of the Woman

We are studying the judgment of the serpent and of Satan, and in this judgment, God speaks of the *Seed of the Woman*. The Seed of the Woman is Jesus Christ, the hope of all humanity.

Gen 3:14 Then the LORD God said to the serpent: Because you have done this, you are cursed more than any livestock and more than any wild animal. You will move on your belly and eat dust all the days of your life.

Gen 3:15 I will put hostility between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed. He will crush your head, and you will bruise His heel.

Your seed is the seed of Satan—all unbelievers and all fallen angels; and *her seed* is Jesus Christ. The idea of *the Seed of the Woman* is very unusual, as the word used here is primarily associated with men. This might become more obvious if we look at the Greek word which is used to translate this Hebrew word (you will recognize the Greek word): sperma (σπέρμα) [pronounced SPHER-mah], which means 1) *from which a plant germinates; 1a) the seed, i.e. the grain or kernel which contains within itself the germ of the future plants; 1a1) of the grains or kernels sown; 1b) metaphorically a seed, i.e. a residue, or a few survivors reserved as the germ of the next generation (just as seed is kept from the harvest for the sowing); 2) the semen virile; 2a) the product of this semen, seed, children, offspring, progeny; 2b) family, tribe, posterity; 2c) whatever possesses vital*

force or life giving power; 2c1) of divine energy of the Holy Spirit operating within the soul by which we are regenerated. Strong's #4690. This is not a word we would associate with the woman (this word is found 45 times in the New Testament, and only twice associated with a woman—Heb. 11:11 Rev. 12:17).

In the Bible, God says that the woman would be **delivered** [saved] **through childbearing**; this means that, from the woman would come Jesus Christ. This is the virgin birth. Jesus Christ would deliver the woman and all mankind.

What we find in the Bible is a common thread as well as progressive revelation (we find out more and more about this, as we move through Scripture). In the book which is the essence of theology, we rarely have a full theological treatment of any topic in any one passage. However, when we put these passages together, we understand what we are being taught.

The Seed of the Woman as Found in the Bible

Scripture	Commentary
<p>[The Second Person of the Trinity speaking to the serpent]: "I will put hostility between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed. He will crush your head, and you will bruise His heel. (Gen. 3:15).</p>	<p>This is the first Messianic passage, interestingly enough, made to Satan, rather than to Adam and the woman. The Seed of the Woman is Jesus Christ. He would be born without the contribution of fallen man (the sin nature, which is passed down genetically by the man). There would be enmity between Him and the serpent (who represents Satan). Jesus Christ will crush Satan (the final judgment) and Satan will bruise the heel of Jesus Christ (the cross).</p>
<p>Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and she has called [or, proclaimed] His name <i>Immanuel</i> [which means, <i>God with us</i>] (Isa. 7:14).</p>	<p>The sin nature is passed down through the man, and we are told here that no man would be involved—a virgin would conceive and then give birth. This would be the <i>Seed of the Woman</i>.</p> <p>There are those who claim that the word here translated <i>virgin</i> does not mean <i>virgin</i>, but simply means <i>young woman</i>. Although this can be refuted with a careful study of the Hebrew word and the Greek word used to translate it, none of that is necessary. Y^ehowah here gives us a sign; if some young woman gives birth, this certainly does not qualify as a <i>sign</i>. <i>Young women giving birth</i> happens all of the time. However, when a <i>virgin</i> gives birth, <i>that</i> is a <i>sign</i>.</p>

The Seed of the Woman as Found in the Bible

Scripture

Commentary

For to us a Child is born, to us a Son is given; and the government shall be on His shoulder; and His name shall be called [or, *proclaimed*] Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. There is no end of the increase of His government and peace on the throne of David, and on His kingdom, to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice from now on, even forever. The intense love of Jehovah of Hosts will do this (Isa. 9:6–7).

Jesus is the Seed of the woman, the Child Who is born. Here, He is presented as royalty, much as a young child born into royalty would be presented. What is in view here is the Millennial reign of Jesus Christ.

In both of the Isaiah passages, we do not have the common way of naming a person. Instead, we have the phrase *to proclaim His name*. This is better understood as the proclamation of One's reputation, essence or being.

In the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God to a city of Galilee named Nazareth, to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David. And the virgin's name was Mary. And he came to her and said, "Greetings, O favored one, the Lord is with you!" (Luke 1:26–28).

This same theme—the Seed of the Woman Who would be born to a virgin—continues into the New Testament; and God sends the angel Gabriel to Mary, a virgin, who does not realize the amazing even which is about to transpire.

But she was greatly troubled at the saying, and tried to discern what sort of greeting this might be. And the angel said to her, "Do not be afraid, Mary, for you have found grace with God. And behold, you will conceive in your womb and bear a son, and you shall call His name Jesus. He will be renown and He will be called the Son of the Most High. And the Lord God will give to Him the throne of His father David, and He will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of His kingdom there will be no end." (Luke 1:29–33).

When an angel comes to Mary and tells her that God is with her, the woman is confused. Why would God send an angel to tell her these things?

The angel Gabriel speaks to the woman, telling her that she will give birth to the Savior-Messiah (*Jesus* means *Savior* and *Christ* means *Messiah*). The Messiah would be born to assume the throne of King David. The kingdom of no end is the Millennium, which culminates in the eternal state.

Saying the name *Jesus Christ* would have been seen by some, at this time, as blasphemous. Our Lord is called *Savior-Messiah*, and calling Him the Messiah infuriated many religious Jews at that time.

The Seed of the Woman as Found in the Bible

Scripture	Commentary
<p>And Mary said to the angel, "How will this be, since I am a virgin?" (Luke 1:34).</p>	<p>Mary fully understands that this angel is not simply speaking of her bearing a child sometime in the future; but that she will conceive of this child as a virgin.</p>
<p>And the angel answered her, "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the Child to be born will be called holy--the Son of God (Luke 1:35).</p>	<p>Quite obviously, Mary—a virgin—is concerned. How can she give birth being a <i>virgin</i>? The angel Gabriel tells us that she will give birth to a child of the Holy Spirit. The result would be the hypostatic union, the Unique Person of the Universe, the God-man.</p>
<p>And behold, your relative Elizabeth, in her old age, has also conceived a son, and this is the sixth month with her who was called barren. For nothing will be impossible with God." (Luke 1:36–37).</p>	<p>To help convince Mary of God's power, the angel points out that her barren relative, Elizabeth, is now pregnant with a son.</p>
<p>And Mary said, "Behold, I am the servant of the Lord; let it be to me according to your word." And the angel departed from her (Luke 1:38).</p>	<p>Mary is not here so much giving permission, as expressing positive volition toward the plan of God for her life.</p>
<p>Now the birth of Jesus Christ took place in this way. When his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together [sexually] she was found to be with child from the Holy Spirit (Matt. 1:18).</p>	<p>Matthew lays out the events of the virgin birth. Mary and Joseph were engaged to be married, and it became apparent that Mary was pregnant.</p>
<p>And her husband Joseph, being a just man and unwilling to put her to shame, resolved to divorce her quietly (Matt. 1:19).</p>	<p>Quite obviously, Joseph was concerned when his wife was pregnant. In the culture of that day, people did not celebrate a birth which involved some miscellaneous man. This would be very humiliating to both Joseph and Mary.</p>

The Seed of the Woman as Found in the Bible

Scripture	Commentary
<p>But as he considered these things, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying, "Joseph, son of David, do not fear to take Mary as your wife, for that which is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit. She will bear a Son, and you shall call His name Jesus, for He will save his people from their sins." (Matt. 1:20–21).</p>	<p>An angel appears to Joseph in a dream to quell his concerns, to tell him that this Son was sired by God the Holy Spirit. He will save the people from their sins.</p> <p>It is also important to note that God the Holy Spirit desired for Joseph and Mary to remain together as a couple. The Bible presents both the line of Joseph and the line of Mary. Therefore, even though Joseph, like Mary, is a sinner, he plays an important role in the raising of our Lord.</p>
<p>All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet: "Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel" (which means, <i>God with us</i>). When Joseph woke from sleep, he did as the angel of the Lord commanded him: he took his wife, but knew her not [i.e., did not have sex with her] until she had given birth to a son. And he called his name Jesus (Matt. 1:22–25).</p>	<p>Joseph was understandably concerned over this issue, and an angel revealed to Joseph that this was the fulfillment of Isa. 7:14.</p> <p>Mary and Joseph were married, but they did not consummate their marriage until after the birth of Jesus.</p> <p>Joseph names Him <i>Jesus</i>, which means <i>Savior</i>.</p>
<p>But when the fullness of time had come, God sent forth his Son, born of woman, born under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as sons (Gal. 4:4–5).</p>	<p>The <i>fullness of time</i> simply refers to the time frame as set up by God's plan. As in the other passages, Jesus is always represented as being born of the woman and never as born of Joseph. Jesus Christ is the <i>Seed of the Woman</i>, uncorrupted by sin. This in no way implies that Mary is sinless—she was born with a sin nature, just like everyone else. However, apparently, there is no inherent sin in the egg of the woman.</p>

The Seed of the Woman as Found in the Bible

Scripture	Commentary
<p>I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet. For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman, having been deceived, became in transgression. Yet she will be delivered through childbearing (1Tim. 2:12–15a).</p>	<p>When explaining why the woman is not given authority in the church, Paul gave this explanation: (1) Adam was formed first and therefore has the authority; and (2) the woman was deceived in the transgression. Although Paul writes that the woman would be delivered through childbearing (the birth of Jesus Christ), this applies to men as well—we are also saved through His birth (which leads to His substitutionary death on the cross).</p>
<p>And there appeared a great sign in the heavens, a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon was under her feet, and a crown of twelve stars on her head, and having a Babe in womb, she cries, being in travail, having been distressed to bear (Rev. 12:1–2).</p>	<p>The woman is clothed with the Light of God (the sun). Under her feet is the moon, which represents the shadow images fo Jesus to come (found in the Old Testament). The moon is the lesser light which rules the night. The 12 stars refers both to the 12 tribes of Israel and to the 12 Apostles of God. The Babe in her womb is Jesus Christ.</p>
<p>And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads (Rev. 12:3).</p>	<p>The great red dragon represents the forces of Satan. Most identify this as being a 10 nation coalition, but with 7 rulers (= <i>heads, crowns</i>).</p>
<p>And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her Child as soon as He was born (Rev. 12:4).</p>	<p>Satan, having been judged and warned about the Seed of the Woman, stood ready to devour this Child as soon as He was born. An example of this is Satan inspiring Herod to kill all of the children in his realm to destroy the Christ as a child (Mary and Joseph and Jesus moved to Egypt, at this time, for safety, foreshadowed by Jews moving to Egypt in their infancy).</p>
<p>And she bore a male son, Who is going to rule all nations with a rod of iron. And her Child was caught up to God and to His throne (Rev. 12:5).</p>	<p>And in the final book of the Bible, the Revelation, the Child born is presented as being born of Israel, and as One resurrected (He was caught up to God and His throne), Who would rule over the nations.</p>

This same theme is continued all the way from the beginning of man's sin (5000–6000 years ago), to the prophet Isaiah (circa 700 B.C.), to the actual virgin birth (approximately 6 B.C.), to the epistles of Paul (circa 50 A.D.), and finally to the book of Revelation (circa 90 B.C., but which spoke of events which would take place far off in the future). The consistency of the doctrine of the Bible is amazing to behold. Here we have had 6 different authors, writing over a period of 2000–3000 years (or more), and they are completely in synch about the virgin birth of Jesus Christ, the Seed of the Woman. All the way from the first book of the Old Testament to the first chapter of the New Testament, this same theme continues, affirmed by the other gospel writers and by the epistles, and finally by John's vision, called Revelation, the final book of the Bible.

This represents one of the great differences between the Bible and other so-called holy books. Mary Baker Patterson Glover Eddy is responsible for Christian science and its *holy book*. I do not recall the exact history of the Book of Mormon and the Book of the Covenant, but I believe only Joseph Smith wrote it (wearing *magic* glasses). The Koran was the work of Mohammed. Whenever some holy book is created, there is primarily one hand writing it, the book contradicts Christian doctrine, and is *never* recognized by any significant number of Christians as being a true continuation of the revelation of Scripture (although all 3 religions—Christian Science, Islam and Mormonism—do). And, in every case, these books contradict the most fundamental doctrines of the Word of God. However, in the Bible itself, we find an unbroken line of cohesive doctrine, from cover to cover, though written by many different men over a period of many centuries. The Seed of the Woman is but one example of many doctrines which begin in seed form in the Old Testament and come to complete fruition in the New.

Lesson 37: Genesis 3:14–16

The Woman's Desire for Her Man

Last time, we covered the the Seed of the Woman, and, before that, the judgment of Satan.

So far, God has judged Satan. Each of the 3 judgments is Hebrew poetry. In this passage, God speaks to Satan, who is indwelling the serpent.

Genesis 3:14–15: God's Judgement of the Serpent

The LORD God said to the serpent,
“Because you have done this,
you are cursed above all livestock and above all beasts of the field;
on your belly you shall go, and dust you shall eat all the days of your life.
I will put enmity between you and the woman,
and between your seed and her Seed;
He shall crush your head, and you shall bruise His heel.”

God first judges the serpent; but then speaks directly to Satan, telling him, in shadow form, what would come to pass. There will be a natural animosity between the seed of the serpent (unbelievers and fallen angels) and the Seed of the Woman (Jesus Christ). We hear this regularly in the United States and elsewhere, where the name *Jesus Christ* is used as an epithet. We do not find, to the best of my knowledge, special curses associated with Buddha or Mohammed or Confucius; but we do with Jesus Christ. This illustrates this inherent animosity between the seed of the serpent and the Seed of the Woman.

The cross is revealed here, for the first time, in shadow form. “He [Jehovah, the Seed of the Woman] will crush your head and you [Satan] will bruise His heel.” The cross will be Satan bruising the heel of our Lord—He will stumble, but then stand up again (the resurrection); but our Lord’s judgment on the cross will crush the serpent’s head.

God now speaks to the woman. Notice that, Adam blamed God and the woman, and the woman, in turn, blamed the serpent. So God started with the serpent, then He will speak to the woman, and then, finally, to Adam. God to the woman:

Gen 3:16 He said to the woman: I will intensify your labor pains; you will bear children in anguish. Your desire will be for your husband, yet he will dominate you.

Again, this is Hebrew poetry, and there is a lot here to examine.

Prior to this point in time, there were no children. The woman did not get pregnant, even though she and Adam had sex in the garden probably many times when in innocence (this is a reasonable assumption, but never specifically laid out in the book of Genesis). However, at this point, God promises the woman that she will have children and that giving birth will be painful. If you are a woman, and you are trying in some way to minimize the sin of the woman, note the judgment here. At this point in time, God could have had the man and the woman produce children in a myriad of ways (as nature reveals to us). However, the woman is judged by bearing children in great pain.

Jesus Christ gives the woman an additional pronouncement of judgment: “Your desire will be for your husband, yet he will dominate you.” The word *desire* here is *teshûwqâh* (תְּשׁוּבָה) [pronounced *tesh-oo-KAW*], and it means *desire, craving, longing; the longing [of a woman for a man or a man for a woman]*. Strong’s #8669 BDB #1003. This word is found only 3 times in the Bible. Here, Gen. 4:14 and Song of Solomon 7:10.

A woman has a two-fold desire for her husband. She desires him, his love and care; but she also desires his authority. Being a man, this first sense is always fascinating to me, as I know what men are really like. How a woman can look on a man and long for him—desire him—is absolutely amazing to me. A girl can have the absolute worst father in the world, or her father may walk out on her, and she will, at a very early age, still crave or desire a man. In fact, girls from lousy homes or with lousy fathers will still, usually in their teens, develop a strong desire for this or that boy—often one with similar traits to her own father—and be inexplicably drawn to him. Had I not been a high school teacher

observing this first hand on many occasions, I might even doubt the Bible at this point—but, even though we men can be pretty worthless, insofar as genders go, women still desire us.

There is a second way to understand the woman's desire for a man, and that may be more what is in view here: the woman desires the husband's authority as well. The Bible often sets up parallel thoughts, and the second part of this sentence is, "[He will dominate you.](#)" or "[He will have authority over you.](#)" Her desire for her husband stands in contrast to this statement. The husband will have the authority in marriage and man will have the authority in life; but the woman will always desire this authority and she will continually try to usurp it. Like Adam, we men will too often give in at this point, which is destructive to the marriage and destructive to society as well. For an example of this, we have had a strong feminist movement in the United States over the past 40 years, and as this movement has gained strength, the institution of marriage and family have simultaneously—and not coincidentally—suffered great loss. We have a much higher divorce rate, we have men and women choosing to live together rather than to marry, and we have a rise in homosexual unions during the same time period. We have society glorifying the single mother, and yet, every statistical study shows that children of single mothers are more likely to use drugs, end up in prison, not complete high school or college, etc. Every set of bad behaviors for children are more likely to be manifested in the children of single mothers than in children who have a father and a mother at home.

Our culture has become quite confused on this issue of single motherhood. The worst situation for a child is, to be born to a single mother and to be raised by that single mother (statistically speaking). He is more likely to be poor and more likely to go to jail. In fact, if you simply make of list of what a parent would want for his or her child—college or some sort of training, a well-balanced life, marriage, children (in that order), a successful life—and a list of things a parent would not want for his or her child (poverty, fathering children out of wedlock or having a child out of wedlock, early involvement with drugs and/or alcohol, dropping out of high school, breaking the law), the child born to and raised by a single mother is much more likely to have his or her life defined by the second list rather than by the first. In the United States, we have blamed poverty and racial prejudice for these evils, but, when a home is headed by a married mother and father, regardless of the race or economic level, the children turn out better; and there is little if any racial divide in any of these areas.

We have, as a society, made it easier for a Black mother to be a single mother; and have even, to some extent, encouraged this. As a result, there are far more Black families headed by single mothers than in any other racial group; and all of these negative things which children get into, happen in a disproportionate number to children of unwed mothers, which are, for the most part, Black women. So, statistically, we associate poverty, drugs and crime with Black families, but the actual correlation is with single mothers more than it is with a racial group. We are simply confused on this issue because our government encourages single motherhood among Blacks (I have rented out houses for many years, and somewhere between 80–90% of the women on government-subsidized housing are single Black mothers).

It was not always this way. In the United States, before the Great Depression, the unemployment rate among Blacks was lower than that among whites. There were not an inordinate number of children being born out of wedlock. However, since government has stepped in to *right* all the wrongs of many decades of racial prejudice, the Black family has been all but destroyed, and now all of these problems which we tend to associate with race (poverty, drugs, single motherhood), actually did not exist in these numbers prior to government giving Blacks *a hand up*.

This governmental support for single Black mothers is a perfect example of human good. This is the same as Adam and the woman sewing fig leaves as genital coverings, but on a national scale. No politician, when dealing with the inequities of our society, thought, *I want to pass legislation to destroy the Black family*. That was just a natural yet unexpected by-product of legislative human good developed on a national scale.

Satan, on the other hand, is brilliant. He knows what is most likely to occur in the future. God designs here the glue to keep families together (the woman's desire for her man; the man's authority); and Satan seeks to destroy this in any way possible.

God herein sets a precedent. The man and the woman will have children; the woman will bear the child; and the woman will be under the authority of the man. A part of the glue which binds this family unit is the natural desire of the woman for the man. At the same time, part of their conflict will be the woman's desire for his authority.

The woman's first act as a fallen creature was to give the fruit to Adam. Remember, sin just won't leave well enough alone. Satan cannot allow the restored world to just function, while he hangs out in some other galaxy; likewise, the woman cannot leave Adam a note saying, "I screwed up, and I am leaving you forever. Love, the woman." The woman knew that she screwed up and her first overt act as a sinner was to put Adam behind the 8-ball as well. Adam submitted to her authority when he took the fruit from her and ate it.

Women from that very day have been trying to usurp the authority of man. This authority is found throughout our lives, including in the church: **I do not allow a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; instead, she is to be silent. For Adam was created first, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman, having been deceived, was in the transgression. But she will be delivered through childbearing, if she continues in faith, love, and holiness, with good sense** (1Tim. 2:12-15). Paul tells Timothy, from the perspective of the order of creation, the woman is under the authority of the man. If you will recall, the woman was created *for the man as a help to him, as his counterpart*. Furthermore, the man names her, which is another confirmation of the man's authority.

As a fallen creature, the woman faces two antithetical desires: first to her right man (or, sometimes to any man who fulfills a certain criterion); but secondly, she wants to dominate the relationship, which she will attempt to do through manipulation (trade-outs, pouting, moodiness, psychological warfare, etc.); and sometimes, the woman just takes over, because the man simply gives up or is unable to exercise his authority as the leader.

Some men are simply not equipped in their souls to be leaders and they fall into a subservient role when given the opportunity.

Sometimes, this just pops out unexpectedly. I dated a gal several times, and things were fair to middling. Then one day, we were driving somewhere together, and I missed a turn because I was unable to read the street sign. When I turned into a parking lot to go back, this woman began barking out step-by-step directions on how to drive through the parking lot, giving me unasked for and explicit left and right turn directions while in the parking lot, to exit and go back to the correct street. It was as if this desire to tell me what to do and when to do it had been building up over a period of several weeks, and when she saw an opening—my missing a turn—she took it.

So the woman has this desire toward the man; and yet, at the same time, has the desire for his authority, the very thing, that if she takes it from him, her respect for him diminishes dramatically.

Gen 3:16 He said to the woman: I will intensify your labor pains; you will bear children in anguish. Your desire will be for your husband, yet he will dominate you.

I hope that you are coming to appreciate just how compact and understated these first few chapters of Genesis are.

Lesson 38: Genesis 3:14–20 God Judges Adam, the Woman and Satan

Here is what we have studied so far (this is actually Hebrew poetry):

Genesis 3:14–16

Then the LORD God said to the serpent:

Because you have done this,
you are cursed more than any
livestock
and more than any wild animal.
You will move on your belly
and eat dust all the days of your life.

God begins by judging the serpent, which essentially symbolizes God’s judgement of Satan.

I will put hostility between you and the
woman,
and between your seed and her seed.
He will crush your head,
and you will bruise His heel.

At this point, God judges Satan. Satan formed an alliance with the woman against the man; God would establish hostility between the seed of Satan (unbelievers and fallen angels) and the Seed of the Woman (Jesus Christ). Jesus Christ would crush the head of Satan (a fatal blow) and Satan would strike the heel of Jesus Christ (His death on the cross).

Genesis 3:14–16

He said to the woman:

I will intensify your labor pains;
you will bear children in anguish.
Your desire will be for your husband,
yet he will dominate you.

The judgment on the woman is that she will endure much suffering in order to give birth; however, despite this pain, many women desire to give birth to a child.

The woman will have an insatiable desire for the man; a desire which begins at a very early age. Little girls as young as 2 or 3 can experience this desire; it is a natural affection and attraction girls of all ages feel toward men.

However, there is also this natural desire of a woman—particularly in a relationship—to dominate the man. She may work incessantly and even unconsciously, to achieve this dominance; and loses respect for the man whenever she dominates the man.

God has spoken to the serpent and has judged it (judging Satan as well); He spoke to the woman, and judged her. God is a God of righteousness and justice. The actions of Adam and the woman must be weighed against God's perfect righteousness, and because it does not measure up, the justice of God must pronounce judgment.

It is built into our very nature to require that justice be done. Let's go back to an illustration from life. A child molester is caught, tried and sentenced. If he is given a month or a year in jail, we are appalled and outraged, because his actions have destroyed the innocence of a child (there is nothing more moving to a father than to observe this natural affection and attraction that his little girl has for him and there is nothing worse than to have this natural affection and attraction polluted). If a child molester is given a sentence to where he will be in jail for, say, 20 years, most people are satisfied with that sentence (although, of course, some would expect life, and some would even like to see the death penalty applied at this point). It is built into our very nature to want to see an unrighteous act judged and the evil-doer properly sentenced. I chose a particularly odious crime, one which offends even most criminals.

I learned about the importance of the execution of justice as a teacher. If there was an unruly child, the other children wanted me to deal with him. I could not ignore or condone bad behavior, because this signaled to the other students that there were no standards in my classroom. Any time a kid did or said the wrong thing, at least 20 heads would turn toward me to see what I would do. I have even heard children complain when I or another teacher did not deal with obvious wrongdoing in the classroom. In their little souls, there was a concept of righteousness and justice. They knew when something was wrong and they knew that it had to be dealt with.

Therefore, the ultimate authority, God, has to speak to the wrongdoing which has taken place and He needs to judge it. God could not look at the serpent and the woman and say, "This was a very bad thing. Please, don't do it again."

Next, God speaks to Adam:

Gen 3:17 And He said to Adam, "Because you listened to your woman's voice and [because] you ate from the tree concerning which I commanded you, 'Do not eat from it,' the ground is cursed because of you. You will eat from it by means of painful labor all the days of your life.

Adam clearly understood what was right and wrong. He knew that by eating from the fruit of the tree, he was disobeying God. However, he chose to take the fruit from the woman, he chose to listen and put himself under the authority of the woman, and the ground is cursed because of that.

We do not know the conversation which Adam and the woman had. If we take the first sentence literally, then we are to understand there definitely was a conversation which took place between the man and the woman ("Because you listened to your woman's voice..."). However, interestingly enough, Paul tells us that Adam was not deceived but the woman was (1Tim. 2:14). So, whatever the woman told Adam—even if it involved lying—Adam was able to boil this down to the truth. Adam was cognizant of the issues here, but chose to eat from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, having listened to his woman's voice. This phrase, as well as the verb used here, indicates some measure of obedience on Adam's part. Whether the woman held out the fruit and said, "Take it and eat it; it's good;" or whether there was a more lengthy conversation, we do not know. What we do know is that Adam understood perfectly what he was doing.

In the Garden of Eden, God caused fruit to grow from the trees, and Adam and the woman simply ate from these trees. In innocence, eating does not appear to be necessarily to sustain life, but was done for enjoyment. They had perfect bodies with a perfect metabolism, so they could eat or not eat—at least, for longer periods of time (remember, Jesus will fast for 40 days in a body uncorrupted by sin). However, in their fallen state, their bodies would undergo a change, and there would be a corresponding change that would be reflected in the entire earth. The entire earth would be cursed, and Adam would have to learn how to cultivate fruit and vegetables in order to survive. Doing so would require a great deal of work; and our lives today are defined by work. Verse 19 literally says, "by the sweat of your brow." Adam would have to work hard and sweat but he would also have to think as well, and the use of man's mind in order to eat would produce the most prosperity. Some theologians understand the phrase "by the sweat of your brow" to refer to the thinking and planning which takes place when it comes to a man providing for his needs and the needs of his family.

Now, recall, that outside of the garden, there was not a lot of vegetation (Gen. 2:5 properly translated). Inside the Garden of Eden, there was lush vegetation. However, there

appears to be an additional change—the ground itself would be cursed. This is described in v. 18:

Gen 3:18 It will produce thorns and thistles for you, and you will eat the plants of the field.

The earth fell into some sort of fallen state along with Adam and the woman. They acquired sin natures as a result of disobeying God; both the man and the woman were culpable, but unequally so. Since they fell, the entire earth underwent a change, and the result was, the ground did not just produce fruit and vegetables, but it would also produce things which made life difficult for mankind. From this point on, fallen man lived in a fallen world.

We do not know the full extent of what it means for the earth to be cursed. Was the earth outside of the garden gumbo soil (as we have here in the south) or filled with rocks (as I recall the soil of parts of California)? Or was there an actual, physical change which takes place? In any case, where Adam and the woman would go, from the ground would come thorns and thistles. For many years, Adam and the woman have been naked and barefoot. You cannot walk through certain places barefooted. When thorns and thistles begin to grow, the world will become a more and more inhospitable place for Adam and the woman.

Gen 3:19 You will eat bread by the sweat of your brow until you return to the ground, since you were taken from it. For you are dust, and you will return to dust."

Man is formed out of the elements of the ground, and when we die, we will return to the ground and, at some point, become indistinguishable from it. This is also a fascinating thing for the Bible to tell us—reiterating that we are made of the chemicals of the earth. No doubt, many ancient men and scholars would distinguish themselves from the chemicals of the earth, thinking themselves to be made of different stuff; but God, from the very beginning, identifies our bodies with the chemicals, elements and compounds of the earth.

Let's see how all of these judgments read together:

Genesis 3:14–19: God's Judgments of the Serpent, the Woman and the Man

Then the LORD God said to the serpent:

Because you have done this,
you are cursed more than any livestock and more than any wild animal.
You will move on your belly and eat dust all the days of your life.
I will put hostility between you and the woman,
and between your seed and her seed.
He will crush your head, and you will bruise His heel.

He said to the woman:

I will intensify your labor pains;

Genesis 3:14–19: God's Judgments of the Serpent, the Woman and the Man

you will bear children in anguish.
Your desire will be for your husband,
yet he will dominate you.

And He said to Adam,

"Because you listened to your woman's voice
and [because] you ate from the tree
concerning which I commanded you, 'Do not eat from it,'
the ground is cursed because of you.
You will eat from it by means of painful labor all the days of your life.
It will produce thorns and thistles for you,
and you will eat the plants of the field.
You will eat bread by the sweat of your brow
until you return to the ground, since you were taken from it.
For you are dust, and you will return to dust."

You will notice that God's judgment of the man was much more involved and lengthy than that of the woman. This was a judgment of man and all mankind. Furthermore, this was a judgment leveled against his authority because with authority comes greater responsibility and greater penalties.

Gen 3:20 Adam named his wife Eve because she was the mother of all the living.

Adam listened to God and understood that the woman would give birth at some point in time and that all life would come from her; so he named her "Eve." It is possible that Adam named the woman after she gave birth the first time and he may have named her based upon the promise/judgment of God ("You will bear children in anguish"). In the Hebrew, this is Chavvâh (חַוְוָה) [pronounced *khahv-VAW*], which means *life, living*; which we transliterate *Eve*. Strong's #2332 BDB #295.

We had a generic name for the woman before: *Ishshah*; but it worked because there were no other women. No one was going to be born because there was no reason at this time for anyone to be born. However, now that the woman would be giving birth to sons and daughters, there needs to be a proper noun to distinguish her from the other women, so Adam calls her *Eve*.

We are born with 2 strikes against us, and we strike out as soon as we get the chance (i.e., we commit personal sins). Men and women are born with a sin nature and with Adam's original sin imputed to this sin nature. So, even though we look at a baby and see absolute innocence, God looks at a baby and sees it as condemned from birth. This is actually a good thing, because, if we are born condemned, then, if we die before reaching the age of accountability (where we have the concept of God in our minds), God can impute righteousness to us, based upon the cross. We have to be condemned before we can be

saved. Since Jesus Christ died for the sins of every person, and since God-consciousness is not a part of a person's makeup until somewhere between age 3 and 18 (or so), a child that dies before reaching this age is in a theological limbo (for some). However, since, that child is born condemned; and since Jesus Christ died for that child; and since their volition is not an issue, as they have not yet reached God consciousness; it follows that, all such babies or infants who die early are saved. This is why it is a good thing that we are condemned from birth. We find this confirmed in 2Sam. 12:15b–23.

As soon as we develop enough volition to sin, then personal sin becomes a part of the trifacta which condemns all mankind. That the sin nature is alive and well in any child soon becomes apparent with the child's vocabulary. Every child learns the word *momma* first and then *daddy* (or its equivalent) and then the 3rd word they learn is *no!* That is the old sin nature speaking.

The sin nature will be genetically passed down by the male and not by the female. The reason for the virgin birth of Jesus Christ (Isa. 7:14) is far more than simply being a sign; the virgin birth of Jesus Christ is important because, our Lord cannot be born with a sin nature. The only way for anyone to be born without a sin nature is to be born apart from the contribution of the man. Jesus Christ is born without Adam's imputed sin. Since our Lord is born without a sin nature, then there is nothing Adam's imputed sin can be attached to. So Jesus is born without a sin nature and without Adam's sin imputed to Him. He also lives approximately 30–36 years without committing any personal sins.

Women have a sin natures; they are recipients of the imputation of Adam's original sin; and women commit personal sin. However, because of the difference of the sins of the man and the woman, what the woman contributes to the fetus is an embryo which is not corrupted by the sin nature. So the hope of our redemption is found in the seed of the woman. When that embryo is combined with the male sperm, then we have a living fetus, and one which is corrupted at conception by the sin of Adam.

It is fascinating just how interwoven the Bible is. A few thousand years later, the line of Adam will go through David, through Solomon, and eventually through Jeconiah (also known as Coniah and also as Jehoiachin), a very evil King of Judah. A curse on Jeconiah is pronounced by God through Jeremiah (Jer. 22:24—"As I live," says the LORD, "though you, Coniah son of Jehoiakim, the king of Judah, were a signet ring on My right hand, I would tear you from it."), which essentially guarantees that the promises made to David (the Davidic Covenant) would not be passed down through Jeconiah's line. This is known in theology as *the Coniah curse*. Jeconiah is treated, in essence, like the old sin nature. His evil nature attaches itself to the line of David, just as sin is passed down specifically from the father. The Messiah cannot come from a man, because it is through the man that the sin nature is passed down. In this curse, the Messiah cannot be born in the line of Jeconiah, who is a real person, but who represents the sin nature. The passing along of the sin nature is illustrated in Scripture with this actual person. We find these real-life situations which illustrate spiritual realities over and over again in the Bible. Jeconiah was a real king; he was a real person; and God really cursed him for his evil actions. However,

he illustrates the passing down of the sin nature and the passing down of Adam's original sin to all mankind. The Coniah curse.

Joseph, the legal father of Jesus, is in the line of David, Solomon and Jeconiah (Matt. 1:1, 6–7, 12); but his seed was not used to impregnate Mary (Matt. 1:18–25). Therefore the Jeconiah curse—the curse of the old sin nature—is not passed down to our Lord. The line which was not corrupted—the line which was not cursed—goes from David to Nathan to Mary (Luke 1:26–35 3:23, 31). The virgin birth was real, and the sin nature was not passed down to Jesus through the man, because there was no man involved in His conception; the *curse of Coniah* (which real curse represents the sin nature) has been bypassed.

The cursing of the ground, because of Adam's sin, is analogous to the cursing of all mankind. Calling the woman the *mother of all living* and speaking of her Seed as being at enmity with the seed of the serpent, speaks of the Savior to come, born of the woman, and born without a sin nature.

The key to understanding much of the Bible is Jesus Christ: His birth, His person, His hypostatic union, His death and His resurrection. He is the fundamental Truth of the Bible, from cover to cover, from the first verse of Genesis to the last verse of Revelation. It may take a lot of studying before you begin to put it all together and begin to appreciate Who and What Jesus is, and just how much the Bible is about Him.

How do you—let's say that you see yourself as just an average Christian—understand this? God has designed the pastor-teacher to teach Bible doctrine; to teach the truth of the Bible. If you see the Bible as just too easy to interpret this way or that way, then sometime, in the near future, sit down with the book of John (the 4th gospel) and read it (almost any translation is good). Don't bring to it all of your preconceived notions; just read it for what it says. Who and What Jesus Christ is will become apparent. You may not understand every parable and every miracle (quite frankly, it took me 30 years before I began to understand why Jesus turned water into wine as His first miracle, as it seemed to me to be a parlor trick devoid of meaning); but you will develop a fundamental understanding of Who Jesus is. Salvation will be clearly presented—again and again.

And we as men, even place Jesus in the center of our history. What comes before Him is *before Christ* and what follows Him is called *the year of our Lord (Anno Domini)*. We did not exactly pinpoint His birth, but man's attempt was to use His birth as the foundation of our modern calendar. And no matter where you go in this world, almost every single nation has defaulted to the Julian/Gregorian Calendar, even though they may have a long history of another calendar. The Buddhist countries have a Buddhist calendar, but it has been adapted to the Julian/Gregorian calendar; and many Buddhists in Buddhist countries simply use the Julian/Gregorian calendar, despite thousands of years of heritage. And this calendar calls to them, *this day, in the year of our Lord; as measured by the birth of Jesus Christ*. Now, you may point out that this has all come about because of the predominance of American business. It does not matter what the reason is. God uses many different means to achieve His ends.

In almost every civilized culture, the 7-day week is a fundamental part of that culture, connecting it to the restoration of the earth and the creation of man and animals; and the Julian/Gregorian calendar, also adhered to by almost every civilized nation, uses Jesus Christ as its starting point. Every person who references some date, e.g., August 5, 2009, is testifying to the centrality of Jesus Christ to human history.

Lesson 39: Genesis 3:21

The Sacrificial Death of Christ for our Sins

Here, in Gen. 3:21, we will be exposed to the gospel of Jesus Christ, that Jesus died for our sins and paid for our wrongdoing.

In order to understand this, I need to introduce two theological terms: *type* and *antitype*. The Old Testament is filled with real historical events, ceremonies and rituals, all which point to Jesus Christ and His death on the cross. These things are called *types*. These are things which illustrate the Person of Jesus Christ or the death of Jesus Christ for our sins. What they illustrate is called the antitype. If there were 3 or 4 things in the Old Testament that we could point to and say, "See how this parallels Christ" then the concept of type and antitype would not be very compelling. However, there are literally hundreds of people, historical incidents, religious symbols, ceremonies and rituals all of which speak of the Person and work of Jesus Christ. Gen. 3:21 introduces the concept of *type*.

To remind you of what has happened so far: Satan has deceived the woman, and she ate from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. She gave fruit from the tree to Adam, and he ate this fruit from the tree. Adam had not been deceived. God came to them in the spiritual part of the day and called to them. When their sin was known, God judged the serpent, Satan, the woman and then the man.

Now, we have the gospel [= *the good news of Jesus Christ*] taught right here, in the 3rd chapter of Genesis, immediately after Adam and the woman sin.

Gen 3:21 The LORD God made a covering out of skin [or, *animal hide*] for Adam and his wife, and He clothed them.

This verse is extremely important and it is often ignored or not fully understood. Adam and the woman clothed themselves with fig leaves; God rejected this covering of fig leaves and, instead, covered them with animal skins. There were no leather stores outside the Garden of Eden at this time. In order for God to get these animal skins, He would have to slaughter an animal in front of Adam and Eve. This spoke of our Lord's sacrificial death on behalf of all mankind, and we find this death referred to as far back as our chapter, the 3rd chapter of the 1st book of the Bible, immediately after the fall. Furthermore, God covered the nakedness of Adam and the woman with this animal skin (which is in the singular in the Hebrew), which signified that they would be covered by the blood of Christ (His spiritual death covers our sins; we are forgiven because Jesus took our sins upon His Himself, bearing them in His Own body on the cross—1Peter 2:24a).

In the Old Testament, since Jesus had not yet come in the flesh, the Bible speaks of man's sins being covered rather than forgiven (see Ex. 30:10 Lev. 1:4 Neh. 4:5). The word "atonement" which we find throughout the Old Testament, means *a covering over*. We only find this word in the Old Testament, but never in the New. In the Old Testament, Christ was yet future and our sins had not been paid for; so God covered over our sins in time, which He would forgive in full in the future. And when Jesus came in the flesh, then He began to speak of Him forgiving us our sins (Matt. 9:6 and Mark 2:5–12—where Jesus proclaims that He has the ability to forgive sins, something which the pharisees rightly understand only God can do).

Again, note the subtlety of Genesis. We are not beat over the head with this doctrine; we are simply told that God made clothing of an animal skin for Adam and his wife. This is not because God has determined, "These fig leaves just make the wrong fashion statement; leather is what people are wearing these days." Nor is it a matter of leather being better than the fig leaves, in the clothing realm. The key is, the animal sacrifice. Jehovah Elohim killed an animal, in front of Adam and the woman, something they had never seen before, as this was the first animal death in the era of mankind. They watch the blood as it was pumped out of the carotid, and they observe life leaving the animal. It is possible that an altar was built where part of the animal was burned. However, all we are told is that, the animal's skin was used in order to cover them over, to conceal their nakedness, the visible reminder to them that they had sinned against God and that everything had just changed in their world because of this sin.

This also introduces the notion of *atonement*, which is one of those theological terms which many people have heard of, but few understand.

The Doctrine of Atonement

1. The Hebrew word here is *kâphar* (כָּפַר) [pronounced *kaw-FAHR*], which means *to cover, to cover over [with], to be covered [with]; to spread over; to appease, to placate, to pacify; to pardon, to expiate; to atone; to obtain forgiveness; to free an offender of a charge*. Strong's #3722 BDB #497. This verb is much more common than its noun cognates.
2. The idea of *atonement* is not full and complete forgiveness, but a *covering over* of the sins committed. Psalm 65:3: *When iniquities prevail against me, You [God] atone for [or, cover over] our transgressions*.
3. *Atonement* is a temporary measure. Sins are temporarily *covered over*.
4. *Atonement* is strictly an Old Testament term, because it refers to God covering over our sins until Christ came.
 - 1) We do not find the word *atonement* in the New Testament, except in Rom. 5:11 (in the KJV and other translations) where the Greek word is mistranslated *atonement*.
 - 2) After the death of Christ, are sins are not merely covered over, but they are removed from us, and we are not only forgiven, but justified.
5. The excellent theologian L. S. Chafer (whose book set *Systematic Theology I* strongly recommend) likens this to *promising to pay a debt*. You owe far more

The Doctrine of Atonement

money than you are able to pay back, and a generous benefactor collects your IOU's and promises to pay them on your behalf. His promise is you *atonement*. He fulfills this promise when he actually pays for these debts.

6. Therefore, *atonement* is temporary; *forgiveness* is forever.
 - 1) If you are married, and you have gotten into an argument with your spouse, does your spouse bring up every wrong thing that you have ever done from the past? That means, she did not forgive for those transgressions; she just temporarily covered them over, and will trot them out every time an argument calls for additional ammunition.
 - 2) The word *forgiveness* (or some form of this word) is found 38 times in the Old Testament. The word *atonement* (or some form of this word) is found 64 times in the New Testament (a shorter set of texts). This is because *atonement* is an Old Testament theme and *forgiveness* is a New Testament theme.
7. In the Old Testament, our sins are temporarily covered over; in the New Testament, our sins are forgiven. Matt. 6:14–15 9:2–7 (“...**the Son of man has the power to forgive sins on earth.**”) Acts 5:31 13:38 26:18 Eph. 4:32 Col. 1:14
8. What God is doing here in Gen. 3, although the word *atonement* is not used, is He is covering over the sin of Adam and the woman with the animal skin. This is a temporary measure; God is not forgiving them their sin; He is covering it over. Their sins will be forgiven because of the cross.
9. All of this is real. Adam and the woman really existed; they took fruit from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil and ate it; and God killed an animal and used its skin to cover over Adam and the woman's nakedness. These are real historical events which convey spiritual truth, which is something which we find throughout the Bible.
10. One deep truth: you cannot have an animal hide without first killing the animal.
11. The sacrifice of the animal is a picture of Christ dying on the cross. The sacrifice of the animal and the covering over with the animal skin is a *type*; and Jesus Christ dying for our sins is the *antitype*.
12. Animal sacrifice is associated with atonement. In fact, this association is the most common use of the word *atonement*. Ex. 29:36–37 30:10 Lev. 1:4 4:20, 26 1Chron. 6:49 Neh. 10:33
13. The first time the word *atonement* is used is Gen. 6:14, where the Ark is made watertight by *covering* it over with pitch. The verb is *kâphar* and *pitch* is a noun cognate of *kâphar*. The picture is, Noah and his family were *covered over* and survived the judgment of God, which came upon the world.
14. When Daniel was telling when the end times would come and when the Messiah would come, part of what he said was, “**Seventy sevens are decreed as to your people, and as to your holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make atonement for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy.**” (Daniel 9:24). Atonement is clearly associated with the Messiah to come, who would make an atonement for iniquity.

The Doctrine of Atonement

- 1) As an aside, this passage from which I took this verse tells exactly *when* Messiah would come.
15. One of the nouns built from this verb is generally translated *atonement* and is used primarily to refer to the *Day of Atonement*, that one day of the year that the High Priest entered into the Holy of Holies of the Tabernacle, and sprinkled blood on the Mercy Seat of the Ark of God.
 - 1) There is a good chance that you do not know what any of these things are, so let me give you a brief run down of each of the items above:
 - (1) The Tabernacle is a large semi-permanent tent, but people did not go inside of the Tabernacle; only the priests.
 - (2) There were several articles of furniture associated with the Tabernacle, some of which were inside of the Tabernacle and some which were outside. From above, this furniture was arranged in the shape of a cross (some pieces were inside the Tabernacle and some were outside, partially obscuring the *cross*). In other words, the cross to come was partially hidden from view.
 - (3) Inside the Tabernacle was a compartment (like a room) that no one could ever enter into except for the High Priest (who portrayed Jesus Christ), who would enter into this room once a year. This room was called the Holy of Holies.
 - (4) Inside the Holy of Holies was the Ark of God, which was a picture of Jesus Christ. It was a box made of acacia wood (speaking of His humanity) which was overlain with gold (speaking of His Deity).
 - (5) On top of this box was the *mercy seat*, with two angels looking down upon the mercy seat. The two angels speak of the Angelic Conflict, which we covered back in lessons #4–5.
 - (6) The High Priest entered into the Holy of Holies once a year and sprinkled blood onto the mercy seat.
 - (7) Inside of the Ark were 3 things which spoke of the sin of man: the Ten Commandments, written on stone; Aaron's rod that budded, and a gold jar with manna. These 3 things also explain God's involvement in our lives. We are sinners before God, to which the Ten Commandments are a witness. However, because Christ dies for our sins, we receive both provisions in time (pictured by the manna) and we are resurrected in time (pictured by Aaron's rod that budded).
 - 2) Every single one of these things is a picture of Jesus Christ and His dying for our sins. The Tabernacle, the furniture of the Tabernacle, the Holy of Holies, the Ark of God, the High Priest are all *types*; each of these things speaks of the Person or work of Jesus Christ. Whatever part of the nature of Jesus Christ or whatever aspect of His death for our sins that is portrayed is the *antitype*
16. To bring things to a full circle, the word *Mercy Seat*—that is the thing which is on top of the Ark of God—is actually the Hebrew word *kappôreth* (כַּפֹּרֶת) [pronounced

The Doctrine of Atonement

kap-POH-reth], which is another noun cognate of the verb *to atone for; to cover over*. Once a year, the High Priest enters into the Holy of Holies and sprinkles blood on the Mercy Seat, which *covers over* our sins until Christ comes.

17. In summation, *atonement* refers to the temporary covering over of our sins until Christ comes in the flesh to die for our sins.
18. What is pictured here in Gen. 3:21 is God *covering* Adam and the woman with animal skins, which came from the killing of an innocent animal, which is a picture of Christ dying for our sins on the cross.

When I was first saved, and began to study the Bible, I was impressed by and fascinated by all of the fulfilled prophecies of the Old Testament. However, over the years, what has come to impress me even more is how Jesus Christ and His death on the cross for our sins are portrayed again and again and again in the Old Testament.

Again, the correct theological term for this is a *type* and *antitype*. That is, the Ark of God is an example of *type* and Jesus Christ is the *antitype*. The *type* might be seen as analogous to a lock, and Jesus Christ is the perfect *key* which unlocks the *type*. Jesus Christ fits perfectly into the lock and fully unlocks its meaning. We only fully understand a *type* when we match it with the *antitype*.

So far, we have studied at least 2 instances of type in the Old Testament. In v. 15, God said that the serpent would bruise the heel of the Seed of the Woman, and that the Seed of the Woman would crush the head of the serpent. At the cross, Satan will strike the heel of our Lord, but this is not a fatal blow. However, as a result of the cross, Jesus Christ will crush the head of Satan. These words spoken by God are the type; the cross and the results of the cross are the antitype. In this verse, God covering Adam and the woman with an animal skin is, again, a type, representing Jesus Christ, Whose future death on the cross temporarily covers over the sins of mankind in the Old Testament.

Gen 3:21 The LORD God made clothing out of an animal skin for Adam and his wife, and He clothed them.

Notice that this is God doing the work. The first time that this is illustrated (Christ's death on the cross), God does all of the work. He kills the animal, skins the animal, and uses the skin to clothe [or, *cover over*] Adam and the woman. Adam and the woman receive the results of His work.

Lesson 40: Genesis 3:22–24

Expelled from the Garden

In Gen. 3:14–19, God judges the serpent, Satan, the woman and then the man in poetic language. Adam gives his wife a proper name in v. 20, corresponding to her new role, which is in accordance with her sin. In v. 21, we studied the gospel of Jesus Christ along with the doctrine of atonement.

V. 22 begins a new paragraph. Vv. 14b–16 and 17b–19 are Hebrew poetry, and, many Bible translations will make this clear by their formatting of the text. Vv. 21–22 tell what happen next, and in v. 22, Jehovah Elohim is speaking again, but no longer is He speaking in the meter of Hebrew poetry as He did when judging Adam, the woman and Satan. So, what He says here is separated both by narrative and by from what has come before.

Gen 3:22 The LORD God said, "Since man has become like one of Us, knowing good and evil, he must not reach out, and also take from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever."

As a new paragraph, following the narrative, Jehovah Elohim is no longer speaking to the man, the woman or to the serpent. The change in the Hebrew indicates this. Jehovah God now speaks to His equals. "Man has become like one of Us." Jehovah Elohim (or, possibly, *Jehovah of the Godhead* or *Y^ehowah of Gods*) is speaking to the other members of the Trinity here, in much the same way as we read in Gen. 1:26. So that man does not remain accursed for all eternity, God separates man from the Tree of Life, which would have perpetuated man's life forever in a fallen state.

We are a human soul and a human body, which are intertwined in such a way that even modern science cannot explain it. If you have believed in Jesus Christ, you also have a human spirit. Our bodies are riddled with sin; every cell of our bodies is infected by the sin nature, much in the same way as every cell in our body contains the blueprint for our bodies. This sin nature is found in the essence of our souls as well, and we must be rid of this human body (in its fallen state) in order to be rid of our sin nature. We will be given a new, uncorrupted body, but only after we have shed this body of sin.

I should stop here for a moment and clarify myself. This does not mean that the body is evil and the soul is good, ala Platonic philosophy. The Bible never teaches this kind of dualism. However, we are in a fallen body with a corrupted sin nature; and that when we die and are raised again in a resurrection body, this will be without the deeply embedded old sin nature. Think of the sin nature as perhaps a virus in your computer that you are unable to eradicate without reinstalling your operating system. It corrupts your data and you are unable to remove it without starting over, so to speak.

The volitional choices made by Adam and the woman corrupted all mankind in 3 ways:

How We Stand Corrupted and Condemned before God	
Principle	Text/Commentary
A sin nature which is passed down by the man:	Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me (Psalm 51:5). For sin shall not have dominion over you, for you are not under Law, but under grace (Rom. 6:14). But if I do what I do not desire, it is no more I working it out, but sin dwelling in me (Rom. 7:20). If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us (1John 1:8— <i>sin</i> in the singular can refer to the sin nature).

How We Stand Corrupted and Condemned before God

Principle	Text/Commentary
Adam's original sin, which is imputed to all mankind	In Adam, all die (1Cor. 15:22a). In fact the gift [Jesus Christ] is not like what occurred through the one who sinned [Adam]. For on the one hand the judicial verdict [imputation of Adam's original sin] came by one transgression [Adam's] resulting in condemnation, but on the other hand that gracious gift [Christ & His work on the cross] came because of the many transgressions [personal sins of the human race] resulting in a judicial act of justification [dikaiōma = δικαίωμα]. (Rom. 5:16—Joe Griffin's annotations).
Personal sin, which we commit at our first opportunity:	All have sinned and come short of the glory of God (Rom. 3:23). The soul that sins, it shall die (Ezek. 18:20a). For there is not a just man on the earth who does good, and does not sin (Eccles. 7:20).
Sometimes some or all of these concepts are gathered under the single heading <i>sin</i> :	And if Christ is in you, indeed the body is dead because of sin , but the Spirit is life because of righteousness (Rom. 8:12). But the Scripture shut up all under sin , so that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe (Gal. 3:22).

There are more problems than this which stand between God and us—e.g., our relative righteousness and His perfect righteousness—

The tree of life would apparently perpetuate the life of Adam and the woman forever, but their lives would be perpetuated as sinners, their very bodies and souls intermingled with the sin nature, as is true for us as well. Therefore, God must allow the sin nature, which brought forth spiritual death, to culminate in physical death, so that Adam and Eve might be raised again in resurrection bodies, uncorrupted by sin. For since death came through a man [Adam], the resurrection of the dead also comes through a man [Jesus]. For just as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all will be made alive (1Cor. 15:21–22). Paul goes on to write: So it is with the resurrection of the dead: Sown in corruption, raised in incorruption; sown in dishonor, raised in glory; sown in weakness, raised in power; sown a natural body, raised a spiritual body. If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body. So it stands written: The first man Adam became a living being; the last Adam became a life-giving Spirit. However, the spiritual is not first, but the natural; then the spiritual. The first man was from the earth and made of dust; the second man is from heaven. Like the man made of dust, so are those who are made of dust; like the heavenly man, so are those who are heavenly. And just as we have borne the image of the man made of dust, we will also bear the image of the heavenly man. Brothers, I tell you this: flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, and corruption cannot inherit incorruption (1Cor. 15:42–50; and Paul herein quotes Gen. 2:7). When our work is done, God will then separate us from our corrupted bodies in death; and in this passage, God will keep Adam and the woman from the Tree of Life, because they can no longer be allowed to perpetuate their corruption.

One of the fascinating studies of science is eugenics, genetics, longevity and aging. Our body, if memory serves, essentially reproduces itself every 7 years. That is, the cells of our bodies are replaced every 7 years. So, built-in to our aging process is the means by which this aging process ought not to continue. But it does. Every person, regardless of his lifestyle, dies. His body, even though it is continually reproducing new cells, seems to wear out and die anyway. This is because we carry within each cell, the seeds of death. Every cell is corrupted. As God promised, in dying, we die. And this is because, **flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, just as corruption cannot inherit incorruption.**

Gen 3:23 So the LORD God sent him away from the garden of Eden to work the ground from which he was taken.

Now, it is possible that the Garden of Eden was a perfect place on an imperfect earth. However, it is more likely that all of the earth became corrupted when Adam and the woman ate of the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil (God said, "**Cursed is the ground because of you.**"). In any case, God separated Adam and Eve from the garden, and, in particular, from the Tree of Life. In order to eat, man would have to till the ground, and it is reasonable that Jesus Christ even taught Adam how to farm the ground.

In innocence, Adam gardened for the exercise and the enjoyment. It felt good for him to use his muscles, just as a young child seems to be in the mode *on* for most of his young life. He wants to use his muscles. Any game or activity which allows him to use his muscles, he enjoys. However, things for Adam will now change. He is in a body of sin. His human soul is corrupted by sin. At this point, he must work in order to eat. In innocence, he worked the garden because he enjoyed it; and there was all manner of produce available in the Garden of Eden to eat. He is no longer in the Garden of Eden, but outside, where it is more barren, where Adam must work daily in order to provide enough food for himself and for his wife.

We all go through this same metamorphosis; as innocent children, we want to use our muscles constantly. As young parents, we look at the energy of our children and wonder if that is fair, for them to have so much energy and for us to barely keep up with them. And as we enter adulthood, we then must go out and work in order to provide for our basic sustenance, just as God promised Adam: "**Because you listened to your wife's voice and ate from the tree about which I commanded you, 'Do not eat from it': The ground is cursed because of you. You will eat from it by means of strenuous labor all the days of your life. It will produce thorns and thistles for you, and you will eat the plants of the field. You will eat bread by the sweat of your brow until you return to the ground, since you were taken from it. For you are dust, and you will return to dust.**" (Gen. 3:17–19).

So God removes Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden altogether.

Gen 3:24 He drove man out, and east of the garden of Eden He stationed cherubim with a flaming, whirling sword to guard the way to the tree of life.

V. 24a literally reads, [And so He drives out the Adam](#). The tense of the verb is imperfect, which indicates either a future action or a continuous action. The context indicates that this was a continual action. That is, God continued to maintain separation between Adam and the Garden of Eden.

Although nothing is said about the woman here, it would make little sense for God to say to the woman, “Your choice: you can stay in the Garden or go with the man.” For God to have said or to have implied anything like that would have been theologically significant, and therefore, included in the Word of God. However, since we find nothing like this stated or implied, and since the woman will bear children outside of the Garden, it is reasonable to assume (1) the woman went out of the Garden with Adam and (2) she had no choice in this matter (she is under Adam’s authority and bearing children, by which they will both be delivered, requires both Adam and the woman).

Like Adam, the woman has a sin nature, which sin nature permeates her body and soul (excluding the egg which the woman drops once a month). Therefore, the woman cannot be allowed to remain in the Garden of Eden where the Tree of Life is.

Although the sins of Adam and the woman are distinguished, there is nothing in the Bible which suggests that Adam’s sin was better or worse than that of the woman’s. Even when we discuss their motivation, which was different, and the circumstances of their sins, which were different; the prohibition was not to eat from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil; and they both violated that particular prohibition. The judgment laid upon Adam and laid upon the woman indicate differences in their sins, but not in their relative culpability. That is, the woman is not sent to prison for 10 years and the man for 20 years. They are both fallen creatures because of whom the earth is cursed.

[Gen 3:24b ...and east of the garden of Eden He stationed cherubim with a flaming, whirling sword to guard the way to the tree of life.](#)

Cherubim are angels. This is a transliterated word and the *im* ending in Hebrew indicates plural. This is the first time which we find this word, and it occurs over 90 times in the Old Testament, and most of the time, in the plural.

Interestingly enough, the next time that we encounter this word, it will be associated with the building of the Ark of God (this is not the same thing as the ark of Noah, by the way). Recall that the Ark of God speaks of Jesus Christ. On top of this Ark is a covering (taken from the verb *to atone for*). Affixed to this lid are two *cherubim*, one on each side of the lid, facing each other and looking down. The High Priest, once a year, on the Day of Atonement, comes in and sprinkles blood on this covering. No one sees this occurring, as it is done in the Holy of Holies, a room in the Tabernacle where no one can go into except the High Priest, and only on this one day each year. The blood sprinkled on the Ark of God refers to Jesus Christ dying for our sins. The cherubim who are standing on this covering are observing what is going on. They represent the Angelic Conflict, in which we find ourselves; and they represent angels who are watching over us. I would suggest that one cherub represents the elect angels and the other represents the fallen angels.

Gen 3:24b East of the garden of Eden, He [Jehovah Elohim] stationed cherubim with a flaming, whirling sword to guard the way to the tree of life.

The word rendered *flaming* here is lahaṭ (להט) [pronounced LAH-haht], which means *flaming*; but this word is tied to the magical arts, and the verb from whence this comes means both *to burn, to flame* and *to hide*. Strong's #3858 BDB #529. We only find this noun in one other place: **Then Pharaoh summoned the wise men and the sorcerers, and they, the magicians of Egypt, also did the same by their secret arts** (Ex. 7:11). *Secret arts*, variously translated as *enchantments, sorceries, occultisms*, is the same word, but in the plural in Ex. 7:11. So, there is more going on here that angels standing in front of the Garden of Eden with swords which gleam from the sun's rays hitting the shiny metal surface of the swords. The result is, they hide the Garden of Eden of Adam and the woman (and from all their descendants).

The second word which describes this sword is *whirling*, which is the Hithpael participle of the verb hâphak^e (הִפְּחַק:) [pronounced haw-FAHK^e], which means, in the Hithpael, *to turn, to turn [transform] oneself; to change onself, to turn this way and that; to be turned*. Strong's #2015 BDB #245.

It appears as though this Garden of Eden was not only guarded by these angels (cherubim), but that its entrance may have become invisible to Adam and the woman, as if it is in other dimension. Even though we do not fully comprehend here exactly what is going on, it is clear that there is more than just angels standing in front of the Garden of Eden, and that there is some mystical quality to this. Recall that, in the Garden of Eden, we have all of this lush vegetation and outside of the Garden, it is dry and more barren (compare Gen. 2:10–14 and 2:5). It would stand to reason that the lushness of the Garden of Eden would be a grand oasis amid an otherwise flat and barren land. Therefore, it would make sense for there to be some mystical quality to hiding the Garden of Eden from Adam and the woman.

They are leaving a place where God has provided for them vegetation already growing, already with fruits and vegetables, and outside of the garden, Adam will be responsible for this (Gen. 3:17–19).

God made certain that Adam could not find his way back to the Garden of Eden; He stationed angels to guard the garden in which is the Tree of Life. The key is that these cherubim are guarding the **way to the Tree of Life**. It is not so much the Garden of Eden which is the thing being guarded, but the *way to the Tree of Life*. God cannot allow Adam and the woman to eat from this tree and thus perpetuate their lives in this fallen state.

It would certainly take time for anything to grow for Adam. However, it would make sense, given that men would live for hundreds of years, that they could go much longer without food.

Adam and the woman fell into sin by eating from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. This was the only way in which they could sin against God and both of them chose to commit this sin.

God judged the serpent, Adam and the woman—which involved a promise concerning the Seed of the Woman—and then banished Adam and the woman from the garden.

As usual, there are a great many details left out, with a great deal of subtlety. The Garden of Eden was a fully grown forest which perhaps covered hundreds of square miles; outside of the Garden of Eden, the land was somewhat barren. Therefore, in order for God to hide the Garden from Adam and the woman, there had to be some sort of mystical quality in its being hid. However, other than this being hinted at, we know little else.

We still do not know if Adam had tools or what sort of tools he had or whether God gave them to Adam or whether he made the tools himself (although I will discuss this later in more detail). Along the same lines, Adam and the woman are now outside of the garden, and God told Adam that he would be able to eat only by the sweat of his brow, so we know that Adam is now a farmer for his subsistence. However, we are given no information about this, apart from God's judgment of Adam.

In Genesis chapter 4, we have the history of Cain and Abel.

Gen 4:1 Adam knew his wife [or, woman] Eve intimately, and she conceived and gave birth to Cain. She said, "I have acquired a male child with [or, by] the LORD."

Adam and the woman are now in a fallen state. Under perfect environment, there were no children. You may draw your own conclusions. Whether this was true or not of animal life is unknown. However, at this point, we begin the continual cycle of birth and death.

The word for *wife*, incidentally, is simply the word for *woman*. You may recall that Adam, when he first met the woman, called her 'Ġshshâh (*woman*) because she was taken out of 'Ġysh (man).

The Hebrew word translated *to know intimately* is one of the most common Hebrew words, and it has a myriad of meanings, all related to *knowing* and which meaning is determined by the context. Here, the context indicates that Adam and the woman had sex. It is likely that there was sex prior to the fall, but its occurrence is not specifically alluded to. Here, the sex between Adam and the woman resulted in *conception* and later the *birth of Cain*.

Several translations indicate that Eve says, "I have gotten a male child with the help of the Lord." Although this may be the sense of this statement, it is not what Eve said. There is no word for *help* here. Most translations have *from the Lord*, but the word *from*, a very common Hebrew preposition, is not found here either. What is found is either the sign of a direct object or the preposition *with, at, near, by, among, directly from* (the sign of the direct object and this preposition are the same word). What Eve says is hopeful statement,

that God has provided the male-child which He promised her, the Seed of the Woman Who would crush the head of the serpent. The text tells us specifically that she conceived because of having sex with Adam; and she reveals the hope that this child came about with God.

Cain, being the first child born, is not necessarily associated in Eve's mind with the sex that she had with Adam 9 months previous. So her statement here is not that God helped her to get pregnant; her statement focused on the promise God made to her, that she would bear a child to crush the head of Satan. However, Cain was not to be that child.

It is my opinion that, one of the reasons we have children is to illustrate God's relationship to us. A parent is like a god to their children—particularly the father. There must be the proper mixture of love, righteousness and justice in the parents in order to raise a child properly. A child must have some concept of right and wrong. Teaching them what is right and wrong is the function of righteousness; holding them accountable for their sins and failures is justice; showing them compassion and affection, despite their shortcomings, is love. A good parent is going to attempt to manifest these attributes toward his children. As a result, every family is a microcosm of God and mankind.

I am certain that you have encountered children whose parents emphasized love over righteousness, or righteousness over justice; and that the child was either very spoiled or self-righteous because of this disproportionate approach. A child raised with too much justice and not enough love might be legalistic and lack compassion.

Obviously, gross sin in the life of the child can potentially destroy the parent-child relationship (drug addiction, for example).

[Gen 4:2](#) Then she also gave birth to his brother Abel. Now Abel became a shepherd of a flock, but Cain cultivated the land.

Abel handled livestock and Cain was a farmer, which are two very reasonable choices in life. There was animal life and there was plant life. Cain chose to follow in his father's profession of farming and Abel chose to deal with animals.

That Abel handled the livestock is quite fascinating. Man did not eat meat prior to the flood (Gen. 9:3). Therefore, Abel did not raise animals for food. He was able to domesticate them, to breed them, and he possibly used them to work in the fields. That farm animals were used for milk or for skins is quite possible; the latter is certainly very likely. However, primarily, animals were used to sacrifice to God. These animal sacrifices looked forward in time to Jesus Christ dying for the sins of man. They were a teaching device used by God, beginning when He covered Adam and the woman with animal skins.

We would have naturally expected Cain to be a farmer, cultivating the land, because that is what his father, Adam, was. At that point in time, there was essentially one occupation, which was farming. However, somehow, as Abel grew to be a young man, he took up being a shepherd. When this just came to him or whether Adam dabbled in domesticating

animals, we don't know. However, by domesticating and directing certain animals, it is reasonable to assume that Abel was able to associate them with their farming. After all, they all had to eat, and that required farming.

These are brilliant men, who are probably far more intelligent than you and I. That Abel was able to figure out that animals could help with farming is not a huge step.

Gen 4:3 In the course of time Cain presented some of the land's produce as an offering to the LORD.

This narrative makes little sense to a person unfamiliar with the basic themes of the Bible. **God saved us, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy, through the washing of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit (Titus 3:5). For it is by grace that you are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works, so that no one should boast (Eph. 2:8–9).** We know that man would produce food and sustenance from the sweat of his brow, and therefore, Cain must have worked hard on these vegetables and fruits, and he brought the works of his own hands to God. We know that such works are unacceptable to God.

Gen 4:4a Abel also presented *an offering*--some of the firstborn of his flock and their fat portions.

I have mentioned earlier in our studies that the Bible was divided into verses and into chapters long after the Bible had been completed. Gen. 4:4–5 illustrate this. This should have been 3 verses, not 2, and the thought at the end of v. 4 carries into v. 5. I have correctly divided them above and below.

Abel brought to God an animal sacrifice. In order for Abel to bring to God these *fat portions*, the animal must be first slaughtered. Abel did not bring live animals to God and say, "You can have this calf which was just born." The animal was slaughtered and then cut up.

Gen 4:4b–5a The LORD had respect for Abel and his offering, but He did not have respect for Cain and his offering.

The verb here is a bit tricky. By itself, it means *to look at, to gaze upon, to behold*. With the preposition *unto* (which preposition generally designates respect or deference), most translators then understand the verb to mean *to have respect for, to have regard for*. The King James Version, which is reasonably consistent, gives 9 different translations to this one verb which is only found 15 times in 3 stems (the Hebrew stem will modify the meaning of a verb) Let me that, when I give the meaning for a verb, I always take into account the stem of the verb in context, whether I mention the stem or not.

If we wanted to give this verb the most limited meaning, then God looked upon Abel's animals, which were sacrificed to Him. The imperfect tense indicates that God continued *to look upon* his sacrifices. However, God did not even *look upon* Cain's fruits and

vegetables. Surely, you have had the experience where you are standing with Charley Brown and a friend of Charley's comes up to you, and talks to Charley as if you are not even there. That is the sense of this verse. There is interaction between God and Abel, but it is as if Cain is not even there.

The difference is simple: Cain brought to God the works of his hands: his fruits and vegetables, which he had slaved over. Abel brought God animal sacrifices, which looked forward to the death of Jesus Christ on the cross. God found Abel's offering acceptable, but He rejected Cain's. A sacrificed animal represents Jesus Christ; recently harvested vegetables do not. These recently harvested vegetables represent the work of man's hands.

What is being taught here, in seedling form, is, we cannot bring our works before God. He has given us the only acceptable sacrifice, which is Jesus Christ, His Son. When we come to God, it must be on the basis of the sacrifice and death of Jesus Christ; never on the basis of our own works.

Gen 4:5b Cain was extremely furious, and he was downcast.

I should insert here that there is a problem with this translation, although this is how it is normally understood. The actual translation with a lengthy explanation is found in **Genesis 4** ([HTML](#)) ([PDF](#)).

Remember how God promised Adam that he would spend all of his days sweating in a field growing enough food to eat. This is what Cain has been doing. He has been working for weeks on these fruits and vegetables. Most of us have planted a garden at one time or another, and the time between planting and harvesting is a long time, and it requires some work. So Cain, for weeks on end, had first worked this soil; and he carefully selected plants, seedlings or seeds, which he carefully planted, watered, and looked over, keeping these plants from being eaten by animals or insects. He may have dug a canal or he might be carrying water from a nearby river to his crops. Then Cain, after months of work, took the best of his fruit and vegetables—produce which looked luscious, produce which Cain would love to eat. But instead of enjoying the fruits of his labor, he brings these to God, and God does not even look at them. It is as if Cain is not even there. All of this hard work, all of this wasted produce—the best of Cain's crop that season—and God has absolutely no regard for it. Cain was furious; he burned with anger. He thought about it, and it made him mad; he thought about it some more, and he became furious. The verb which we find here, along with the adverb, indicates that this anger was something which Cain stoked like a fire.

There are two separate offerings which are brought to God—some animals, which were presumably killed before God; and a fruit basket. There was considerably more work involved in the second gift—in Cain's gift. With regards to Abel's gift, he domesticated animals, but they had the calves or lambs or whatever it was; but Abel did not do any work when it came to producing that baby animal.

We do not know precisely what took place. Did God consume the animal with flames? We do not know the specifics; we simply know that God accepted Abel's offering and He rejected Cain's. Whatever happened, it was apparent that God looked with favor upon Abel and his animals; and that He ignored Cain and his abundance of vegetables and fruits.

The Bible is subtle. The author does not beat us over the head with an explanation here (as I am doing); he simply records what happened. We know that God honors the animal sacrifice because this looks forward to the offering of His Son, the Lamb of God. He does not honor the offering of Cain, because this simply speaks of man bringing to God the works of his hands. Our works are unacceptable to God.

As a child, you may have been told, "If you are a good little boy (or girl), God will bring you into heaven; and if you are bad, God will cast you into hell." That is simply not true. The Bible teaches us that we are all flawed. We are born with a sin nature which permeates our body and soul. To this sin nature has been imputed Adam's original sin, so that we stand condemned by God at the moment of our birth. And, as soon as we have an opportunity to exercise our volition, we sin. These 3 types of sin form a barrier between man and God. No matter how good we are, our good deeds cannot break down this threefold barrier. No matter what, these fruits and vegetables—the works of our hands—are not acceptable to God. Our works mean nothing to God. God is completely holy, which means that He is righteous and just. There can be no contamination of God's attributes. He cannot look down at us and say, "You know, Cain, you worked really, really hard on growing those vegetables. I know that this represents months of work, and, even though this is not generally My policy, you worked so hard, that I have to say *good job* with respect to these fruits and vegetables which you have brought to Me." God cannot do this. It is contrary to His character. God does not reward us for effort. God does not reward us for good intentions. God does not reward us for human good. Our good works are not acceptable before God. **He [God, our Savior] saved us, not because of works done by us in righteousness, but according to His Own mercy, by the washing of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit, whom He poured out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior (Titus 3:5).**

The sin nature has an area of weakness and an area of strength. From the area of weakness, the sin nature produces sins; from its area of strength, it produces human good (human good is called *dead works* in Heb. 6:1 and *wood, hay and stubble* in !3:11–15, to be burned up by God—but **we will be saved, yet so as through fire**). However, both sin and human good are repugnant to God because it has the same source—your sin nature.

I am sure that you have owned a cat at some point in time, and that cat captured and killed a rat, and then brought it to you—this smelly, dirty, torn-up, dead or half-dead rat, which your cat spent hours catching and killing, and now he brings this present to you, to show you what he is up to. You're not going to frame that dead rat; you are not going to save it as a memorial to your cat's hard work; you are not going to put this rat in a sealable clear bag and save it in the freezer and show it to friends and family when they come by; you are going to throw the rat in the garbage, because it is gross and offensive to you; furthermore,

you might even yell at your cat. The works of our hands are gross and offensive to God. God does not honor human good. God does not reward us for having a moral life. Our sin nature, Adam's imputed sin and our actual sins are offensive to God, and they stand between us and a holy God. Christ's death on the cross removes these barriers between man and God; our good works do not. So God honors the offering of Abel, which offering represents Christ's death on the cross. God disregards Cain's offering, which offering represents the work of his corrupt hands.

Another illustration: let's say you observe a man digging through a smelly garbage can with his bare hands. Then you observe him unclog a stopped up toilet, filled to the brim. And then this same man, without washing his hands, prepares the most beautiful fruit salad for you that you have ever seen. Are you going to eat it? You cannot even think about eating this salad because of the activity that the preparer has done. The idea makes you retch. His filthy hands have corrupted what he produces, even though you may not see any evidence of this on the fruit plate he offers you. This is how God sees the works of our hands. **We are all unclean and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags [to God]** (Isa. 64:6a). The Hebrew here actually reads *menstruous rags* rather than *filthy rags*.

Let me give you a modern-day example of how human good is harmful to mankind. Several influential environmentalists decided, back in the 1960's, that DDT was a terrible poison and that it should not be used. One of the results of this anti-DDT movement is, DDT is not used in Africa. We may argue as to the problems of the use of DDT, but not using it has allowed mosquitos to flourish in Africa, along with the disease malaria, and literally millions of Africans have died from malaria. Using DDT in Africa would have saved many of these lives and it would have prevented a great deal of suffering in Africa. These people who managed to get such a ban on DDT believed that they were (and are) doing the right thing. They believe that their actions were to benefit mankind; and, as a result, millions have died.

Junk Science has a page on DDT: <http://www.junkscience.com/ddtfaq.html>

To sum up: Cain brings to God the works of his own hands; his filthy hands were a part of all that he brought to God, and God had to reject his works. God cannot look with favor on Cain's works any more than we can longingly look upon a fruit salad prepared by a man who has just unclogged a toilet.

Lesson 42: Genesis 4:1-7

Cain's Human Good and Mental Attitude Sins

Here is what we have studied so far:

Gen 4:1-2 Adam knew his wife Eve intimately, and she conceived and gave birth to Cain. She said, "I have acquired a male child with [or, by] the LORD." Then she also gave birth to his brother Abel. Now Abel became a shepherd of a flock, but Cain cultivated the land.

You will recall that God had promised deliverance to Adam and the woman through the Seed of the woman, The woman assumed that her firstborn was just that—the Seed which would crush the serpent’s head.

Gen 4:3–5 In the course of time Cain presented some of the land's produce as an offering to the LORD. Abel also presented *an offering*—some of the firstborn of his flock and their fat portions. The LORD had respect for Abel and his offering, but He did not have respect for Cain and his offering. Cain was extremely furious, and he was downcast.

Time passes and Cain and Abel bring offerings to God. Abel brings an animal sacrifice and Cain brings the works of his hands, a bloodless offering, the fruits and vegetables from his farming. God looked upon Abel’s offering with favor; but God ignored Cain’s. According to the Hebrew, God did not even look at Cain’s offering. It was as if Cain didn’t exist and all of his hard work was for naught. This pisses Cain off.

Gen 4:6 Then the LORD said to Cain, "Why are you furious? And why are you downcast [lit., *and why has your face fallen*]?"

For several generations, Jehovah Elohim seemed to have a face to face relationship with man. All of the language in this passage seems to indicate that Cain, Abel and God are all together in one place. That God is speaking with Cain and teaching him, suggests to me that Cain is saved (he obviously believes in Jehovah Elohim, although he does not do what he has been instructed to do by Jehovah Elohim). What Cain does by way of his offering to God does not illustrate Jesus to come, and Y^ehowah herein reasons with him.

In the original Hebrew, this reads **God says unto Cain...** The preposition of respect is used here. I have looked at several translations, and none of them give a literal rendering to God’s first question: “**Why is there burning anger to you?**” Every translation which I have seen renders this verb as this is a 2nd person verb (e.g., *why are you burning with anger?*), but the verb is actually in the 3rd person followed by the prepositional phrase *to* [or, *for*] *you*.

Cain does nothing to hide his feelings. His face has fallen. He feels insulted and overlooked. Quite obviously, this does not mean that his face literally fell; but his expression was one of great disappointment as his anger continues to seethe.

Throughout the Bible, we ought to simply read the words and understand them as we would any other piece of literature. I take the Bible literally; however, when we have a phrase like, “**Why has your face fallen?**” we can reasonably assume that Cain’s face has not literally fallen from off of his skull, but that this is an expression of disappointment, anger, and jealousy. In other words, we can take the Bible literally without literally interpreting phrases and sentences which clearly are not literal.

God continues to speak to Cain.

Gen 4:7 If you do right, won't you be elevated? But if you do not do right, sin is crouching at the door. Its desire is for you, but you must master it.

The word for *sin* here is *chattâ'th* (חַטָּאת) [pronounced *khat-TAWTH*], which means *misstep, slip of the foot; sin; sinfulness; a sin-offering; penalty, calamity, misfortune*. Strong's #2403 BDB #308. This word occurs only 3 times in the book of Genesis: Gen. 4:7 18:20 31:36. At this point in time, God apparently did not delineate what sin was. At this point, *sin* was making an bloodless offering to God.

Do you recall God's judgment of the woman? He told her that her *desire [longing, craving]* would be toward her man. That same word is found here. This verse literally reads, "**Sin is lying at the opening [or, door] and to you, [is] its [sin's] desire, and you [even you] [must] master [or, have dominion over] it.**" Cain is told by God to overcome this sin. This sin began in Cain's desire to bring God his own works. This sin has turned into anger, and anger will turn into murder. God is telling Cain that he has to get out in front of this mental attitude sin before it takes him too far. Cain's fallen face was fraught with mental attitude sins; and God was telling him to get a hold of himself before acting on these mental attitude sins.

All of this began as human good. Cain simply worked hard and harvested the best fruits and vegetables that he had and brought them all to God. This is something with which unbelievers have trouble: they want to trust in their own works, in their own efforts, and they are angry when God does not accept them. The sin which Cain had committed is, he brings God the works of his own hands. **Without the shedding of blood, there is no forgiveness** (Heb. 8:22b). In order to do right, Cain needs to bring an animal sacrifice to God. Throughout all time, God has a specific plan and agenda. Coming to God does not mean we approach Him in any way that we please. There is a protocol, and that protocol, in this time period, is bringing an animal sacrifice. The Bible never teaches that there are a variety of ways to get to God—the Bible eschews all religions and presents Jesus Christ as our only way to God.

When it comes to establishing a relationship with God, the Bible presents Jesus Christ as the only way to God. His death on the cross was the punishment for our sins (more specifically, when God pours our sins on Him between noon and 3 pm and judged our sins in Him, this is what saves us). The Bible never suggests anything like *all roads lead to Rome*. In the Old and New Testaments, there is one way to God, and that is Jesus Christ. Below are a few examples of this.

Jesus Christ is the Only Way to God	
Scripture	Text/Commentary
Cain and Abel	Abel brings an animal which he sacrifices and God finds this acceptable. Cain brings God the works of his hands and God rejects these works. The animal sacrifice speaks of Christ dying for our sins. Only the animal sacrifice is acceptable to God; the works of our hands are not.

Jesus Christ is the Only Way to God

Scripture	Text/Commentary
Moses and the Rock	When in the desert with the Jews, Moses and these Jews were twice faced with a <i>no-water</i> situation. The first time they faced this situation, God told Moses to strike the Rock once, and out from it would come living waters. This represented Jesus Christ being judged for our sins (the striking of the Rock) and from Him proceeds life (the living waters). When faced with this situation again, God told Moses to speak to the Rock. Moses was not to strike the Rock again, because that would indicate a second judgment of Jesus Christ, which is incompatible with the truth. However, Moses instead struck the Rock twice, in anger, and was not permitted to enter into the Land of Promise because of this (he violated the type which God had established).
The Jews and early heathen religions	At no time in the Old Testament does a prophet ever tell the Jews, "These people have a worship system just as valid as yours; they are just coming to God in a different way." Over and over again, the Old Testament prophet warns the Jews not to follow or to even give respect to heathen religions. The Jews were continually disciplined by God for following other religions.
The prophets	On several occasions, a prophet of God would speak the words of God, e.g., "So says Jehovah [this is Jesus Christ], the King of Israel, and His Redeemer, Jehovah of Hosts: I am the First, and I am the Last; and there is no God except Me." (Isa. 44:6).
Jesus Christ	It does not get much clearer than this: Jesus told His disciples, "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man comes to the Father but by Me." The key is not following the set of principles laid down by Jesus, but the key is coming to God through faith in Jesus Christ.
Paul affirms what Christ said.	Paul affirms this exclusivity in 1Tim. 2:5–6a: For God is one, also there is one Mediator of God and of men, the Man Christ Jesus, the One having given Himself a ransom on behalf of all. Jesus Christ is equal to both parties in the dispute. On one side is a Holy God and on the other side is fallen man. Jesus Christ is true humanity and undiminished Deity; He is equal to both parties, and therefore, He is able to mediate between man and God.

Jesus Christ is the Only Way to God

Scripture	Text/Commentary
The Apostles and the gnostics	There were two fundamental schools of thought among the gnostics: (1) the body itself is inherently evil, so that they rejected the bodily incarnation of Jesus Christ (i.e., they did not believe that He was really human; they did not believe that He had a real physical body. (2) It would be impossible for God to die on the cross (which follows logically, if Jesus is not true humanity). The epistles argued against all of the heresies and distortions of their time, including these. For many deceivers [these are the gnostics] have gone out into the world, those who don't confess that Jesus Christ came in the flesh. This is the deceiver and the Antichrist (2John 1:7). He Himself bore our sins in His own body on the tree, that dying to sins, we might live to righteousness; by Whose stripes you were healed (1Peter 2:24).

These are only a few examples of all those which may be found in the Bible which indicate that God has a specific plan for man, and that it does not include coming to Him by whatever religion suits our fancy.

Therefore, we have only one way to God, and that is through Jesus Christ. Not only do we come specifically through Christ (and not Buddha, Confucius or Mohammed), but we enter into a protocol system which defines a precise, day-to-day walk with God. We cannot be sloppy in our initial approach to God nor in our daily walk with Him. There is a precise grace system in place for our lives on this earth. Just like salvation, it is a grace system.

Just as there is a protocol system of salvation (faith alone in Christ alone), there is also a protocol system of spirituality for the Christian life. Most believers are saved, and afterwards, many of them start going to church and start being more moral than they used to be. This is *not* the Christian way of life. Nor is the Christian way of life going to a church which titillates the emotions, because there will come a time in your life when these emotions will no longer be titillated. The fundamentals of the Christian way of life is to name your sin or sins to God when you get out of fellowship (1John 1:8–10); and to grow in grace and in the knowledge of God's Word (2Peter 3:18). Both of these things must be a part of your daily life; and if your church does not frequently exhort you to name your sins to God (not to a priest or to a pastor or to those you committed the sins against); and if a church is not regularly teaching the Word of God, then you are in the wrong church.

As an aside: when I was first saved, within a few months I heard an excellent Bible teacher on a tape recorder. At that time, knowing almost nothing, I figured I would just go out and find a church where the Bible was carefully taught. I was in for quite a surprise. I went to about a dozen churches and was surprised how few of them taught the Bible verse by verse, chapter by chapter, from the pulpit (out of the ones I went to, only one made any attempt to do this, and they did not teach the importance of naming one's sins to God).

God saw to it that His Word was brought to me at that point in time, although it took awhile before I fully appreciated what He had done. For that reason, I have attempted to make a list of churches whose primary focus is to teach the Word of God and I have posted them here (they are arranged by state in alphabetical order):

<http://kukis.org/Links/thelist.htm>

Most of these churches have some sort of an online ministry (some of them, you can listen to the teaching being streamed live); and many of them have lessons which can be ordered or downloaded from their site. The financial policy should be consistent at these churches: they will *never* publish a price list or pester you for money.

My point in this is, God has provided His Word carefully taught for anyone who reads this. We are urged to **grow in grace and the knowledge of His Word** by Peter, and God never mandates that we do something without providing the means by which we may obey His mandates.

Lesson 43: Genesis 4:1–8 1John 3:12

Cain Murders Abel

At this point, we will study Cain murdering Abel. First, this is what has already transpired:

Gen 4:1–6 Adam knew his wife Eve intimately, and she conceived and gave birth to Cain. She said, "I have acquired a male child with [or, *by*] the LORD." Then she also gave birth to his brother Abel. Now Abel became a shepherd of a flock, but Cain cultivated the land. In the course of time Cain presented some of the land's produce as an offering to the LORD. Abel also presented *an offering*--some of the firstborn of his flock and their fat portions. The LORD had respect for Abel and his offering, but He did not have respect for Cain and his offering. God was extremely furious with Cain, and Cain's face was downcast. Then the LORD said to Cain, "Why are you furious? And why are you downcast [lit., *and why has your face fallen*]?"

Human good often leads to sin and even to murder. The sin nature produces human good just as it produces sin. One of the most common sins which results from the production of human good is self righteousness. I am sure you have observed this in others. Someone does something good (in their own estimation), and then, they just have to go out and tell people about it. Their soul lusts for approbation and recognition (the sin nature also possesses a lust pattern).

A significant number of people in the environmental movement are heavily involved in human good. As a result, they become self-righteous and often angry toward those with whom they disagree. A minority in the environmental movement have parlayed this anger and self righteousness into violence, and, in a few instances, murder. Essentially, these are following *the way of Cain*, spoken of in Jude 1:11.

Cain and Abel are spoken of again in the great *faith* chapter of Hebrews: **By faith we understand the ages** [periods of time = dispensations] **to have been prepared by the Word of God. For the things that are seen do not come to be from that which is visible. By faith Abel offered to God a better sacrifice than Cain, because of which he was reported to be righteous** [this is experiential righteousness], **God testifying about his gifts** [God looked upon Abel's animal sacrifice with favor], **and through it** [through his gift], **he who died** [Abel] **still speaks** (Heb. 11:3–4). Abel was told what sort of a sacrifice to bring to God, and he believed God and brought God an animal sacrifice. It is this sacrifice that God continues to testify about, and Abel's righteousness is witnessed to by God. The slain animal speaks of Jesus Christ and Abel stood upon the blood of Christ in order to be righteous. Because this is recorded in the Word of God, Abel's testimony still speaks to us. Again, even here in the book of Hebrews, the offering of Cain is completely ignored.

Cain, from his sin nature, presented the best of his crops to God. His sin nature desired recognition from God. He became angry and implacable. God will tell him what he needs to do, but Cain will not hear of it. Instead, he will murder his own brother.

Gen 4:7 [God continues speaking to Cain]: "If you do right, won't you be accepted? But if you do not do right, the penalty for sin is crouching at the door. His [Abel's] desire is for you, but you will rule over him."

The penalty for sin is crouching at Cain's door is the sin of pride, self righteousness and anger; his sin nature desire approbation and recognition from God.

Cain is proud of the vegetables that he brought to God; he believes that God ought to accept the works of his hands. He worked hard on those vegetables. Because of the judgment of all mankind, putting together enough food to eat requires a great deal of sweat and toil, so for Cain to take the fruits of his labor and offer these to God, and then for them to be rejected—it was simply too much for him. From this sin of pride, Cain goes to the sin of anger. No doubt he is frustrated as well. His sin nature has taken control.

Do you recall the principle of *rebound*? That is a term originated by R. B. Thieme Jr. which means that you name your sin to God. God said to Cain, "**Why are you angry, and why has your face fallen? If you do well, will you not be accepted?**" Cain simply needs to acknowledge to God his mental attitude sin cluster (anger, pride, disappointment, implacability, self righteousness).

At this point, Cain is quite jealous of Abel. God has accepted Abel's sacrifice and has ignored Cain's. Cain is angry with God and Cain is angry with Abel. Abel, like most kid-brothers, admires Cain; and Cain, being the firstborn, should rule over Abel. So, Cain has nothing to be upset about. He simply needs to name his sin to God and offer up an animal sacrifice.

Although the Bible does not appear to be specific here, God appears to be manifest to both Cain and Abel. They are able to converse with God, although we do not have any

specifics. My guess would be that God appears to them as a man, as this is commonly found in the Old Testament—however, we are not told this specifically.

Instead of naming his sin and doing what is right, Cain forms a plan.

Gen 4:8 Cain said to his brother Abel, "Let's go out to the field." And while they were in the field, Cain rises up against Abel, his brother, and kills him.

No person has ever been murdered before. Cain figured out how to murder Abel by watching him slice open the neck of an animal sacrifice. You slice open the neck, the animal's heart pumps out its blood, and it dies. Cain is so angry at this point, that he has chosen to lure his brother away from God (not recognizing God's omniscience) and away from their parents, in order to kill him. Abel would never suspect anything is amiss, because no one in human history has ever been murdered before.

We already know that Cain's anger is burning; and the fact that Cain takes Abel out into a field indicates premeditation. Surely you have seen a movie about a love triangle or have read about one where one man kills another in order to remove his competition for the love of a woman. This is what appears to be playing out here. Cain and Abel both bring offerings to God, and God looks at Abel's and ignores Cain's, telling him that his offering is acceptable if he does the right thing (i.e., bring an animal sacrifice). Cain seems to think that, if Abel is out of the way, that God will give respect to his offerings of the works of his hands.

Cain's anger is percolating and it is as if he did not hear what God said. God guided him to do that which was right, but Cain ignores this or doesn't hear it (typical for a person who is angry), and he instead lashes out against Abel. Cain appears to view this more as a competition than as a protocol system (in a protocol system, there is a right way of doing things and a wrong).

The word translated *to kill* is *hârag* (הָרַג) [pronounced *haw-RAHG*], which means *to kill, to slay, to execute; to destroy, to ruin*. It is a very common word in the Old Testament, found over 160 times in 3 stems. Strong's #2026 BDB #246. On at least one occasion, Cain has observed Abel kill an animal for as a sacrifice. Because this is an animal sacrifice which illustrates the death of Jesus Christ, Abel would have used a sharp object or a blade of some sort to cut the carotid of the animal. Cain would have watched the blood being pumped out of the carotid of the animal as it died. In fact, Cain probably observed this ritual on many occasions in the past. He no doubt observed Adam sacrifice animals in the past, and here, he has recently seen Abel kill an animal as a sacrifice to God.

Cain puts 2 dn 2 together here. He can do the same thing to Abel—cut his carotid—and remove this competition from God's approbation. Since I am sure most of you cannot relate to that, think of it as 2 women fighting over a man and taking it too far; or two men fighting over a woman and taking it too far. It is the same concept.

I have mentioned tools in the past. We do not know what the Adam family had by way of tools, but these are not cave men. These are not dim-witted, cave-dwelling, spear-waving, animal-chasing cavemen. Being the first people created, they were probably far superior to us in the realm of intellect. We will find out that their bodies were far superior to ours, living for nearly 1000 years before giving out. We have Adam and Cain farming and Abel domesticating and shepherding animals, suggesting that some sort of tools existed at that time. However, nothing is ever clearly cited so far, with one exception: the angels standing guard in front of the entrance of the Garden of Eden have shining, gleaming swords. For this reason, I suspect that God provided the Adam family with tools. However, at this point, we really do not know whether God provided them with tools or whether they fashioned these tools themselves; nor do we know the relative sophistication of these tools (although, if these tools came from God, then they would be clearly quite sophisticated). Quite obviously, if God can create and make all that we see, God is also capable of fashioning tools for Adam and his family. It is not out of the question that God, from time to time, brought tools to Adam and his family, as presents. However, let me emphasize that this is conjecture on my part (however, we will come to a passage in the not-to-distant future where the pre-existence of tools is again suggested).

Slitting the throat of an animal, with whatever Adam or Abel had, seems to be the most reasonable method by which to kill an animal for a sacrifice. Cain, having observed this, tries it on Abel. Perhaps he asked to see the knife which Abel used, and then suddenly turned on Abel and killed him with it.

Using a sacrificial knife (or blade) to kill a person was a new thing in the world. This idea had never occurred to Adam or to Abel. I recall in grammar school carrying a pocket knife to school on a regular basis. Sometimes, kids would gather to play with their knives at recess. Nothing was ever thought of it. It was routine. If you were a cub scout or a boy scout, you always had your pocket knife. The idea of seriously hurting someone with a knife was just not in the realm of thinking of most kids. Therefore, for decades, carrying pocket knives at school was a non-issue and for many decades, and there were no knifings or knife fights. So when Cain asked Abel to see his knife, this was not a cause of alarm for Abel. Cain could have lured him into the field and asked him specifically to bring this knife, and no alarms would have gone off in Abel's head because this is just not a thought which he would have.

John writes about Cain in 1John 3:12: **We should not be like Cain, who was from the evil one and murdered his brother. And why did he murder him? Because his own deeds were evil and his brother's righteous.** Let's unravel the verse beginning at the end: Cain killed Abel because his deeds were evil and his brother's deeds were righteous. That means, *prior* to killing Abel, Cain's deeds were evil. What were Cain's deeds? He offered up the works of his hands—these fruits and vegetables—to God. Cain's own hard work and his own offering to God are called here *evil*. The word for *deeds* here is *ergon* (ἔργον) [pronounced *EHR-gon*], which means *works, deeds, business, employment, that which any one is occupied; that which one undertakes to do, enterprise, undertaking; any product whatever, any thing accomplished by hand, art, industry, or mind; an act, deed, thing done: the idea of working is emphasized in opp. to that which is less than work.* [Primarily Thayer

definitions]. Strong's #2041. Notice, these are deeds, works, overt acts. We're not looking at Cain's motivation here, we are looking at his production, and the Bible tells us that his production of bringing these luscious fruits and vegetables to God was evil. If you conjure up the illustration that I gave you in the previous lesson—of a man who works on a stopped up toilet, and then, without washing his hands, prepares you a wonderful looking fruit salad—that illustrates what Cain's works are to God. These works are inspired by Satan, herein called *the evil one*, as Cain is spoken of as being *from the evil one*.

We should not be like Cain, who was from the evil one and murdered his brother. And why did he murder him? Because his own deeds were evil and his brother's righteous. There is one more fascinating thing buried in the Greek in this verse—the word for *murder* is sphazô (σφάζω) [pronounced SPHAHD-zoh], which means *to slay, slaughter, butcher; to put to death by violence; to mortally wounded*. Strong's #4969. The primary use of this word, particularly in the Old Testament⁷, means *to slaughter a sacrificial animal*. Generally speaking, that means to grab or bind the animal and to slit its throat with a sharp knife so that the blood is quickly pumped out of the body via the carotid. This confirms that Cain, after watching Abel kill several sacrifices, decides to kill Abel in the same way.

The use of this particular Greek verb is further evidence of the use of a knife.

We may also surmise that Cain buried Abel by what follows in vv. 10–11. One of the characteristics of sin is, we attempt to hide our sins from others (unless we can find a subgroup of society which will support us in our wrongdoing). I recall as a 4 year old stealing toys from my best friend. I knew I was wrong, even though I cannot recall my parents teaching me about stealing. I hid the toys behind some bushes in front of my house. I did not bring them into my house; I did not play with them out in the open. I was jealous of what he had, and I wanted them for myself. However, I clearly knew that I was wrong in what I did, so I had to hide what I had stolen.

Cain does not run to God or to his parents and admit what has happened. He buries Abel out in the field, hiding his body from his parents and from God (which we will determine from Gen. 4:11).

Lesson 44: Genesis 4:9–14a

God Punishes Cain

In the previous lessons, Cain observed Abel slitting the throats of the animal sacrifices, and Cain figures out that he can do this same thing to Abel. This all came as a result of Cain's human good act of offering up freshly picked vegetables and fruits to God. Cain became jealous of the approbation which God gave to Abel, he became angry at both God and Abel, and then he devised a plan in his mind to kill Abel. Cain lured Abel out to a field, probably asking him to bring his sacrificial knife with him, and then he used this knife to kill his brother Abel.

⁷ When I speak of the Greek in the Old Testament, I am referring to the Septuagint, the very early Greek translation of the Old Testament, made between 300–100 B.C.

Although God taught Adam and Eve doctrine in the garden, it is unclear as to how much teaching took place there and what the content of that teaching was. However, as we have observed, there are several indications that God taught the Adam family regularly. We do know that there were animal sacrifices and offerings made; that God is speaking to Cain at this time and correcting him; and that God had come to Adam and the woman in the spirit of the day in the garden. All of these things suggest that there were probably daily services of some sort. There is a congregation of at least 4, and we can only guess at the content of what God said (apart from what is recorded in the Bible). However, no one had ever murdered anyone before, so there were probably few or no lectures on sin, and certainly nothing was said about murder. However, Cain, without being told, knew that this act of murder was wrong and he hid this act from God. **For God's wrath is revealed from Heaven upon all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, holding the truth in unrighteousness, because the thing known of God is clearly known within them, for God revealed it to them** (Rom. 1:18–19). God does not have to tell us what is wrong in order for us to recognize sin. Imprinted on every man's conscience is some semblance of right and wrong. Some of our conscience comes from the teaching of parents and society, but there appears to be some inherent understanding of right and wrong.

I gave the example of the toys which I stole as a very young child (at age 4). Given where I lived as a child, I doubt that my parents spent any amount of time, at that age, telling me not to steal. It just was not an issue. The importance of honesty was drilled into me at a young age, but not a prohibition of stealing. However, when I stole these toys, I knew I was wrong, and I knew that I had to hide what I had done. When I was found out, then I am sure I got a lecture on stealing.

There is a searing of one's conscience which can take place, either through repeated sins of the same sort or by rationalizing these sins. In this same passage in Romans, this is alluded to: **But they became vain [or, empty, like a vacuum] in their internal deliberations, and their undiscerning heart was darkened** (Rom. 1:21b). Cain knew what he did was wrong and he hid this deed from everyone.

Gen 4:9 Later, the LORD said to Cain, "Where is your brother Abel?" "I don't know," he replied. "Am I my brother's guardian?"

It is fascinating that God begins many of His conversations with man with a question. God, not Socrates, developed the Socratic method of teaching. After Adam and the woman ate of the tree and hid themselves, God called out, "Where are you?" when He knew where they were. When Adam gave an answer, God asked him two questions: "Who told you that you were naked? Did you eat from the tree which I commanded you not to eat from?" Then to the woman, the first thing God said was, "What have you done?"

As Rom. 1:18–19 tells us, there are concepts of right and wrong imprinted on our souls, and God asks these questions in order to reach into a person's soul. God is expecting Cain to look into this own soul so that he can comprehend what he has done.

Cain, I believe, thought about this, and knew God would speak to him, so he developed an answer. What Cain says after is something which man has done for centuries—he says something which sounds good, almost like a slogan. “Am I my brother’s keeper?” or “At what time was I placed in charge of knowing the whereabouts of Abel?” What he says is terse and, if one does not give it much thought, seems to get him off the hook. The intent is to stop the conversation. However, this does not work with God.

Gen 4:10–11 Then He [God] said, "What have you done? Your brother's blood cries out to Me from the ground! So now you are cursed from the ground that opened its mouth to receive your brother's blood you have shed.

God is aware of Cain’s sin, that Cain slit his brothers throat, and that Abel’s blood flowed out onto the ground. Although it is not clearly stated, as one can interpret this language as metaphorical, it is likely that Cain hid Abel’s body; and given his profession as a farmer, it is likely that Cain buried Abel’s body in the ground. God’s punishment further suggests that Abel was buried to hide Cain’s murder.

Gen 4:12 If you work the land, it will never again give you its yield. You will be a restless wanderer on the earth."

God punishes Cain by taking away one of his joys in life, which is farming. Cain would not be able to cause the ground to yield a successful crop. Cain will have to wander the earth, in part, to escape retribution and, in part, because his days as a farmer are over. As a punishment, God has put an end to the works of Cain’s hands. Cain will no longer be able to produce this form of human good.

Gen 4:13 But Cain answered the LORD, "My punishment is too great to bear!"

If you love your work, you will understand Cain’s distress here. Cain loved to farm. Cain loved the feel of the soil in his fingers; he loved the gradual growth of the plants which he grew; he enjoyed working outside.

I had a similar situation—I loved teaching high school kids, and I was very good at it, as long as I had the backing of the administration. When I first moved to Texas to teach, I thought that I was in heaven. I heard *yes, sir* from the kids and the principals outright stated that it was their job to make my job easier. There was the practice of spanking in the schools, strong and firm discipline, and there was real love and affection between the adults and children. This changed over the years, and the paperwork increased dramatically while principal support decreased dramatically, as did school discipline. There has always been some degree of sadness to lose that part of my life; and for those of you who love your work (and many people do), you understand this. I keep in touch with one teacher friend in particular, and teaching has become more difficult and less rewarding even since I left that profession. The ground is no longer yielding its production. Cain, who will live for hundreds of years to come, will no longer be able to enjoy the work that he loves, because the ground will no longer yield its production for him, and he is struck with a profound sadness. Cain expresses this profound sadness:

Gen 4:14a Look, You have banished me today from upon the face of the soil..." [This is a very literal translation from the Hebrew].

Cain essentially repeats his punishment, applying it directly to himself. The verb is in an intensive stem and means *to drive out, to thrust out, to banish*. It is a fascinating judgment, as Cain will spend the rest of his life walking on this very soil which will no longer yield up crops to him.

I used myself as an illustration, and this parallel situation was, I was no longer able to get from my students the kind of response and learning which I expected from them. I could farm that soil, but I was no longer harvesting the crop which I could previously harvest. The uniform support of parents and principals was no longer there, and without their support, I was unable to get the results which I expected to get. Cain could try all that he wanted, but God would no longer give him the support which would yield up a decent crop.

Gen 4:14a Look, You have banished me today from the soil, and I will hide myself [or, I will be hidden] from Your presence..."

The second verb is in the Niphal stem, which can be passive or reflexive. Therefore, this can mean *I will hide myself* or *I will be hidden from*. What Cain wanted was God's approbation. Cain wanted God to look at his human good and say, "Well done, Cain!" God cannot do this. God cannot reward human good. Just as a plumber, whose hands are covered with the filth of unstopping a toilet, is unable to prepare for you any kind of food that you will eat and be appreciative of; so the works of Cain's hands are not acceptable to God. God can only be approached through His Son, and only by way of the cross (i.e., by means of the animal sacrifice).

For most acts of human good, we do not get this. If someone sets up a soup kitchen to feed the hungry, or drives a fuel efficient car or lobbies for the ethical treatment of animals, we do not understand that this is repugnant to God (if done by an unbeliever or by a believer out of fellowship; or if the human good is a part of Satan's evil cosmic system). I am sure that you, the first time that you read that God dissed Cain for bringing vegetables and fruits, that you did not get it. You may have thought, *He worked hard to grow those fruits and vegetables; why not at least say, "Good job, Cain!"*? And again, I say, these are the works of his hands; they do not reflect the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and God cannot accept the works of our hands as efficacious for our sins. I know that some parents told you from a very young age, *if you are good, you will go to heaven; and if you are bad, you will go to hell*; but that is simply not true.

Let me choose a more repugnant act: the works of the 9/11 terrorists. They worked hard on this project of killing 3000 Americans. They sacrificed their time; they carefully plotted this out, and they gave their lives for this mission, believing that God [or, *Allah*, in their thinking] would reward them. God can no more tell these terrorists, "Good job, because I know that you are brave and sincere men" any more than He can tell Cain the same thing. To you and me, this may seem like comparing apples and oranges; however, to God, human good is human good, and He finds it unacceptable. God will destroy all the human

good produced by believers in Jesus Christ (1Cor. 3:15) and the works of unbelievers will be the basis of their indictment at the final judgment (Rev. 20:12–15).

What Cain desired was God's approval; he wanted God's approbation. When the works of his hands did not get the desired result, then he killed Abel in order to remove what Cain believed to be his competition. However, what Cain did has the exact opposite effect—he will be hidden from God's Presence.

Lesson 45: Genesis 4:9–15

God's Agenda in His Punishment of Cain

Cain has murdered Abel and buried his body. Here is what we have covered so far:

Gen 4:9 Later, the LORD said to Cain, "Where is your brother Abel?" "I don't know," he replied. "Am I my brother's guardian?"

Cain knew that he would be asked something about Abel, so he had a slick answer already prepared.

Gen 4:10–12 Then He [God] said, "What have you done? Your brother's blood cries out to Me from the ground! So now you are cursed from the ground that opened its mouth to receive your brother's blood you have shed. If you work the land, it will never again give you its yield. You will be a restless wanderer on the earth."

Cain, who loved farming, would be disciplined in two ways: he would not longer be able to make farming work for him; and he would always be on the run. This is because he used his farming skills to bury his brother's body.

Gen 4:13–14 But Cain answered the LORD, "My punishment is too great to bear! Listen, You have banished me today from the soil, and I will hide myself [or, I will be hidden] from Your presence and become a restless wanderer on the earth, whoever finds me will kill me."

Cain recognizes that he is being punished and will have to wander, away from God's presence and away from his just punishment, which would be death. The one thing which Cain desired, God's approbation, would be withheld from him, as he would no longer be in God's presence.

At this point in time, Cain is old enough to be married (Gen. 4:17), and his wife would have been his sister. So, at this point in time, there is a population on earth of at least 4: Adam, Eve, Cain and his wife. So, who might kill Cain? Adam. Abel may have had a wife and they may have had children. And, given that Cain is old enough to be married, Adam and the woman probably had additional children. Therefore, even though there may not be anyone but Adam who would be ready and willing to kill Cain, life for these people was nearly 1000 years, so, within 20 years, there may be several people who would want to avenge Abel's death. As a result, Cain cannot stay in one place. This is an additional

problem for him as a farmer. A farmer cannot pick up and move at a moment's notice. A farmer must stay with the soil. Cain no longer has this luxury.

The Bible often has an agenda. It records real and true human history, but these events are recorded with a specific agenda in mind. Cain spent endless hours prior to this farming; and Abel has spend day after day tending the flocks. These things are not recorded. We know their chosen professions, but the Bible never records *a day on the farm with Cain*. The Bible never goes into detail as to the animals which Abel raised. The Bible records specific information, and always with a specific purpose (although we may not always be able to ascertain the purpose of any given passage). In this passage, we are told that God will accept nothing other than His Son's death on the cross (the animal sacrifice of Abel) and that He will not give approval to our works, no matter how impressive they may seem (the fruits which Cain brought to God). Furthermore, if Cain does nothing more than bring to God his human good, then he will remain banished from God's presence forever (more precisely, for the rest of his life).

Just as God clothed Adam and the woman with animal skins, thus covering over their sin, illustrates the cross of our Lord; so does this narrative about Abel and Cain. So we are dealing with real historical narratives, but these narratives have a purpose. Whoever wrote these things down probably could have written page upon page telling us about other details; but these other details do not illustrate the gospel or spiritual truth. Therefore, many interesting historical narratives are not covered in the Bible.

God apparently had a time and place when He would meet with Cain and Abel, as they brought offerings to God. We are only told of this occurring one time, but there is nothing in the narrative to make us think that this was a one-shot event.

Cain, as a believer who has sinned grievously, retreats from God's presence. He chooses to hide from God's presence, and he is in fear of additional judgment. From the very beginning, sin is associated with separation from God and from a later judgment. Furthermore, the punishment for sin is seen as too great to bear. All of these are spiritual truths. Sin separates us from God and, apart from the cross, sin is associated with a later judgment.

I used the illustration of stealing toys from my best friend (at age 4). I recall having incredible guilt from that act, and facing him as a friend would have been very hard to do after betraying him as I did. Cain's sin against God was much worse, so how can Cain continue to come to God as if nothing had happened? Furthermore, how can Cain face Adam and Eve, his parents, after killing their son?

[Gen 4:14](#) "Listen, You have banished me today from the soil, and I will hide myself [or, I will be hidden] from Your presence and become a restless wanderer on the earth, whoever finds me will kill me."

Cain sets up a pattern here for the criminal psyche. He has just killed Abel and hidden his body, but at no time does Cain speak of the sorrow and grief this would bring to Adam and

Eve. Since Cain is old enough to marry, there must be additional siblings apart from Cain and the late Abel, so they would also be grief-stricken—yet not a word about that either. What does Cain talk about? He is worried about his own life. He expresses no empathy or sympathy toward those he has harmed, but he is quite concerned about his own future well-being.

Furthermore, Cain does not clearly acknowledge his sin to God; therefore, he will remain temporally separated from God. It appears as though Cain will remain out of fellowship for the remainder of his life. Again, a parallel: as believers in Jesus Christ, if we have sinned and do not name this sin to God, we remain temporally separated from God (1John 1:7–10).

Gen 4:15 Then the LORD replied to him, "In that case, whoever kills Cain will suffer vengeance seven times over." And He placed [or, established, ordained] a mark on Cain so that whoever found him would not kill him.

In this instance, the case of the first murder, God allows for banishment to be the punishment for the crime.

Interestingly enough, God does not exact the death penalty here and He does not allow anyone else to do so either. Let me suggest to you *why*: Abel is a type of Christ and his blood was shed for Cain; therefore, Cain is pardoned for his sin. The picture is, the innocent one sheds his blood so that the guilty one is preserved. Another spiritual parallel.

There is quite a lot of disagreement as to what the *mark of Cain* is. The word often translated *mark* is *’owth* (אֹת) [pronounced *oath*] which means, *sign, token, pledge, assurance*. Strong's #226 BDB #16. We have already seen this word back in Gen. 1:14: **And God said, Let luminaries be in the expanse of the heavens, to divide between the day and the night. And let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days and years.** Same Hebrew word. Another legitimate (and more literal) translation would be: **Therefore, the Lord will ordain, with reference to Cain, a pledge of assurance that anyone who finds him will not kill him.** This translation takes into account the tenses and morphology of the verbs, the *lâmed* preposition, which most translators do not translate, as well as the more common meanings of the words used.

Furthermore, we have a later use of the word too often translated *mark* where there was not necessarily a physical mark made. Rahab the prostitute, when selling out her city of Jericho to Joshua, asked for him to give her assurance that she and her family would be protected. **And now, please swear to me by Jehovah, since I have dealt with you in kindness, that you will also deal with my father's house in kindness, and shall give to me a **sure sign**; and shall keep alive my father, and my mother, and my brothers, and my sisters, and all that is to them, and shall deliver our souls from death** (Joshua 2:12–13). Joshua and his men responded by giving her an oath that they would treat her and her family in grace and truth (Joshua 2:14).

Gen 4:15b Therefore, the Lord will ordain, with reference to Cain, a pledge of assurance that anyone who finds him will not kill him.

God is giving Cain assurance that he will not be murdered; however, it is not clear whether Cain actually bore any sort of a physical change (although that is the general interpretation which most translations give to this verse). What you will find is, there are a number of things in the Bible where we understand the gist of what is going on, but we do not fully understand every single detail. An example of this is, in the future, there will be a distribution of land, and who gets what plot of land will be determined by the throwing of lots. However, we will not have any idea exactly what these *lots* looked like or how throwing them determined this or that. Context tells us the results of throwing the lots, but none of the details. Here, it is clear that Cain will not be executed for his crime (although he is punished); but exactly what God does in order to reassure Cain is not revealed to us. In my opinion, what Cain receives is God's assurance, and nothing else.

A question that you should be asking yourself: this is the Old Testament and the God of the Old Testament is supposedly a severe, harsh God; so what happened to *an eye for an eye; a tooth for a tooth*? God is not just pardoning Cain, he is providing Cain with protection. Why does God do this? Let me suggest the following:

God did not give man the law yet. There is no organized society as such yet. There is a society, but it is just a group of people with nothing more than social mores. There is no law, no governing body, no court system, no police force, etc. This may be hard to understand, but what that means is, anyone who kills Cain would be guilty of revenge, hatred, murder, and vigilantism. In other words, the killing of Cain would be the result of a whole new set of sins. A system of law must be in place in order for someone to be guilty of breaking the law. A court system must be in effect to impartially judge those who have gone against the law. Law is not effective or meaningful unless it is impartial. There could be no impartiality in the killing of Cain and God despises anarchy.

What will be required is a codex of laws, with specifics laid out. Interestingly enough, the first time that murder is specifically defined as a sin with specific consequences is not given to us until Gen. 9:6, which is after the flood. If God said this earlier, we are not aware of it.

Let's look at one more verse from the New Testament about Cain: **Yet in like manner these people also, beguiled with sensual images and carried away to an impious course of conduct,⁸ defile the flesh, reject authority, and blaspheme the glorious ones...But these people blaspheme all that they do not understand, and they are destroyed by all that they, like unreasoning animals, understand instinctively. Woe to them! For they walked in the way of Cain and abandoned themselves for the sake of gain to Balaam's error and perished in Korah's rebellion (Jude 1:8, 10–11). *Walking in the way of Cain* simply means to depend upon the works of their hands for approval from God and to not understand**

⁸ From comma to comma is one Greek word, with this meaning, according to Thayer. This is often translated with the single word *dreamers*, which does not convey what is being said here. Strong's #1797.

why God wants what He wants. For many such persons, they gain the approval of man, and that is good enough for them.

As we will find throughout the Bible, the specifics which are recorded history have parallels or application even to today.

Cainian Parallels	
Cain	Parallel
Cain offers up his own human good works to God, and God rejects it.	God rejects all human good production.
Abel brings to God an animal sacrifice. This sacrifice is acceptable to God.	The sacrifice of Jesus Christ is acceptable to God; God is never propitiated by human works.
Cain will no longer be a successful farmer. Although Cain apparently produced some wonderful fruits and vegetables, they have long since rotted or have become waste and he will no longer be able to produce more.	The works of our hands are transitory. They will not survive. They will rot and be thrown away.
Cain is banished from society.	God must separate the profane from the holy. At the end of the Millennium, all unbelievers and fallen angels will be removed from believers by being thrown into the Lake of Fire. We recognize this principle in society and remove criminals from society as well (a degenerate society does not recognize this principle).
Cain will no longer be in the Lord's presence.	Unbelievers who have chosen not to come to God through Jesus Christ will be banished from Him forever. The logic is simple: if you have no desire to meet God on God's terms during life, you will certainly have no interest in spending eternity with God.

Cainian Parallels

Cain	Parallel
<p>This is a point which cannot be overemphasized: you have to be willing to approach God at least one time in your life on His terms, which terms are compatible with His character. The cross of Jesus Christ is compatible with His essence. The cross represents God's love, righteousness and justice. We do not get to approach God with our own human works, which ignore God's love, righteousness and justice completely. We do not get to devise some picture of God in our minds, and worship <i>that</i> God—that is blatant self-worship. If we are not willing to come to God just one time in our lives—faith in Christ requires only a few seconds of our time—then we will not want to spend eternity with the One we have rejected every single second of our lives.</p>	
Cain does not admit his sin and he will no longer be in the Lord's presence.	Believers who do not name their sins to God are out of fellowship, and therefore, temporally removed from God's presence.
Cain's punishment is too great for him to bear.	We are unable to bear the punishment for our own sins. It is only through Jesus Christ (Abel's animal sacrifice) that we are delivered.
Cain will be punished, but he will not be executed by God.	Cain is a believer in Jehovah Elohim; they spoke regularly. So, Cain will be under a temporal judgment, as he stays out of fellowship; but he will not be cast into the Lake of Fire as a final judgment.
Innocent Abel dies but Cain receives assurances from God that he will not be killed.	This simply represents the death of Jesus Christ for the sins of the world. We deserve to die, but the Lamb of God died in our stead.

I may not know the reason why God included this or that verse or this or that chapter in the Bible, but there is always a reason.

Lesson 46: Genesis 4:16–24

The Line of Cain

So far in this chapter, Cain and Abel assembled before God and brought Him their offerings. Abel's offering of a slain animal was accepted (which sacrifice represents the death of Jesus Christ for our sins). Cain's offering of the works of his hands was ignored (God rejects the good produced by man in the flesh). Cain is furious, and he later lures Abel to a deserted area and kills him (very likely with a sacrificial knife). God has judged Cain and Cain will no longer have success as a farmer; and further, God banishes Cain from the rest of society.

Gen 4:16 Then Cain went out from the LORD's presence and lived in the land of Nod, east of Eden.

As I suggested before, Adam, Eve, Cain and Abel all had a face to face relationship with the Lord. He walked with them and He spoke with them. Cain will be banished from God's presence; that is, he will no longer have a face-to-face relationship with God.

We are given some description of the land around Eden. Prior to the flood, man found himself in essentially one area. Cain left this area and moved to Nod, which word means *wandering*.

As we will find out, Cain will not be banished alone. He will have his wife. Now, in case you wonder from where did Cain get his wife, she would have been one of his sisters (Gen. 5:4).

The Bible does not always specifically connect things together, e.g., from where did Cain get his wife. Adam and Eve had sons and daughters, but the Bible does not point out that they intermarried. This is left to us to sort this out. Just because some factoid which we think is important, for whatever reason, is missing from the Bible, does not indicate that the Bible is defective in any way. God has portions of man's history recorded for specific reasons.

One of the most fascinating aspects of Scripture, although you may not think this, is genealogy. The Bible records, in bits and pieces, and eventually, in full, all the genealogies which take us from Adam to Jesus (the *2nd Adam*). I have searched out my own genealogy, and it is huge and, in essence, virtually infinite (like everyone's line). And as I move backward into time, I can go in several directions.

In the Bible, over a period of 2000 to 4000 years (over which period of time the Bible was written), a dozen or so men specifically chose certain genealogies to follow. Some genealogies are followed to a dead end and they just stop, never to be picked up and followed again. However, there is one genealogy which is followed all the way from Adam to Jesus. God knows what He is doing. The fact that we have this complete genealogy indicates that God, from beginning to end, knows what He is doing; and this complete genealogy is evidence that the Bible is complete. No other genealogy is followed from beginning to end (in fact, few genealogies are followed for more than 10 generations); and once we get to Jesus, there are no more genealogies to follow (no one thinks that there is some importance in following Peter's genealogy or the genealogy of Mary and Joseph, who had children together after the virgin birth of Jesus). In fact, there is only one genealogy followed from beginning to end in all of human history—just one.

We will follow out Cain's genealogy, but, at some point, we will stop, and it will never be picked up again anywhere else in the Bible.

Gen 4:17–18 Cain knew his wife intimately, and she conceived and gave birth to Enoch. Then Cain became the builder of a city, and he named the city Enoch after his son. Irad

was born to Enoch, Irad fathered Mehujael, Mehujael fathered Methushael, and Methushael fathered Lamech.

Cain's wife would have been one of his sisters. Furthermore, Adam and Eve would have had more male children other than Cain, Abel and (soon-to-be-mentioned) Seth. So, when Cain left Adam and Eve, he took with him a woman, one of his sisters, here called *his woman*.

Enoch, Cain's son, means *dedicated, consecrated, or initiated*. The Bible will follow out specific lines for a long time. Other lines will be followed out for a short time, but enough to indicate a person's contribution to society. These early lines are particularly important, simply because we are seeing the actual history of man unfold before our eyes, from the very beginning.

Cain himself was no longer a farmer, so he became a builder, which suggests the use of tools (which will be mentioned in this chapter). What he builds is the common Hebrew word for *city, town*.

Enoch sires Irad, which means *fugitive; runner; wild ass; heap of empire; dragon*. There is very little agreement to the meaning of Irad's name. The first part of his name actually means *city*, so I think the meanings given by most others may have missed the mark. *City of Mist* would be a reasonable interpretation of Irad's name.

Irad's son is Mehujael, which means *struck down by God*. Cain's line is the line which is judged and separated by God from the rest of society. The *'el* ending of a name is often a reference to God in some way, since it means *God*.

The name of *Methushael* also has a meaning related to God, and the first part of this name means *man*, which is why some say this name means *man of God* (however, they are leaving a portion of his name out). If these are different vowel points,⁹ his name would mean *man of Sheol, man of the grave*, which I believe is more accurate.

These two names give us a clue as to the thinking of Cain and his descendants: they see themselves as struck down by God and one set of parents associate their son with death from the day he is born (*a man of Sheol*). They see themselves as victims, even though they are where they are as a result of their own volition.

These two verses take us 5 generations from Cain: Enoch, Irad, Mehujael, Methushael and Lamech. The name of *Lamech* is given many meanings, chief among them, *powerful*.

Gen 4:19–20 Lamech took two wives for himself, one named Adah and the other named Zillah. Adah bore Jabal; he was the father of the nomadic herdsmen.

⁹ Recall that the vowel points were added over 2000 years later.

Lamech is the first polygamist named in Scripture (and he is likely the first polygamist in human history). This is given as a matter of fact. So far, there is only one thing associated with the word *sin*, and that is the work of Cain's hands (Gen. 4:7). There is only one thing thus far associated with punishment from God, and that is Cain's murder of Abel.

Apart from Eve, Adah (*ornament*) and Zillah (*shadow*) are the first two women named in the Bible. These women were likely descendants of Cain; however, it is not impossible for them to have come through Seth (who has not been named yet in the Bible) or through Adam and Eve.

Cain built a city, and, presumably, his extended family lived in and around this city, adding to it. However, Jabal lives in a tent and tends cattle (this can be any kind of livestock, including sheep and goats). Jabal has a portable shelter (a tent) and he is able to gather and keep together cattle, which he takes from field to field. **And Adah bore Jabal; he was the father of those living in tents, and with cattle.** This indicates that Jabal came up with this concept of having a portable house and moving his cattle around to different pastures.

Gen 4:21–22 His brother was named Jubal; he was the father of all who play the lyre and the flute. Zillah bore Tubal-cain, who hammered out [and sharpened] all kinds of bronze and iron tools. Tubal-cain's sister was Naamah.

There were people of note in Cain's line: one man invented the lyre and flute and developed music using those instruments. It would make sense that he had to have some kind of tools with which to work the wood to make instruments of wood.

Jabal and Jubal's half brother, Tubal-cain, worked with metals. This is the first place where we specifically have man and metal tools associated together. Tubal-cain figured out not necessarily how to make tools but how to sharpen them. The verb found here does not mean *to make*, but *to hammer [out]*, *to sharpen*. What Tubal-cain sharpens is a word found only here, which could mean *tools* (the noun is closely related to the verb which means *to engrave*, *to plow*, *to cut [into something]*). What further suggests that these are *tools* is that they are *of copper [or, bronze] and iron*. There are ways one could express that Tubal-cain was the first man to make or to devise tools of iron and copper and bronze; however, it appears that he, instead, takes tools which already exist, and maintains them and transforms them as well. This became his profession.

Being a man of tools, one of my interests is, *what does the Bible say about tools?*

Why I Believe that Man Had Tools Early On

1. When Adam and the woman are banished from the Garden of Eden, the angels guarding the entrance to the Tree of Life display swords.
2. Adam and Cain were farmers. Adam farmed in the Garden of Eden. It is reasonable to suppose they used some sort of tools in order to do this.
3. Abel killed animal sacrifices as an offering to God. Although one may certainly kill an animal with one's bare hands, it makes more sense that Abel had a knife

Why I Believe that Man Had Tools Early On

- or a blade of some sort.
4. When Cain killed Abel, there is no indication of a struggle in the narrative. If Cain killed Abel with his bare hands, following the example of Abel killing an animal for sacrifice, the narrative would probably have been much different. However, a quick slice of Abel's throat would have been sudden and not required a struggle, and this would match up with the text. Furthermore, the verb used in the New Testament referring to this indicates that Abel was killed with a sacrificial knife.
 5. Tubal-cain is not presented as one who *makes, develops, or invents* tools, but as one who *hammers and sharpens* tools. This also suggests the pre-existence of tools.
 6. God can obviously make anything; and Adam, Cain and Abel would have been geniuses; so their being able to make tools is reasonable.
 7. Cain is said to build a city. Jabal is said to have a tent. This suggests the use of tools.
 8. The evidence which we have points more toward Adam and his descendants using tools than not.

Again, these are not animal-chasing, wooden-spear raising, cave-dwelling heathen, but men who lived hundreds of years, men who were geniuses, and men who could take up a field of study and pursue that field for hundreds of years.

[Gen 4:23–24](#) Lamech sang to his wives: Adah and Zillah, "Hear my voice; wives of Lamech, pay attention to my words. For I killed a man for wounding me, a boy for striking me. If Cain is to be avenged seven times over, then for Lamech it will be seventy-seven times!"

One of the first songs in the antediluvian age (before the flood) was written and performed by Lamech, who apparently got into a fight and killed a man as well as a teenager. This extended family was separate from God, and there were no laws. That God chose to protect Cain and to execute vengeance upon anyone who attempted to kill him, was known to Lamech and, apparently, to all. Therefore, there was even some celebration in this dark society, of what Cain did and what Lamech did.

Note that in this fallen line, there is both great achievement and great sin. Murder is actually celebrated, and this song is known well enough to be recorded in the Bible.

You will notice Who is almost never mentioned in this genealogical line? God. Cain knows Jehovah Elohim (Jesus Christ). Cain spoke face to face with God on many occasions; yet he seems to teach his children and grandchildren precious little about Who God is.

The fact that we are able to follow Cain's line indicates that there is some sort of communication between this offshoot of Adam's line and Adam, as these things have been recorded for us. We don't know who recorded these things, or who remembered these events and continued to pass them down. Since Scripture is recorded by those who have

believed in Jehovah Elohim, we may assume that there was an oral history begun in the time of Seth. Given the achievements of the line of Cain, actual writing is not out of the question.

In this portion of Gen. 4, we followed Cain's line out far enough to determine that early man had tools, musical instruments, professions, and criminality. This line of Cain is a fallen line and the Bible will not return to it.

Lesson 47: Genesis 4:25–26

The Line of Seth

In the previous lesson, we followed the line of Cain. We followed his line out for several generations, and noted some of the remarkable innovations of particular men. In this lesson, we will follow the line of Seth, one of the 3 named sons of Adam and Eve. As we will find throughout the Bible, some lines are followed and just stop; and some lines are continued. The lines of the fallen will just stop.

At this point, we go back to a different line. Man will be continually separated into two primary genealogies in the book of Genesis, and they represent fallen man and saved man. One genealogy will come to an abrupt halt (representing the final judgment) and one will be continued (representing hope and eternal life). The line which is continued is a picture of salvation and the lines which are abruptly cut off represent those who reject Jesus Christ.

Gen 4:25 Adam knew his wife intimately again, and she gave birth to a son and named him Seth, for *she said*, "God has appointed to me another child [lit., seed] in place of Abel, since Cain killed him."

To understand what had happened, Adam and Eve were essentially childless again. Abel had been killed and Cain was banished. They had at least one girl, and that would have been Cain's wife. What appears to be the case—and this is only from inference, it is not directly stated—Adam and Eve now have no children—at least, no male children—until Seth is born. However, it could also be that, they had no male children of note. The line of Seth is the line of Christ.

Eve said, "God has appointed to me another child [or, seed] in place of Abel" does suggest that Seth is their 3rd-born male child. The word used here is tachath (תַּחַת) [pronounced *TAH-khahth*], which means *instead of, in lieu of; in the place [in which one stands]; in exchange for; on the basis of*. Strong's #8478 BDB #1065.

Eve said, "God has appointed to me another child [or, seed] in place of Abel" tells us 3 things:

What Eve's Words Tell Us:

1. Seth is seen as a *replacement* for Abel.

What Eve's Words Tell Us:

2. Seth appears to have been named while in the womb, as the word for *child* here is actually the word *seed*. Adam and/or Eve recognized the connection between a seed growing into a great plant and a child growing from a *seed*, so to speak, into a man.
3. Finally, Eve recognizes that a child is from God, something which we seem to have lost in our society. Too many in our society believe that, when they are with child, they can choose to terminate the life of that child if his being born is too inconvenient.

Eve specifically names Seth, which name she takes from the verb *shîyth* (שׂיַת) [pronounced *sheeth*] which means, *to put, to set, place; to appoint; to arrange, to set in order; to found; to station*. Strong's #7896 BDB #1011. God appointed [*shîyth* (שׂיַת)] a child to her, so she therefore names him *Shêth* (שֵׁת).

We will not follow any more of Cain's line. From this point forward, we will only follow the line of Seth. We will follow *the line of promise* or the *line of redemption*. This does not mean that everyone in Cain's line was not saved. Cain himself believed in Jehovah Elohim and spoke with Him (however, he spent most of his life separated from God). However, Cain's line became a degenerate line, committing, tolerating and even celebrating murder. The problem is simple: when a society tolerates and even celebrates a sin, that society is degenerate.

Gen 4:26 A son was born to Seth also, and he named him Enosh. At that time it was begun to call on the name of the LORD.

Obviously, Adam and Eve had another child, a female, and she and Seth married. Adam and Eve were the proper mold—one man and one woman—and most relationships followed that design (with the exception of Lamech).

Seth names this child, and names him *Enosh*, which means *man*. The emphasis of this word is upon *man's mortality* and this name could also be translated *mortal*. It comes from a verb which means *to be weak*. Its synonym in the Hebrew is *Adam*, which also means *man* (but without an emphasis upon man's weakness or mortality). *Adam* also means *red*, after the soil from which he was made. That there is a twofold meaning of his name is simply God being clever.

The final sentence here is worth noting. God appeared to meet face to face with Adam, Eve, Cain and Abel. However, when we get to Enosh, the son of Seth, **it was begun to call upon the name of Jehovah**. First of all, if your translation reads *men began to* or *people began to*, the words *men* and *people* are not found in this verse. Furthermore, the first verb, *to begin to* grabs one's attention because 1) it is in the passive intensive and 2) this is the only time that this verb occurs in the passive intensive (Hophal stem) in the entire Bible. Whatever this means, it is a seminal moment in human history.

Let me suggest to you that, from this point on, there was no longer common, direct contact with God. God would still visit man in various theophanies (as a man, an angel, a burning bush), but there is no indication that God comes regularly to speak with anyone directly. With Adam and Eve, God seemed to come to them at a particular time of the day (the spiritual time of the day). With Cain and Abel, God came periodically to receive sacrifices from them (I am making the reasonable assumption that this occurred more than once).

That God came regularly at one time, but is no longer coming to man regularly would also suggest that there is some rudimentary doctrines developed by this time, although they are not clearly revealed. That is, there was a sacrificial system and some understanding of right and wrong. God did not simply leave His creation because man had fallen. However, apparently at this point, regular and direct contact was no longer the established relationship between God and man, so that men began to call upon the name of Jehovah.

It should be reasonable to make this interpretation, because sin automatically causes a rift between God and man. Therefore, this is illustrated by God no longer having direct, daily communication with man.

Enosh was born 235 years after Adam's age began to be calculated (Gen. 5:3, 6). We do not know if Adam's age was calculated from creation or from the fall. In this time outside of the garden, there must have been some sort of system of believer protocol developed, however, we know little about it. There were animal sacrifices instituted, although we have no specifics even to that (that is, how often, which kinds of animals, etc.).

This is the first of several lists of one important genealogy.

Over a period of perhaps 3000 years, approximately 9 different men recorded the genealogy of Jesus Christ. They recorded His legal line (from David through Solomon down to Joseph) and his actual line (from David through Nathan to Mary). The line from Adam to Abraham to David (and then to Jesus) is also recorded in the Bible. These various authors did this under the influence of God the Holy Spirit (2Tim. 3:16 2Peter 1:21).

The Genealogy of Jesus Christ	
Human Author*	Passage/Commentary/Notable People
Noah or Shem	Gen. 5:1–32 Adam to Seth to Noah to Shem
Abram	Gen. 11:10–27 Shem to Abram
Isaac	Gen. 25:19–26 Abram to Isaac to Jacob
Joseph	Gen. 37:2 46:8–25 Jacob to Judah (along with the rest of the tribes of Israel).
Nathan, Gad, Unknown?	1Chron. 2:3–15 Judah to Perez to Jesse to David.

The Genealogy of Jesus Christ

Human Author*	Passage/Commentary/Notable People
Ruth	Ruth 4:13–22 From Boaz and Ruth to Jesse to David.
<p>Both the book of Kings and the book of Chronicles follow out the kingly line of David through Solomon down to Josiah and the deportation of the people of Judah; however, this is a history rather than a genealogy, per se (which parallels the genealogy in Matt. 1:7–13). What is followed out in this history is the legal and kingly line of Jesus (which line takes us to Joseph).</p> <p>This history is continued in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, to Zerubbabel, a descendant of David and the governor of Judah when the people are returned to the land.</p>	
Ezra	Ezra 3:8 Ezra takes up the slack and lists a short line leading to Zerubbabel from Israel’s captivity.
Nathan, Gad, Unknown?	2Sam. 5:13–14 1Chron. 3:1–5 14:3–4 David to Nathan (who is in Mary’s line but not Joseph’s) and Solomon, who is in Joseph’s line, but not Mary’s.
Matthew	Matt. 1:1–16 Abraham to Judah to David to Solomon to Joseph. This is the legal and kingly line of Jesus to His step-father, Joseph.
Luke	Luke 3:23–38 Adam to Noah to Abraham to Isaac to Jacob to Judah to David to Nathan to Mary (the genealogy actually takes us to Joseph, the <i>supposed</i> father of Jesus) to Jesus. This is the line of our Lord’s humanity, a direct line from Adam to Mary and then to Jesus—the only complete genealogy recorded in human history.

* I am giving the name of the human author I believe to be responsible for recording this information.

I have not included all of the names in each genealogy, but only the names of those you may already have heard of.

I realize that most of you yawn at the thought of a genealogy; however, nowhere else in the history of man do we have a 4000 year long genealogy given for anyone. We have nothing which comes anywhere near to this (at best, history records a line of kings or rulers over a particular country over a period of several hundred years).

It is amazing that, over a period of 4000 years, that God called a man, every dozen or so generations, to make certain that the line from the first Adam to the last Adam was recorded in Scripture. It is impossible to overemphasize the fact that this occurs one time in all of human history. God called at least 9 or 10 men out of history to make certain that

this line was preserved in writing—men who were separated by hundreds of years in time, men who had very little in common, apart from being believers in Y^ehowah Elohim.

Matthew and Luke certainly began to recognize the significance of Who Jesus is, and they no doubt went to whatever court records there were in order to get a portion of our Lord's genealogy (from 400 B.C. to their present). However, how did Ruth know to record this genealogy? How did Nathan (or Gad) know? How did Noah or Shem realize that they needed to record their genealogical line? God the Holy Spirit guided them to record an unbroken line from Adam to Jesus, a line whose length and completeness is unduplicated in all human history.

I don't know if you recall, but back in lesson 19, I recorded the 10 amazing things found in just the first chapter and a half of the Bible. Such things continue throughout the Bible—particularly in the book of Genesis. We quickly read over such things, often ignoring half of the words. Still, in the back of our minds, we often wonder, *why the hell is this in the Bible? What's up with all of these begat's?* And yet, the recording of these various genealogies produces one of the many unique things about the Bible—an unbroken genealogy from the first Adam to the last Adam. 1Cor. 15:20–22, 45: **But now Christ has been raised from the dead; He became the firstfruit of those having fallen asleep. For since death is through man, also through a Man is the resurrection of the dead; for as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all will be made alive. Therefore, it stands written, "The first man, Adam, became a living soul." The last Adam became a life-giving spirit (and Gen. 2:7).**

However, this is not even the half of it. What follows in Gen. 5 is even more amazing. Yet, for most of you, if you simply read it, Gen. 5 will mean little or nothing to you.

Lesson 48: Genesis 5:1–2

“These are the Generations of...”

In this chapter, we are going to follow the line of salvation from Adam to Noah, and you might be expecting that this would be the most boring thing to study ever—almost one entire chapter of a genealogy. You're going to be surprised as to what we'll find hidden in this chapter (it will take us 2 lessons to get that far).

Gen 5:1 This *is* the book of the generations of Adam: In the day that God created man. He made him in the likeness of God.

This is the second time that we have a phrase similar to **This is the book of the generations of...** (the first was in Gen. 2:4—it read *these are the generations of*). That was the account of the creation of the heavens and the earth; this lists those descended from Adam.

Men have long supposed that Genesis was handed down verbally until man reached a point at which he could write it down. I am fine with that, *and* we have come to that point. At the end of the previous chapter, we read **it was begun to call upon the name of Jehovah.** In this chapter, we began with *this [is]* followed by the Hebrew word for *book*, *missive*,

document, legal document, or scroll. The noun found here refers to something which is *written down*. I believe that these two things are tied together. We may look upon Gen. 4:26 as being in a different chapter from Gen. 5:1, but there were no chapters or verses in the original writings. We go directly from *then it was begun to call upon the name of Jehovah* to *this is the book of the generations of Adam...* As soon as man was able to record human history, God no longer came to man regularly in what appears to be a daily fellowship and teaching.

The environment of the earth and its population is much different than we have been led to believe. Man was more intelligent, they lived longer, and we know that he had developed tools, musical instruments, houses and cities early on. I would submit to you that mankind, at this point in time, was very technologically advanced, and that the concept of turning their language into the written word was not some giant leap.

Gen 5:1 *This is the book of the generations of Adam: In the day that God created man. He made him in the likeness of God.*

One could make the argument that these are the first words of the Bible, so to speak. What came before was later added, or, what came before was in a separate accent, passed on verbally. In any case, someone recognized that it would be a good idea to write these things down. What will follow will be the 10 generations of Adam to Noah. We do not know if Enosh began to write this down or Adam; and that each generation added a few verses; or if Noah wrote down this entire genealogy, seeing that the end of man, apart from him and his family, was near. In any case, bear in mind that, for a period of time, almost all of these men in this chapter were alive at the same time on this earth.

We find a similar introductory statement (*These are the generations of...*) in Gen. 2:4 5:1 6:9 10:1, 32 11:10, 27 25:12, 19 36:1, 9 37:2. Pastor Robbie Dean calls these the *toledoth's*, because the Hebrew word here is: *tôwlêdôth* (תּוֹלְדוֹת) [pronounced *tohlee-DOHTH*], which means *generations, results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history*. Most of the time that we find this statement, what follows is a genealogy. It may be a long or a short genealogy. The use of this word also appear to be a marker throughout the book of Genesis, and it may even point to a new author each time, or a new source.

I believe that it will be worth our while to look ahead, gather up each time that we find the words, *these are the generations of*, and to see what follows:

“These are the generations of...”		
Scripture	Immediate Context	What Follows
Gen 2:4 <i>These are the generations [results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history] of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens.</i>	The environment into which Adam was brought; Adam’s first day, including the building of the woman.	The fall of man, Cain and Abel, the genealogy of Cain, the birth of Seth.

“These are the generations of...”

Scripture	Immediate Context	What Follows
<p>Because there is no time in the Hebrew tense system, one could reasonably argue that Gen. 2:4 looked backward to what God had created and restored in the previous 1½ chapters.</p>		
<p>Gen 5:1 This is the book of the generations [results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history] of Adam. When God created man, he made him in the likeness of God.</p>	<p>The line of Adam through Seth down to Noah. This is a long genealogy (10 generations) in which lifespans are given.</p>	<p>The demonic corruption of man.</p>
<p>This is the only time that we have the words <i>the book of</i>. I submit to you that, at this point, information began to be written down.</p>		
<p>Gen 6:9 These are the generations [results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history] of Noah. Noah was a righteous man, blameless in his generation. Noah walked with God.</p>	<p>Noah and his immediate family living in world where mankind had been corrupted.</p>	<p>The flood and Noah's family after the flood.</p>
<p>Gen 10:1 These are the generations [results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history] of the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. Sons were born to them after the flood.</p>	<p>The sons and grandsons of Japheth, Ham and Shem (who are the sons of Noah). This chapter gives us the early nations of the earth.</p>	<p>The Tower of Babel.</p>
<p>This is one of the few times a family list is concluded with a similar phrase. Gen 10:32 These are the families of the sons of Noah, according to their genealogies, in their nations, and from these the nations spread abroad on the earth after the flood. However, this conclusion also gives credence to the hypothesis that Gen. 2:4 also looked backward.</p>		
<p>Gen 11:10 These are the generations [results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history] of Shem. When Shem was 100 years old, he fathered Arpachshad two years after the flood.</p>	<p>The line of Shem down to Abraham. This is a long genealogy where lifespans are given.</p>	<p>The next genealogy.</p>

“These are the generations of...”

Scripture	Immediate Context	What Follows
<p>Gen 11:27 Now these are the generations [results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history] of Terah. Terah fathered Abram, Nahor, and Haran; and Haran fathered Lot.</p>	<p>Terah, his sons (which include Abram) and Abram's wife Sarai.</p>	<p>The lives of Abram (Abraham) and Isaac, down to the death of Abraham, including God's promise to Abram, the conflict between Sarai and Hagar, Abram's nephew Lot, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the birth of Isaac, the offering of Isaac, the death of Sarah (Sarai), Isaac's wife, and Abraham's death.</p>
<p>Although the two genealogies above seem to belong together, the second one leads into the great narrative of Abraham's life, which is fairly extensive.</p>		
<p>Gen 25:12 These are the generations [results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history] of Ishmael, Abraham's son, whom Hagar the Egyptian, Sarah's servant, bore to Abraham.</p>	<p>The sons of Ishmael. This is a line which ends.</p>	<p>Nothing.</p>
<p>Gen 25:19 These are the generations [results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history] of Isaac, Abraham's son: Abraham fathered Isaac</p>	<p>Isaac and his wife with twin sons to be born (Esau and Jacob).</p>	<p>Some of Isaac's life; and much of Jacob's life, including the treachery of his own sons.</p>
<p>Gen 36:1 These are the generations [results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history] of Esau (that is, Edom).</p>	<p>Esau's wives and sons. This is a line which ends.</p>	<p>Nothing.</p>
<p>Gen 36:9 These are the generations [results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history] of Esau the father of the Edomites in the hill country of Seir.</p>	<p>Several generations of Esau are chronicled. This is a long genealogy. This is a line which ends.</p>	<p>Nothing.</p>

“These are the generations of...”

Scripture	Immediate Context	What Follows
<p>The two genealogies above appear to fit together, and neither of them actually leads into any sort of a narrative. This is a literary way of indicating that these lines led nowhere; that is, these are lines of the unsaved (quite obviously the line of Esau continued, as we find the Edomites for thousands of years).</p>		
<p>Gen 37:2 These are the generations [results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history] of Jacob. Joseph, being seventeen years old, was pasturing the flock with his brothers. He was a boy with the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, his father's wives. And Joseph brought a bad report of them to their father.</p>	<p>Joseph and the favoritism of his father and the jealousy of his brothers. The immediate context lists no specific family lines, and only Reuben and Judah are mentioned by name as Joseph's brothers. The overall focus of the final 14 chapters of Genesis is Joseph on the one hand, and Jacob and Joseph's brothers on the other.</p>	<p>We follow two parallel narratives: (1) Joseph being sold into slavery by his brothers and his eventual life in Egypt; and (2) that of his father Jacob and his brothers. These two narratives will merge when Jacob's family has to go to Egypt for additional food. Jacob's family then moves to Egypt.</p>

Obviously, most of the time, this phrase (*These are the generations of...*) introduces either list of sons and sometimes grandsons; or it introduces a genealogical line. In most cases, this phrase marks the beginning of a new set of narratives.

You will note, at first, this phrase is not standardized, which we would expect from different authors. However, it quickly becomes standardized, which is something we would expect from subsequent authors.

Although the line of promise and the line of fallen men are both followed, only the line of promise (Adam to Noah to Shem to Abram to Jacob) leads anywhere. The line of fallen man always goes to an abrupt stop, and is never picked up again. This does not mean that the line dies out; it means that line *goes nowhere*; not continuing a line of unbelievers indicates that it is cut off, spiritually speaking.

[Gen 5:1](#) This is the book of the generations of Adam: In the day that God created man. He made him in the likeness of God.

The word *likeness* is found only 3 times in the books of the Law (the first 5 books of the Christian and Hebrew Bibles):

Adam, Created in the *Likeness* of God

Scripture	Text/Commentary
<p>Gen 1:26 And God said, Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the heavens, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over all the creepers creeping on the earth.</p>	<p>Man is made in the image and likeness of the Godhead. Man had shadow qualities of God and man was made triune (body, soul and spirit), just as God is triune. God has sovereignty, man has free will; God has omniscience, man has mentality; etc.</p>
<p>Gen 5:1 This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, He made him in the likeness of God.</p>	<p>When man decided to chronicle his own existence, it is recognized immediately that he was made by God in the likeness of God.</p>
<p>Gen 5:3 And Adam lived one hundred and thirty years and fathered a son in his own likeness, after his own image. And he called his name Seth.</p>	<p>Seth was born in the likeness and image of Adam, setting up a parallel relationship: God and man; man and his son. This word is not repeated for each son born. In order to maintain the parallel, we have just one son here as God has One Son.</p>

This word is not used until thousands of years later by some of the prophets.

In case you were wondering, the Hebrew word is *d^emûwth* (דָּמוּת) [pronounced *dehm-OOTH*], which means *likeness, [shadow] image, similitude; model, pattern; [and, later] appearance [of something resembling something]*. Strong's #1823 BDB #198.

Gen 5:2 He [God] created them male and female, and blessed them, and called their name Adam [= *man, mankind*] in the day when they were created.

You will recall that I have previously suggested that only Adam was created on the 6th day, but he was created in such a way as to be divisible later, when God took his rib and made of this rib, Eve (which was a cloning, although God changed a chromosome). This verse does not really support or contradict that notion. *Adam* simply means *man, human being, mankind (much more frequently intended sense in OT); Adam, first man*. However, just so I am being clear, I have not been persuaded fully that Eve was made after the 6th day of restoration or on the 6th day of restoration. I realize that one could take this same verse and argue for Adam and Eve being created as separate persons on this 6th day of restoration as well.

As we have studied previously, the word *day* in the Hebrew, can simply refer to a period of time, which may be more or less than 24 hours. Therefore, the phrase **in the day when they were created** does not necessarily refer to a 24-hour period of time.

Also, has been pointed out previously, we do not have to take a cell of every type in order to clone animal (that is, we do not have to take blood cells, skin cells, bone cells, etc.). So,

the idea that God is able to take Adam's rib and make from that Eve, is not scientifically unsound. The fact that Adam's sons were all born with the correct number of ribs is also genetically sound (for instance, if you cut off your finger and then sire a child, that child will be born with 10 fingers).

Next lesson: the gospel (good news) of Jesus Christ is revealed in the genealogy of Adam.

Lesson 49: Genesis 5:3–31 The Gospel of Jesus Christ Hidden in Adam's Line

At this point, we begin the line of Adam and this will take us all of the way to Noah. In this genealogy, we will actually find out how long the antediluvian age was (*ante* = *before*; *diluvian* = *deluge, flood*).

As mentioned before, it is not clear to me whether Adam's age was calculated from his creation or from his fall. However, given that his age is not particularly long, I would lean toward the years given in this chapter as those applicable to Adam as a fallen man. In the Garden of Eden, there was the Tree of Life. Apparently that tree, combined with the way our bodies were designed, made man's life virtually everlasting.

Gen 5:3–6 And Adam lived 130 years and fathered a *son* in his own likeness, according to his image, and called his name Seth. And the days of Adam after he fathered Seth were 800 years. And he fathered sons and daughters. And all the days that Adam lived were 930 years. Then he died. And Seth lived 105 years, and then he fathered Enos.

We are given 3 stats here for each person: how old each person is when they father a son; how much longer they live after that; and their age at death is given. The son whose name is given is not necessarily the firstborn. This sets up a pattern: from time to time, we will follow a specific line. We will follow the line of Adam all the way to Jesus Christ. Although this will be given in full in Luke 3, Luke bases this line will upon several genealogical lines which are noted throughout the Bible as well as upon some extra-Biblical resources.

This is a very unusual thing to be found in a book written by dozens of men over several millennia. How do you follow out a line—and why would you follow out a particular line—for hundreds of years, each writer of Scripture knowing exactly which child to choose. These families might have 3 or 4 children and they may have 9 or 10. Every writer of Scripture who records a genealogy knows the pertinent line to follow. This is not the only line which is followed in the Bible, but it is the only line which is followed from first to last, and then stopped. Once we come to Jesus Christ, no holy book continues to follow out the genealogy of, for instance, His half-brothers and half-sisters; nor is the line of Peter followed out. Somehow, 9 or 10 writers of Scripture, separated in time by hundreds of years, determined that there was a particular genealogical line to be followed, and somehow, they chose to record that correct line again and again, for 77 generations. And the Apostles which follow these writers of Scripture know that there are no other lines of any importance. Matthew records the genealogy of Joseph and Luke records the genealogy of Mary, going all the way back to Adam, who is called *the son of God*

(Luke 3:38). But no one makes any attempt to record anyone else's complete line because there is no reason to. In the end, Luke takes us from the first Adam to the last Adam (Luke 3:23–38 1Cor. 15:45) and there is no reason to go any further.

Gen 5:7–18 Seth lived after he fathered Enosh 807 years and had other sons and daughters. Thus all the days of Seth were 912 years, and then he died. When Enosh had lived 90 years, he fathered Kenan. Enosh lived after he fathered Kenan 815 years and had other sons and daughters. Thus all the days of Enosh were 905 years, and then he died. When Kenan had lived 70 years, he fathered Mahalalel. Kenan lived after he fathered Mahalalel 840 years and had other sons and daughters. Thus all the days of Kenan were 910 years, and he died. When Mahalalel had lived 65 years, he fathered Jared. Mahalalel lived after he fathered Jared 830 years and had other sons and daughters. Thus all the days of Mahalalel were 895 years, and then he died. When Jared had lived 162 years he fathered Enoch.

The first thing that you may notice is, there are names here similar to the line of Cain. Some are the same and some are similar. Bear in mind that, since the line of Cain (at least a portion of it) is recorded in Gen. 4; this would indicate that someone in Adam's line was keeping track of Cain's family as well as some of their activities. There was likely some intermarriage which occurred as well.

You will notice that man is also a lot more fit at this time, living typically to about 900 years of age. Evolution has taught us that man has become more evolved, and better (presumably; at least, *fitter*) with each generation. The Bible tells us that man is not evolving, but, to some extent, devolving,

With everything that we know from the Bible and from genetics, this would make sense. Breeds of dogs is a relatively new thing. We have been able to, over the past 1000+ years, isolate certain characteristics of dogs into a breed. However, this involves continued breeding within a line, which will not produce the healthiest, longest living dogs. We have determined that inbreeding in a family (between brother and sister or even between cousins) can produce children who are weaker and more prone to various ailments. However, when man was first created, it was not like this. Man, as created from the hand of God, was far healthier than is man today.

One of the things which is fascinating is, our cells reproduce and die out. Every 7 years, we are supposed to be a brand new person. That is, all of the cells we had 7 years ago are gone and have been replaced. It is as if we were designed to live forever.

We now come to Enoch, whose end is quite unusual.

Gen 5:19–24 Jared lived after he fathered Enoch 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Thus all the days of Jared were 962 years, and he died. When Enoch had lived 65 years, he fathered Methuselah. Enoch walked with God after he fathered Methuselah 300 years and had other sons and daughters. Thus all the days of Enoch were 365 years. Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him.

Enoch was simply taken by God; he did not endure death. His child Methuselah lived longer than any other person. This is known as, *blessing by association*. We will cover this doctrine in more detail at a later date, but, briefly speaking, if any member of a family is growing spiritually, then those of his family, those in his neighborhood, those in his city, those in his business, often enjoy blessing as well. Blessing to this individual believer overflows and spills onto those in his periphery. The United States is a wonderful example of blessing by association. We have more believers by percentage of population than any other nation on earth. We have more mature believers and more accurate Bible teaching as well. Therefore, we would expect the United States to be the most blessed nation on earth, which it is. We would expect more people would desire to move to the United States than to any other nation, which is also the case. But I digress.

Enoch, who walks with God, and then, was not; has a son who lives longer than anyone else on this earth. Methuselah was blessed because he was the son of Enoch.

Recall that I said that there was some system of protocol in place at this time; the fact that Enoch *walked with God* indicates this. How does a person have a complete idea as to his relationship with God without having some sort of system in place? How did Enoch figure out how to *walk with God*? Enoch apparently had a close relationship with God and, also apparently, had a way to know how to walk with God. That is, man, at that time, must have had some extensive knowledge of right and wrong, which could have even been ingrained in man's soul.

However, there does not appear to be a specific system of justice laid out at this time. That is, there are 3 murders that we are aware of, and the murderers, Cain and Lamech, do not appear to be sentenced to anything other than being separated from the line of Adam through Seth. Although they face potential revenge and retribution, nowhere in Gen. 1–6 do we have some sort of government or some sort of law laid out, apart from man's internal conscience.

[Gen. 5:22a, 24](#): And Enoch walked with God three hundred years after he fathered Methuselah. And Enoch walked with God. Then he was not, for God took him.

This also suggests, however, that God was with Enoch in a personal way, face to face, as He had talked to Adam, Eve, Cain and Abel. This seems to further define the relationship which God had with men at that time. He spoke with some directly, but His presence became less frequent, so that, men, for the most part, would call upon His name (Gen. 4:26).

However, what we appear to be lacking in this antediluvian age is, a written-down law. What appears to be lacking is a system of justice. God appears to have allowed anarchy to be the rule of law, with God intervening on one occasion to separate Cain from Adam and Eve, as well as to further curse the ground upon which Cain walked.

[Gen 5:25–31](#) When Methuselah had lived 187 years, he fathered Lamech. Methuselah lived after he fathered Lamech 782 years and had other sons and daughters. Thus all the

days of Methuselah were 969 years, and he died. When Lamech had lived 182 years, he fathered a son and called his name Noah, saying, "Out of the ground that the LORD has cursed this one shall bring us relief from our work and from the painful toil of our hands." Lamech lived after he fathered Noah 595 years and had other sons and daughters. Thus all the days of Lamech were 777 years, and he died.

Noah is a type of Christ. What is tied to the earth (the ground) is cursed, and those who are with Noah would be delivered.

Let's stop for a moment and look at the meanings of these men's names, starting with Adam (*man, mankind*) and ending with Noah (*rest*):

man, mankind → compensation, appointed, foundation → frailty, man → possession, possessor, purchaser → praise of God → descent, to descend → dedicated, consecrated (who was taken up) → man of the javelin → powerful, strong youth; poor, made low → rest

One might see this as the history of mankind: we begin with *man*, who is **appointed** to this earth as the **foundation** of this earth (man is given authority over all the earth). However, man fell, so he is **frail** and subject to death. We then move to Israel, which is God's **possession**. This leads us to the Jesus Christ, in the flesh, Who is the **praise of God**. He **descends** to earth (since Jesus is God), **dedicated** and **consecrated** to God (and the church is in Christ, so they are **dedicated and consecrated** to God). Then Jesus is **taken up** (resurrected) and the church will be **taken up** (raptured), which will leave us with the Tribulation, where men are at war (**men of the javelin**), and some men are **powerful** and some are **made low**. This leads us to the Millennium, where there will be **rest** for God's people.

One additional item of interest: Lamech, who will live to the age of 777, is representative of the tribulation, which is 7 years in length. I don't really care to delve into numerology in the Bible, unless there is a strong reason to do so, but this is, at least interesting, particularly given that Lamech's age is unusually short compared to the others in this line. Also of some interest, there will be 77 generations from Adam to Christ. 7 is often seen as a representation of God's perfect number or as a number which represents completeness. Man, on the other hand, often associates 6 with the perfect number, a name 6 is actually given in mathematics.

Interestingly enough, I wrote this material several months ago, and, about a week ago, I was led to this link on the internet where a pastor does a very similar thing.

The Gospel of Jesus Christ in the Genealogy of Adam to Noah		
Name	Meaning*	Text/Commentary**
<u>Adam</u>	Man	
<u>Seth</u>	Appoint	Meaning according to Easton, Fausset and ISBE.

The Gospel of Jesus Christ in the Genealogy of Adam to Noah

Name	Meaning*	Text/Commentary**
<u>Enosh</u>	Mortal, frail, miserable	As per Hitchcock, Smith and ISBE.
<u>Kenan</u>	Sorrow, dirge, elegy	I come up with the meanings <i>possessor, purchaser</i> here. I don't know from whence this pastor got his meaning of Kenan.
<u>Mahalalel</u>	The blessed God	It is almost unanimous that this name means <i>praise of God</i> (which is close).
<u>Jared</u>	From the verb <i>yarahd</i> , which means <i>Descent, will come down</i>	
<u>Enoch</u>	Teaching	Consensus is this means <i>dedicated, consecrated</i> .
<u>Methuselah</u>	His death will bring	There are two disparate meanings here: <i>man of the javelin</i> but, more likely, <i>he dies and it is sent</i> . When named, <i>it</i> would have referred to the flood (which was judgment). When our Lord died on the cross, both salvation and judgment were sent (in the flood, there was an ark, which was the salvation of those who believed).
<u>Lamech</u>	Despairing	I come up with two disparate meanings: <i>a strong man, powerful</i> or <i>poor, made low</i> .
<u>Noah</u>	To bring relief, rest, comfort	Also, the meanings <i>repose; consolation</i> .

*The meaning, according to Chuck Missler.

**Commentary in case there is any disagreement; or additional things to say.

Together, these all mean (according to Missler): **“Man [is] appointed [to] mortal sorrow; [but] the blessed God will come down teaching [that] His death will bring [the] despairing, rest.”**

These definitions were taken from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pSb9SPeMkhY> which video maker credits Chuck Missler.

Taking the revised meanings, we come up with: “**Man [is] appointed [to] mortal [ity]; purchased (or, possessed) [by] the Praise of God [Who] will descend [as the] Dedicated [One] (Who will be taken up). He dies and is sent [to the] poor [who are strong in Christ] [bringing them] rest [or, comfort, repose, consolation].**” So here we have the gospel of Jesus Christ as well as the history of mankind hidden within the names of the chosen genealogy.

Even when we correct some of these meanings, and even add in the second meanings, we still have the gospel and human history laid out for us, all in Gen. 5:3–31. Again, the words of the Bible give testimony to the fact that this is the Word of God.

Also recall that the only line in human history followed out from beginning to end is the line of Jesus Christ. By this point in our study, you should have come to realize just how phenomenal and unique the book of Genesis is, and, by extension, the entire Bible.

Let me also recommend that you go back and re-read Introductory lessons 11 and 12, so that you may better appreciate just how phenomenal the Bible is:

<http://kukis.org/Basicexegesis/Introtoexegesis.htm#Introductory%20Lesson%2011:%20The%20BibleChristian%20Apologetics%20and%20Biblical%20Prophecy>

Lesson 50: Genesis 5:3–32

Adam and his Descendants

In the previous two lessons, we studied the genealogy of Jesus Christ, and it was pointed out that no other person in the history of man has a genealogy which goes all the way back to the first man. This genealogy is unique as it is the only complete genealogy recorded in all of human history. Although, it is quite obvious that those in this line also have a complete genealogy; the culmination of the Davidic line in Jesus Christ marked the final complete genealogy.

We also observed that the saved genealogy, the genealogy of promise, also had hidden within it the history of mankind as well as the gospel of Jesus Christ—our salvation laid out in the genealogy itself; the promise of Jesus Christ, our Savior, hidden in the genealogy of Adam to Noah.

In this final lesson on Gen. 5, which is rather long, we will tie up the loose ends and then move on to Gen. 6 in the next lesson.

Gen. 5:3–24 When Adam had lived 130 years he fathered a son in his own likeness, according to his image, and he named him Seth. The length of time Adam lived after he became the father of Seth was 800 years; during this time he had other sons and daughters. The entire lifetime of Adam was 930 years, and then he died. When Seth had lived 105 years, he became the father of Enosh. Seth lived 807 years after he became the father of Enosh, and he had other sons and daughters. The entire lifetime of Seth was 912 years, and then he died. When Enosh had lived 90 years, he became the father of Kenan.

Enosh lived 815 years after he became the father of Kenan, and he had other sons and daughters. The entire lifetime of Enosh was 905 years, and then he died. When Kenan had lived 70 years, he became the father of Mahalalel. Kenan lived 840 years after he became the father of Mahalalel, and he had other sons and daughters. The entire lifetime of Kenan was 910 years, and then he died. When Mahalalel had lived 65 years, he became the father of Jared. Mahalalel lived 830 years after he became the father of Jared, and he had other sons and daughters. The entire lifetime of Mahalalel was 895 years, and then he died. When Jared had lived 162 years, he became the father of Enoch. Jared lived 800 years after he became the father of Enoch, and he had other sons and daughters. The entire lifetime of Jared was 962 years, and then he died. When Enoch had lived 65 years, he became the father of Methuselah. After he became the father of Methuselah, Enoch walked with God for 300 years, and he had other sons and daughters. The entire lifetime of Enoch was 365 years. Enoch walked with God, and then he was no longer present because God took him.

Enoch is the only man in this line, apart from Adam and Noah, who is individually mentioned in the New Testament (apart from a genealogy). Enoch is first mentioned in the great faith chapter of Heb. 11: **By faith Enoch was taken up [lit., transferred, transported] so that he did not see death, and he was not to be found because God transferred him. For before his removal he had been commended [or, received a good report] as having pleased God** (Heb. 11:5). The New Testament confirms to us what we studied here in the Old—that Enoch did not die, but God transferred him from life to eternal life. Enoch and Elijah are the 2 men of the Old Testament who are said to be taken by God in this way.

Jude also writes of Enoch: **About these [clouds without water...wandering stars, for whom impenetrable darkness is reserved forever] also Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, saying, "Behold, the Lord came with ten thousands of his holy ones, to execute judgment on all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their works of ungodliness which they have done in an ungodly way, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him."** (Jude 1:14–15).

The interpretation here is quite difficult, so let's take it in points:

The Explanation of Jude 1:14–15

1. The passage we are examining, reads: **About these [clouds without water...wandering stars, for whom impenetrable darkness is reserved forever] also Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, saying, "Behold, the Lord came with ten thousands of his holy ones, to execute judgment on all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their works of ungodliness which they have done in an ungodly way, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him."** (Jude 1:14–15).
2. Jude is comparing, but not conflating, unsaved man in the end times and the fallen angels of Gen. 6 (which includes the half-human, half-angelic beings of Gen. 6). He will include other judgments against man as well.
3. For many ages, there have been irreverent men who creep into history, to turn the

The Explanation of Jude 1:14–15

grace of God into legalism, lasciviousness, excess and/or insolence. Jude 1:4: **For certain persons have crept in unnoticed--men spoken of in ancient writings as pre-destined to this condemnation--ungodly men, who pervert the grace of our God into an excuse for immorality, and disown Jesus Christ, our only Sovereign and Lord.**

4. Jude illustrates God's judgment of those who do not believe by using the Exodus generation as an example. Those who were 20 and older when they left Egypt were struck down by God in the desert for their defiance and unbelief. Bear in mind, these were people who believed in Jesus Christ (Jehovah Elohim in the Old Testament); and God took them out via the sin unto death in the desert. Moses was not lost or confused and therefore wandered in the desert for 40 years; God took that time to kill off the older generation. **Now I want to remind you, although you once fully knew it, that Jesus, Who saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe** (Jude 1:5). See also Heb. 3:7–11 where the writer notes that their bodies dropped in the desert and that God *loathed* that generation.
5. Similarly, God judged the angels of Gen. 6 (which we will study next)—those who did not keep themselves separate from mankind—and has them in chains of darkness until now. Jude 1:6: **And angels--those who did not keep the position originally assigned to them, but deserted their own proper abode--He [God] reserves in everlasting bonds under darkness, in preparation for the [final] judgement of the great day.**
6. Those of Sodom and Gomorrah are also spoken of here, who went astray in their unnatural sexual lust. **Just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities, which likewise indulged in sexual immorality and pursued unnatural desire, serve as an example by undergoing the punishment of eternal fire** (Jude 1:7).
7. These are examples of men and angels who instinctively have some kind of understanding, and yet they blaspheme God and things about which they have no knowledge; and yet, with their actions that corrupt themselves, doing things they instinctively know are wrong. The examples given already are of those who have corrupted themselves, although within themselves, they recognize their self-degradation. Jude 1:10: **Yet these men blaspheme things of which they know nothing, and in things which, like untamed animals, they understand instinctively--in all these they corrupt themselves.**
8. Men who are so corrupted, sneak into churches and pervert the doctrines of the church (which is Jude's main point). Jude 1:4, 11–13. We have the modern example today of Liberation Theology and its American counterpart, Black Liberation Theology. These are men who, over decades, have crept into churches (at first, into Catholic churches in South and Central America, in the 50's, 60's and 70's), who managed to pollute the church with their evil doctrines, cloaking Marxism in distorted Christian doctrine. See [Black Liberation Theology](http://kukis.org/Doctrines/liberationtheology.htm) at <http://kukis.org/Doctrines/liberationtheology.htm>
9. Jude then describes these kinds of men, and, includes angels in this indictment: **These men--sunken rocks! --are those who share the pleasure of your love-**

The Explanation of Jude 1:14–15

- feasts, unrestrained by fear while caring only for themselves; **clouds** without water, driven away by the winds; trees that cast their fruit, barren, doubly dead, uprooted; wild waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering **stars**, for whom is reserved dense darkness of age-long duration (Jude 1:12–13). The words *clouds* and *stars* are often references to angels (see Heb. 12:1 Rev. 12:4).
10. Enoch, in his time, prophesied against the angels who sinned (Gen. 6); and in this prophesy was a parallel prophecy which also applies to the end of the Tribulation. **About these [clouds without water...wandering stars, for whom impenetrable darkness is reserved forever] also Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, saying, "Behold, the Lord came with ten thousands of His holy ones, to execute judgment on all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their works of ungodliness which they have done in an ungodly way, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him."** (Jude 1:14–15). What we have is God's certain judgment, which has been executed in the past (the flood, Sodom and Gomorrah, the Exodus generation), and will be executed in the future at the end of the Tribulation; can also be depended upon for those false teachers who creep into churches to pervert the doctrine of God's Word. The righteousness of God judged men and angels in the past (Gen. 6 and the Exodus generation); and the righteousness of God will judge mankind at the end of the Tribulation; therefore, God's righteousness also judges those who stealthily enter into churches in order to lead the faithful astray.

One more thing that we ought to deal with is this quotation "Behold, the Lord came with ten thousands of his holy ones, to execute judgment on all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their works of ungodliness which they have done in an ungodly way, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." This quotation is not found in the Old Testament. There is an apocryphal book of Enoch which reads: "Behold: He comes with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon them, and destroy the wicked, and reprove all the carnal, for everything which the sinful and ungodly have done and committed against him." This book was written before Christ (170–65 B.C.), was never considered to be a part of the Old or New Testament canon, and it carries within it information and traditions which were passed down through the years. Like mythology, this book contains some things which are true and things which are false. Whether this quotation had a common origin in tradition, written down in the book of Enoch and in the book of Jude; or whether Jude lifted this passage from the book of Enoch, we don't know. We only know, by the doctrine of inspiration, that this is a true quotation, regardless of its exact origins.

Information about the book of Enoch can be found here:

<http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?letter=E&artid=384>

<http://www.earlyjewishwritings.com/1enoch.html>

A translation of the book of Enoch is found here:

<http://www.johnpratt.com/items/docs/enoch.html>

Again, bear in mind, the book of Enoch is not a part of the Word of God; the books of Genesis and Jude are.

[Gen. 5:22a, 24](#): And Enoch walked with God three hundred years after he fathered Methuselah. And Enoch walked with God. Then he was not, for God took him.

To me, this is one of the most fascinating aspects of the antediluvian civilization (*ante = before*; diluvian = *deluge, flood*). There is some concept for *walking with God* which is not clearly defined in Gen. 1–6. We know that there is an animal sacrifice involved in this walk, and no doubt, some history was taught by God to those who would listen (the fall of Adam and Eve). But we do not have any more specifics than this.

Furthermore, this time period appears to be some form of limited anarchy. Although Cain was banished and punished for his murder of Abel, his life was not taken by God or by anyone else. Furthermore, a descendent of Cain's, Lamech, kills 2 people, and there does not appear to be any system of justice which is applied to him. Instead, he writes and performs a folk song about this, and he receives some notoriety for what he has done. What we do not find in this antediluvian era is a system of laws and consequences laid out by God. God deals with two sets of sins directly (the sins of Adam and Eve; and the murder of Abel by Cain); but He does not ever lay out a set of laws, other than indicating His requirement that He be worshiped with an animal sacrifice rather than with a fruit and vegetable offering.

In other words, what appears to be the case is, God gave man and angels great freedom with regards to their thoughts and actions, requiring only worship from His faithful with animal sacrifices. In this, Enoch somehow determined how to walk with God, so much so, that God took Enoch.

One more thing on Enoch: Enoch was a *type* of Christ. His name means *consecrated, dedicated*, as was our Lord Jesus Christ. In order for Enoch to walk with God, he would have offered up blood sacrifices (as Jesus Christ is our sacrifice). God took Jesus into heaven alive after His resurrection (Acts 1:9), just as He takes Enoch into heaven here. In other words, Enoch is a picture of Jesus to come.

Back to the genealogy:

[Gen. 5:25–31](#) When Methuselah had lived 187 years, he became the father of Lamech. Methuselah lived 782 years after he became the father of Lamech, and he had other sons and daughters. The entire lifetime of Methuselah was 969 years, and then he died. When Lamech had lived 182 years, he had a son. He named him Noah, saying, "This one will bring us rest from our labor and from the painful toil of our hands because of the ground that the LORD has cursed." Lamech lived 595 years after he became the father of Noah, and he had other sons and daughters. The entire lifetime of Lamech was 777 years, and then he died.

In this genealogy, two things stand out: Enoch walking with God and being taken; and Noah's name being clearly defined. He named him Noah, saying, "This one will bring us rest from our labor and from the painful toil of our hands because of the ground that the LORD has cursed." (Gen. 5:29). So these 2 people—Enoch, who is a type of Christ, and Noah—are tied together, as they are prominently featured in this genealogical line. And what are we told about Noah? "He will bring us rest from our labor...because of the ground that Y^ehowah has cursed." So Noah is seen as a type of Christ. Jesus Himself promises us this rest: "Come to me, all who labor and are heavily burdened, and I will give you rest." (Matt. 11:28).

Somehow, the author of Genesis knew to feature Enoch and Noah prominently, so that the few words spoken about them point to Jesus Christ.

Enoch, Noah and Jesus	
Enoch and Noah	Jesus Christ
Since Enoch walked with God, we must assume that he offered up animal sacrifices.	These animal sacrifices are a picture of Jesus dying for our sins.
Enoch, who walked with God, was taken by God into heaven.	Jesus walked with God the Father throughout His entire life. There was no sin in Him. Jesus was taken by God into heaven, receiving approval from God, because His sacrifice was sufficient.
Noah, the only other prominent name in this genealogy, is called <i>Noah</i> because "He will bring us rest from our labor...because of the ground that Y ^e howah has cursed."	Jesus calls to us: "Come to me, all who labor and are heavily burdened, and I will give you rest." (Matt. 11:28).
Over and over again, God the Holy Spirit, through the very words of the Bible, points toward Jesus Christ, our Lord and Savior.	
Of course, both Enoch and Noah are in the <i>saved line</i> or the <i>regenerate line</i> or, if you will, the <i>genealogical line of grace</i> .	

This particular line in Gen. 5 will give us the actual time frame of the antediluvian age. We simply add up how old each man was before bearing the child mentioned, and then add this to 600 years, which is approximately how old Noah was at the time of the flood.

Gen 5:32 And Noah was 500 years old. And Noah fathered Shem, Ham, and Japheth.

Gen 6:3 Then the LORD said, "My Spirit shall not abide in man forever, for he is flesh: his days shall be 120 years." This verse will receive more of an explanation in the near future.

Noah had fathered these sons by age 500.

Here are the lines of each person, with the approximate overlap.

0 A.F. [After the Fall] Adam (930 years) _____
130 A.F. Seth (912 years) _____
235 A.F. Enosh (905 years) _____
325 A.F. Kenan (910 years) _____
395 A.F. Mahalalel (895 years) _____
460 A.F. Jared (962 years) _____
622 A.F. Enoch (365 years) _____ ↗
687 A.F. Methuselah (969 years) _____
874 A.F. Lamech (777 years) _____
1056 A.F. Noah (950 years) [1656 A.F. flood] _____

The flood would have taken place after Methuselah and Lamech have died (Methuselah died the year of the flood). Noah is said to be 500 years old by the time that he fathers Shem, Ham and Japheth. God is going to give man an additional 120 years (Gen. 6:3), so this takes us to approximately 620 years for the age of Noah at the time of the flood (we will later find out that he is 600 at the time of the flood—Gen. 7:6). What this tells us is, 20 years before Noah sires his youngest son, God speaks to him and tells him that there will only be 120 more years that God would allow the violence on earth to continue.


His father, Lamech, sires Noah at age 182 and then lives an additional 595 years. Therefore, Methuselah and Lamech, Noah's grandfather and father, have both died prior to the flood (along with all of Noah's ancestors). It would make sense that both of these men believed in Jehovah Elohim (Jesus Christ).

Also, Methuselah would have lived 100 years after Noah's sons were born and Lamech would have lived 95 years past the birth of Noah's sons. Both Methuselah and Lamech were born before Adam died; Noah would have been born shortly after the death of Seth and before the death of Enosh.

A better and more accurate chart may be found at:

<http://www.biblestudy.org/maps/large-chart-life-span-of-patriarchs-from-adam-to-noah.jpg>

A More Accurate Chart of the Lifespans of Noah's Ancestors:



From <http://www.biblestudy.org/maps/large-chart-life-span-of-patriarchs-from-adam-to-noah.jpg>

One of the things which is fascinating is the age of Noah before he bears children. You will note that children were born to these men between the ages of 65 and 187. For whatever reason, it appears that Noah had no children until he was 500 years old. To be specific, Noah sired Seth at age 500 or 501 (which we get by comparing Gen. 5:32 7:6 11:10). If these 3 sons were born around this time period, then Noah's children only know their father, grandfather and great-grandfather. I am sure that there is a fascinating story here. Did Noah go for hundreds of years without meeting his right woman? Did they marry, but were they unable to have children until later in life? Were there other children, some who died young and/or did some go astray? Whatever the back story is, God knew what He was doing.

All of Noah's ancestors will die off before the flood; the only people from the line of promise still alive at the flood is Noah and his immediate family. Noah's father will know Adam, and Noah will be born before the death of Seth. Except for Adam and Enoch, Noah would have had the opportunity to know all of his ancestors.

We do not know how long Adam lived before he and Eve ate from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. However, from Adam to the flood is: $130 + 105 + 90 + 70 + 65 + 162 + 65 + 187 + 182 + 600 = 1656$ years.

Lesson 51: Genesis 6:1–2

Mankind Becomes Corrupted by Angelic Beings

Gen 6:1 And it happened, that men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them.

Over a period of nearly 1700 years, where man's lifespan is approximately 900 years, there would have been a significant population boom on this earth. There could have been easily a billion people. According to Robbie Dean, there were probably 6 or 7 billion people, a figure based upon each family having 6 children. Recall that men lived about 900 years, so even if they waited until age 100 to start having children, that gave them quite a bit of time to raise up a brood. In our own lifespan, 100 years ago, having 10 children was not unusual (I have found this in my own family line). There is at least one family that I am aware of which 19 or 20 children (and I am sure there are more than that). We also know that Noah had 3 children around age 500. So if a family has at 400–500 years during which they can have children, then 6 children in a family is a very conservative estimate.

What about the genealogies that we studied? There is no reason to assume that each family had 1 or 2 children and that was it. We followed specific genealogical lines, and, since we followed the genealogical line leading to Jesus, there can only be one son per family who is named to lead to the correct line. This means that the population before the flood could be the same as our population today—mathematically, that would make perfect sense. However, out of several billion people, the writer of Genesis knows which genealogical line to follow.

The weather in antediluvian times was dramatically different. The Bible has already pointed out that God watered the Garden of Eden by the 4 rivers which flowed around or through it; and we are also told that there were few plants outside the garden because God had not yet caused rain to fall upon the earth (Gen. 2:5, 10–14). This is based upon the Bible, and some people reject this because they believe there have been no dramatic changes on this earth apart from slow, gradual ones. This is called a belief in uniformity. A person might be 20 years old or 50, but they look around them and determine that the changes to the earth during their lifetimes are gradual, and therefore conclude, that there have been few grand changes to the earth (apart from an ice age or two).

It is fascinating that men simultaneously believe in uniformity and evolution. In their own minds, the earth is unchangeable yet from the earth, man evolves. Taken to an extreme, this can represent deifying the earth or some sort of earth-worship, which manifests itself in hyper-ecological movements. Man is seen as subservient to the earth or as a cause of the troubles of the earth. What is most important in the mind of the hyper-ecologist is the ability to enforce a set of ecology laws which the general public must follow (changing one's light bulbs; driving small, fuel-efficient cars; etc.). This is also known as "Gaia (earth)

worship” or “Green religion;” and those who are true believers are every bit as passionate as any Christian, if not more so.

There are a variety of theories of changes which took place because of the flood, e.g., the earth was not tilted on its axis until after the flood. I have no idea about that one. Perhaps with this, a year may have been, at one time, exactly 360 days, and the flood changed the tilt of the axis as well as time it takes the earth to circle the sun. There were bacteria after the flood; or, at least, bacteria was much more prevalent after the flood. In any case, these are various theories which have been proposed. Although we may revisit these theories, none of them find clear and unequivocal support from the Bible.

However, the Bible does speak of the earth as having at least 7 and maybe 8 dramatically different environments.

Biblical States of the Earth	
Scripture	Text/Commentary
Angelic Creation	The Bible teaches that angels were created before man, that some of the angels fell, and that the earth was encased in ice. This has led many to conclude that the earth was previously inhabited by angels, but, after the angels sinned, the earth was frozen solid temporarily. We know precious little about this state (when angels lived upon the earth), assuming that it actually existed. Some have suggested that dinosaurs lived on the earth during this time.
The Frozen State (the Ice Age)	Again, just as we assume angelic creation lived upon the earth; we also assume that there was a time when the earth was packed in ice. This is by implication of the above and Gen. 1:2. We understand this to be the Great Ice Age. According to Wikipedia, which I take with a grain of salt, the most well-documented and extensive ice age, called the Cryogenian Period, produced a <i>snowball earth</i> and ice sheets reached all the way to the equator.
The Restored Earth	The man and the woman lived in innocence; there was no death; there were no children. This appears to have been a perfect state. However, man lived in a forested area, called the Garden of Eden; and not all of the restored earth had plants and trees growing. Man apparently was a vegetarian and animals did not have any ferocity. Gen. 1–2

We have no idea as to the period of time that any of these 3 environments existed.

Biblical States of the Earth

Scripture	Text/Commentary
Antediluvian	The Bible speaks directly of this state of the earth in Gen. 3–6. The ground is cursed because of the sin of Adam, but some of the things in the previous state are continued—e.g., the earth is not watered by rain, but obviously, there had to be some provision of water. Many have suggested that there was a canopy of water vapor about the earth, and the Bible speaks of the water under the ground. This suggests that there was perhaps a greenhouse-like atmosphere and that man had to irrigate in order to grow trees and crops. This time period lasted for almost 1700 years.
The flood	For about a year, the earth was covered with water, which destroyed all living things on the earth, apart from those in the seas and in the ark. The flood prevailed over the earth for about a year.
We can theorize, and make suggestions as to how any of these environments changed (e.g., the flood was a result of God tilting the earth on its axis). However, we have no Biblical support for that theory.	
Post-diluvian	The chief difference between the antediluvian and the post-diluvian states is, rain became a regular and necessary part of man's environment. If there are other changes which took place, they are not clearly enumerated in the Bible. However, God promised that He would never flood the entire earth again. This is the state of the earth in which we presently live.
Millennial	After the Tribulation, Jesus Christ will rule this earth from Jerusalem, sitting on David's throne. Animals will lose their ferocity; there will be peace on earth; and the desert will bloom like a crocus (Isa. 2:4 11:6–8 35:1 65:25 Micah 4:3).
New Heavens and a New Earth	Several times in the Bible we are told that God will create a new heavens and a new earth (Isa. 65:17 66:22 2Peter 3:13 Rev. 21:1). There is little said about this new earth, and less about its environment. Rev. 21:1 tells us there will be no more sea. The city of Jerusalem appears to be suspended above the earth and in the shape of a cube, 1500 miles per edge (Rev. 21:16). There is no sun or moon, and there is no night (Rev. 21:23–25). Even though there is no sea, there will be a river, a river walk, and the Tree of Life bearing 12 kinds of fruit (Rev. 22:1–2).

The Bible is not anti-science. Back in [Introductory Lesson #13](#), I gave many examples of the science stated or implied in the Bible, and how accurate these statements are, despite the fact that science did not develop these principles until 1000+ years later. The Bible simply gives several environments that the earth has been as well as what the earth will be. Science, by the way, agrees with at least one of these environments: the Ice Age. Historical accounts agree with regards to the flood. So we have extra-Biblical evidence that these 2 states of the earth existed.

Gen 6:1 And it happened, that men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them.

Things are going to get quite weird in this chapter. The Bible treats these matters in a very matter-of-fact way. When we compare the Bible to mythology, you will see that the Bible is much more subtle. Things which would catch our eyes or capture our imagination (the persons of this chapter and their exploits) are not recorded in the Bible, although these things appear to be the basis for mythology—and nearly every culture has mythological traditions.

The word usually translated *men* is actually *the Adam*. However, we know that this refers to mankind in general because the end of this verse reads *and daughters were born to them*. That is a 3rd person masculine plural suffix, but the only thing it can point back to is *the Adam*, which can also be reasonably translated *mankind*. We use our word *man* in the same way. The evolutionist says, *man has been on this earth for a million years*. Even though evolutionists are wrong about this, we immediately understand this to refer to mankind.

Gen 6:2 The sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were pleasant; and they took wives for themselves from all whom they chose.

In this verse, we have, literally, *the sons of God*. In the Hebrew, that is *bene hâ Elohim* (בְּנֵי מִיְהוָה), which is, literally, *sons of the God*, but properly translated *the sons of God*. I have heard many theories about *who* these *sons of God* are, but only one makes sense to me: these are angels—more specifically, fallen angels. We find this phrase, *the sons of God* in the following passages: Gen. 6:2, 4 Job. 1:6 2:1 38:7 and similar phrasing in Psalm 29:1 Psalm 89:6 Dan. 3:25. The passages in Job unquestionably refer to angels (the scenario is Satan going before God). This would lead us to understand the other passages in the same way.

We find evidence of this understanding in the book of Jude: **And the angels who did not keep their proper domain, but left their own abode, He [God] has reserved in everlasting bonds under darkness for the judgment of the Great Day** (Jude 1:6). The verb *to keep* also means *to attend to carefully, take care of; to guard*; metaphorically *to keep one in the state in which he is; to observe; to reserve: to undergo something*. What they did not keep was their *beginning, origin; the person or thing that commences, the first person or thing in a series, the leader; that by which anything begins to be, the origin, the active cause; the extremity of a thing; of the corners of a sail; the first place, principality, rule, magistracy [of*

angels and demons]. What these angels did not guard or keep appears to be *their original state*. Whatever these angels did not guard or keep, **they forsook or deserted their own habitation (dwelling place)**. Therefore, God has placed these angels into some form of bondage and He is guarding them **until the great day of judgment**. There are no other specific incidents in the Bible to which this could refer other than this chapter of Genesis.

Peter also talks about this same thing: **For if God did not spare angels when they sinned, but cast them into Tartarus and committed them to chains of thick darkness to be kept until the [final] judgment; if he did not spare the ancient world, but preserved Noah, a herald of righteousness, with seven others, when he brought a flood upon the world of the ungodly;...** (2Peter 2:4–5). The overall context is, Peter is assuring his readers that God will judge the wicked and that He will deliver the righteous (compare 2Peter 2:1, 3, 7, 9). Fallen angels had sinned from the beginning, when they went with Satan. This is not a reference to all fallen angels, as they play a prominent part in the Scriptures from beginning to end. So we are not talking about all the angels who fell with Satan, as putting all of them into chains of darkness would eliminate many of the problems we have here on earth and virtually end the Angelic Conflict. Therefore, we are speaking of a particular subset of the fallen angels. Let me submit to you that the angels spoken of here and in Jude 1:6 refer right back to this chapter of Genesis. Again, there is no other reasonable alternative.

Here is what is going on: fallen angels are somehow able to take on themselves a human form, and they are able even to impregnate women. The Bible does speak of angels coming and speaking to man, and rather than on some magnificent form, they appear to be men (e.g., Gen. 18).

What came from these relationships between the sons of men (angels) and the daughters of men are super-humans, for lack of a better term. If there was a period of time when something like this really did happen, doesn't it seem reasonable that somehow, in some way, we would know about it today? Don't you think that such a fantastic occurrence, that angelic beings bred with women, and the result were these super-humans, that we might have some history of this?

Think about mythology for a moment. No matter what mythology is studied, these are often gods who have relationships with women on this earth. There are a lot of stories and a lot of different names, but the basis for mythology is almost always the same: male gods (which would be angels) have sex with human women, and the result are these super-human creatures; and none of these super humans are noble and just and righteous; they mostly chase women and they fight.

Now, let's go back to that passage in Jude: **And the angels who did not keep their proper domain, but left their own abode, He has reserved in everlasting bonds under darkness for the judgment of the Great Day** (Jude 1:6). God allowed some freedom to even the fallen angels. Let me remind you that it appears as if the earth was in some sort of limited anarchy at this time. That is, there does not appear to be any set of laws laid out with clear-cut consequences. God directly dealt with Cain; and it appears as if no one dealt with Lamech (who killed 2 people and then wrote a song about it).

However, after the flood, these same angels are now in everlasting bonds of darkness, until the Great White Throne Judgement (Rev. 20). Again, the words of Peter: **For if God did not spare the angels who sinned, but cast them down to Tartarus and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved for judgment; and did not spare the ancient world, but saved Noah, one of eight people, a preacher of righteousness, bringing the flood on the world of the ungodly** (2Peter 2:4–5). In the Greek, these verbs are primarily aorist tenses, which refers to a point of time, generally in the past. There is a one perfect tense, which refers to an action which takes place in the past and has results which continue into the future, and that is *reserved*. So they are reserved, set aside, for judgment in the past, with the result that they will be judged in the future.

So, what we have are angels which have sinned whom God cast down into Tartarus, which Thayer tells us is *the name of the subterranean region, doleful and dark, regarded by the ancient Greeks as the abode of the wicked dead, where they suffer punishment for their evil deeds; it answers to Gehenna of the Jews*. And from out of all this, God delivers 8 people: Noah and his wife, and his 3 sons and their wives. In other words, Peter associates *the angels who sinned* with Noah. These angels are cast into Tartarus and Noah and his family are delivered, while a flood is brought upon a world of the ungodly (the angels who sinned and the women they fornicated with and the man-angel race which resulted from these unions).

Lesson 52: Genesis 6 Testimony to the Historical Accuracy of the Old Testament

We have studied how God restored the earth in 6 days; how Adam and Eve were created and made, how they fell, the offerings of Cain and Abel, and the two sets of genealogies. We are about to study the flood of Noah, which is precipitated by an intermingling of fallen angels and women. Many of these things seem rather fantastic to us. Some of us believe in evolution, so we often discount the creation account is a fable or as some sort of exaggerated or spiritual account in order to make some spiritual point. And what would that point be? That God is extremely powerful? Except, just not powerful enough to create the heavens and the earth.

Before we move further in our study of Genesis, it has come to my attention that there are some who believe that the New Testament is true and the Old Testament is not. Or that both parts of the Bible are filled with myths and legends.

The Bible is a different sort of book than any other religious book; it is different from Islam, the Book of Mormon, from Mary Baker Patterson Glover Eddy's *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, and from Buddhism's *Dhamma*. The Bible presents as its background an historical narrative—an historical narrative which takes us all the way from the beginning of human history to the end of human history. At no time do we have a completely developed theological treatise by one author. That is, even though the Bible is seen as a religious book, none of the authors developed completely any theological concept by themselves. Even though Paul addressed various churches on doctrinal matters, every letter that he wrote was based upon a set of circumstances and questions

which came from that particular church. Had those things not been a part of Paul's experience, the epistles—the most concentrated doctrinal portion of the Bible—would not have existed. Furthermore, Paul never says, "Now I am going to explain to you every facet of the hypostatic union." Nor does he say that about any other doctrine. We develop what we know about God (theology) from what is presented in the Bible, and most often, from what is presented in an historical context. No other religious book does that. No religious book is tied so directly and so completely to a series of historical events. Now, I could also add that no other book has been written over such a lengthy period of time by so many authors, and yet maintains a continuity, but I want to deal with one particular item of Scripture: its accurate historical nature in both the Old and New Testaments.

You have to accept the history of the Old Testament as well as the New Testament. You do not get to write off this or that chapter as just too fantastic or too weird. So there is no misunderstanding, once you have believed in Jesus Christ, regardless of how you feel about the Bible, you are saved—and you cannot lose this salvation. However, there is only one historical book which tells us Who Jesus is, before He walked this earth, while He walked this earth, and where He is now. This historical narrative is the Bible. Every other book written about Jesus is based upon the Bible or upon the fertile imagination of some heretic.

Some of the information which I will present in here, I have presented before, but in more detail; and some of it I have not presented before; but the general topic will be, *the historicity of the Bible (both Old and New Testaments and its absolute accuracy)*. The reason for this is, the historical narrative of the Bible is intertwined with what the Bible teaches; and ultimately, the basis for our faith in Jesus Christ. If I doubt the flood or the fall of Adam or the creation account, at what point do I believe something I read and when do I dismiss it as some made-up story? And, how do we somehow put ourselves up as the experts, able to determine what actually happened as opposed to what is just a story? If I can *spiritualize* the account of the flood, then can I *spiritualize* the incarnation of Jesus? When Jesus says, "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life; no man comes to the Father but by Me" can I decide not to take this literally and say, "He just wants us to act like Him because things would all be better if we did." Or when Jesus claims to be God, "I and the Father are One" or "Before Abraham, I existed eternally" or "Your sins are forgiven;" do I get to put my own spin on His words?

It is quite obvious that there are myriads of writers who have put their own spin on Jesus. Most people, if you ask them, would agree that Jesus and Hitler represent the opposite ends of a spectrum of man; and Jesus is highly revered as a great teacher and philosopher; but they are unwilling to accept most of what He says. They have 5 or 10 quotations which they like a lot; but they discard the rest of it. However, it would be quite illogical to say that Jesus is a great teacher if you only like about 5% of what he says. That would make Him a pretty lousy teacher.

However, my larger point is, if you set yourself as the authority to dismiss this and that part of the Bible, then there is obviously nothing in the Bible that you cannot philosophically overrule, including the words and sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

What did Jesus say and what do the Apostles say?

If you accept the New Testament, then you have to accept the Old...because everyone in the New Testament accepted the Old as fact.

When it comes to the creation of the earth, Jesus says, "There will be affliction in those days, such as has not been the like from the beginning of creation which God created until now, and never will be." (Mark 13:19).

Paul, in Rom. 1:20, writes: For the unseen things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things made, both His eternal power and Godhead, for them to be without excuse. Paul points to what God has made as proof of existence, power and wisdom. God's attributes are not seen (these are *the unseen things of Him*), but they are clearly understood, based upon what God has made. In fact, the more that science and biology uncover, the more we understand the incredible complexity of God's creation. We carry within almost every cell of our body the building plans for our bodies (DNA).

God is called the Creator in Rom. 1:26 1Peter 4:19 and what He created is called *the creation* in Rom. 8:19–22 2Peter 3:4 Rev. 3:14.

You may recall that all members of the Godhead are involved in the creation of the heavens and the earth and the restoration of the earth (Gen. 1:1–2, 26–31), and the New Testament goes along with that. In fact, the New Testament tells us that it was Jesus Who did the actual work. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things came into being through Him, and without Him not even one thing came into being that has come into being. And the Word became flesh and tabernacled [i.e., *lived*] among us. And we beheld His glory, glory as of an only begotten from the Father, full of grace and of truth (John 1:1–3, 14). Quoting from a psalm as proof of what the writer of Hebrews was saying, he wrote, *And, "You, Lord, at the beginning founded the earth, and the heavens are works of Your hands. They will vanish away, but You will continue; and they will all become old, like a garment, and You shall fold them up like a covering, and they shall be changed. But You are the same, and Your years shall not fail."* (Heb. 1:10–12; Psalm 101:26–28). This writer not only quotes a psalm to indicate that Jesus created the earth and the heavens, but he also asserts that the heavens and earth will become old, like a garment; yet God's Word (which is the Bible) will stand forever.

Paul affirms that Jesus is the Creator of all things: *[Jesus] is the image of the invisible God, the First-born of all creation [Firstborn here is used in a figurative sense, referring to the rights and responsibilities of the firstborn]. For all things were created in Him, the things in the heavens, and the things on the earth, the visible and the invisible; whether thrones, or lordships, or rulers, or authorities, all things have been created through Him and for Him. And He is before all things, and all things have subsisted in Him* (Col. 1:15–17). That God created all things through Jesus Christ is also found in Eph. 3:9. Jesus is called the Creator in Rev. 4:11.

When released by the chief priests and elders, Peter said, “And hearing them with one passion lifted voice to God and said, Master, You are ‘the God who made the heaven and the earth and the sea, and all things in them,’ ” (Acts 4:24; Ex. 20:11).

At no time in the Bible, in the Old or New Testaments, do we have any indication that the creation and restoration of the earth is anything different from how it is portrayed in Gen. 1. Jesus told many parables, and not only was it clear that he was speaking in a parable, but He also would explain the meaning of these parables immediately afterwards. However, Jesus never explained the parable of creation (nor did any other writer of the New Testament); it was always understood as factual.

Jesus also taught that Adam and Eve were historical people created from the hand of God. When He was asked about divorce, Jesus said, “Have you not read that He Who created them from the beginning ‘created them male and female’? And He said, ‘For this reason a man shall leave father and mother, and shall be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.’ So that they are no longer two, but one flesh. Therefore, what God has joined together, let no man separate.” (Gen. 19:4b–6; Gen. 1:27 2:24).

Paul also treats the creation of man and woman as the basis for the differences between men and women in 1Cor. 11:8–12.

Jesus treats the murder of Abel as a real event in Matt. 23:35 and Luke 11:51, wherein He sets out the parameters for the Old Testament canon (these men named in that passage represent the first death and the final death of the Old Testament).

What transpired between Cain and Abel is treated as an actual historical event by the writer of Hebrews: **By faith Abel offered a greater sacrifice to God than Cain, by which he obtained witness to be righteous, God testifying over his gifts; and through it, having died, he yet speaks.** Even though Abel died, the writer of Hebrews reasons, his gift—an animal sacrifice—has meaning even today. However, so that his readers are not confused, what Jesus offered was a better sacrifice than the animal Abel offered (Heb. 12:24). John and Jude also refer to Cain as a real person in 1John 3:12 and Jude 1:11.

You will recall that we studied Enoch and his translation from life to life in Gen. 5:18–24. Every writer of Scripture after this treats him as a real person, including him in genealogies (1Chron. 1:3 Luke 3:37); and that God took him is spoken of by both Jude and the writer of Hebrews (Heb. 11:5 Jude 1:14–15).

You will recall that we used 2 New Testament passages to confirm that the *sons of God* in Gen. 6 were fallen angels (2Peter 2:4–5 Jude 1:6).

Jesus treats the flood as a real event, and Noah as a real person. Jesus compares the baptism of fire to the flood of Noah in Matt. 24:37–41 Luke 17:26–29. Adam and Noah are treated as real people in the line of Jesus in Luke 3:36–38.

The writer of Hebrews speaks of Noah's great faith in Heb. 11:7. Now, what sense would it make for a writer of Scripture to commend the faith of some character in a fable? If the flood is some made-up story and Noah is some made-up guy, how can he be praised for having great faith?

Peter also treats Noah as a real person and confirms that 8 people went into the ark and were preserved in 1Peter 3:20. Peter again refers to Noah in 2Peter 2:4–5, associating him with the angels who sinned.

Let's turn to some generalized statements made by Jesus about the Old Testament. The terms *Law*, *Law of Moses*, *words of the Law*, *the Law and the Prophets*, and *the Scriptures* all refer back to the Old Testament, as the New Testament was written after the resurrection of our Lord.

It is important to understand the historical context of the incarnation of Jesus Christ. He had come into a world where the Scribes and the Pharisees had dramatically distorted the Mosaic Law, turning it into a legalistic relationship to God. That is, you must conform to a myriad of laws and customs in order to gain God's favor. This does not mean that there are not such things as right or wrong in this world—things which God approves of or disapproves of—but the Jewish theologians over the years had distorted the Law to explain just what Jews could and could not do. For instance, if someone drove by you and splashed mud on your tunic, you could not clean your tunic off, if it was the Sabbath. However, you could wait until the mud dried, and then give it one squeeze. So Jesus was not negating anything in the Old Testament; He was correctly interpreting the Old Testament and disregarding the religious system which had been superimposed upon it. Matt. 5:17, Jesus says, **“Do not presume that I came to nullify the Law or the Prophets [one of the designations of the Old Testament]; I did not come to nullify, but to fulfill [the Law and the Prophets].”** The chief problem was, these religious types knew a few passages here and there, and they knew their Talmud, but they did not really know the Bible (i.e., the Old Testament). **And answering, Jesus said to them, “You are wrong, because you do not know the Scriptures or the power of God.”** (Matt. 22:29). In other words, they needed to have an accurate understanding of the Old Testament. At no time did Jesus treat the Old Testament as anything less than the Word of God.

In Luke 16:17, Jesus said, **“But it is easier for the heaven and the earth to pass away than to void even one point of the Law [i.e., the Old Testament].”** In fact, Jesus elevated what He said to the permanence of the Bible, and therefore, making His words as important as those of the Old Testament: **“The heaven and the earth shall pass away, but My Words shall not pass away.”** (Luke 21:33). This was a very strong statement for Jesus to make—that His words were on a par with Old Testament Scripture. This was a pretty radical thing for Jesus to say; and since that time, many people have turned this around and have elevated Jesus' words above the Old Testament (at least, the words of Jesus which they like).

Jesus also said that the Old Testament Scriptures were all about Him: **And beginning from Moses, and from all the prophets, He explained to them the things about Himself in all the**

Scriptures (Luke 24:27). “You search the Scriptures, for in them you think you have eternal life; and these [Scriptures] bear witness of Me.” (John 5:39). We have dozens of Scriptures which Jesus fulfills in His incarnation, but probably the most dramatic instance of this is found in Luke 4:16–21: And He came to Nazareth where He was brought up. And as was His custom, He went in on the day of the sabbaths, into the synagogue, and He stood up to read. And the scroll of Isaiah the prophet was handed to Him. And unrolling the book, He found the place where it was written: “The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me. Because of this He anointed Me to proclaim the gospel to the poor; He has sent Me to heal the brokenhearted, to proclaim remission to captives, and to the blind to see again, to send away the ones being crushed, in remission, to preach an acceptable year of the Lord.” And rolling up the scroll, returning it to the attendant, He sat down. And the eyes of all in the synagogue were fixed on Him. And He began to say to them, “Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your ears.” (Jesus was quoting from Isa. 61:1–2).

You will note that Jesus, on many occasions, took a verse or a passage of Scripture and then explained it. Jesus also taught by using parables on many occasions. However, what Jesus *never* did was, take an historical event from the Old Testament and treat it like a parable.

My point is, Jesus was not revamping the Law of Moses; He was not teaching a new and better way; Jesus was teaching the Old Testament; that He fulfilled the Law and the Prophets, and that His Own words He placed on an equal footing with the Old Testament.

The problem with the Scribes and the Pharisees were twofold (1) they did not know the Scriptures and (2) they adhered to a whole system of traditions which did not conform to the Mosaic Law. In other words, Jesus understood the Old Testament to be authoritative, and at no time did He bring any historical incident of the Old Testament into question.

To sum up, no one in the New Testament treats Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, Enoch or Noah as characters of some moral tale; they are treated as real people, and events of their lives which some people would like to spiritualize are treated as real occurrences in the New Testament by Jesus and by every writer of the New Testament. If Jesus recognized and presented this historical incidents as accurate, can we doubt them?

Lesson 53: Genesis 6

The Historical Accuracy of the Bible Part II

Since we are studying a part of Scripture which is quite fantastic—the angelic corruption of mankind followed by a worldwide flood—it is reasonable to first determine whether or not the Old Testament is simply filled with stories which have some sort of moral to them, or whether these are actual, historical incidents.

In the previous lesson, we looked at how Jesus and the Apostles used the Old Testament; did they treat it as a fictional history or as an actual history? Did Jesus, the Son of God, affirm the Old Testament or did He teach that these were fables? Our conclusion was, all

Old Testament historical references made in the New Testament treats this history as accurate and authoritative.

We are going to approach the Old Testament in 3 ways which, if you are a believer in Jesus Christ, will help to calm your doubts about the historicity of the Old Testament. The first approach is to review some of the amazing things we have read in the first 5+ chapters of Genesis.

Some amazing things found in the first part of Genesis:

We have studied a number of things so far in the first few chapters of Genesis which are quite unusual—things which should strike you as astounding.

Amazing Things in Gen. 1–6

1. We have the Trinity portrayed in the first chapter of Genesis. The Hebrew name for God, *Elohim* (first found in Gen. 1:1), is in the plural, and could reasonably be translated *the Godhead*. The Spirit of God is found in Gen. 1:2. That there is both a singularity and a plurality within the Singular God is found in *Elohim* (plural) taking a singular noun throughout; and yet, God appears to be speaking to God in Gen. 1:26a: **And God** [plural noun] **said** [this verb is in the masculine singular], **“Let Us make** [plural verb this time] **man in Our image, according to Our likeness.”** The 1st person plural suffix is affixed to 2 singular nouns: *image* and *likeness*. That is, there is a likeness and image associated with the Godhead which has both a singular and a plural connotation—*likeness* and *image* are both singular nouns, indicating a singularity of essence; and yet we have more than one person possessing this *image* and *likeness*. That God is both a singularity (God is one in essence) and simultaneously a plural Entity (God is 3 in person), is a difficult concept for many to understand; yet, a few verses in the first chapter of Genesis handle this concept quite deftly. How on earth could this possibly be found so early in the Bible? The Jews did not then and still do not believe in the Triune God; and yet, here it is, in the first chapter of Genesis, clearly laid out.
 - 1) I gave you the example of building a house: it requires someone to plan how the house is to be build (God the Father); someone to actually build the house (God the Son); and there is energy involved in the building of this house—i.e., power tools (God the Holy Spirit).
2. God creates light (day 1) before He creates the sun (day 4). If this were some fable written by imaginative writer; and various people intentionally changed some of the text from time to time, surely someone read this and said, “Let’s fix this” and make these things a simultaneous event. Man automatically associates light with the sun and does not differentiate between them. The Bible does, however.
 - 1) We have already studied how God will be called *light* in later passages; and we observed that light can be broken down into 3 component parts which function as one complete whole.
3. On day 2, God creates the atmosphere—and he spends all day making this atmosphere. How did ancient man even know that there is an atmosphere?

Amazing Things in Gen. 1–6

Science discovers the atmosphere thousands of years later (Torricelli figured out that air has weight and takes up space in 1643 A.D.), and yet, some so-called primitive writer somehow speaks here of God spending one entire day making the atmosphere for the earth. If this is just some made-up story, then how did they know this? How did they realize the substance and importance of our atmosphere?

4. God used the rib of Adam from which to fashion Eve. When did we first begin to understand cloning? The 20th century. How did some old ancient guy, a few generations from the cave (supposedly) decide that God would be able to clone Adam and then modify this clone (in a very good way, might I add) to produce a counterpart for Adam? This is a 20th and 21st century concept found in a book parts of which could be over 5000 years old.
5. God does all of this restoration in 6 days, and then rests on the 7th day, initiating the concept of a 7 day week with a day of rest thrown in. Is it not an amazing coincidence that somehow, nearly all mankind (almost every race, nation and civilization) adopts a 7-day week—it is almost ingrained in our genetics. Why don't we find evidence of 6, 8 or 10 day weeks scattered throughout ancient history? Of course, Christians, Jews and Muslims have a 7-day week. But, the Hindu Calendar is also a 7-day week.¹ The Chinese calendar is a 7-day week.²
6. In Gen. 2:7 3:19, the writer of Genesis tells us that God made man out of the dust of the earth. Now, how in the world did anyone figure out that we are made up of the same chemicals as found in the earth? Even if you want to make up some explanation, the actual chemistry of this is pretty amazing, something we have only begin to fully appreciate in the past century or so. If you want to attribute this to a really phenomenally lucky guess, that's fine. The writer of Genesis has made some pretty amazing lucky guesses, hasn't he? On the other hand, maybe this is not just a lucky guess; perhaps this Bible is the Word of God.
7. You will recall that the Bible describes an unusual environment, where it did not rain during the antediluvian age. This is simply an oddity to find this aspect of the antediluvian era mentioned. We instinctively don't want to believe this, but the writer of Genesis includes this, with the same matter-of-fact approach that he applies to everything else. It is not over-emphasized and receives little fanfare.
8. Jesus is presented in the Gen. 3 and 4. He is called the Seed of the Woman in Gen. 3:15. An animal had to be sacrificed in order to clothe Adam and Eve with animal skins (Gen. 3:21). Furthermore, the Old Testament speaks of *covering* our sins whereas the New Testament speaks of the forgiveness of our sins. God *covered* the nakedness of Adam and the woman after they sinned. Along the same lines, Abel's sacrifice of an animal was acceptable, but Cain's offering of fruits and vegetables was not (Gen. 4:1–5). The slain animal speaks of Jesus on the cross, bearing our sins. Although this is subtle, it is still found in the Genesis. The use of literary subtlety does not negate theological principles. This is the death of Jesus Christ on the cross presented in shadow form. Furthermore, this theme—Jesus Christ dying on the cross for our sins—will be continually presented in shadow form again and again and again in the Old Testament.

Amazing Things in Gen. 1–6

9. In Gen. 5, we have the first genealogy of promise—the regenerate genealogy if you will—and hidden within this genealogy is the gospel of Jesus Christ and the future history of man. Bear in mind, the Old Testament was preserved accurately by Jews; so they had no reason to try to square the Old Testament with Christian theology. At no time did some influential set of Jews look at the New Testament and decide, *we need to make the Old Testament conform to the New*. Given the animosity between Jews and Christians in the first century, doing something like that would make absolutely no sense. Furthermore, we have portions of the Old Testament which predate Jesus Christ by a century called the Dead Sea Scrolls.
10. Only two names are given prominence in this genealogy, and they both prophetically speak of Jesus Christ. Enoch speaks of the resurrection of Jesus Christ and Noah speaks of the rest offered by Jesus Christ, despite the curse of the earth.
11. When the English meanings of the names from the genealogy of Gen. 5 are strung together, we get the gospel of Jesus Christ: (from Chuck [Missler](#)) **“Man [is] appointed [to] mortal sorrow; [but] the blessed God will come down teaching [that] His death will bring [the] despairing, rest.”** A slightly [revised](#) version would be: **“Man [is] appointed [to] mortal [ity]; purchased (or, possessed) [by] the Praise of God [Who] will descend [as the] Dedicated [One] (Who will be taken up). He dies and is sent [to the] poor [who are strong in Christ] [bringing them] rest [or, comfort, repose, consolation].”**
12. This begins a series of genealogies which will connect the first Adam and the Last Adam, finally summarized in Luke 3, but a line which is continued throughout the Bible by 9 or so different authors over a period a several thousand years. It is fascinating that, even though each family has many children—particularly in Genesis—they always knew which child to go to next for each and every generation for 77 generations.
13. What is coming up is a very unusual bit of human history, but just the opposite of what you would expect is emphasized. Whereas, the amazing exploits and personalities of corrupted mankind would capture the imagination of most writers, the writer of Genesis will focus, instead, on the flood—the judgment of God; the ark—which is the salvation of God; and then he will lay out a series of details which are surprisingly reasonable, given the circumstances.

If you believe in Jesus Christ, then these 12 amazing things by themselves ought to convince you of the accuracy of the Old Testament.

¹ <http://hinduism.iskcon.com/practice/402.htm> accessed November 4, 2009.

² http://www.herongyang.com/2009/2009_chinese_calendar_gb.html accessed November 4, 2009.

The testimony of Jesus:

It is worth repeating that Jesus took the Scriptures (the Old Testament) and spoke of them often, taking them as authoritative. If the Old Testament is a book of fables and tall tales, or exaggerated events, why would Jesus treat them as inerrant?

Let's look at it this way: Jesus is viewed as their Savior by believers and as a great teacher or as a prophet by others. Why would a Savior, great teacher or prophet treat fables as historically accurate?

The Testimony of Jesus Concerning the Old Testament

1. Jesus constantly referred back to the Old Testament Scriptures as authoritative. Matt. 21:42 Mark 12:10
2. He told the sadducees that they were in error because they did not know the Scriptures, nor did they believe in the power of God. Matt. 22:29 Mark 12:24
3. Jesus taught that the traditions of the elders confused and distorted the Word of God. Mark 7:13
4. Jesus continually spoke of the Scriptures being fulfilled, or that He fulfilled the Scriptures, or that something was coming to pass, as prophesied in the Scriptures. Matt. 26:54–56 Mark 12:10 14:49 15:28 Luke 4:21 John 13:18 17:12 19:28
5. Jesus proclaimed that the Scriptures could not be broken. John 10:35
6. Jesus stood upon the Word of God when being tempted by the devil. Luke 4:4
7. The writers of the gospels observed what things occurred and that these things fulfilled the Old Testament Scriptures. John 19:24, 36–37
8. Jesus proclaimed that the Scriptures spoke of Him. Luke 24:27 John 5:39
9. People were both amazed and convinced when Jesus taught them the Scriptures. Luke 24:32, 45
10. The disciples were convinced of some things because of what they saw and were taught by Jesus from the Scriptures. John 2:22
11. Jesus used the Scriptures to make authoritative pronouncements. John 7:38
12. Men determined Who Jesus is, based upon the Scriptures. John 7:42
13. The disciples were convinced because reality jived with the Scriptures. John 20:9
14. What Jesus said was equivalent to the Word of God. When He spoke, it was quite phenomenal for any man to claim such authority. However, we now have the exact opposite situation where people cling to the words of Jesus (the ones which they like), but they discount most or all of the Old Testament. Luke 5:1 John 3:34 8:47
15. in a similar vein, Jesus equates the phrase *Word of God* with the gospel (the good news of Jesus). Luke 8:4–15, 21
16. When some woman came along and tried to elevate Mary, the mother of Jesus' humanity, Jesus told her, "**No; rather, blessed are those hearing the Word of God, and keeping it.**" (Luke 11:28).

At no time did Jesus ever treat an historical event in the Old Testament as a fable or as a parable, which was designed to teach some deeper or greater meaning. Even though Jesus continually taught in parables, at no time did he take the flood, treat it as a parable, and extrapolate some kind of moral or spiritual meaning from it. Jesus continually recognized and proclaimed the authority and accuracy of the Scriptures.

At this point, you need to be challenged. Most people, no matter who they are, concede that Jesus was a great teacher. How is it possible for Jesus to be a great teacher in your eyes if you only agree with about 5% of what He said? I can take any miscellaneous yahoo from any crowd, and probably find a few things he and I can agree on. That does not make him a great teacher. If Jesus spent most of His public ministry affirming the absolute authority of a book of fables, then how can you call Him a great teacher?

Testimony of an historian of ancient history:

Will Durant, one of the greatest ancient historians of the 20th century, wrote: *The discoveries here summarized have restored considerable credit to those chapters of Genesis that record the early traditions of the Jews. In its outline, and barring supernatural incidents, the story of the Jews as unfolded in the Old Testament has stood the test of criticism and archeology; every year adds corroboration from documents, monuments, or excavations...we must accept the Biblical account provisionally until it is disproved.*¹⁰ If Will Durant, a man who knows far more about ancient history than you or I, and a man who doubts Old Testament miracles, can accept that which is not miraculous in the Old Testament as accurate history; how much more ought we, as believers in Jesus Christ, be able to accept the Word of God as it stands written?

Chief philosophical difference between evolution and the Bible:

The sticking point for many people is evolution. Evolution is taught as a fact in nearly every public school in the United States. It is not presented as merely a theory, but as the *only* reasonable and scientific explanation for everything around us. Even though I cannot personally recall a single lecture on evolution from my pre-college days (I heard many in college), I completely believed in evolution at the time that I believed in Jesus Christ (age 21). Many of those who believe in evolution have it fundamentally ingrained into their souls as much as they believe in gravity. Many believers in Jesus Christ also believe in evolution and many will automatically react if you suggest that we did not evolve, and that there is reason to support this.

Evolution is a philosophy build upon death and imperfection. Somehow, when the first bird mutated from reptile parents, this bird of the reptiles was not quite yet a bird. No one thinks that two lizards had a perfect bird; but that there was some kind of intermediate thing, with a bird characteristic or two, which eventually gave birth to something with more bird-like characteristics. Eventually, after millions of years, this was perfected, through

¹⁰ *The Story of Civilization; 1. Our Oriental Heritage*, by Will Durant; MJF Books, ©1963; p. 300 (footnote).

many imperfect part-bird/part reptiles, and many deaths. Scales slowly morphed into feathers, and the body somehow became lightweight enough to fly; and the metabolism changed from being cold-blooded to warm-blooded. If anything sounds like a fable, that does. And the more we know about biology, the less sense this makes. How do scales turn into feathers? How do we have so many reptiles on the way to becoming birds? We know about the DNA of two mating reptiles, and we know how some of these characteristics play out. Yet, despite knowing that, intelligent, educated people believe, reptiles turned into birds (and those evolutionists who do not believe that, believe in transformations which are equally ridiculous).

On the other hand, the Bible reads: **And God created the great sea animals, and all that creeps, having a living soul, which swarmed the waters, according to its kind; and every bird with wing according to its kind. And God saw that it was good** (Gen. 1:21). There are no half-measures in the book of Genesis; God created these animals to bear young according to its kind, and that it was good. Not a tenth good, needing some evolution; just plain good. Death is seen as a result of man's sin; not because God used death in order to cause life forms to evolve. **Sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, so also death passed to all men, inasmuch as all sinned** (Rom. 5:12). God's restoration was all good, which is repeated again and again in Gen. 1. It is because of man that death came into the world.

Evolution is actually the thinking and philosophy of Satan. We are brought up to believe that everything is getting better and better and better. This explains why there are intelligent people who sincerely believe that we can progress to a world without nuclear weapons. They believe in man and in the evolution of man. However, the Bible teaches that we are all fallen man and that our salvation is based upon Jesus Christ, not upon man becoming better in some way (nicer, more peaceful, more religious, or more of whatever you think is better). We will see technological advances which are quite impressive, but man will stay the same.

Additional reasons why the Bible is not filled with fables:

In a previous lesson, I discussed certain scientific principles found throughout the Bible—the earth being a sphere; the earth hanging upon nothing, the earth in an orbit, for instance—and how these dozens of principles are alluded to thousands of years before man understood them. That lesson is found [here](#).

There are prophecies about Jesus Christ from the very beginning of the Old Testament (Gen. 3:15) to the very end (Mal. 3:1–2). I covered a few of those prophecies in a previous lesson [here](#). For other studies, I have gone into much greater detail on the Old Testament prophecies about Jesus Christ:

<http://kukis.org/Doctrines/JesusChristOT.htm>

I have done this in chart form in these places:

http://kukis.org/Doctrines/Chart_Jesus_Old_New.htm

http://kukis.org/Charts/Messianic_Prophecies.htm

So, if the Old Testament knows all about Jesus before His incarnation, and we know that we can trust the Bible in that regard, then it is reasonable and logical we can trust the historical events of the Bible, even if there are some unusual aspects to these events.

Concluding remarks:

I would like you to bear all of this in mind while we examine the corruption of mankind by fallen angels and the judgment of God by means of the Great Flood. And so that you do not feel as if this is some form of blind, irrational faith, always bear in mind that there are traditions in almost every ancient culture which speak of these two related events.

Lesson 54: Genesis 6:1–3

Mankind Becomes Corrupted by Angelic Beings

A few lessons ago, you will recall that we determined that the sons of God in Gen. 6 (during the time of Noah) are fallen angels and that the daughters of men represent the female population of the earth.

Gen 6:1–2 And it happened, that men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them. The sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were pleasant; and they took wives for themselves from all whom they chose.

Since the idea of fallen angels cohabiting with human females seems a bit fantastic, let's make certain that this is what is being taught, and that it is a reasonable thing to believe.

Why the Sons of God in Gen. 6 are Angels

1. The designation here, *sons of God*, is found in Job 1:6 2:1 38:7, where it clearly refers to angels.
2. Two New Testament passages look back upon this time frame, and are consistent with this being sexual unions between angels and women, and that a flood was brought to destroy all the population of the earth, except for Noah and his family. **And the angels who did not keep their proper domain, but left their own abode, He has reserved in everlasting bonds under darkness for the judgment of the Great Day** (Jude 1:6). Jude refers to a group of angels who did not keep to their own proper domain, and these, God has set aside in everlasting bonds under darkness until the Judgment Seat of Christ. This cannot refer simply to angels who have fallen with Satan (Rev. 12:4) who are called demons in the New Testament (Matt. 4:24 7:22 etc.), because they are active in the Old Testament, during the Dispensation of the Hypostatic Union and during the Church Age (Deut. 32:7 Psalm 106:37 Matt. 4:24 8:16 Acts 16:18 25:19 1Cor. 10:21 1Tim. 4:1 Rev. 16:14). Since demons continue to function between

Why the Sons of God in Gen. 6 are Angels

- the time of Moses and the 2nd Advent of Christ, then demons of are reserved in bonds of darkness must refer to a specific group of demons in history, whose actions are so heinous as to require God to so restrict them. Gen. 6 is the only place in the Bible to which this could logically refer.
3. Peter, in fact, associates these same angels with Noah and the flood: **For if God did not spare the angels who sinned, but cast them down to Tartarus and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved for judgment; and did not spare the ancient world, but saved Noah, one of eight people, a man proclaiming righteousness, bringing the flood on the world of the ungodly;...** (2Peter 2:4–5). Here, they are called angels who sinned; God casts them into Tartarus and they are set aside for a later judgement, held with chains of darkness. So, even if the Jude passage is not clear to you, Peter is very clear.
 4. Fallen angels cohabiting with human females is exactly what mythology is all about and helps to explain why we find various national mythologies having common themes in almost every ancient culture. Mythology is all about the gods coming to earth, having sex with women and producing superhuman offspring who chase women and fight. We have been told incorrectly that these are the ways that man either explained things or taught some kind of morality; but for this to be a consistent theme in most ancient cultures, having an historical basis for these stories makes even more sense.
 5. Gen. 6:3 tell us that the men of this earth are *also* flesh; that is, they are also human.
 6. Later in this chapter, God will speak of mankind being *corrupted*. This is the perfect word to describe the human race, which had become totally corrupted by angelic infiltration and sexual unions with angels. What remained on this earth were 8 people who were still uncorrupted. Gen. 6:11–12
 7. Throughout the Bible, God takes actual historical events and uses these to teach a greater spiritual truth. Here, corrupt mankind is analogous to man sinning and passing along the sin nature from generation to generation. In order to solve this problem, there must be a great judgment and a cleansing (which is the historical judgment and cleansing of the flood). Gen. 6–8
 8. Satan is a great Biblical scholar and a counterfeiter as well. Satan understood that the *Seed of the Woman* would somehow be divine; so, in this age of anarchy, Satan instructs his angels to fornicate with the daughters of men. This produces a race of half-angel/half-man creatures, who are counterfeits of the hypostatic union (Jesus Christ, the God-man). This is also an attempt to corrupt the entire human race so that it cannot be saved.
 9. In most instances where angels interact with man, they have the form of man. Gen. 18 is one example of many.
 10. The human form these angelic beings were allowed to assume would have been powerful, and they would have been extremely charming creatures with vast intelligence; characteristics which would have drawn women to them. By contrast, human women would have been pleasant enough for an angel, which is precisely the language used in Gen. 6:2. If you are a male who has dated a

Why the Sons of God in Gen. 6 are Angels

beautiful girl, of whom you thought, “This woman is so gorgeous; I wish she would shut the heck up,” that would probably convey the attitude of the fallen angels (except that they viewed the women as *pleasant* and not *gorgeous*).

11. There are only 2 other theories which are presented to explain Gen. 6. The alternate, false theories are:
 - 1) One of these false theories is that these *sons of God* are men in the line of Seth, and that they get involved with the wild women of Cain’s line. God does, from time to time, wipe out certain groups of people and certain nations when they reach a critical degeneracy point. However, removing all life from the earth is a more dramatic measure than we find anywhere else in the Bible (even at the end of the Tribulation, only unbelievers are removed from the earth).
 - 2) A second false theory is, these *sons of God* are powerful tyrants, perhaps demon-possessed men, who corrupt the earth. Again, this does not square with the identical terminology as is found in Job; and God destroying the entire earth seems a bit extreme, even under these circumstances.
12. Destroying the entire population of the earth, save 8, seems to be warranted if all men have become corrupted in this way.
13. God is just, righteous and omniscient. This means that God has all of the facts, that he acts appropriately and God does not overreact.
14. The fact that God would destroy all life on earth would require remarkable circumstances to lead Him to do that. In fact, since we are looking at a unique occurrence in human history—a worldwide flood—it is reasonable to suppose there are unique factors leading up to the flood. A corruption of the entire human race by fallen angels would be unique and corrupting enough as to require a worldwide flood. Men being just sinful—or, more specifically, believers and unbelievers marrying and having a bunch of wild, undisciplined kids— does not seem to rise up to a point where God must destroy all mankind; there has to be more going on than just human sinfulness.

There are only 3 theories as to what is occurring in Gen. 6. The first theory is consistent with the use of the designation *sons of God* elsewhere; it is consistent with a limited state of anarchy; it is consistent with mythology; and it is consistent with a dramatic destruction of all flesh by a worldwide flood. The other two theories are unsatisfactory with respect to these very same things.

One speculative thought occurs to me—also in mythology, there are some who are half-animal and half-man; and we have the legend of the werewolf, which changes back and forth between being a man or a wolf; so the thought has occurred to me, perhaps angels cohabited with animals as well. There is nothing in the Bible about this, but it may help to explain why God chose to destroy all men and all animals together.

Gen 6:1–2 And it happened, that men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them. The sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they *were* pleasant; and they took wives for themselves from all whom they chose.

There is one more thing which I find fascinating here, and that is how the *sons of God* found the *daughters of men* to be. They did not look upon these women with great lust. They did not see these women as being incredibly beautiful. The word found here is תּוֹב (טוּב) [pronounced *tohv*], which means, *pleasant, pleasing, agreeable, good; approved*. Strong's #2896 BDB #373. This is not a word used to describe the incredible beauty of a woman. We might use this word to say that Jennifer Lopez is a *good* businesswoman or that she has *good* taste in clothes; but we would use other words if we wanted to better describe her physical charms (and there are many common Hebrew words in the Bible used to describe incredible physical beauty; but not this word). Remember, these are angelic creatures, who are incredibly beautiful themselves. So when Satan tells his demon corps to go down to earth and to fornicate with human women, they look them over and decide, "They're alright; they're pleasant. I can live with that. They are attractive enough." Because these are angels, they are not looking upon these women with incredible and uncontrollable sexual lust.

Gen 6:3 And Jehovah said, "My Spirit will not always strive with man, in that, he is also flesh. Yet his days will be 120 years."

There are some real problems with this verse, and an alternate reading is, *And Jehovah said, "My Spirit will not always strive with man in his going astray, for he is flesh. Yet his days will be 120 years."* Although most translations are similar to the former translation, there are some problems with each translation.

The difference between the texts is in the *pointing*. The original text of the Old Testament was written with only consonants, and it was read so often that, most learned Jews knew how to pronounce the text, even though it lacked vowels. However, some time around the incarnation of Christ or before, the Masorites determined that, in order to preserve the text and the correct pronunciation of the words, along with the Hebrew language (which was not being used any more), vowels needed to be inserted. They did not want to simply add to the text, as this was revered as the Word of God, so they placed dots, and hyphens, and jots and tittles¹¹ above and below the consonants. This way, the text was retained exactly as originally written, if one ignored the markings above and below the text itself. This is one of the few passages where the vowels are in question, and a different pointing (a different set of vowels) gives us a slightly different understanding of this verse.

I think that there is a textual error here, and that perhaps there should have been the repetition of the same consonants, but with different vowel points, yielding, *And Jehovah said, "My Spirit will not always strive with man in his going astray, in that he is also flesh. Yet his days will be 120 years."* It is not out of the question for a passage like this to be

¹¹ To be accurate, a *jot* actually refers to the smallest consonant and a *tittle* to the diacritical markings above and below the text.

missing some letters which were repeated. This is a common copyist error which is found elsewhere in the Bible, and easily explained (the copyist looks up to a specific set of letters, and then looks down and begins to copy them; when he looks up again he finds these same set of letters, and he copies what follows, leaving out one set of repeated letters).

Like almost all textual problems found in the Bible, the difference in the text is minor and has no effect upon any major or minor doctrine of Scripture. We do not find, for instance, one set of manuscripts from one part of Israel, which tout one set of doctrines, and another set of manuscripts where many passages are changed in order to reflect a different perspective from another part of Israel. There are a lot of theories out there, e.g., various people or groups of people changed or modified passages in the Old Testament, which would have resulted in dramatically different manuscripts. However, what we find, from the year 100 B.C. on up to 1400 A.D. are remarkably accurate and consistent manuscripts with very minor differences such as this particular one. And, most importantly, the ancient Hebrew manuscripts upon which we depend, do not reflect any set of doctrinal differences related to a particular family of manuscripts. Although the Bible was not as ubiquitous in those days as now, the idea of *changing a passage in the Bible* back then, would have been nearly impossible, as there were too many texts. The Dead Sea Scrolls are essentially the remains of a library. It would be foolish to think that this was the only ancient collection of books in the Judæan area. For much of ancient history, various books of the Old Testament no doubt existed in dozens of libraries, if not hundreds. My point in this digression is, although there are several people who say that this or that group made wholesale changes to the Bible, making such changes would have been impossible to do.

On the other hand, doctrinal differences can certainly be a part of any *translation* of the Hebrew and Greek (far more than any supposed changes made to the Old or New Testaments). There are particular slants and approaches which guide many English translations. A common doctrinal slant is, some English Bibles use a vocabulary which favor the charismatic movement and speaking in tongues; other English translations use a different English vocabulary which yields a text which does not support the views of the charismatic movement (one translation might use the words *ecstatic utterances* while another might use the word *dialects*). Wholesale doctrinal differences can be imbedded within an individual translation, but it is something which is not found in ancient families of manuscripts (a family of manuscripts would be manuscripts which appear to be associated with a particular city where such manuscripts were made).

What may surprise you is, the Catholic Bible, apart from the inclusion of the Apocrypha, is not dramatically different from the Protestant Bible. A Catholic Bible is a translation of a translation (Jerome translated the Hebrew and Greek into Latin—an excellent translation, might I add—and his Latin text is used as the basis for many Catholic Bibles). However, more modern Catholic-approved translations, e.g., the Revised English Bible or the New Revised Standard Version, make use of all ancient texts.

I have spent a long time on just a couple of letters in the text of Gen. 6:3, and went on quite a tangent. You may be thinking, *well, then, just pick a translation of Gen. 6:3 and go with it*; because, you can see that the differences are fairly insignificant. This is the case

throughout the Old Testament. Human errors crept into the copying process; but they are so few and so minor, as to be remarkable. However, they ought to be pointed out, so that you realize just how trivial most of these manuscript problems are (this passage is actually a fairly significant textual problem, comparatively speaking).

Gen 6:3 And Jehovah said, “My Spirit will not always plead a cause for [or, *strive with, vindicate*] man in his going astray, in that he is also flesh. Yet his days will be 120 years.”

The verb translated *to strive* in many translations has several meanings associated with the judicial system. It can also mean *to plead a cause*. Although there are several theories about this particular word (Dr. Robert Dean says that recent scholarship suggests that this word means *to remain, stay, or abide*), it is found 25 times in the Bible, always with a judicial connotation. God is making a case with man—even with corrupted mankind—to believe in Him. I think the most accurate understanding here is, God will not permit man to have an open-ended offer of vindication in this state of being half-man/half-angel.

God has allowed, for a time, angels to have relationships with man. In fact, this antediluvian period of time appears to be a time of no specific law or government. It is not quite anarchy, as God specifically judged Cain; but judgment appears to be God’s. In the Garden of Eden, God allowed Satan to indwell a serpent. Satan could not allow the man and the woman to simply live in a peaceful existence in the Garden of Eden. We are very aware of how large this earth is, and how much larger the universe is, so even though Satan was allowed some modicum of freedom of movement, he chose to interfere with mankind very early on rather than to isolate himself.

Have you ever been to a beach and witnesses a smaller child build a sand castle, and, as soon as it is finished, a larger child comes along and wreaks havoc on this creation? This is what the fallen angels did. Satan observed the man and the woman, for days, and possibly for years, and formulated a plan to bring them down and to destroy their idyllic existence.

This is an important fact of sin. Rarely do we choose to just sin alone, and leave all others unaffected. Our sins almost always impact other people. A person in the illegal drug business, as an obvious example, is dependent upon ruining the lives of 100’s or 1000’s of other people, in order to be successful. Sin and rebellion against God do not just exist in a vacuum.

We isolate criminals from society by putting them in jail; and yet, most of them, when released, go back to doing the same things with their lives, which involves the corruption of many others.

In Gen. 6, we find the same thing. Fallen angels are given some leeway in their ability to interact with man, and their desire is to corrupt mankind. God had promised Adam and Eve is that they would be delivered (saved) through Eve’s childbearing. The fallen angels heard this and, when given the opportunity, attempted to corrupt that process. They were

allowed to take on a physical form to interact with mankind, and their purpose in this was to woo women and to corrupt their children by a sexual union between angels and women.

Note how consistent this is with the psyche of women. Women tend to like men they see as intelligent, strong, and powerful; they are attracted to men with whom they feel some measure of inferiority. What could be more impressive and attractive to a woman than an angel, in the form of a man? If I was at a party with Brad Pitt, George Clooney and Jude Law, I would suspect that the women at that party would pay much more attention to these guys than to me.

Man's *erring* or *going astray* refers to this corruption of the seed of the woman. One of Satan's consistent aims is to take a promise of God and try to corrupt it, nullify it or distort in some way. Satan, who is the father of lies, treats all truth in this manner—he corrupts it, distorts it or attempts to nullify it.

Lesson 55: Genesis 6:1–3**Grace Before Judgment**

The first 3 verses of Gen. 6 read:

Gen 6:1–3 And it was that men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them. The sons of God [i.e., *fallen angels*] saw the daughters of men, that they were pleasant; and they took wives for themselves from all whom they chose. And Jehovah said, “My Spirit will not always plead a cause for [or, *strive with, vindicate*] man in his going astray, in that he is also flesh. Yet his days will be 120 years.”

We have already studied and confirmed that these are fallen angels who have taken human females as their sexual partners, producing offspring which are half-man/half-angel, which is an attempt to corrupt the Seed of the Woman. All flesh on the earth, apart from Noah's immediate family, had been so corrupted.

There are only 2 other theories which have been offered up to explain this passage, and, as we studied, neither theory holds water.

You may wonder, how could women allow themselves to be violated by demonic beings? We may reasonably assume that the fallen angels were allowed to take some sort of human form just as we will see angels who come to deliver messages to man seem to have a human form as well. Furthermore, women are drawn to men who are strong and powerful and intelligent. We mortals are nothing compared to angels. So when a woman was to choose between an angelic creature and a human male, the choice was easy. Besides, these fallen angels would simply kill any man who challenged them.

Gen 6:3 And Jehovah said, “My Spirit will not always plead a cause for [or, *strive with, vindicate*] man in his going astray, in that he is also flesh. Yet his days will be 120 years.”

The one primary mistake made with this verse is to think that it assigns a life expectancy of 120 years to man; it does not do that. This would make no sense, as in previous passages and future passages, in this same book, men will show a gradual decrease in their lifespan, from over 900 years down to about 70 years.

Let's first of all touch on life expectancy. In working with the isolation of genetic traits in animals (e.g., with cats and dogs), we have, in a very short amount of time (in less than 1000 years), been able to develop breeds with specific physical and personality traits. We have also found that, such breeding generally reduces the lifespan, strength or other positive aspects of the dog (or cat). Therefore, if we take the line of Adam and Eve, but continue to restrict this line, to remain within certain families of this line, then we would expect to also negatively impact man's lifespan, which is exactly what has occurred.

This 120 years simply means that, from that point, God gave this generation 120 years to believe in Jesus Christ (i.e., *Jehovah Elohim*). As we have seen in the study of the previous chapter, when Noah was about 480 years old, God started him on this mission. About 20 years later, in this midst of all this, Noah sires 3 sons. Before the ark was completed and the rains came, these 3 sons found wives who were also uncorrupted. It is even possible that these wives are their sisters, as incest was not forbidden until the Mosaic Law.

God allows 120 years during which mankind, such as it was, would be given the chance to change their minds and turn to God. This sort of thing is found throughout the Bible and throughout human history. God is going to judge a group of men (e.g., a nation), but there is a period of grace where man is allowed to turn toward Him (e.g., Nineveh during the time of Jonah; [northern] Israel before being militarily defeated and dispersed in 721 B.C.; or Judæa during the incarnation of Jesus).

God gives grace to man before judgment; that is, there is always a time period during which God reveals the truth, and allows those who believe in His Son to be saved. These are edited notes from one of Robbie Dean's sermons:

The Principle of Grace Before Judgment

1. Before every divine judgment throughout human history, God always gives mankind a period of grace during which to be saved. God does this for nations, and He does this for individuals. God gives us grace before judgment in our own personal spiritual lives. Before He lowers the boom in divine discipline, He will precede that with grace to give us an opportunity to rebound (to confess our sins), and to get back into fellowship so that we walk by means of the Holy Spirit. At this particular time there was a 120-year period time of intense evangelism before the judgment of the flood. However, what often happens in human history is, God gives grace and man rejects it.
 2. There never has been a time in history when mankind did not have the opportunity to believe in Jesus Christ. No matter what the dispensation was, man was always given a chance to believe in Jesus Christ. In the antediluvian
-

The Principle of Grace Before Judgment

civilization, there was a period of time there for them to respond to the gospel. In the Old Testament period, the gospel always anticipated deliverance, it looked forward to the promised seed of the woman, and that was the focal point of salvation. Just because we don't know how the gospel got around, just because we don't have historical records, doesn't mean the gospel did not make its way to many different nations. In fact, from the little bit of evidence that we do have in the New Testament era we know that the gospel has made it to a lot of places in many different eras by a variety of means.

3. God's grace before judgment prior to the flood: God granted the human race 120 years of warning, according to Genesis 6:3—120 years of hearing Noah proclaim the gospel. Methuselah, in the line of promise, doesn't die until just before the flood. So there were others in that line who were believers who were also proclaiming the gospel. Noah was not the only one, but all of the others were older and they would have died physically prior to the flood. And as Hebrews 11:7 points out (**By faith Noah, being warned by God concerning events as yet unseen, in reverent fear constructed an ark for the saving of his household. By this he condemned the world and became an heir of the righteousness that comes by faith.**). They not only proclaimed the gospel verbally but the fact that he and his sons were building the ark was a visual statement of condemnation of that antediluvian civilization.
4. In the Old Testament the prophets warned the Jews about the approaching judgments of 722 B.C. when the Assyrians took out the northern kingdom of Israel, and they warned the southern kingdom about the judgment of Babylon coming in 586 B.C. In fact, 100 years earlier Isaiah was prophesying about the approaching of the Babylonian destruction of Israel.
5. Jesus warned the Jews in Matthew 24 about the coming judgment for rejecting Him as Messiah. They were warned about the Roman armies coming and destroying Jerusalem.
6. Every person has adequate testimony to the existence of God prior to death. Romans 1:20 says: **So that they are without excuse.** That tells us that every human being has common grace that presents clear evidence that God exists. His invisible attributes are made clear in the heavens, but man rejects that and suppresses the truth by means of unrighteousness.
7. In the Tribulation period the gospel will be proclaimed as never before in human history and there will be numerous warnings; grace will precede the judgments.

Taken from Robert Dean's Genesis-041 series (The Flood: Grace) (slightly edited).

Noah would have been in one place building this ark with his sons. So Noah probably did not travel about proclaiming the coming of the flood (although this is possible). Half-angel/half-man creatures probably came to Noah. Remember, those who sin cannot leave those who do not sin alone (this is a principle; I am not asserting that Noah is sinless). Sin has an innate desire to corrupt others. Just as a drug user will try to encourage others to

use drugs, just as an atheist will try to convert believers,¹² so would corrupt humanity come to Noah's project to alternately ridicule or dissuade him. This is how fallen man and fallen angels operate. Noah would, at their arrival, answer their jibes and proclaim the coming flood, which would be God's judgment on this world.

An interesting theological question is, *what if some of these half-angel/half-man creatures believed in Jehovah Elohim?* That is, trusted in Him for their salvation? I have pondered this from time to time and I don't really have an answer, apart from saying, God would be just in His actions in such a case. However, none did, so this question is moot. We do know that God gave corrupt mankind 120 years to believe in Him, and no one did, apart from Noah's uncorrupted family.

A better question is, **why** didn't any of these half-angel/half-men believe in Jehovah Elohim? Here, I have a theory. Angels and fallen angels are brilliant. Fallen angels have chosen to take a stand against God. They would be persuasive enough to either convince their young that they could not be saved; or that there was no loving God out there. Is it possible for extremely intelligent creatures to convince inferior intellects of things which are false? Of course. That is what some aspects of public education are all about. That is how you can have intelligent, educated people believe in evolution or man-caused global warming; and argue for it as if their lives depended upon it. Both theories are being taught to our children as fact in our schools today without any opposing evidence being presented (and there is a lot of scientific evidence out there which calls both theories into question).

Gen 6:3 And Jehovah said, "My Spirit will not always plead a cause for [or, *strive with, vindicate*] man in his going astray, in that he is also flesh. Yet his days will be 120 years."

There was probably a very practical aspect to this 120 year time period: this gave Noah enough time to design the Ark; build the ark; to establish a zoo of sorts, so that animals may be collected and kept on his land; and to gather the food and water necessary for the animals and for his family. Although the Bible devotes a lot of time to the flood itself (from Noah's perspective), it tells us precious little about the preparations which Noah and his family made. At the suggestion of Dr. Dean on his Genesis series, I have been reading a book called *Noah's Ark: A Feasibility Study* by John Woodmorappe. Quite frankly, it is not the most entertaining book that I have ever read; Woodmorappe goes through every conceivable detail of an undertaking such as we have here. He determines how many animals there were; what their sizes would have been; what their food and water needs would be (to the point of discussing the diets of these animals); and he even deals with the waste made by these animals and the smell. Woodmorappe takes nothing as being accomplished supernaturally, apart from the flood itself. He considers far more details than ever occurred to me, and shows how these things could have been accomplished. There

¹² This is a fascinating observation: atheists will, with little or no encouragement, make attempts to convert others to their unbelief. On the other hand, believers have to be encouraged to share their faith. What most unbelievers and atheists do not realize is, a person who believes in Jesus rarely has any burning need to share the gospel with anyone. Most believers, if there was a verse in the Bible that said, "Unless you are an evangelist, you don't need to worry about telling others about Christ," would breathe a sigh of relief.

are 5 or 10 citations on each page to back up the assertions that he makes (that is, actual studies which have been done in animal husbandry as related to each aspect of the ark). He goes as far as to examine decomposing excreta—its odor and the hazardous gas it produces. I don't necessarily recommend this book as a good and interesting read; but, if you doubt that the situation to be herein described could occur, then you need to get Woodmorappe's book to see that it is entirely possible and even reasonable. One additional point on Woodmorappe's book—he always looks at the *worst case scenario*; the maximum number of animals; the assumption that there is no hibernation which takes place; the assumption that there is nothing supernatural about this endeavor (apart from the actual flood itself, which is certainly not completely supernatural).

This chapter and this passage open up a Pandora's Box of questions. If you have something which is born of man (with a sin nature) and from a fallen angel (which do not procreate among one another), can this person/demon be saved? We really do not know, but, we do know that none of them trusted in Jehovah Elohim. Even at this time, Noah was offering up animal sacrifices, and yet, he was only able to evangelize his own immediate family.

Today, we are impressed by numbers. When a mega-church has a membership of 10,000 and there are hundreds added to the rolls each month, we see this as being a successful and blessed ministry. When Billy Graham would go out to evangelize, and thousands of people would show up, and hundreds and even thousands would come forward, we see this as being successful. However, success is not in numbers. A large church may or may not teach accurate doctrine. An evangelist may speak to large crowds or small crowds, and the response might be large and it might be small (and it might be nonexistent)—that is immaterial. The key is, *are you faithful to God's calling? Are you faithful to the Word of God?* A pastor may preside over a handful of people and he may preside over several thousand. No matter what the numbers are, the pastor needs to faithfully and accurately teach the Word of God.

Here, Noah is given the responsibility to evangelize the earth, and he does this by the building of an ark and offering up animals. People knew about this ark. And when they asked Noah, he would tell them, "God is going to judge this earth and cover it with water. You need to believe in Jehovah Elohim." And, for 120 years, Noah ended up with a total congregation of 7. And, he probably made his sons come and participate when they were young (they were apparently born after God gave this warning).

You need to contemplate these numbers: there could have been as many as several billion people on the earth (half-fallen angel, half-person); and Noah evangelized for 120 years, and he ended up with 7 regular congregants. This indicates great faithfulness to the plan of God on the part of Noah. How many pastors are out there with a congregation of 20, and they are holding down a second job in order to make ends meet, and this congregation does not ever seem to grow in numbers, whereas, the mega-church down the street seems to grow by leaps and bounds? Such an experience can be difficult for a pastor to endure, but if that is your spiritual gift, then you go with it. If you have a congregation of 10 or 20, and you are accurately teaching the Word of God, then you are doing the will of God.

Noah here is a great man of God, and he proclaims the Word of God daily, and his congregation reaches a grand total of 7 and stays right there. For all we know, his son's wives might even be their sisters, which would indicate that all Noah was able to evangelize as his own family (and not necessarily every member).

In your life, you may impact a very small number of people. You might lead 3 people to Jesus Christ and you might start 1 or 2 other people on the road to spiritual growth. The key is not numbers, it is your faithfulness.

So that there is no confusion, *faith* is meaningless without an object. There is no substance to some ethereal, unfocused faith. Faith needs an object, and that object is first Jesus Christ, and then Bible doctrine, the Word of God. It is only through the Bible that we have a direction for our faith. It is only in the truth of the Word of God which gives meaning and substance to our faith. This is why the believer must begin to know the Word of God after salvation.

Noah, in order to act, will have to exercise faith. It cannot be some undirected faith toward the undefined; he had to place his faith in something very specific. **Being divinely warned by God about the things not yet having been seen, moved by reverence and fear, by faith Noah prepared an ark for the salvation of his house; through which he condemned the world and became heir of the righteousness according to faith** (Heb. 11:7). Noah had a faith toward God and toward God's Word. He acted based upon his faith in what God told him.

There has to be more to your life than simply believing in Jesus Christ and then exercising a nebulous, unfocused, directionless faith in whatever happens. Faith in Jesus Christ is very specific, and that faith in Christ is the door to your salvation. Faith in what God says (the Bible) is the key to the rest of your life on earth. And you must know the Word of God in order to have faith in the Word of God.

Lesson 56: Genesis 6:1–3

Satan's Counterfeits

The first 3 verses of Gen. 6 read:

Gen 6:1–3 And it was that men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them. The sons of God [i.e., *fallen angels*] saw the daughters of men, that they were pleasant; and they took wives for themselves from all whom they chose. And Jehovah said, "My Spirit will not always plead a cause for [or, *strive with, vindicate*] man in his going astray, in that he is also flesh. Yet his days will be 120 years."

We have studied these verses quite thoroughly, and I have shown that this is a demonic corruption of humanity. I believe that, even at this time, Satan had some understanding of the redemption of mankind as well as some knowledge of the Seed of the Woman (and possibly the Hypostatic Union?), and that this was his response to those doctrines.

There are 2 things which Satan does well: he lies and he counterfeits:

Satan's Counterfeits

1. The Hypostatic Union is the union of God and man into One Person forever, the Person of Jesus Christ. Whether this was intentional or not, Satan has counterfeited the Hypostatic Union with the mixture of fallen angels and man. Satan's intention was undoubtedly to corrupt all mankind; however, he ended up counterfeiting the Hypostatic Union. Gen. 6:1–5 Jude 1:6 2Peter 2:4–5
2. Satan has a semi-organized system of evangelists, preachers, and apostles. That there are counterfeit religious types should not be surprising, as Satan presents himself as an angel of light. **For such men are sham apostles, dishonest workmen, masquerading as apostles of Christ. And no wonder, for even Satan himself masquerades as an angel of light. So it is no surprise if his servants also masquerade as ministers for doing right, whose doom will be in accordance with what they do** (2Cor. 11:13–15). See also Matt. 13:24–30
 - a. There are false apostles in 2Cor. 11:13 Rev. 2:2
 - b. False prophets in Matt. 7:15 Mark 13:22 2Peter 2:1 1John 4:1.
 - c. False teachers in 2Peter 2:1.
 - d. False Christs, also called antiChrists. These are those who deny that Jesus is the Messiah (the Christ): **Who is the liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is the antichrist, he who denies the Father and the Son** (1John 2:22). See also Mark 13:22 1John 2:18
3. These false evangelists and counterfeit ministers proclaim a false gospel. Paul writes to the Galatians: **I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting him who called you in the grace of Christ and are turning to a different gospel--not that there is another one, but there are some who trouble you and want to distort the gospel of Christ. But even if we or an angel from heaven should proclaim to you a gospel contrary to the one we [originally] proclaimed to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so now I say again: If anyone is proclaiming to you a gospel contrary to the one you received, let him be accursed** (Gal. 1:6–9). **For if someone comes and proclaims another Jesus than the one we proclaimed, or if you receive a different spirit from the one you received, or if you accept a different gospel from the one you accepted, you are ready to put up with [these means purveyors of truth]** (2Cor. 11:4). These false prophets and false teachers **even deny the Lord Who bought them** (2Peter 2:1).
4. Satan has developed his own system of false doctrine. **Now the Spirit expressly says that in later times some will depart from the faith by devoting themselves to deceitful spirits and teachings of demons, through the hypocrisy of men who speak lies, branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron, who forbid marriage and require abstinence from foods that God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and know the truth** (1Tim. 4:1–3). Certainly you know one religion which forbids marriage to its ministers and another religion which forbids the eating of certain kinds of food.
5. Satan even has a counterfeit Communion Table. **You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons. You cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the**

Satan's Counterfeits

6. **table of demons** (1Cor. 10:21). These are simply false religious rites and rituals. Satan has a counterfeit righteousness, a counterfeit system of morality and a counterfeit system of religion. An example of such rites and rituals is criticized and condemned by Christ in Matthew 23:23–35: “**Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you tithe mint and dill and cumin, and have neglected the weightier matters of the law: justice and mercy and faithfulness. These you ought to have done, without neglecting the others. You blind guides, straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel! Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you clean the outside of the cup and the plate, but inside they are full of greed and self-indulgence. You blind Pharisee! First clean the inside of the cup and the plate, that the outside also may be clean. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like whitewashed tombs, which outwardly appear beautiful, but within are full of dead people's bones and all uncleanness. So you also outwardly appear righteous to others, but within you are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you build the tombs of the prophets and decorate the monuments of the righteous, saying, 'If we had lived in the days of our fathers, we would not have taken part with them in shedding the blood of the prophets.'** Thus you witness against yourselves that you are [truly] the sons of those who murdered the prophets. Fulfill, then, the standard of your fathers. You serpents, you brood of vipers, how are you to escape being sentenced to hell? Therefore I send you prophets and wise men and scribes, some of whom you will kill and crucify, and some you will flog in your synagogues and persecute from town to town, so that on you may come all the righteous blood shed on earth, from the blood of innocent Abel to the blood of Zechariah the son of Barachiah, whom you murdered between the sanctuary and the altar.” The scribes and pharisees were the primary religious groups in Jerusalem during the time of Christ. They would do exactly what they said they would not do—they would participate in the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, the God-man, the greatest of the prophets. They presented a religious exterior, but, because they had not believed in Jesus Christ and therefore, were not regenerated (born again), they were filled with sin (or, controlled constantly by their sin natures). Even today, we have religions which kill those with whom they disagree.¹
7. The purpose of Satan in the employment of all of these counterfeits is to blind man and to keep him from the truth. **In their case the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God** (2Cor. 4:4).
8. The purpose of these false teachers and false doctrine is to lure men away from the truth, to cause them to depart from the faith. **Now the Spirit expressly says that in later times some will depart from the faith by devoting themselves to deceitful spirits and teachings of demons** (1Tim. 4:1). **For among them [the proud and the arrogant; those completely under the control of their sin nature] are those who creep into households [where churches met] and capture weak women, burdened with sins and led astray by various passions, always learning and never**

Satan's Counterfeits

- able to arrive at a knowledge of the truth (2Tim. 3:6–7). For the time is coming when people will not endure sound teaching, but having itching ears they will accumulate for themselves teachers to suit their own passions, and will turn away from listening to the truth and wander off into myths (2Tim. 4:3–4).
9. Satan desires to remove the focus and spiritual walk of the believer by getting him to concentrate on temporal things (Mark 4:16–19). All of this is done by Satan to snare even believers and cause them to do Satan's will (2Tim. 2:22–26).
 10. Satan has a demon organization, which is a counterfeit of God's church and His angelic creation (these are the angels which Satan persuaded to sin against God). This unseen demon organization more powerful than any human organization. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places (Eph. 6:12). If you ever wonder how can such evil things occur and how can man be so blinded or so blatantly cruel, this is why. We are presently at war with spiritual darkness in high places.
 11. Satan's supreme desire is to be God. Satan, in his fall, said, "I will be like the Most High" (i.e., like God). This corruption of mankind is another Satanic attempt to take back the earth and to rule over it, taking this authority away from man, to whom God had given authority over the earth. Because of this desire to be God, Paul calls Satan *the god of this world* (2Cor. 4:4) and *the prince of the power of the air* (Eph. 2:2).
 12. Satan has a counterfeit *fatherhood*, as Jesus accused some religious types of being like their father, the devil. John 8:44
 13. Since Satan's religious systems are filled with lies, it is only appropriate that Jesus should also call him a liar and the father of lies (John 8:44). In this way, Satan is the antithesis of Jesus Christ, Who is the way, the truth and the life (John 14:6).

¹ See <http://thereligionofpeace.com/>

References: http://www.divineviewpoint.com/satan_counterfeits.pdf which was written by Buddy Dano (but also taught similarly by R. B. Thieme Jr. and L. S. Chafer before him). Also see <http://www.lakeeriebiblechurch.org/Doctrine/pdf/SATANANDSATANICCOUNTERFEITS.pdf>

We may rest assured that Satan did everything that he could to lead people away from God and into doing Satan's will. At that time, this involved sexual union between fallen angels and human females.

You will recall in Gen. 3 that God covered up the nakedness of Adam and Eve, something which God did not do for Satan and the fallen angels; so that indicated from the beginning that God's dealings with fallen man would be different than His dealings with fallen angels. Satan noticed this.

Satan was also aware of the importance of the Seed of the Woman (Gen. 3:15), so that, even if Satan did not have a rudimentary understanding of the Hypostatic Union (Jesus

Christ being the God-man), he at least understood that the Seed of the Woman was a threat to him; so Satan sought to corrupt the seed of all women.

Satan also wanted his earth back, so corrupting all mankind was his way of taking it back and establishing his dominion over the earth.

Recall that Satan has already been judged (along with the fallen angels), but that judgment has not been carried out yet. Satan is out on appeal, and he will continue to condemn himself and damn himself to the Lake of Fire based upon all of his subsequent acts (subsequent to his own fall).

We find out from Job 1–2 that there is a lot which goes on behind the scenes, some of which we are privy to and some which we are not. Most of us understand the concept of power-lust, even though only a few of us are stricken with that defect of the soul. Given all that we know about Satan from the Bible, we may reasonably assume that he suffers from great power lust and would like to rule over the earth. First leading man to fall and then corrupting mankind is no doubt a part of Satan's plan to take control of the earth along with all mankind.

We do not know all that goes on behind the scenes. However, it is clear that God gives Satan great latitude in his function. This may seem wrong to you, but remember, God gives both you and I a great deal of latitude on our own lives as well. It is not unreasonable to suppose that Satan was organizing a kingdom of sorts on earth at this time. That would be Satan wanting to be like God.

If you want to understand Satan, outside of the Bible, study Mao, Stalin or Hitler. These men were probably demon-possessed, if not Satan-possessed. They did not want disorderly, chaotic societies. They had a vision for their nations and their people. These men were both feared and beloved by their people, and, amazingly enough, despite the fact that Mao killed more innocent people than any other single person on this earth, he is still held in high regard by many Chinese (I personally know one of them who will fervently argue for the goodness of Mao). It is not a coincidence that both Mao and Stalin forbade evangelism and all 3 men killed millions of Christians and Jews. This is both a practical approach to their tyranny, as well as a clear signature of Satan, who desires fame and will nearly always make his presence known. Killing millions of Christians and Jews, while, at the same time garnering the devotion of the masses, is a clear signature of Satan.

However, the governments that these men set in place were doomed to fail. Paraphrasing what L. S. Chafer said decades ago, "Poverty, war and chaos are not necessarily the intention of Satan but the natural result of his inability to establish a millennial-type rule over this earth."

The resulting chaos of sin and the intermingling of fallen angels and man resulted in great chaos and violence. This is not necessarily Satan's objective but the natural result of his inability to establish order and civility.

One of Satan's great platitudes is that of equality, and the mixture of fallen angels with mankind accomplishes some sort of equality (although all rulers who seek to impose equality, always see themselves as far above those who are made equal). Recall Satan's lie to the woman, "You will be like God." He was simply trying to establish an equality of sorts, even though, in no way, did he see himself as low as this lowly creature.

Satan never actually establishes any sort of lasting order, but he polarizes a society, and even if Satan is able to exert the goal of some sort of equality over a country, that leaves a lot of very unhappy people (who are then jailed, reeducated, and/or killed). The few early verses of this chapter give us a glimpse into Satan's intentions and shortcomings.

Lesson 57: Genesis 6:1–5

Hebrew Structure and Ancient Mythology

The first 3 verses of Gen. 6 read:

Gen 6:1–3 And it was that men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them. The sons of God [i.e., *fallen angels*] saw the daughters of men, that they were pleasant; and they took wives for themselves from all whom they chose. And Jehovah said, "My Spirit will not always plead a cause for [or, *strive with, vindicate*] man in his going astray, in that he is also flesh. Yet his days will be 120 years."

Angels were given the ability to cohabit with human females, and they continued to do so until all mankind was corrupted, apart from Noah and his family. At the point of complete corruption, God gave corrupted man 120 more years to believe in Him.

We have not yet studied v. 4:

Gen 6:4 There were giants in the earth in those days. And also after that, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore to them, these were the mighty men of old, men of renown.

The Hebrew word for *giants* is *Nephilim*. We only find this word used one other time, and this is where the size and power of the people living in Canaan are exaggerated (Num. 13:33). This word is probably taken from the verb *nâphal* (נָפַל) [pronounced *naw-FAHL*], which means *to fall, to lie, to die a violent death, to be brought down, to settle, to sleep deeply*. Strong's #5307 BDB #656. There is also the related word *nêphel* (נֶפֶל) [pronounced *NAY-fel*], which means *miscarriage, untimely birth, abortion; premature birth*. It does not mean *an unnatural birth*; but a related word might mean that. Strong's #5309 BDB #658. So, by tradition and use, *Nephilim* means *giants*; but etymologically, it means *fallen; untimely birth*; and possibly, *unnatural birth*.

The Bible is quite straightforward here: the sons of God (fallen angels) had sex with the daughters of men, and the resultant children were *mighty men, warriors*; and these men were well-known, even to this day. They were called the *Nephilim*, a word found nowhere else except as where it is used as an exaggeration.

You may not have caught this, but there appears to be a structural problem in Gen. 6:1–5. Let’s look at these verses again (we have not yet examined v. 5, by the way), and I will boldface the problematic phrase:

Gen 6:1–5 And it was that men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them. The sons of God [i.e., *fallen angels*] saw the daughters of men, that they *were* pleasant; and they took wives for themselves from all whom they chose. And Jehovah said, “My Spirit will not always plead a cause for [or, *strive with, vindicate*] man in his going astray, in that he is also flesh. Yet his days will be 120 years.” There were giants in the earth in those days. **And also after that**, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore to them, these were the mighty men of old, men of renown. And Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man *was* great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart *was* only evil continually.

At first glance, there appears to be 4 classes of creatures: *giants (Nephilim)*, *sons of God*, *daughters of men*, and *mighty men of old*. The language is a little tricky here, and requires some explanation. The general principle is, the Hebrew often goes back and covers the same ground again, as we saw in Gen. 1 and 2.

There is no punctuation in the Hebrew. There are no paragraphs; letters are not separated by spaces. So the syntax of the language itself provides us the structure of a paragraph or a chapter.

The Structure of Gen. 6:1–5

- A** And it happened, that men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them.
- B** The sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they *were* pleasant; and they took wives for themselves from all whom they chose.
- C** And Jehovah said, “My Spirit will not always plead a cause for man [or, *vindicate* or *strive with man*] in his going astray, in that he is also flesh. Yet his days will be 120 years.” (There were giants in the earth in those days).
- B** And also after that, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore to them, these were the mighty men of old, men of renown.
- C** And Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man *was* great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart *was* only evil continually.

The first **A B C** gives us a logical progression—there is a population explosion of humankind; followed by the corruption of mankind by angels; followed by a warning of the judgment of God. The writer adds the parenthetical *there were giants on the earth in those days*.

For the second **B** and **C**, we go back to **A**. This gives us: And it happened, that men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them. And also after that, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore to them, these were the mighty men of old, men of renown. And Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.

In other words, the phrase *and also after that* does not mean **after** God pronounced judgment and there were giants on the earth; but it goes back to *after the population explosion of humankind*.

The first progression is: population explosion, corruption of mankind, judgment of God.

The second progression is: population explosion, corruption of mankind, that these were men of great renown whose every thought was evil, and this tells us *why* God is judging this population of the earth.

The plural demonstrative adjective is applied first to the *days* in which giants (the Nephilim) are on the earth (There were giants in the earth in those days); and the second time it is used, it is applied to *the mighty men* (these were the mighty men of old, men of renown).

The author uses this structure to take this situation in two directions; yet he throws in a plural demonstrative adjective twice to suggest that, the Nephilim *are* the mighty men, the men of renown.

This gives us 3 sets of creatures in total: fallen angels who take on a human form; human women who have sex with these angels in human form, and their offspring, who are called *Nephilim*, *mighty men* and *men of renown* .

My apologies to those of you who think this is far too much detail, but there is some interpretation involved in all of this, so I wanted to give the grammatical structure in order to explain the interpretation. Although this is not exactly the way some Bible translations translate these verses, what I have given here is accurate with respect to the Hebrew text and with respect to a common recurring Hebrew style.

As you can find out with a google or dogpile search, there is lot out there about mythological figures. All of our greatest ancient cultures have stories about these mythological creatures. What is most often the case, gods come down, have sex with the women on earth, and then children are born to them—men of great renown, just exactly as the Bible tells us.

I simply went through a few myths to pick and choose a few interesting tidbits from them:

Bits and Pieces of Ancient Mythology

Culture	Myth and Commentary
Sumerian (this would be from ancient Iraq, often called the cradle of civilization)	Gilgamish (the protagonist of <i>Epic of Gilgamish</i>) is two thirds-god and one third-man. In the 9 th tablet of this epic (out of 12), Gilgamesh makes a perilous journey to visit Utnapishtim (the Faraway, a Sumerian mythological counterpart of Noah) and his wife, the only humans to have survived the Great Flood and who were granted immortality by the gods, in the hope that he too can attain immortality.
Babylonian (this is the same area)	There are two gods from which all others were descended, Apsu (male) and Tiamat (female). From the union of these two were born Lahmu and Lahamu, who are represented as snakes. Each generation brings more gods: Lahmu and Lahamu begat Anshar and Kishar, who bore a son named Anu. Anu sired a son most often called Ea, known as the "all-wise". Each new god born was more perfect and powerful than his predecessors (evolution is not a new idea). In anger, Apsu decided to unmake that which he had made; but Ea learned of Apsu's plans, and kills Apsu.
Babylonian	Marduk is the greatest king of the gods, goes to war against Tiamat, also presented as an ocean. Marduk crafts seven windstorms and fills his body with fire, then mounted his storm chariot and rode off to battle, with 7 hurricanes trailed behind him, causing disturbances in Tiamat's ocean. After defeating Tiamat, Marduk develops the calendar and creates man. Mankind he crafted from the blood of Kingu, and man's purpose was to toil and do physical labor so that the gods might spend their time in leisure.
Persian (same general area, but a more recent culture)	The characters of Persian mythology are generally good or evil. The result is continual discord. There was Zahhak (Azi Dhaka), who was guarded by two vipers which grew out of his shoulders. No matter how many times they were beheaded, new heads grew on them to guard him. The snake is a symbol of evil, as in many other Oriental mythologies.

There is certainly not a direct parallel between these various mythologies and the Bible, but there are interesting similarities which we come across. I chose these particular myths in order to (1) illustrate their weirdness (any myths would have worked for that) and to (2) show some of the parallels which exist between mythology and Biblical history.

You may wonder, *why are these myths so dramatically different from one another?* At the time of Noah, there was a population on earth of perhaps several billion people. Therefore, there were billions of man-angels to speak of. No doubt, one of Noah's sons (and perhaps all 3) remembered these men, their exploits, and told these stories of the antediluvian era

to their own sons. Furthermore, unlike the Bible, these stories became distorted, skewed and embellished as time went on.

If you spend any amount of time examining the myths of other cultures, they are often very weird and supernatural. The person who tries to convince you that they are no different from the narratives in the Bible is the same kind of person who treats Islam and Christianity as morally and functionally equivalent. No doubt, you have spoken to someone who truly believe that Christianity and Islam are no different, and they might make reference the Crusades, the killing of abortion doctors, and Tim McVeigh in order to make their case. However, there is a great difference both in scope and acceptance. Both Catholic and Protestant groups have nearly universally condemned the Crusades and the killing of abortion clinic workers all the way from the congregations to the highest levels of the denominations (I don't know of any exceptions; but there are crazies, even in Christianity). There is not this same universal condemnation from Islam concerning, say, suicide bombers. Even in the United States, 8% of the Muslim population believe that suicide bombings of citizens is sometimes justified when in the defense of Islam. For U.S. Muslims under 30, this rises to 15%. Quite obviously, surveys to determine how many Christians approve of the Crusades or Tim McVeigh are non-existent, because the answer would be uninteresting. I could not locate numbers for Christian approval of killing abortion clinic workers, but surely it is far below 1%.¹³ There is a difference in scope as well. Throughout the 1990's and the first decade of 2000, 6 abortion doctors or workers have been killed in the United States and Canada.¹⁴ On any given day of the year, that would be considered a very slow day for Islamic extremist killings (typically, Muslim extremists kill 5–30 people every single day of the year, including on Ramadan—and most of their victims are civilians and/or fellow Muslims).¹⁵ Even in war zones like Afghanistan and Iraq, the number of innocent civilians killed by Muslim extremists is about 20x those killed by the establishment military forces there (the United States, its allies, and the establishment military and police force in those countries), as these extremists intentionally target civilians.

Please remember that the Crusades occurred hundreds of years ago with a very corrupt religious institution. The last Muslim attack occurred within the past hour or two. There are more killings by Muslims any given year than during the entire 350 years of the Spanish Inquisition.

Please bear in mind that Satan has a great ego, and when he takes control, he wants you to know who he is. So, even though Hitler, for instance, inspired and moved his nation; we know that he killed millions of Christians and Jews—that is Satan telling us who he is. That is his ego at work.

¹³ I was only able to locate one unscientific, online poll of 732 participants, and such a poll is worthless.

¹⁴ Source: http://www.cleveland.com/nation/index.ssf/2009/06/many_worry_death_of_abortion_d.html accessed December 4, 2009.

¹⁵ Source: <http://thereligionofpeace.com/> accessed December 4, 2009. This site appears to be updated at least daily.

Back to our topic—the Biblical narrative and mythology: choose any ancient mythology and compare it to the first 10 chapters of Genesis, and it will be clear, even from a cursory reading, that there is a dramatic difference between them. If you maintain that there is no difference between them, you are simply being intellectually dishonest. You might as well set the writings of William Shakespear next to the written howlings of Alan Ginsberg¹⁶ and claim that they are identical.

Our passage reads:

Gen 6:1–4 And it was that men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them. The sons of God [i.e., *fallen angels*] saw the daughters of men, that they *were* pleasant; and they took wives for themselves from all whom they chose. And Jehovah said, “My Spirit will not always plead a cause for [or, *strive with, vindicate*] man in his going astray, in that he is also flesh. Yet his days will be 120 years.” There were giants in the earth in those days. And also after that, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore to them, these were the mighty men of old, men of renown.

Most writers of fiction (or even of history), at this point, would have talked about some of these men; about the gods, about the women, about their children, and exploits of their superhuman children. Instead, this is what the writer of Genesis says:

Gen 6:5 And Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man *was* great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart *was* only evil continually.

You and I, we’re interested in this half-demon/half-human creatures. What can they do? What are they like? What kind of adventures are they involved in? God focuses in on their thinking instead.

Lesson 58: Genesis 6:1–5	Righteousness, Justice and the Thinking of Man
---------------------------------	---

The first 4 verses of Gen. 6 read:

Gen 6:1–4 And it happened, that men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them. The sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they *were* pleasant; and they took wives for themselves from all whom they chose. And Jehovah said, “My Spirit will not always plead a cause for [or, *strive with, vindicate*] man in his going astray, in that he is also flesh. Yet his days will be 120 years.” There were giants in the earth in those days. And also after that, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore to them, these were the mighty men of old, men of renown.

¹⁶ An excerpt: I saw the best minds of my generation destroyed by madness, starving hysterical naked, dragging themselves through the negro streets at dawn looking for an angry fix, angelheaded hipsters burning for the ancient heavenly connection to the starry dynamo in the machinery of night,... See <http://www.idiom.com/~wcs/howl.html> if you want more of this.

This, as we have studied, speaks of the corruption of mankind by angels, who were allowed to cohabit with women. The result of their unions has been preserved, to some extent, in the mythology found in nearly every ancient culture.

Gen 6:5 And Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.

You will notice the key to these men is not their great strength or their great exploits or even their violence, but their evil thinking. You are what you think. This is what is important. The Bible emphasizes what we think; as what we think is who we are. **As a man thinks in his heart, so he is** (Prov. 23:7a). What goes on in our frontal lobes is the key to our lives—even our spiritual lives (Rom. 12:1 2Cor. 10:5). Every thought of these Nephilim was anti-God and anti-Bible doctrine (that is, anti-truth).

You may ask, *why did God allow this corruption of man to happen?* God allows free will; God allows the free will of man and of angels. In the antediluvian age, there does not appear to be a codified law laid out; nor are there specific consequences laid out. God allows human history to teach us a number of things. There is this angelic creation, some of whom are fallen. One objection which people make against the Bible and against God is, *how can God cast some of His creatures into hell* [more accurately, a Lake of Fire]? *Why doesn't God just let them live somewhere else?* The universe is huge and apparently, angels can travel with ease from the earth to the Throne Room of God (Job 1–2). There are apparently millions of planets out there; but fallen angels choose to congregate here, on earth, and do what they can to interfere with God's creation—specifically with man. The more freedom these angels are given, then more that they bring chaos, harm and suffering to God's creation.

When you put a criminal in jail for life, what is one of his chief thoughts? *How can I escape and reenter society? What crimes can I commit when back in society and how can keep from being re-arrested?* Those who are evil will not leave others alone. People are not content to sin alone. Their desire is to bring others into their fold. The criminal, fresh out of jail, does not make a 5–year plan to remove himself from society. He does not determine, *I am going to establish a legitimate business, save all of my profits, and buy a house and a plot of land away from society.* Most recently-released criminals do not shun illegal activity; they just make a more concentrated effort not to be caught next time around. And all illegal activity has a negative impact on those in the criminal's periphery.

Criminals do not desire to lead a life apart from society. The example I have given many times in the past is, a person who takes drugs will not do so quietly and alone; he is going to spend some time evangelizing his friends and family to take drugs as well. It is the nature of evil to try to corrupt others; and, as the Bible says, ***a little leaven, leavens the whole lump*** (Gal. 5:9). Therefore, God cannot allow any sin. Nor can He allow the tiniest of sins to go unpunished.

Some who take drugs also sell drugs. This person, in order to be successful, has to, for all intents and purposes, ruin the lives of hundreds, if not thousands, of people, to whom

he sells drugs; and these people, in turn, cause a great deal of grief to others (they may steal in order to support their own drug habit; they may prostitute themselves in order to support their own drug habit, which leads to a whole other set of problems). Essentially, they must perpetrate chemical murder upon others in order to make their lives work for them.

One of the greatest problems in our society is alcoholism; and this sin does not simply affect the alcoholic. It is a strain on his every human relationship, whether by blood, marriage or vocation. Sin never functions in complete isolation.

We will see this same thing in the Gog and Magog rebellion in the end times. Satan and the fallen angels will be released from their prison after 1000 years (at the end of the Millennium), and the first thing they do is lead man to rebel against God and against perfect environment. So, even after being incarcerated for 1000 years, Satan and his angels are not rehabilitated; they don't think, *let's just go to some other planet, far away from here, and hang out*; they rebel against God and try to take as many people with them as possible. This is in Rev. 20:7–8; and God will judge them and throw them all into the Lake of Fire forever (Rev. 20:9–10).

Continuing on this tangent: how does Satan get man to rebel against Jesus Christ and against perfect environment? Easy. Our election of 2008 is a classic example. At the end of President George W. Bush's 2nd term, we had enjoyed 28 years of great prosperity in the United States under 4 different presidents. Although there had been 3 recessions during this 28 years (and the beginning of a 4th in 2008), our lives here in America were quite good. Unemployment was in the 4–6% range, inflation was nearly non-existent; interest rates were low, and even though we were engaged in 2 wars, total military death rates were not that different from military deaths during peacetime (a fact which receives no press whatsoever). And for the environmentalists, the United States even had at least one year of economic growth and, simultaneously, a reduction of greenhouse gases. Yet, a significant majority Americans were convinced that we were *on the wrong track*, despite nearly 3 decades of prosperity—prosperity that almost all America enjoyed and a prosperity and way of life almost unheard of in the rest of the world. In early 2008, newspapers and other media outlets began to report on the horrendous economic situation (using the words *Great Depression* over and over again), until, by the end of 2008, Americans had been convinced that the United States was in desperate economic peril (there were some terrific economic problems which were occurring, but the media all but ignored the actual origins of those problems). The end result was, people who had no concept of what had occurred economically, were convinced that President Bush systematically spent 8 years destroying the economy (and many of these continue to blame Bush a year later). My point is not to begin a political argument here, but to show that men can be convinced that things are bad without requiring details, clear explanations or even actual facts (at the time that these articles had begun to appear, there were no apparent problems in our economy). All they have to do is hear falsehood again and again from different sources, and they begin to believe it. Lies and propoganda tend to be very effective when someone does not know the truth.

If that example ruffled your feathers, let me give you another. Mao Tse-tung was the greatest mass murderer of the 20th century, killing somewhere between 49,000,000 and 78,000,000 of his own people.¹⁷ Even though Hitler was an evil son-of-a-bitch, he was not in the same league as Mao when it came to viciously murdering one's own people. However, today, there is this great stigma attached to Hitler (and rightly so); and when a modern politician is compared to him (like Presidents Bush and Obama), this is a grave insult (and rightly so). However, Mao is not seen the same way, even though he killed at least 4x as many people as Hitler did. In fact, one White House aide recently cited Mao as a philosopher for whom she has high regard. I personally know one Chinese-American woman who is incensed when I tell her that Mao was the worst murderer in the 20th century. She still looks upon Mao with great affection, as do most Chinese (and some governmental officials). Again, my point is, lies and propaganda can be very effective.

In a similar fashion, Satan, in the end times, after 1000 years of perfect environment, will be loosed from confinement and he will lead man in a rebellion against God and against perfect environment, and man will follow him (I suspect that inequality will be one of the issues that Satan will focus upon, because, if there is freedom, there is automatically inequality). That is the nature of sin; and, more specifically, the nature of lies and propaganda.

How did we get from Noah's ark to here? We began with evil filling the imagination of those upon the earth, which led us to the concept of sin and evil being pervasive and persuasive, which requires God to completely remove sin and evil. This is also true from a practical standpoint and because of God's perfect character. Since God is perfect righteousness and perfect justice, all sin must be judged, punished and removed. This led us to the fact that man can be led astray by evil, even under conditions of perfect environment (and I then gave the illustration of leading man astray during a good environment).

We are in a situation where God is going to judge the entire world and remove all life from this earth, except for those saved by being associated with Noah. That will be an application of divine justice.

Now lets approach the application of justice in a different way: when you raise a child, and you try to teach him right from wrong, in doing so, consequences have to be *real*. If you threaten a child with discipline, but never follow through, the child picks up on this rather quickly (a 3-year-old of my acquaintance knew she could pester daddy and get whatever she wanted; but when her mom said *no*, she did not ask a second time). When a child figures out that there are no consequences—no justice applied to his or her unrighteousness—then he or she will continue to do the things you don't want them to do. You have given the child a standard of righteousness but he has not received any justice. The two things have to go together. Righteous standards require the application of justice; and justice has to be based upon a set of righteous standards. These things must go hand-in-hand, even in a secular society.

¹⁷ From <http://www.scaruffi.com/politics/dictat.html> accessed December 15, 2009.

This is exactly what is happening in American schools right now—there are no real consequences for bad behavior, either at the school or at home, so kids are doing whatever they want to do. When I first moved to Texas as a teacher, the ultimate punishment was, a child could be expelled from the school district. There were no alternative schools. So, a kid who took things too far was expelled. Even back then, there were bad kids and bad parents. However, even if a bad kid had lousy parents, that lousy parent would nag this kid every day for an hour while driving him to and from a different school district 20 miles away. Spending an hour a day in a car with a nagging parent was a real consequence (for both parent and child). If this kid gets thrown out of school again, that means he would spend perhaps an hour and a half in a car each day driving to a third school district—and the nagging would increase exponentially. This was a great system of righteousness and justice. Unrighteousness behavior resulted in real consequences (justice), both for the child and the adult or adults in charge of that child. Also, just as importantly, the problem child was removed entirely from his environment where he continued to do wrong (his previous school); which was a good thing for the students there. They saw unrighteousness and they saw it punished; and it was removed from them. There have to be real consequences for wrongdoing. That is, there must be justice applied to a set of righteous standards. There must be righteous standards and there must be justice applied to the person who violates these standards. When dealing with children, it is best when there is participation in and application of this justice by the parents, as they are the most important factors in the life of that child, and God's authority over that child. The Texas school system, at that time, automatically involved the parent, even if that parent did not want to be involved.

God is perfect and any form of sin, no matter how minor, is an affront to His perfect character. There are real consequences for bad behavior in God's universe; and the flood of Noah and the destruction of the corrupted human race exemplifies this.

Gen 6:5 And Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.

Right now, there are pockets of evil in this world, albeit, very large pockets of evil (in fact, there are entire nations which are evil). There are a great many believers who think evil, who fall into this cosmic system, and support this cosmic system. And, of course, there are believers who are in and out of fellowship, who sometimes sin and sometimes think evil. However, this was all the thinking of all living creatures on this earth who had the capacity to think (apart from Noah and his family, of course).

The LORD saw how evil humans had become on the earth. All day long their deepest thoughts were nothing but evil (God's Word™).

The LORD saw that man's wickedness was widespread on the earth and that every scheme his mind thought of was nothing but evil all the time (the Holman Christian Standard Bible).

Yahweh saw that human wickedness was great on earth and that human hearts contrived nothing but wicked schemes all day long (the New Jerusalem Bible).

Whereas, a writer of fiction would have told us all about these mighty men, these men of renown, as we find in so many mythologies, God the Holy Spirit focuses our attention upon the thinking of these men.

The human race had become completely polluted, in its humanity and in its thinking.

Lesson 59: Genesis 6:1–7

Civilizations/God Changes His Mind

Gen 6:1–5 And it happened, that men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them. The sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were pleasant; and they took wives for themselves from all whom they chose. And Jehovah said, “My Spirit will not always plead a cause for [or, *strive with, vindicate*] man in his going astray, in that he is also flesh. Yet his days will be 120 years.” There were giants in the earth in those days. And also after that, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore to them, these were the mighty men of old, men of renown. And Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.

We have studied these first 5 verses quite thoroughly—from the fact that this refers to fallen angels cohabiting with humankind; and the fact that God concentrates on their evil thinking while we are more interested in their exploits and personalities.

Gen 6:6 And Jehovah changed His mind that He had made man on the earth, and He was angry to His heart.

Here is where we have to understand common figures of speech. The Bible also tells us that, **God is not a man that He should change His mind** (Num. 23:19a—by the way, the old King James’ word for this is *repent*). However, it says right here that God changed His mind. So, which is it? Does God change His mind or not?

God changing His mind is called an anthropathism, where a human characteristic is applied to God—a human characteristic which He does not possess—and this is done in order to help explain the actions of an infinite God to finite man. An anthropathism brings God’s thinking and motivation down to our level. It is like saying, “God, in His anger, will cast Satan and his minions into the Lake of Fire.” God is not angry at anyone, but, at some point in time, God will cast all the angels who sinned and all fallen men into the Lake of Fire. There must be a time of justice. God does not do this out of anger; but from His justice, His righteousness and His love. That can be explained (i.e., the interaction of these 3 facets of God’s character), but it is moderately difficult to explain, so the Bible sometimes shortcuts the explanation by ascribing *anger* to God’s actions, a human characteristic that He does not possess.

You may object. You may say, *shouldn't we always take the Bible literally?* The Bible is filled with figures of speech, most of which are very common, and many of which, we use and recognize ourselves in a different setting. There is a 1000 page book written by E. W. Bullinger which enumerates and explains these figures of speech which are found in the Bible, and it is a book that I refer to often. Here's the deal: most of the time, we take the Bible literally. If there is an apparent contradiction (i.e., it appears to be a contradiction, but it actually is not), then we have to decide how to deal with that discrepancy. In some passages, God is said to repent (which means, *to change His mind*); however, Num. 23:19 unequivocally states that God is not a man, so He does not repent. The explanation is not difficult to grasp. We have passages referring to God's eyes or God's hands, even though He does not have hands or eyes (this is called an anthropomorphism); so we should not be confused when human thoughts and feelings are occasionally applied to God, even though He does not actually possess these human characteristics.

Definition of an **anthropomorphism**: the ascribing of human characteristics to God. Although this is properly the ascribing of physical characteristics to God (e.g., the *hand* of God), this word is also taken to mean, the ascribing of mental and emotional characteristics of man to God. These are characteristics which God does not possess, but are used in order to explain divine action through the use of a human attribute.¹⁸

Definition of an **anthropopathism**: the ascribing of human emotions, passions or thinking to God which do not inherently belong to Him. The Webster definition is: *The affections of man, or the application of human passions to the Supreme Being*. My point in quoting Webster is, this concept has been around for a long time; I did not just suddenly invent it in order to explain this passage.

Gen 6:6 And Jehovah changed His mind that He had made man on the earth, and He was angry to His heart.

God does not change His mind. He does not have to. God knows the end from the beginning (Isa. 41:22–24 46:10 Jer. 1:5); He knows everything (Job 28:24 Psalm 139:1–4). So when we do some evil thing, this does not totally shock God and take Him by surprise (although we may surprise ourselves by our own depravity). God does not look down on some heinous thing that we do and say, “I had no idea he was going to do that; I am so p.o.'ed that I am going to smite him.”

God does not become angry. God is not happy and smiling one day, then looks down from heaven, sees the sins which you or I commit, and suddenly, He is mad or upset. We cannot ruin God's day. God is not subject to wide, emotional swings. Anger is used here to describe God's relationship to mankind in terms that we understand; and to foreshadow the death of all flesh upon the earth as a result of God's judgment. You and I—we've been

¹⁸ There is an alternate understanding of this word, which refers to the thinking of those who actually believe that God possesses these human characteristics (Mormonism is an example of this doctrine, as they believe that God the Father actually possesses a human form and is on some planet taking care of business).

angry before. We understand that concept. Anger expresses God's motivation and response to a situation in human terms; ascribing to God emotions and feelings which He does not have, yet explaining in somewhat of a shorthand manner God's thinking to man through the use of these well-understood emotions. If God was actually angry, He could have destroyed corrupted man then and there, raining down fire from heaven and done this instantly. However, God gives this corrupted mankind 120 years. However, if man does not turn toward God, then He will destroy man from this earth in order to preserve the human race as a whole.

God has given us many parallels in our lives in order to understand Him and what He does. We have the illustration of cancer, which is an undisciplined growth of cells, not functioning cohesively or in concert with the rest of the body and its functions. The only solution which will preserve one's life is to remove the cancerous cells altogether, whether this be by surgery or some other means. This is how God must deal with some of the most corrupt subsets of mankind. In this case, God will have to remove all of corrupted man, with the exception of Noah + 7. Today, we have almost figured out that we cannot allow militant Muslim extremists to function without constraints. Most of us understand that it is better to simply find them and remove them from the human race, as a cancer. God has to do this periodically with portions of the human race.

Each time that God begins again, it is referred to by some theologians as a *civilization*. Each civilization begins with believers only. You will note that there is a correspondence between the civilizations below and the environments of the earth, previously discussed in Lesson #51.

Each civilization begins with believers only. Every civilization, except for the last one, ends with a judgment, and those who are in rebellion against God are removed from the earth.

Civilizations	
Civilization	Explanation/Commentary
Original angelic creation	God apparently created all angels and gave them the earth to dwell in. When Satan fell and took a third of the angels with him, the earth was apparently packed in ice. The details of this are sketchy at best. Some of these details are postulated. Gen. 1:1–2 Rev. 12:4
The antediluvian civilization:	Adam and Eve were created and began living in the Garden of Eden on the restored earth. After they sinned, children began to be born to them. Later on, mankind was corrupted by angelic beings, who left their first estate. God will remove corrupted mankind from this earth with a flood and He will put the angels who sinned (those who corrupted mankind) into chains of darkness. Gen. 2:1–8:22 2Peter 2:4–5 Jude 1:6

Civilizations

Civilization	Explanation/Commentary
The post-diluvian civilization:	God destroyed all mankind, except for Noah and his family, by the Great Flood. Noah and his family will survive this flood and we are all descended from them. This is where we are now, and this civilization will come to an end with the Great Tribulation (Matt. 24:14–51 Rev. 4–19). At the end of the Great Tribulation will be the baptism of fire, which will remove all unbelievers from the earth. From Gen. 9:1 to Rev. 3. This is the civilization which we are in today.
The Millennium:	God will remove all unbelievers from the earth by the baptism of fire (Matt. 24) and Satan and his minions will be bound for 1000 years (Rev. 20:2–3a) and the Millennium will begin with believers only. The Millennium will be a time of perfect environment (Isa. 11).
The New Heavens and the New Earth	At the end of the Millennium, Satan and his minions will be loosed from prison and he will convince some men (apparently a lot of men) to rebel against God and against perfect environment (Rev. 20:1–9). God will destroy those who rebel against Him and cast them into the Lake of Fire (Rev. 20:10–15), along with the unregenerate men from previous civilizations. He will then create a new heavens and a new earth, which will begin a new civilization, about which we know very little (Isa. 65:17–22 Rev. 21:1–22:5).

You will note that there is an overlap between this and the different environments of the earth.

[Gen 6:7](#) And Jehovah said, “I will blot out man whom I have created, from the face of the earth, both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air. For I have changed My mind that I have made them.”

To whom is God speaking? God is speaking to the other members of the Godhead. Furthermore, He is speaking aloud for the benefit of the angels who have sinned and those who have not. I was a substitute teacher for several years, and I had to establish my authority early on in the classroom. Often, the best way to do this was to make an example of the first problem child I encountered. He became an example who sometimes provided me with reasonable discipline for the rest of the day. The benefit was to those kids who might act up, but they knew that there would be justice applied to violations of a righteous standard. So making an example of one was also important to the other students and to classroom discipline. Along these same lines, we, fallen man, and angels who have not sinned, also learn from these pronouncements of God.

What God thinks, says and does is for our benefit. We learn from His Words. So what God says here in v. 7 speaks to us even today. There is an absolute cleansing which must

take place. God must eventually remove all sin. In every civilization, under a variety of environments (including perfect environment in the Garden and in the Millennium), as long as God allows sin to go unpunished, everything always turns to crap.

The second verb is mâchâh (מָחָה) [pronounced *maw-KHAWH*], which means *to wipe, to wipe out, to blot out, to obliterate, to exterminate*. Strong's #4229 BDB #562. This is a very strong word, even in the Qal stem (the normal Hebrew verb stem), and it means *to completely blot out, to completely obliterate, to completely remove something*.

God promises to destroy all that He has created—all mankind and all of the animals; as the sin of fallen angels has corrupted everything. **A little leaven, leavens the whole lump** (Gal. 5:9).

Gen 6:7 And Jehovah said, "I will blot out man whom I have created, from the face of the earth, both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air. For I have changed My mind that I have made them."

In this verse, the anthropathism that God has changed His mind about creating man is repeated. Again, this does not mean that God actually changed His mind, but this is something that we, as men, can understand; as we understand what it means to change our minds. God knew that this would happen and He is dealing with it. God's righteousness is absolute and His justice is perfect; the result will be the flooding (cleansing) of the entire earth.

The Bible does not tell us whether animals are corrupted by angels or not. It is not unreasonable to suppose that animals were corrupted as well (as mankind was corrupted), since God chose to destroy them from the earth. However, we do not really know. We know that there are mythological characters which are half animal and half human (or half demon), but the Bible does not tell us one way or the other.

Furthermore, let me suggest that, at the point at which God judges the world with a flood—cleanses the world—from that point on, no one else would have believed in Jesus Christ. It was the point at which corruption had become maximum. Whereas we would have focused on the exploits of these real creatures of mythology, God looked into their souls and determined that they had reached a point of no return.

Bear in mind, even though the earth was filled with billions of half-angel/half-man creatures, it is Noah and his family who survive (who are far less powerful than these creatures). God preserves them for Noah's 600 years in the antediluvian age and He will preserve them in the flood and He will preserve them when the earth begins the post-diluvian era.

Application: We live in the greatest nation in the world in the United States and the most blessed nation in human history. Most kings in previous centuries would have changed places with us in a heartbeat (apart from their power lust). However, we also live during a time in the United States where anything could happen, and our lives could change dramatically over the next 10 years. If there are dramatic changes which come

about—war, famine, disease, depression, inflation—think about Noah and how God preserved him. Any of the mythological creatures could have destroyed Noah and his family. God preserved Noah and his family. The flood destroys every living creature on this earth (apart from fish); but God preserve Noah. Noah knew God’s Word; he knew why God created him (he had a personal sense of destiny); he knew what he was supposed to do (which requires knowing God’s thinking and God’s plan for his life); and he executed this plan. God preserved Noah, not because he was a really good person, but because he knew God’s plan for his life, and he executed that plan. If this seems far-fetched to you, and if knowing the will of God seems to be an abstruse (or even, meaningless) concept, then you simply do not know the Word of God. Our guide and our directions for our lives today are just as perspicuous as they were for Noah some 5000 or so years ago. If the Word of God is an integral part of our souls and if we have a personal sense of destiny, then God uses us and preserves us under the most difficult of circumstances.

Lesson 60: Genesis 6:6–9

Old Testament Sanctification

In the previous lessons, we have found that the earth had become corrupted by the cohabitation of angels with man, and, as a result, the earth had become filled with violence. Furthermore, every thought and imagination of corrupt men was continually evil. Therefore, God acted. Just as allowing a cancer to spread unchecked will kill the body, allowing this level of evil to continue would have assured that no one born from that point on would have believed in Him; or belief in Jehovah Elohim would have been crushed. Since all humanity had become corrupted by demons, the crushing of belief would have been far more effective than what we have seen in our age (even though entire nations have tried to either obliterate or control faith in Christ—e.g., Russian, China, Germany, and almost every Arab nation).

Gen 6:6–7 And Jehovah changed His mind that He had made man on the earth, and He was angry to His heart. And Jehovah said, I will blot out man whom I have created, from the face of the earth, both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the birds of the air. For I have changed My mind that I have made them.”

As we have already studied, God did not actually change His mind, but this is an anthropomorphism. Furthermore, God did not get angry; that is also an anthropomorphism.

Gen 6:8 But Noah found grace in the eyes of Jehovah.

The verb here means *to find, to discover*; and it is in the Qal perfect, indicating a completed action and/or an action completed in a point in time. If Noah had, by a long life of good deeds and good behavior found grace in Jehovah’s eyes, this would have been the Qal imperfect (or the verb would be expressed with a Qal active participle), either of which would have indicated continuous action.

This is the first time in the Bible that we are introduced to *grace*. *Grace* is generally understood to mean *undeserved favor*; it is more accurately defined as *all that God is free*

to do for man on the basis of the cross.¹⁹ You need to be clear on the fact that grace is not something which we earn or deserve, nor is it some kind of religiosity which becomes infused into our character when we believe in Jesus Christ. Noah discovered (perfect tense) this grace in God's eyes (in God's estimation, in God's opinion).

There are several Hebrew words translated *grace*. This particular word is *chên* (חֵן) [pronounced *khayn*], which means *grace, favor, blessing*. Strong's #2580 BDB #336. In most instances, this involves an inferior discovering grace in the eyes (estimation) of a superior (e.g., between man and God, between a subject and a king). Another very common word for *grace* is *cheçed* (חֶסֶד) [pronounced *KHEH-sed*], which means *grace, benevolence, mercy, kindness*. Strong's #2617 BDB #338. This word is often tied to an act of kindness or benevolence of one person to another based upon a relationship. *Chên* is found about 70 times in the Old Testament; *cheçed* about 250 times.

Noah did not *earn* God's grace. Noah did not work for God's grace. He *discovered* God's grace. It did not happen over a period of time; it happened in a point of time. This eliminates the concept of infused grace, that, for whatever reason, God is so pleased with you so that He pumps this quality of grace into your soul, which begins to seep out into your life (which is, in itself, illogical; if God is pleased with you in the first place, why does He need to infuse you with grace?). Instead, this reads, **Noah discovered [point of time] grace in God's estimation.**

Even though the word *sanctification* is only found once in the book of Genesis (Gen. 2:3), we need to examine the doctrine of sanctification in order to separate certain concepts in our minds.

The Doctrine of Sanctification

1. Sanctification comes from the Hebrew verb *qâdash* (קָדַשׁ) [pronounced *kaw-DAHSH*], which means *to be [make] pure [clean, holy, separate, sacred]; to consecrate [sanctify, dedicate, hallow, set apart]*. Strong's #6942 BDB #872.
 - a. This verb means that something is set apart to God or it is set apart for God; this something takes on the quality of being sacred, holy, different from that which is tied to the earth.
 - b. This verb occurs only once in Genesis (Gen. 2:3), but the concepts are pertinent to this passage.
2. Sanctification from the standpoint of man:
 - a. Eternal Sanctification: When we believe in Jesus Christ (or Jehovah of the Old Testament), we are eternally set apart to God. This happens in a point of time; in this case, when Noah discovered grace in the estimation of God (Gen. 6:8). In Gen. 15:6, we are told that **Abram believed in Jehovah, and it was credited [to his account] as righteousness.**
 - b. Temporal or Progressive Sanctification: After salvation, when we fall out

¹⁹ I heard this definition from R. B. Thieme Jr.; it is a restatement of the definition given by L. S. Chafer.

The Doctrine of Sanctification

of fellowship, we get back into fellowship by naming our sins to God. As we grow spiritually (from learning the Word of God), we are sanctified in our spiritual growth. Noah grew spiritually to the point where, God issued some unusual orders to him and Noah obeyed these orders.

- c. Ultimate Sanctification: When we receive our resurrection body in the end time and our sin nature is completely removed from us, cut out like a cancer. This occurs after we have died (or been raptured). When Noah is raised up in the future, he will be in a resurrection body without the sin nature.
3. R. B. Thieme Jr. called this phase I–III sanctification.
 - a. Phase I sanctification: salvation;
 - b. Phase II sanctification: the believer in time growing **in grace and knowledge of Jesus Christ**.
 - c. Phase III sanctification: ultimate sanctification, occurring after death or the rapture, and receiving the resurrection body minus the old sin nature.
 4. Sanctification from the standpoint of God:
 - a. God sets something aside for Himself.
 - b. We might reasonably say, God sets something aside to be in service to Him or to glorify Him.
 - c. As Noah grew spiritually, he began to function in service to God. **Being divinely warned by God about the things not yet having been seen, moved by reverence and fear, by faith Noah prepared an ark for the salvation [or, deliverance] of his house; through which [preparation] he condemned the world and became heir of the righteousness according to faith** (Heb. 11:7). This lines up with temporal sanctification above.

More information on this doctrine can be found at:

<http://kukis.org/Doctrines/OTSanctification.htm> or <http://kukis.org/Doctrines/OTSanctification.pdf>

Additional links to the Doctrine of Sanctification:

<http://www.theopedia.com/Sanctification>

<http://www.versebyverse.org/doctrine/sanctification.html>

By the time that Noah is born, Adam has died and so has Seth. So Noah hears about the garden, man's fall, and God's judgment through someone who heard it from someone else or he heard it directly from God. Whether the first few chapters of Genesis existed in written form or as memorized history, we do not know. However, probably Noah and then his son Shem preserved what we know of the antediluvian period. Whether this was written down or preserved verbally, we do not know. However, it is because of these men we know the events of Gen. 1–9.

At the same time, there is this corrupt human-demon population, who, when they choose to speak, speak lies. The environment that Noah was in would have been quite disconcerting—the bulk of the population are stronger and more intelligent than he is and they would be quite hostile toward Noah. He is being told something entirely different from

the truth from all of these sources, and, again, bear in mind that these who are corrupt flesh are extremely intelligent, and could argue circles around you and me.

Application: Great intelligence and an extensive educational background does not make a person correct or a source of truth. If that were true, the United States educational system would be the most phenomenal education system in the world and in the history of mankind, because we have a huge number of educators with masters degrees and with PhD's. In many public school districts, a PhD in education is required for the superintendent's position (40 years ago, not so much). As a result, we would have expected schools to have dramatically improved over the past 40 years, but they have gotten worse and worse as time goes on. The key to educational outcomes is one's relationship to God and the control of the old sin nature (or lack thereof). Our school system in the United States at the first was primarily developed for the teaching of the Bible (which required a person be able to read and write); and for the teaching of ministers and missionaries. The ultra-secular approach to education has been a relatively recent thing (no longer celebrating Christmas or singing Christmas carols, no more prayer in schools, and the removal of the paddle). And as schools become more and more secular—which is the approach of most well-educated administrators and teachers—schools become worse, as well as far more expensive. As a former educator, I have seen a tremendous amount of waste in our schools. I recall one bed-ridden mentally challenged 20-year-old kid being *educated* at public expense to the age of 20, whose education had culminated in his being able to distinguish shapes (squares, triangles and circles). I attended a meeting for this young man, and teachers were bragging that he was doing well with these concepts. I am not against educating children with disabilities, but their needs to be some honest recognition that there are real limitations on how much some children can be educated.

Application: Where is the best education occurring today? In homes and in private schools (most of which are religious), often at the hand of those with fewer masters degrees and PhD's. In many cases, their parents may struggle with algebra or geometry, and yet the kid who is home-schooled somehow learns these subjects better than under trained and certified teachers with degrees. All the education in the world cannot replace common sense or spiritual discernment.

Noah was acquainted with the truth, but corrupted man all around him thought evil in their hearts continually, and could probably debate circles around Noah because of their great intelligence. It would have been fascinating to see the interaction between Noah and the rest of corrupted mankind during his 600 years before the flood. However, the details of such debates and interactions are not recorded in the Bible.

Noah chose to believe in Jehovah Elohim, which is an act of volition. Maybe you have had this experience: you make judgments on the truth or validity of what someone says based upon their life. One person I have known for many years has, for many of these years, led a very corrupt life, from his earliest youth. Therefore, I have tended to discount all that he says when it comes to truth. So, even though Noah is hearing a cacophony of well-spoken and convincing lies from all directions, he obviously does not trust them, based upon their

lives. There is no room for self-delusion. Any one of you who thinks he is wise by worldly standards must learn to be a fool in order to be really wise. For the wisdom of the world is folly to God. As scripture says: He traps the crafty in the snare of their own cunning and again: The Lord knows the plans of the wise and how insipid they are (1Cor. 3:18–20; Job 5:12–13).

Therefore, Noah finds grace from the Lord because he believes in the Lord. Trusting in Jehovah Elohim is not a matter of merit; it is a matter of choice. Being divinely warned by God about the things not yet having been seen, moved with fear, by faith Noah prepared an ark for the deliverance of his house; through which [preparations] he condemned the world and became heir of the righteousness according to faith (Heb. 11:7). In order to be saved, we must make this choice at some point in our lives—to believe in Jesus Christ. In order to be lost, we must spend every second of our lives choosing not to depend upon Jesus Christ; choosing not to believe in Jesus Christ. This faith in Jesus Christ is followed by a step-by-step walk with God (when we are in fellowship), which takes us into temporal sanctification (in this situation, it is Noah, by faith, preparing the ark). Our temporal sanctification comes through knowing the Word of God and believing the Word of God. We do not grow spiritually because we give money to a church or teach Sunday School or wander about doing good deeds; we grow spiritually because we *know* and *believe* the Word of God. It is by faith [that] Noah constructed the ark. Noah did not grow spiritually because he constructed the ark; he knew the Word of God and he believed the Word of God, and because of his spiritual growth, he built the ark. Furthermore, Noah had a personal sense of destiny, which is a characteristic of mature believers.

Gen 6:9 These are the generations of Noah. Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations. Noah walked with God.

There are 2 different Hebrew words translated *generations* in this verse. We have had the first word before: *tôwl^edôth* (תֹּוֹלְדוֹת) [pronounced *tohl^e-DOHTH*], which means *generations, results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history*. Strong's #8435 BDB #410. We would update this translation to, **This is the genealogy of Noah**. Although Noah's sons will be named in v. 10, the emphasis is more upon what God demands of Noah, as well as the corruption of the earth during the time of Noah. We could very loosely render this: **This is about the history of Noah**. Most of the time, when we come across that phrase, *these are the generations of ____*, we may understand it to mean both *this is the genealogy of ____* and *this is the history of ____*. That understanding would allow for us to examine his genealogy of his life.

The second Hebrew word makes its debut in this verse: *dôwr* (דָּוָר) [pronounced *dohr*], which means *generation; race; people; age, period, time period [of a generation], a time slice*. Strong's #1755 BDB #189. Here we are looking at Noah as contrasted with those of his generation—those who are alive—during his time period.

We might better render this verse:

Gen 6:9 This is the genealogical line and history of Noah: Noah was a just man and perfect [spiritually mature] during his time period [or, *in his generation, or among his contemporaries*]. Noah walked with God.

Next time, we will examine what it means for Noah to be *just* and *perfect*.

Lesson 61: Genesis 6:6–9

Basic Mechanics of the Spiritual Life

Gen 6:6–7 And Jehovah changed His mind that He had made man on the earth, and He was angry to His heart. And Jehovah said, I will blot out man whom I have created, from the face of the earth, both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the birds of the air. For I have changed My mind that I have made them.”

In contrast to corrupted mankind, whom God regretting making, there was Noah.

Gen 6:8 But Noah found grace in the eyes of Jehovah.

However, Noah discovered [perfect tense (which is past tense, completed action)] *grace* [first mention] in Y^ehowah’s estimation. As was previously discussed, Noah found grace in God’s eyes not by living a day-by-day good life, which would have been the imperfect tense, but in the past, as a completed action, which is sanctification phase I (we covered this in lesson #60). Noah grew spiritually, which is sanctification phase II, and this prepared him for the task that God had for him. We find out more about Noah’s temporal sanctification in the next verse:

Gen 6:9 This is the genealogical line and history of Noah: Noah was a just man and perfect [spiritually mature] during his time period [or, *among his contemporaries*]. Noah walked with God.

So far, in the book of Genesis, we are short on mechanics. That is, we cannot examine these first few chapters of Genesis figure out just exactly how Noah became *just* and *perfect*. We do not know exactly what it means for Noah to walk with God, based on these first few chapters. However, there were spiritual mechanics in the days of Noah just as there as spiritual mechanics today (that is, there are basic steps involved in Noah becoming spiritually mature). There was certainly more truth in Noah’s soul and doctrinal information than we find in these first few chapters (Noah certainly knows more than we are told in Gen. 6). When we get to Abraham, we will be given the most fundamental mechanic: believe in Jehovah Elohim and He will credit righteousness to you (Gen. 15:6 Rom. 4:3–6). Noah was aware of this mechanic, and, given his actions which will follow, it is clear that he trusts Jehovah Elohim—not just for salvation, but for the deliverance of his life.

In this chapter, we see Noah’s salvation, but from the God-ward side, and expressed in terms that we can understand:

Gen 6:8 But Noah found grace in the eyes of Jehovah.

This is Noah's salvation. Perfect tense (as we previously discussed) refers to a completed action, as opposed to an ongoing or future action (imperfect tense) or a continuous action (Qal active participle). At some point in time, Noah found grace in Jehovah's eyes. We know from Gen. 15:6 and Rom. 4:3–6 that the mechanics were believing in Jehovah Elohim. However, in Gen. 6:8, we see this as God's grace; and in Gen. 6:9, we see the results as being justified by God.

Here, in this verse, we are given the most fundamental information about Noah which outlines, to a limited extent, the spiritual life of the antediluvial believers.

Gen 6:9 This is the genealogical line and history of Noah: Noah was a just man and perfect [spiritually mature] during his time period [or, among his contemporaries]. Noah walked with God.

Noah is called a *man justified*, the latter word being tsaddîyq (צַדִּיק) [pronounced *tsahd-DEEK*], which means *just, righteous, justified*. Strong's #6662 BDB #843. This is the first time that this word is used in the Bible. This adjective is applied to both man and God. When applied to man, this is a reference to someone who has been saved or justified (Gen. 6:9 18:23 Psalm 1:5 5:12 7:9). This word can also refer to a nation with a pivot of believers (Gen. 20:4) (*a pivot of believers* are those who are spiritually mature within that nation, thus giving it some protection—something we will study later on in Genesis and eventually in Exodus). *Justification* can also refer to a state which is not absolute, but relative, meaning someone who is spiritually mature or more correct or more righteous (Gen. 9:6 1Kings 2:32). When used as a substantive, it would mean *righteous ones, justified ones*. When used of God, this means *absolute or perfect righteousness*. In this case, we are establishing that Noah has believed in Jehovah Elohim and he stands justified because of it. The verb *to be* is in the perfect tense, indicating a past action or a completed action.

The precise mechanics are given to us in Gen. 15:6: **And he [Abram] believed** [perfect tense, a completed action] **in Y^ehowah and He [God] credited** [imperfect tense, which is continuous action or future action] **him with righteousness**. *Righteousness* is very similar to the word translated *just* in Gen. 6:9 (they come from the same root).

So, salvation is seen from God's side in Gen. 6:8–9a (**But Noah found grace in the eyes of Jehovah. This is the genealogical line and history of Noah: Noah was a righteous man**) and its mechanics will be given in Gen. 15:6 (**And he [Abram] believed** [perfect tense, a completed action] **in Y^ehowah and He [God] credited** [imperfect tense, which is continuous action or future action] **him with righteousness**.)

Many English Bibles also tell us that Noah is *perfect*. This Hebrew word is tāmîym (תָּמִים) [pronounced *taw-MEEM*], and it means *complete, whole, entire, sufficient, without blemish*. Strong's #8549 BDB #1071. This is also the first use of this word. This adjective is used most often when referring to a sacrificial animal being *without blemish* (Ex. 12:5 29:1

Lev. 1:3, 10 3:1, 9 4:3). It is an adjective used of Noah (Gen. 6:9) and God ordered this of Abram (Gen. 17:1). This word refers to the *completion* of seven Sabbaths in Lev. 23:15. When spoken of a man, it means a man who operates on the basis of spiritual integrity; i.e., he is spiritually mature and in fellowship). When spoken of God, it is a reference to His character or His works being perfect integrity, which means perfect justice and perfect righteousness are key to what is being examined. Noah has believed in Jehovah Elohim and has been made righteous before God. Noah has discovered grace in God's sight; and he has grown spiritually. We grow spiritually by means of the grace assets which God has given us, according to a grace process, which is learning the truth while filled with the Spirit and, therefore, in fellowship with Him. Calling Noah *perfect* means that Noah is spiritually mature, but not sinless. Being spiritually mature means that Noah has grown spiritually. In order to grow spiritually, Noah required grace and doctrine (divine truth).

There is a second understanding of *tâmîym* which may be reasonably applied here as well: just as this word is used to describe sacrificial animals which are without defect or blemish, it also describes Noah's humanity. Noah is 100% human, as were his sons and his sons' wives (who, as I have mentioned before, may have been his sons' sisters). Noah is uncorrupted humanity, insofar as, he had no *angel-blood* in him.

Speaking of which, I wonder if vampire myths and stories had their ultimate origin in Gen. 6.

The final phrase is, [Noah walked with God](#). Noah's life is marked as a whole by spiritual maturity. He remains in fellowship with God. You may recall that Enoch was said to [walk with God and then he was not, for God took him](#). Noah walks with God and God will preserve Noah and his family in the great flood.

Although mechanics are not clearly laid out in the first 6 chapters of Genesis, in our dispensation, all of the fundamental mechanics of the spiritual life are clearly laid out. We find a few things back in the book of Genesis which give us an idea of how things were, but it is not as clearly laid out as it is in the New Testament.

The Basic Mechanics of the Christian Life

Mechanic or Principle	Text/Commentary
Salvation	<p>Salvation comes through faith in Christ. For God so loved the world, that He gave His only-born Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have eternal life (John 3:16). In the Old Testament, this is faith in Jehovah Elohim (the <i>Lord God</i>). Salvation occurs one time and never has to be repeated. We cannot lose our salvation because it depends upon what Jesus did on the cross, and not what we do in our lives. See also John 3:18, 36 Eph. 2:8–9 Titus 3:5. This is equivalent to Noah being justified in this passage or Gen. 15:6, which reads, And Abram believed [perfect tense; completed action] in Jehovah and it was accounted [imperfect tense; continuous, prolonged or future action] to him as righteousness.</p>
Fellowship (filling of the Holy Spirit)	<p>Sin takes us out of fellowship, and naming these sins directly to God puts us back into fellowship. If we acknowledge our sins, He [God] is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness (1John 1:9). See 1Cor. 11:31 and 1John 1:6–10. Although we find the naming of one's sins to God in the Old Testament (Psalm 51:4); it is more difficult to find in the book of Genesis. God kept on Adam and Eve until they admitted what they had done, when they sinned in the garden. Jacob's sons will admit what they did to Joseph, their half-brother (Gen. 42:21–22). So we see the seeds of this technique in Genesis; however, it is not specifically laid out.</p>
Spiritual growth	<p>Spiritual growth is a matter of learning Bible doctrine on a grace basis. Grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ (1Peter 3:18). That is a command, not an option, for the believer. See also Prov. 8 Luke 2:40, 52 and the dozens of times Paul writes, do you not know... At salvation, we as believers know practically nothing. We barely know the gospel. Knowledge must be acquired and we acquire it through the accurate teaching of the Word of God.</p> <p>Spiritual growth is implied in our passage, where Noah is said to be complete in his generations (during the time periods in which he lived). That is an indication of spiritual growth, although the mechanics are not given. The importance of knowledge of divine truth is found throughout the Old Testament. Prov. 8 is a particularly important passage in this regard: Take my instruction instead of silver, and knowledge rather than choice gold, for wisdom is better than jewels, and all that you may desire cannot compare with her (wisdom) (Prov. 8:10–11).</p>

The Basic Mechanics of the Christian Life

Mechanic or Principle	Text/Commentary
The grace aspect of spiritual growth	<p>All believers are able to understand and to store knowledge of the Word of God. I pray that He [God] may grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with power through His Spirit in the inner man, and that the Messiah may dwell in your hearts through faith. I pray that you, being rooted and firmly established in love, may be able to comprehend with all the saints what is the length and width, height and depth of God's love, and to know the Messiah's love that surpasses knowledge, so you may be filled with all the fullness of God (Eph. 3:16–19). Being able to grow spiritually from the Word of God is not limited to people with high IQ's. If a person has an IQ high enough to understand having faith in Jesus Christ, that same person is able to comprehend with all the saints Bible doctrine. This appears to be strictly a New Testament phenomenon.</p>
This grace system requires that we be taught; ideally by a pastor-teacher	<p>Paul and the other Apostles taught Bible doctrine; however, this was eventually handed off to men like Titus and Timothy, who were pastor-teachers (an Apostle had authority over all churches; a pastor-teacher has authority over only one church at a time). If you have been in a church for over a year, and they have never made it clear to you how to have your fellowship with God restored; if they have never made to perspicuous that the filling of the Holy Spirit comes with the naming of your sins to God, then you are in the wrong church. That is the most fundamental mechanic of the spiritual life after salvation. The authority of your pastor-teacher means very little if they are not teaching you the most fundamental doctrine. See also Heb. 13:7, 17. In the book of Genesis, God appears to teach many men directly (He speaks directly to Adam and the woman in the spiritual part of the day; He spoke directly to Cain after his sin; God is said to walk with Noah and with Enoch, which suggests conversation).</p> <p>If you are geographically removed from a good church, then may I commend to you one of the pastors from this list: http://kukis.org/Links/thelist.htm Most of these pastors have a means by which you can hear the Word of God taught regularly and carefully (they either stream their sermons online, or they make their lessons available as MP3 files, or you can call and have CD's or DVD's of their lessons sent to you. In all cases, there is no charge and none of the pastors listed should ever ask you for money.</p>

The Basic Mechanics of the Christian Life

Mechanic or Principle

Text/Commentary

Such a grace system involves *believing* Bible doctrine

There is more to spiritual growth than simply academic excellence; the key is believing in what you are taught. **Now without faith it is impossible to please God, for the one who draws near to Him must believe that He exists and rewards those who seek Him [which is positive volition toward Bible doctrine]** (Heb. 11:6). This particular chapter (Gen. 6) is about men who, having believed in Jesus Christ, then took their faith even further to believe in the Word of God and to conduct their lives in the sphere of that faith. **The Word did not profit those hearing it, not having been mixed with faith in the ones who heard** (Heb. 4:2). Hearing the Word of God is not enough; one must believe the Word of God; your hearing must be mixed with faith. **By faith Noah, being warned by God concerning events as yet unseen, in reverent fear constructed an ark for the saving of his household. By this he condemned the world and became an heir of the righteousness that comes by faith** (Heb. 11:7). Noah believed what God told him and built an ark, and, by this, condemned the world.

As an aside, faith gets a bum rap in our age of science, where people are falsely led to believe that all that we know can be proven or reasoned out. If this were true, then all scientists and all philosophers would agree on everything, but they don't. Faith is an integral part of every person's perception—even the perception of a scientist. This is why some scientists, for instance, believe in man-caused global warming and other scientists repudiate this notion.

Such grace growth is available only to believers

For who among men knows the concerns of a man except the spirit of the man that is in him? In the same way, no one knows the concerns of God except the Spirit of God. Now we have not received the spirit of the world, but the Spirit who is from God, in order to know what has been freely given to us by God. We also speak these things, not in words taught by human wisdom, but in those taught by the Spirit, explaining spiritual things to spiritual people. But the natural man does not welcome what comes from God's Spirit, because it is foolishness to him; he is not able to know it since it is evaluated spiritually. The spiritual person, however, can evaluate everything, yet he himself cannot be evaluated by anyone. For: who has known the Lord's mind, that he may instruct Him? But we have the mind of Christ (1Cor. 2:11–16). In Genesis (as in the rest of the Bible), the key is always the spiritual line (or genealogy). God follows the lives of some and some genealogies, but these are always limited in scope. The Bible focuses on those who believe in Jehovah Elohim and who exercise faith in God's teachings after they have believed.

The Basic Mechanics of the Christian Life

Mechanic or Principle	Text/Commentary
Spiritual maturity	Believers reach spiritual maturity by being in fellowship and learning Bible doctrine at the foot of an accurate pastor-teacher (metaphorically speaking). Jesus Christ spent most of His ministry teaching. Paul, after he did the work of an evangelist, then established churches for the purpose of disseminating truth. This is equivalent to Noah being called <i>perfect</i> or <i>complete</i> .
Walking with God	A spiritually mature believer then has his remaining years called <i>walking with God</i> . You cannot walk with God if you have limited spiritual growth. If you are spiritually immature, then God will go one way and you will go another. Walking with God means that you, as a mature believer, remain in fellowship for extended periods of time and operate according to the truth that is within you. We find this with Enoch (Gen. 5:22, 24) and Noah (Gen. 6:9). We find this same kind of phrasing in the New Testament as well (Luke 1:6 1Cor. 7:17 Col. 1:10). For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared before that we would walk in them (Eph. 2:10).

These are the foundational steps in the Christian life: faith in Jesus Christ, returning to fellowship with God by naming your sins to Him, and growth through knowledge of the Word of God.

Noah and his family would have had a similar spiritual support system. However, the mechanics (which may be almost identical) are not fully enumerated in the first few chapters of Genesis. These stages are only alluded to in this verse: **Noah was a justified [righteous] man and perfect [complete, spiritually mature] in his generations. Noah walked with God** (Gen. 6:9b).

As an aside, when you witness to another person, it is not necessary to convince them of the validity of the Bible, the truth of Bible doctrine, the power of the filling of the Holy Spirit or of the importance of free enterprise and limited government. You make one thing clear to them: *Believe in Jesus Christ, and you are saved*. You may get to this point in a number of different ways, but that is the essence of the gospel (good news) of Jesus Christ. For the unbeliever, whose thinking may be far removed from the truth, you can only reach them only through the gospel of Jesus Christ (and, if you know them, through the integrity of your life).

We will next begin to examine Noah, the ark and the deluge.

Gen 6:9 This is the genealogical line and history of Noah: Noah was a just man and perfect [spiritually mature] during his time period [or, *among his contemporaries*]. Noah walked with God.

We would reasonably have to understand the Noah's knowledge was vast and that he was spiritually mature. How else could he live in a world which is so corrupted and so filled with false knowledge pontificated by brilliant and lying speakers, and yet still be able to maintain his own moral and spiritual clarity? It would be like going to the typical college or university today, being exposed to almost nothing but liberal political thought, presented as facts, and walking out unaffected by it. When I was in college, I had 3 different teachers present their material as being founded upon evolution (a child development course, a math course, and, if memory serves, a course either on religion or education). This all occurred during the same year. Now, had I not some education up until that point, I might have just accepted evolution as being true (I realize that some of you reading this believe in evolution, and that is fine). If everyone believes in evolution, and no one but crazy flat-earth types believe anything different (or, so it is presented), then a person without any knowledge in this field is going to believe in evolution. This is even more likely when you have been taught evolution in your earliest science class in grammar school, where it is presented as fact (what 7 or 8 year old understands scientific theory as versus scientific fact?). The fact that some of you believe in evolution with great conviction with a faith which is stronger than your faith in Jesus Christ is the sort of pressure Noah was under, philosophically and spiritually speaking.

This is the environment in which Noah found himself—an environment filled with lies and falsehoods and half-truths, as presented by the most brilliant minds ever to be on this earth. With the exception of his own family, Noah only knew a few people in his life who understood truth (he apparently learned some truth from his ancestors). Everyone else spouted lies and distortions. The truth is a difficult thing to hold onto if everyone around you holds that to be false.

As an interesting diversion, during the Korean War, Communists captured Americans and studied their psyche, and they found it quite easy to sway and convince the American mind using a variety of psychological techniques. The Communists also discovered that the hardest people to manipulate were born again believers in Jesus Christ. They were able to confuse and manipulate many of the Americans which they captured, but they had a much more difficult time with the Christians.

The Communists even developed a plan by which to conquer the United States from the inside, all based upon the thinking of the American soldier. They learned how to manipulate him, and a plan was developed to manipulate the thinking of Americans in a similar fashion.

Had Noah been an American, his thinking would not have been affected. He lived in an environment of lies and distortions, and yet his own thinking was uncorrupted.

Gen 6:9 This is the genealogical line and history of Noah: Noah was a just man and perfect [spiritually mature] during his time period [or, *among his contemporaries*]. Noah walked with God.

We have discussed this in the previous lesson: Noah was justified (saved) and he was spiritual mature (*perfect, complete, uncorrupted*).

Gen 6:10 And Noah fathered three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth.

Noah fathers 3 sons approximately 100 years before the flood. God gave mankind 120 years warning through Noah, so Noah has already spent 20 years preparing for this event when his children are born. From these 3 men would come all of humanity.

Gen 6:11–12 The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth. And, behold, it was corrupted. For all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth.

You will note that we have the word *corrupt*, first found in the Niphal (passive stem) imperfect (incomplete or continuous action) and then as a Niphal perfect (passive stem, completed action). The word means *to be marred, spoiled, corrupted; to be corrupt, injured, ruined, rotted*. The earth was becoming more and more corrupted and rotted; this was a continuous action. However, at this point in time, *all flesh had become corrupted*, and here it reads: *All flesh had corrupted its [His] way on the earth*. There are two possible interpretations here, which appear to intersect. (1) There was a way for man to go: faith in Jehovah Elohim and then spiritual growth, and this *way of flesh* had become corrupted. The corruption would have been the sexual relationships with demons along with the resultant philosophies and religions which would have cropped up. (2) We could read this as *His way*, referring to *God's plan for mankind*, and it had become corrupted. All flesh was corrupted and God's way had become corrupted.

What the earth is filled with is a surprisingly contemporary word: *châmâç* (חַמָּץ) [pronounced *khaw-MAWS*], which means *violence, wrong, cruelty, oppression; that which is gained by violence and wrongdoing*. Strong's #2555 BDB #329. You will better recognize the contemporary spelling of this word: *Hamas*.

One thing that you need to understand about Satan—he is tremendously egotistical. He wants you to know who he is. Therefore, when he indwells or influences someone (like Mao, Stalin or Hitler), he is able to simultaneously blind even an entire nation (save for those he murders), and yet, his absolute evil is clear to many of us on the outside. What is quite amazing is, Mao Tse Tung, who murdered more people than anyone else in history is even viewed outside of China as some sort of a cultural hero. This ought to inform you as to how powerful Satan is and how well he can manipulate the truth.

Similarly, in a Satanically-influenced organization like Hamas, there are those who are blinded by this organization and see it as a force for good; but Satan wants to you see that it is him. His egotism requires for you to know who he is. Hamas (*châmâç*) (חַמָּץ)

[pronounced *khaw-MAWS*] means *violence, wrong, cruelty, oppression; that which is gained by violence and wrongdoing*. This sort of evil is a badge of honor to Satan.

Back to Noah:

Interestingly enough, Jesus paints what appears to be a slightly different picture of this time period: “Point of doctrine: In no way will this race pass away until all these things have occurred. The heaven and the earth will pass away, but My Words will not pass away—not ever! But as to that day and that hour [when Jesus returns], no one knows, neither the angels of Heaven, except My Father only. **But as the days of Noah, so also will be the coming of the Son of Man. For as they were in the days before the flood: eating, and drinking, marrying, and giving in marriage, until the day when Noah went into the ark. And they did not know until the flood came and took all away.** So also will be the coming of the Son of Man. At that time two will be out in the field; the one is taken away, and the one is left; two grinding at the mill; one is taken away, and one is left. Watch, then, for you do not know in what hour your Lord comes.” (Matt. 24:34–42).

The description that Jesus gives of the antediluvian era gives us a better feel for this time period. The multitude was involved in day to day activities. Sure, they all knew about crazy Noah building this huge vessel, which sat on land; and they knew that he warned of judgment to come, but they were too involved with their own lives—with *eating and drinking and marrying and giving in marriage*. Jesus looks at this from a different perspective. In Gen. 6, the corruption of mankind and the resultant violence is the focal point; in Matt. 24, Jesus presents their complete disregard of spiritual things and all of those on earth were simply self-involved. For 120 years, Noah proclaimed that God would judge the earth and flood the entire earth; and people were far too busy in their day-to-day lives to bother being concerned by this. Surely, Noah and his ark were the butt of jokes throughout the earth and at every dinner table.

Just to complete the thinking of Jesus above; He was speaking of the time when He would return to this earth. This will occur at the end of the Tribulation, which is 7 years of incredible human drama, much of it played out in the book of Revelation. However, Jesus presents a different view of the Tribulation: people will be eating and drinking and marrying and giving in marriage; they will be carrying on their lives, just as man did in the days of Noah, without thinking about God or the impending judgment they faced. However, at the end of the Tribulation, when Jesus returned, there will be the baptism of fire, which will remove all unbelievers from the earth.

Let's outline these parallels:

The Parallel of the Days of Noah

In the Days of Noah	During the Tribulation
There is great violence on the earth and all mankind has been corrupted (apart from Noah and his family). Gen. 6:5	There is great violence and tribulation on the earth, with vast quantities of people dying in wars and by other means. Matt. 24:6–7, 21 Rev. 6 9
“In the days of Noah...they were eating and drinking and marrying and giving in marriage.” Matt. 24:37–39	Corrupt man continues to live without a thought to spiritual things, as in the days of Noah. Matt. 24:37–39
This will continue until Noah enters into the ark and the rains will begin. Gen. 7:10 Matt. 24:38	This will continue until the baptism of fire. Matt. 24:40–41 (which passage is not about the rapture, but about the baptism of fire; unbelievers are removed) Matt. 25:34
The flood is the judgment of God against the corrupt earth. God will destroy corrupted mankind. Gen. 6:7 7:21–23	The baptism of fire is the judgment of God against the corrupt earth. Matt. 3:11–12 25:30, 46 2Thess. 1:7–9
Civilization will begin with believers only (Noah and his family). Gen. 8:1 9:1	Civilization will begin with believers only (this will be the Millennium). Matt. 25:34

Both of these periods of time—right before the flood and right before Jesus returns for the 2nd Advent—are marked by times of intense violence and negative volition as well as times when mankind pretty much ignores all things spiritual and simply lives his day to day life.

Back to Noah:

Gen 6:13 And God said to Noah, “The end of all flesh has come before Me, for the earth is filled with violence because of them [the *giants*]. And, behold, I will destroy them *with* the earth.”

Many chapters and portions of the Bible are carefully organized, in such a way that may not be obvious at first:

The Organization of Genesis 6:1–13

And it came about that men began to multiply **on the face of the earth**, and daughters were born to them.

The sons of God **saw** the daughters of men, that they were good, and they took wives for themselves from all those whom they chose.

And Jehovah said, “My Spirit shall not always strive with man; in their going astray, he is also flesh. And his days shall be 120 years.”

The giants were **in the earth** in those days, and even afterwards when the sons of God

The Organization of Genesis 6:1–13

came in to the daughters of men, and they bore to them; they were heroes which existed from ancient time, the men of renown.

And Jehovah **saw** that the evil of man was great on the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil all the day long. And Jehovah repented that He had made man on the earth, and He was grieved to His heart.

And Jehovah said, “I will wipe off man whom I have created from the face of the earth, from man to beast, to the creeping thing and to the birds of the heavens; for I repent that I made them.”

And Noah found grace in the eyes of Jehovah. These are the generations of Noah. Noah, a righteous man, had been perfected among his family. Noah walked with God. And Noah fathered three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth.

And **the earth** was corrupt before God, and **the earth** was filled with violence.

And God **looked** on the earth, and behold, it was corrupted. For all flesh had corrupted its way on the earth.

And God said to Noah, “The end of all flesh has come before Me, for the earth is filled with violence through them. And behold, I will destroy them along with the earth.”

You will notice that we have what is going on, *on the earth*; followed by what is *observed*; followed by something which God says. Sometimes, prose is so organized in order to help one to remember it. Whether the Bible was in written form at this time in history is unknown; however, those who believed in Jesus Christ and were interested in Bible doctrine knew these chapters by heart and had them memorized. They were designed to be memorized.

Secondly, note what does not fit in to this organization: Noah. The earth is corrupt and 3 times, God says that He is going to judge the earth; but who is not in this judgment? Who is not a part of this corruption. Who stands outside and apart from all of this? Noah. Noah does not fit into the pattern which we find here: corruption upon the earth which is judged by God. Noah, even in a literary sense, stands out or stands apart from this.

Gen 6:13 And God said to Noah, “The end of all flesh has come before Me, for the earth is filled with violence because of them [the *giants*]. And, behold, I will destroy them *with* the earth.”

One of the things which is hard for us to get our minds around is, there are radically different situations and environments in which man has lived and where man will live. We tend to think, the reality which we live in now, that is how it has always been with man. What was, will be again, what has been done, will be done again, and there is nothing new under the sun! Take anything which people acclaim as being new: it existed in the centuries preceding us (Eccles. 1:9–10). The people of Noah’s time looked at their

environment the same way. They did not expect it to change; they did not believe Noah warning them of the judgment to come.

I write this in the year 2010; in the United States, and in less than a year, we have seen the government seize control of 2 car companies, take more control over FNMA and FHLMC (which are the largest financial institutions in the United States) and our government is attempting to seize control of the entire healthcare system (a sixth of the economy; our government controls roughly half of healthcare already). My point is, things in the United States can change almost overnight. We can have one kind of government one year, and have this dramatic change in government the next. When president-elect Obama said "Change is coming, America," he was not over-exaggerating what he had in mind.

God promised judgment on the earth; Noah and his family believed God; the rest of civilization did not. In a relatively short time, things will radically change on this earth.

We try to ignore just how quickly things can be transformed. We may live our lives separate from God, concerned with only temporal things, and in just a few hours (or even less) a hurricane or a rainstorm or an earthquake can change our reality drastically.

All around Noah is corrupted flesh; everywhere he looks are violence and lies.

Since the flood, life for unsaved man has been relatively unchanged. However, as covered in the introduction, there have been 2 or 3 dispensations since the flood. God has worked somewhat differently and through different agents since the flood (through the nation Israel and later through believers who make up the church).

We have only the Bible and an assortment of mythologies which tell us anything about this pre-deluvian state. We know that man is a violent creature; but man infused with demons he is even more so. The amount of violence which is taking place at this time is even beyond our imagination. God's way is so soundly rejected, that there is continual violence. God has to correct this intense degeneracy.

God tells Noah to build an Ark.

Gen 6:14 Make an ark of cypress timbers. You will make nests [or, *living areas, cells, pens*] in the ark. And you will cover it inside and outside with pitch.

Most translations read, **You will make rooms in the ark.** The word which is often translated *rooms* is qên (קֵן) [pronounced *cane*], which means *nest*, metaphorically *abode, living area*; possibly *cells, pens, chambers, rooms*. This word is found 13 times in the Old Testament; and the KJV translates it *nest* 12 of those times (for instance, Num. 24:21 Deut. 22:6 Job 29:18 Jer. 49:16). The implication is that these will be places designed for animal inhabitation. Strong's #7064 BDB #890. In other words, the ark will not be a huge barge with animals wandering about aimlessly. Noah is building compartments (cages, enclosures) for them to live in.

Gen 6:14b And you will cover it inside and outside with pitch.

This is the first time we actually have the word *to cover*, which is the verb *kâphar* (כָּפַר) [pronounced *kaw-FAHR*] and it literally means *to cover, to cover over [with], to be covered [with]; to spread over*. It also means *to appease, to placate, to pacify; to pardon, to expiate; to obtain forgiveness; to free an offender of a charge*. Strong's #3722 BDB #497. This is the only time that we find this verb in the Qal stem (the normal verb stem). It is most often found in the Piel (intensive) stem, where it is most often translated *to atone, to make an atonement for*. Despite the cornucopia of definitions given, this word fundamentally means *to cover over, to cover up*. We covered the [Doctrine of Atonement](#) back in [lesson #39](#). The idea of *atonement* is not to issue a full and complete pardon for one's sins, but a temporary *covering over* of one's sins. We studied this word originally after Adam and the woman had sinned. God killed an animal—an animal sacrifice to represent Jesus Christ dying for our sins—and covered them with the skin of that animal. Even though the word *kâphar* was not found, the concept was there. We most often find this word associated with the sacrifice of innocent and perfect animals sacrificed in order to cover over our sins (Ex. 29:36–37 30:10 Lev. 1:4 4:20, 26). Daniel prophesied the coming of the Messiah in order to atone for our sins (Daniel 9:24). Finally, it is not the blood of bulls and goats which takes away our sins; but the substitutionary death of Jesus Christ which provides us full and complete forgiveness (Heb. 10:4–10).

Covering the ark with pitch is a picture of salvation; those inside, kept in the ark (which is covered with pitch), would be saved; those on the outside would all die. There was only one doorway into the ark.

Quite obviously, from a practical standpoint, the pitch (tar, asphalt) applied to the inside and outside of the ark made it water-tight.

We will cover the spiritual meaning of the ark in greater detail in the next lesson.

Lesson 63: Genesis 6:13–16

The Doctrine of the Ark

Gen 6:13 And God said to Noah, “The end of all flesh has come before Me, for the earth is filled with violence [= *Hamas*] because of them [the *giants*]. And, behold, I will destroy them with the earth.”

God pronounces judgment of the earth. However, God always allows for there to be a period of time during which man can respond and believe in Him (and for believers to return to fellowship and Bible doctrine). This is known as *grace before judgment*, which concept even finds its way into residential lease contracts (the *grace period*, the time between when rent is due and when late fees begin to accumulate). In our context, the grace period is 120 years (Gen. 6:3).

Gen 6:14 Make an ark of cypress timbers. You will make nests [or, *living areas, cells, pens*] in the ark. And you will cover it inside and outside with pitch.

Here is the picture: Noah and his family will be inside of the ark, which is *covered over* with *pitch* (a noun cognate of *to cover over*); so their sins are temporarily covered over and they are delivered (saved) from the flood (the judgment of God). The sins of all Old Testament saints were covered over and they were saved from the ultimate judgment of God because they believed in Jehovah Elohim. When Jesus dies for the sins of all mankind, their sins are then forgiven and no longer just covered over. This is why we do not find the words *atone* or *atonement* in the New Testament (the KJV incorrectly translates a word *atonement* in Rom. 5:11).²⁰

I've gone back to [lesson #39](#) and added a few points to the [Doctrine of Atonement](#).

Notice that we are only in chapter 6 of the book of Genesis, and we have yet again another shadow image of Jesus Christ and of His salvation.

I don't want to beat a dead horse here, but again and again, we have real historical events which also have a shadow meaning.

What the Ark of Noah Represents	
Noah's Ark	What it Represents
God told Noah to build the ark and God told Noah exactly what to build.	This is God's plan. We can choose to participate in this plan or not. His plan is grace and protection; choosing against God means choosing judgment and destruction.
Noah and his family will be inside of the ark.	The ark is God's design (God's plan), and being inside of the ark is deliverance [= salvation] for Noah's family. This is analogous to being <i>in Christ</i> .
The ark is covered with pitch (lit., <i>covered with a covering</i>).	The word used here is <i>kâphar</i> and it is used to cover over one's sins, a consistent theme of the Old Testament. <i>Kâphar</i> means <i>to cover over; to atone for</i> . This is a temporary measure. Noah and his family are not sinless; their sins need to be covered over. This is <i>not</i> forgiveness, which will be a New Testament theme.

²⁰ Many theologians take the word *atonement* and allow it to stand for *the substitutionary death of Jesus Christ*; however, strictly speaking, that is *not* how the Bible uses this very specific word.

What the Ark of Noah Represents

Noah's Ark	What it Represents
The flood is a literal flood; it is God's judgment of the world. Noah's family are in the ark; the ark is covered over with pitch, and they are all protected in the ark.	Noah and his family inside of the ark are preserved from the judgment of God. We will have a similar situation in the first Passover, where God will see the blood and He will pass over that house, and the family within is not judged.
There was only one entrance (door) into the ark.	Jesus said, "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man comes to the Father but by Me;" and "I am the door. If anyone enters through Me, he will be saved, and will go in, and will go out, and will find pasture" (John 14:6 10:9).

When Jesus spoke in parables, this was not a new thing—this is not something which Jesus suddenly invented. This is how God speaks to us from the Old Testament. All that happens in the Old Testament, which is recorded in the Bible, has meaning and purpose. The meaning and purpose of some real historical events was to be a shadow image of what was to come (or, as we have discussed before, a *type*, which makes sense and has its fulfillment in its *antitype*).

Therefore, it is logical that God in the flesh—Jesus Christ—*continue* to speak to us in parables.

The shadow images of things to come (primarily, of Jesus Christ Who would come and die for our sins) are found throughout the Old Testament.

Let's focus for a moment on the word *ark*. There are 3 arks in the Bible. Every time that we find an *ark* in the Bible, it is a shadow image of Jesus Christ and His death on the cross for our salvation (deliverance from judgment).

The Doctrine of Ark in the Bible

1. The Hebrew word for *ark* is *têbâh* (תֵּבַחַת) [pronounced *tay^b-VAW*], which means *an ark, a chest*. Strong's #8392 BDB #1061. It is found only in 3 passages in the Old Testament.
2. This is the word which we find in Gen. 6–8. Noah and his family will go into this ark, which is covered over with pitch, and they and everything inside of this ark will be saved from the judgment of God, which will destroy everything else. As we have just studied, associated with the word *ark* in this chapter are the words *atone* (*to cover over*) and a noun cognate of that word (*pitch*). By being inside of the ark, Noah and his family are covered over or shielded, if you will, from God's judgment. Their sins are *atoned for* (*covered over*). The ark is the salvation of Noah and his family. Being *in* the ark is analogous to being *in Christ*.

The Doctrine of Ark in the Bible

3. The next time we come across the word *ark* is in Ex. 2. A Jewish slave woman in Egypt gives birth to a child, but there is the edict from the pharaoh to kill all the children of the Jews (they are condemned from birth). The woman builds an ark out of reeds and covers it with pitch (a different word) in order to make it sea-worthy, and places her child in this ark, and he is delivered from judgment because he is in this ark. The daughter of the Pharaoh discovers this baby in the ark, afloat in the Nile, and she adopts him, despite the fact that he is a Hebrew boy (circumcision makes that obvious). Moses is this child and he represents both those who are saved from the judgment of God because he is in the ark; and he is a type of Christ as well. The ark is the salvation (deliverance and protection from judgment) of Moses and it will be the salvation (deliverance) of all the Jews as well. This association of Moses, the savior of the Jews and the ark, draws a straight line between the ark and the Savior. They are the same things. Therefore, our means of salvation is Jesus Christ. Ex. 2:1–10
4. The next time we find the word *ark*, it is in Ex. 25, where specific instructions are given to build *the Ark of God* (also called *the ark of the covenant*).
 - a. This ark would be a small box made out of wood (the wood represents the humanity of Jesus Christ) and it would be overlain with gold (which represents the Deity of Jesus Christ). Ex. 25:10–11
 - b. The ark would be designed so that it could be carried without touching it directly, because we cannot have direct contact with the righteousness of God (we cannot have direct contact with the gold of this ark). In order to move the ark (to have contact with the ark), there were rings fashioned along the sides of the ark and inserted into these rings would be poles made of wood, overlaid with gold (again, a picture of Jehovah, Who provides us a way to have contact with the righteousness of God). Ex. 20:12–16
 - c. On top of the ark was a *mercy seat* made from gold. The word for *mercy seat* is *kappôreth* (קַפֹּרֶת) [pronounced *kap-POH-reth*], which is a noun cognate that comes from the verb *to atone* (do you recognize the root?); and it means *cover, lid*, and we find it used only in the Bible for the *mercy seat* of the ark of the covenant. Strong's #3727 BDB #498. This lid covers are transgressions of the law and our rebelliousness. Ex. 25:17–22 26:34 30:6 31:7 35:19 37:6–9 39:35 40:20 Num. 7:89.
 - d. This ark, which represents Jesus Christ, is *hidden* from view. No one ever sees it (there are a few historical exceptions). It is kept in the Holy of Holies, which is in a compartment inside the Tabernacle (= a semi-permanent tent) of God. Most Jews never saw this ark; but they knew about it from the Word of God. Do you see the parallel? Most Jews would never see with their own eyes Jesus Christ; but He is revealed throughout the Old Testament. They knew about the coming Messiah from the Word of God. Ex. 40:21
 - e. One day each year, on the *Day of Atonement*, the High Priest (who represents Jesus Christ as well) goes into the Holy of Holies, and he

The Doctrine of Ark in the Bible

- sprinkles blood on the mercy seat, which is the covering over the ark. This sprinkling of the blood represents Jesus Christ on the cross dying for our sins. God sees the *covering* of acacia wood plated with gold and He sees the blood and He is *appeased* (or, *propitiated*). Lev. 16:2–34 23:24–27
- f. There were 3 things placed inside of the ark:
 - i. The table of the law, which represents our condemnation before God, as we cannot keep the Law of God. Deut. 10:2
 - ii. Also in the ark is the golden pot of manna, which represents the provision of God. Heb. 9:4
 - iii. Also in the ark is Aaron's rod which budded, which represents the resurrection. Heb. 9:4
 - iv. At some point in time, these latter 2 items were no longer to be found in the ark. 2Chron. 5:10
 - g. One more thing: the Ark of God, inside the Holy of Holies, was a piece of furniture associated with the Tabernacle of God. There were several pieces of furniture associated with the Tabernacle of God. If you left these pieces of furniture in place, but took away the Tabernacle (some of them were inside of the tabernacle, hidden from view; and some were outside and in plain view), you would be left with furniture arranged in the shape of a cross. Go here <http://kukis.org/Doctrines/TabernacleModel.htm> for a picture of this. This arrangement of the furniture was hidden from view from the Jews who worshipped there; but which shape could be discerned from knowing the Word of God (Bible doctrine). Again, what we cannot see is revealed in the Word of God.
 - h. The Ark of God was seen on limited occasions:
 - i. The Jews saw the Ark when it was carried over the Jordan River when they entered into the land of promise. In this way, the ark is associated with the fulfillment of the promises of God to every believer. Joshua 4
 - ii. The Ark of God was used at the battle of Jericho at the direction of God, and the walls of Jericho fell. In this way, the ark is associated with the final wars in the Tribulation and the destruction of God's enemies at that time. Joshua 6
 - iii. The Ark was taken out one time as a good luck charm when the Jews went to fight the Philistines. Not only were the Jews defeated, but the Ark was taken from them. Eli, the High Priest, died when he heard the Ark had been captured and that Israel was beaten badly by the Philistines. There are parallels which may be drawn between the death of the High Priest (who represents Jesus Christ), the capture of the Ark (called the glory of Israel), and the defeat of Israel and the 1st century A.D. when Christ is crucified and the Jews are overrun and defeated by the Romans; and their Temple is burned to the ground. 1Sam. 4
 - iv. However, many Philistines died when associated with this captured

The Doctrine of Ark in the Bible

- Ark (1Sam. 5). They returned the Ark to the Jews, but many Jews died as well, because they treated the Ark lightly (1Sam. 6). You cannot take Jesus lightly nor can you appropriate Him into your own culture and philosophy (Mark 7:21–23).
- v. The Ark is moved by David into Jerusalem. The first time he attempts to move the Ark, one of those bearing the Ark touches it and he dies (man cannot have direct contact with the righteousness of God). The second time David tried to move the Ark, he has studied the Bible, and he is successful (there is a right way of doing things and a wrong). This is done with much fanfare and celebration, and represents our Lord coming into Jerusalem on the final week before His crucifixion. 2Sam. 6
 - vi. The Ark is seen again after Solomon has built the Temple (which represents the Millennial reign of Jesus Christ on this earth).
 - vii. Similarly, Jesus Christ is revealed in the Old Testament as the Angel of God, and appears to a few men; as the God-man, He has a 3 or 4 year ministry; and after His death in His resurrection, He appears to a few men as well. Just as the ark remained hidden from man's eyes most of the time and is known only through the Word of God, so Jesus is hidden from man's eyes most of the time and only known through the Word of God
5. Interestingly enough, both the Ark of God and the Tabernacle fade into the background when David comes on the scene. This is because David is a type of Christ. He represents the 1st and 2nd Advents of Jesus Christ and Solomon, his son, represents the Millennial reign of Christ.

To me, all of this is amazing. I have studied the Bible for over 30 years, and I review material like this, and I am still amazed and impressed by the Word of God.

The ark of Noah is a shadow image of Jesus Christ and our salvation in Him. Noah will be in the ark, his sins covered over, and because of this, he and his family will be delivered from the judgment of God. We are in Christ through faith in Him, and our sins are forgiven, and we will be delivered from eternal judgment because we are in Him (in fact, one of the most common phrases in the New Testament is *in Christ* or *in Him*).

We are only partway through the 6th chapter of the first book of the Bible; do you remember how many shadow images of Jesus Christ that we have had already? He was revealed in the judgment of the serpent; He was revealed in the animal sacrifice which would have preceded God clothing Adam and Eve with animal skins; He was revealed in Abel's sacrifice, which was acceptable, where Cain's was not; He was revealed in the first genealogical line; and here He is revealed in the ark in which Noah and his family will be saved. We are only 6 chapters into the first book of the Bible and the recurrent theme is Jesus Christ and His death for our sins.

Gen 6:13 And God said to Noah, “The end of all flesh has come before Me, for the earth is filled with violence because of them [the *giants*]. And, behold, I will destroy them *with* the earth.”


God’s judgment is certain.

Gen 6:14 Make an ark of cypress timbers. You will make nests [or, *living areas, cells, pens*] in the ark. And you will cover it inside and outside with pitch.

There is a way out. Because of the principle of grace before judgment, God would give man 120 years to believe in Him (Gen. 6:3).

Gen 6:15 This is how you are to make it: The ark will be 450 feet long, 75 feet wide, and 45 feet high.

Your Bible may give this information in *cubits*. A cubit is approximately 18 inches, or half a yard; so the Ark is 150 yards (450 feet) long and 25 yards (75 feet) long. That is nearly 34,000 square feet (your house, if it is unusually large, is about a tenth of this size), and this will be 3 stories high (v. 16), each story being approximately 15 feet high. The total square footage is somewhat smaller than 2 football fields. If you live in a large house (3400 sq ft), the ark of Noah has 30X the living area.



From <http://www.answersingenesis.org/assets/images/articles/am/v2/n2/ships.jpg>

According to *Answers in Genesis*, Greeks built wooden ships this large 2000 years ago and Chinese built wooden ships this large in the 1400's.²¹

The dimensions given here are quite reasonable for a sea worthy vessel to function in an inhospitable water environment, and not dissimilar to large ocean liners used today. In contrast to this, the ark of the Gilgamesh epic measured 200'x200'x200', which is not at all sea-worthy.

²¹ From <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/nab/really-a-flood-and-ark> accessed January 26, 2010.

The ark narrative is presented quite matter-of-factly, but we really do not know the specifics as to *how* this ark was built. Bear in mind that, from Adam to Noah, man's body, and therefore his mind, was far greater than ours. So there may have been great scientific achievements prior to the flood, which would have included metals and tools (recall, we have been told that some descendants of Cain worked with metals and some played musical instruments—Gen. 4:21–22).

Because the line of Cain worked with metals and devised musical instruments, we have reasonably assumed that man also had tools for farming, gardening and building. We do not know the exact nature or origin of these tools, but there is every reason to believe they existed. When it came to the killing of the animal used to clothe Adam and the woman (in order to cover them), we are not specifically told if there was a knife involved. When Abel offered up his animal sacrifices, we are not told if he used a knife (however, that seems to be what a New Testament passage tells us). When Cain killed Abel, we are not told how; although it is reasonable to suppose that Cain observed Abel killing the animal sacrifices and he killed Abel in the same way. If a knife was used, these passages make a great deal more sense.

Another clue that there were tools at the beginning of man, is Gen. 4:2, where Cain is called a *tiller* of the soil, and Adam is associated with *working* the soil in Gen. 2:5, 15 3:23 (this is the same Hebrew verb). Although this Hebrew word cannot be attached directly to the use of tools, tools are at least implied.

This may confuse you because we think in terms of the bronze age and then the iron age, but when technology is lost, as it would have been in the flood, man cannot immediately get it back. You probably use a car and a computer every single day. So, if you had to start from scratch, could you build a computer or a car? Could you even make a screwdriver or tweezers?

Whether God passed tools along to Adam or not, we do not know—although that seems to be the case. However, early man, being far more brilliant than we are today, certainly developed tools. My educated guess, given what God, Abel, Cain and now Noah are able to do; tools are involved in the building of the ark. The first mention of any sort of specific implement is in Gen. 22, where Abraham is about to use a knife to sacrifice his son Isaac.

In terms of archeological discoveries, one of my sources tells me that the first tools were discovered among the 3rd level of the excavation of the mound of Ugarit, where there are *signs of skillful work with metals* at the beginning of the Bronze Age, which predates Abraham by about 1000 years (placing these discoveries around the time of the flood itself). If they had tools close to the time that they exited the ark; then it is reasonable that they had tools before that.

Gen 6:16 You are to make a window [roof? opening? light?], finishing the sides of the ark to within 18 inches of the upper portion [roof?]. You are to put a door in the side of the ark. Make it with lower, middle, and upper decks.

The actual meaning of the first word in this verse (in the Hebrew) is disputed, because this same word is translated *noon*, *noonday*, *midday*, elsewhere. It is therefore taken by many to indicate *light*. This appears to be ventilation at the top of this ark. The Jewish tradition is, this is a large translucent stone which was used as sort of a window (to allow light in). No doubt, Noah needed light and ventilation, but the exact nature of this is unknown to us.

For those who know this narrative, Noah does open a *window* in Gen. 8, but it is a different word altogether. If I was to make an educated guess, I would say that we have an 18 in. opening all around the ark near the top of the ark. The top story of the ark is about 15 ft. high, so this opening would have provided ventilation and light, but it would not have been used to look out. It could have been built in such a way that there was a bit of an overlap as well. Again, this is just speculation.

The ark was a 3-story affair. Probably each son was in charge of one level; and Noah meandered about, in charge of the whole thing. The animals, no doubt, were reasonably distributed. All of the birds, for instance, were probably in the same general area.

There was only one door; again, analogous to salvation. Jesus said, "**I am the door; if any man enters in through Me, he will be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture.**" (John 10:9).

Gen 6:14–16 Make an ark of cyprus timbers for yourself. You shall make rooms in the ark; and you shall cover it with asphalt inside and out. And you shall make it this way: The length of the ark shall be 300 cubits, its breadth 50 cubits, and its height 30 cubits. You shall make an opening in the ark, and you shall finish it above to a cubit. And you shall set the door of the ark in its side. You shall make it with lower, second, and third stories.

It is likely that the directions which God gives are more detailed than this, but not much more. One of the things which we too often ignore is man's creative power—we are made in the image of God and we know that God is a creative Person. A single living cell is so complex that we do not know all there is to know about all that a single cell does, and yet, God created our bodies to be made out of millions of these cells, and in most of our cells, we have our DNA, which are the building plans for our entire body. In building man and animals, it is clear that God is a creative genius. We are made in God's image and we also have a desire to create. God is putting Noah's creative forces into action.

Let me give a personal illustration. I am in the midst of adding some square footage to my house, and, apart from the basic structure, I have a hand in everything else, from the floor plan to the materials used, to the electrical circuitry, etc. Adding on a few square feet is actually quite complex and involves everything I know and a lot of stuff that I didn't know (who knew there are about a dozen ways of hooking up a two-way light switch?). It is a fascinating process, one which may involve the rest of my life, and I enjoy doing it. This is because God has placed in me this desire to create. I have a friend of mine who used to work for the Franchise Tax Board (in Sacramento) and early on in his career, he developed one of their tax forms. I recall him being pretty jazzed about this, and, at the time, I did not quite get *why*, but now I get it. It was something he created.

The most common thing that we create is a child, and this is done best within the confines of a marriage. God uses this creative process to instill us with some responsibility and to better understand our relationship to Him. Our relationship to a child is very much like God's relationship to us. One of the most remarkable things in a parent's life is the creation of a child, and then the raising of that child. We have so much control and responsibility in raising a child that it is almost mind-boggling. What we do with our child in the first 5–10 years essentially determines that child's future. The way that we deal with this little creation after he or she is born is also a very creative process. And just when we think that we have it all figured out, that child then throws us a curve ball, causing us to re-engage all of our creative focus.

Noah is a creative being; God created Noah that way. Noah wants to create things. God does not snap His fingers and say, "Here's your ark" and *poof*, there is the ark. God has Noah build it. And you know what? Noah loved building this ark. This engaged all of Noah's creative processes. At the same time, Noah fathered 3 or more children. Noah's creative instincts are kicked into high gear.

For at least 120 years, Noah and his family were ridiculed; and Noah got to take solace in this incredible project which God gave him to do—to build an ark. There is nothing like the smell of newly cut wood; and there is nothing in life like working with wood. Don't think of the building of this ark as some big, horrendous project that God laid at the feet of Noah and Noah did it because he was a faithful servant of God, and blah, blah, blah. Building this ark and raising his 3 boys was the highlight of Noah's life.

Furthermore, God gave Noah *creative license*. That is part of the enjoyment of the creative process. When a house is built, there are building plans; however, you can take the exact same set of building plans and end up with 2 very different houses. That is the creative process. If you have ever bought a house in a subdivision with houses all built by the same builder, then you have maybe a dozen plans to choose from. However, what made your house *yours* is how you finished it off; the kitchen cabinets you chose, the flooring you had installed, the various fixtures which you picked out. That is the creative process. If a builder told you which floor plan you would buy and exactly all that would be installed in that house, and you have no say in the matter, that builder would go out of business in a week!

God allows Noah's creative juices to flow. Noah makes many of the executive decisions on this ark. God gives Noah some specifications, probably in a little more detail than we find here, but still allowing Noah to make many of the creative choices. This is why this was not an onerous project laid upon Noah, but rather, the highlight of Noah's creative life.

Gen 6:17 And behold! I, even I, am bringing a flood of waters upon the earth in order to destroy all flesh (in which *is* the breath of life) from under the heavens. Everything which *is* in the earth shall die.

I find this to be interesting—God first tells Noah to build an ark, and He gives Noah the dimensions and the specifics, but He does not say *why*. God tells Noah, "The end of all

flesh is before Me...I will destroy them. Now, you make an ark of cyprus timbers for yourself.” (Gen. 6:13–14). And then God gives Noah the building plans. *After* God tells Noah how the ark ought to be built, then God tells him why.

Lesson 65: Genesis 6:14–17

The Miracles of God

Gen 6:14–17 [God instructed Noah] “Make an ark of cyprus timbers for yourself. You shall make rooms in the ark; and you shall cover it with asphalt inside and out. And you shall make it this way: The length of the ark shall be 300 cubits, its breadth 50 cubits, and its height 30 cubits. You shall make an opening in the ark, and you shall finish it above to a cubit. And you shall set the door of the ark in its side. You shall make it with lower, second, and third stories. And behold! I, even I, am bringing a flood of waters upon the earth in order to destroy all flesh (in which *is* the breath of life) from under the heavens. Everything which *is* in the earth shall die.”

Before we go on, I want you to imagine the various ways that God could have preserved Noah, his family and the animals of the earth. God Himself could have made a huge platform and then brought everyone aboard the platform and floated it above the clouds while He destroyed the other inhabitants of the earth. Or, God could have turned all that He wanted to be saved into ethereal beings, unaffected by the changes in the earth, and then changed them back to physical beings, after flooding and then drying out the earth. There are virtually millions of ways that God could have miraculously delivered Noah and his family. However, God chooses to make Noah build an ark, according to God’s specifications, and the narrative here is very straightforward and lacking in miracles, weirdness, or impossible dimensions and incredible situations (apart from the flood itself). In this and the next couple chapters, we will see a very normal set of directions and circumstances for a very abnormal time. The flood itself will be quite spectacular. However, the salvation of Noah and his family and the animals will be very specific and very reasonable.

Let me make a general point: although there are miracles in the Bible as well as miraculous circumstances, these are actually few and far between and really not that awe-inspiring, historically speaking. Seeing Moses turn the waters of Egypt to blood or Jesus healing a man blind since birth would have been quite impressive to the eyewitnesses there. However, to us, several thousand years later, it is not as remarkable. God knows this.

Furthermore, the effect of miracles on those who witness them is not as dramatic as you would suppose. Jews and Egyptians alike saw the wonders which occurred at the hand of Moses, and the Jews believed and the Egyptians did not. 10’s of thousands of people (maybe 100’s of thousands) saw Jesus heal, and some believed in Him and some did not. Those who were negative toward Him tried to get him to incorrectly interpret Old Testament passages or they questioned whether it was lawful for Him to heal on the Sabbath, but they did not tend to question Jesus’ miracles. When Jesus healed men who were blind or lame since birth, and everyone knew who these men were, it was hard to argue that He had not

really healed them. However, the very people who were unable to explain away Jesus' miracles which they themselves witnessed were still negative toward our Lord.

More importantly, being an eyewitness to a miracle does not carry you through a difficult situation. Peter was right there with Jesus and observed miracle after miracle, and, unlike many of the scribes and Pharisees, Peter had believed in Jesus. Yet, when Jesus was seized to be crucified, Peter denied Him 3 times. Peter had already confessed that Jesus was the Messiah, but the problem with Peter was in his soul. Therefore, witnessing great miracles could not carry Peter during the crucifixion of our Lord. Jesus is seized and then crucified, and Peter's world just fell apart. Peter probably witnessed more miracles than anyone else in human history (along with James and John), and yet, he cannot keep it together for even a few hours while Jesus is being held and tried. Clearly miracles did not strengthen Peter's soul.

There is a stripe of believer today for whom miracles are nearly everything. They believe in a Holy Ghost revival with signs and tongues and healings and miracles. Some tout that they believe in a *Big God* (that is, a God Who does miracles for them to see); as over against a God Who appears to be both staid and power-deficient (to them). There is no doubt that God has the ability to heal the sick; God does heal and God heals miraculously (or by means which appear to be miraculous). However, this is an infrequent occurrence, and almost never occurs on some sort of stage with thousands of people watching.

When it comes to a miracle in the sense of defying the laws of nature, there are actually very few of these in the Bible, considering the scope of the Bible (4000–5000 years of human history). It is not that God is unable to function outside of scientific laws and principles (which He invented and put into place); it is simply that, most of the time, He chooses not to. Why would God put together such a tremendous collection of very complex laws if He was simply going to ignore them most of the time?

Given the earth as God created it, it is possible that everything found in the flood epic will be according to the laws of physics and meteorology. The end result of a worldwide flood which conforms to the laws which God has set up is far more spectacular than a flood that is simply miraculous, without a scientific explanation.

There are primarily 4 periods of time in human history when there were an unusual number of miracles occurring within a short time span (and, in many cases, some of these were not miracles, but they simply appeared to be miracles).

Miracles in the Bible

Time Period	Text/Commentary
The Exodus	<p>There were fewer than a dozen miracles which were performed in Egypt in order to get the Pharaoh to let the Israelites go (or, more accurately, to demonstrate the power of God to Pharaoh and to the people of God). There were also about as many miraculous events which took place when the Jews were wandering out in the desert. This was important because it established the nation Israel as God's nation—as a client nation to God—and as the most important national entity in the Old Testament. Not every Jew saw every miracle of God during this time period, but they saw most of them. Over a period of several years, the average Jew saw 15–20 amazing things. What is fascinating is, those who were adults and saw all of these incredible miracles with their own eyes, were absolute spiritual failures under Moses' leadership, and every one of them died the sin unto death in the desert (with barely a handful of exceptions).</p> <p>Two things ought to be clear: even though God did a number of miraculous things, there were not really that many that He did. Furthermore, those who saw these things did not have their souls reinforced with great faith.</p> <p>These miracles accomplished a few specific things: Israel became known throughout the world for what happened—2 million slave Jews picked up their belongings and walked out of Egypt and established a nation, something which had never been done in Human history, before or since. Secondly, most of the Israelites developed enough faith to get them to the next miracle without completely falling apart. Thirdly, the authority of Moses was confirmed, so that the Law of Moses was accepted by the Jews as authoritative from the beginning.</p>
Elijah and Elisha	<p>God was revealed in His Word and in Kings David and Solomon (David represents the 1st and 2nd advents of Jesus Christ and Solomon represents His Millennial reign). However, that was about to change as, kings would no longer meet David's standard. They would be <i>like their father, David</i>, at best; but, clearly, no subsequent king of Israel would ever be as important as David. This ushered in the time of the prophets, whose authority was over that of the kings, and whose words became far more important than the edicts of their kings. Because the focus of the authorities ordained by God was dramatically changed, God made this known by a number of miracles.</p>

Miracles in the Bible

Time Period	Text/Commentary
The Incarnation of Jesus Christ	<p>One of the things which is ignored about Jesus is that His public ministry was confined to a very small area and to a very short period of time and to a very limited number of people (Billy Graham, in one television broadcast, reaches more people than Jesus did). Jesus needed to show that He was the Messiah, and this needed to be shown in such a way that no one could deny Who He was (apart from extreme negative volition). He established Who He was through healings and miracles. These were His credit card, so to speak. When the disciples of John the Baptist came to Him, they asked if He was the Messiah or if they should look for another, Jesus replied, “Go and tell John what you have seen and heard; that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the gospel is proclaimed to the poor.” (Luke 7:22b). These miracles were evidence of Who He was.</p> <p>We are so anthropocentric that we often miss this. The alleviation of suffering was not Jesus’ primary reason for healing—else, He, having the power of God, could have snapped His fingers and everyone in the world would have been healed instantly of whatever infirmity they had. Healing a person showed Jesus to be Who He is, and secondarily, to illustrate that He is the Great Physician—we go to Him for ultimate and complete healing (i.e., salvation, as we are permeated with our sin natures, a disease from birth that only Christ can heal).</p>
The Early Church	<p>The church was a dramatic shift in the plan of God. Therefore, the early authorities in the church and the church itself had to be established by the hand of God. In less than 50 years, local churches with a new mission plan were established, along with a new set of authorities completely separate from the Mosaic Law and separate from the nation Israel. Simultaneously, the Romans destroyed Jerusalem and the Temple.</p>

Miracles were used extensively (by comparison to other generations) during these 4 periods of time, because each was a dramatic shift in God’s representative authority (or, authorities) on earth.

However, it is important to note that, in all instances, many chose not to believe the miracles that they saw with their own eyes and many of those who saw these miracles were not strengthened spiritually, as with the disciples of Jesus or the Exodus generation.

These miracles had a two-fold purpose: to usher in the new age or the change of God's policy (by indicating who had the authority); and the individual miracles themselves were generally very meaningful and representative. That is, when Jesus, for instance, made a blind man see, this was not about the physical cure for blindness; this was all about someone being blind to Jesus, being made to see by the power of the Holy Spirit, and consequently believing in Him. When Jesus healed someone of an infirmity—the actual personal healing aspect is the least important facet of the healing. Such a healing represented someone with a sin nature, which appeared to be incurable, and yet, Jesus Christ is able to solve the problem of the sin nature (i.e., cure the man with the infirmity, which represents the sin nature).

God did not do meaningless magic tricks, like taking a cute live bunny named *Loaffish*, toss him into a tree branch mulcher, and then later produce this bunny unharmed. This is a trick which God could have performed by means of any of His representatives, but it would have been meaningless. Entertaining, but meaningless.

People are confused by the concept of miracles because they think, *that is where God's great power is*. Wrong; the great power of God is in the soul of the individual believer. Remember, we are here to resolve the Angelic Conflict (as discussed in [lessons 4–5](#)). If we observe a miracle, our response would be, "Wow, cool; let me see another." There is no spiritual strength in that. You might witness a dozen miracles in one week, and the next week, when your soul is tested, you do not pass or fail because you saw a bunch a miracles, you pass or fail based upon what is in your soul (that is, do you have a soul filled with divine truth or do you have a soul filled with human viewpoint?). Witnessing a miracle does not build up your soul, nor is witnessing a miracle necessary for someone to believe in Jesus Christ. It is the truth that is powerful; it is the Word of God which is alive and powerful.

Paul wrote a lot of letters to a lot of churches, and not one time did he ever write, "I hear your church is pretty dead. Your members are said to be lacking in energy, and no one new is joining your church. What you need to do is rent a stage and do a bunch a signs and wonders on that stage, and that will get the locals interested and get your congregation re-energized." What did Paul write in his letters to the churches? Bible doctrine. Spiritual mechanics, theology, Christology, soteriology, angelology, etc. Paul fed the soul. When a church got out of line or their faith appeared to be waning, Paul did not promise them, "Okay, just wait till I get there, and show you this new miracle; it is going to blow your minds and strengthen your faith like you would not believe." When Paul wrote a congregation that he was coming to them, it was all about what he was going to teach them. What happens in your soul is a million times more important than signs and wonders.

You may go to a church or to some sort of revival meeting, and you observe people speaking in tongues, a minister touching people on the head, and they flail backwards, and other people you don't know claiming to be healed. For most people, believers and unbelievers alike, they do not see the power of God here; in some churches where this activity is intense, many unbelievers feel as if they have walked into an asylum. However, if these same unbelievers know someone whose life has been turned around—a person

used to be a thief, a drug addict, a liar; and now they appear to be rid of these defects—that catches the unbeliever’s attention. When they know someone whose sole focus in the past was appeasing his own appetite, and now this person is changed, that bears a second look. The power of God is what He does in our souls, not in some 3rd rate sideshow put on by some 4th rate performers. God’s power is illustrated more dramatically when He conforms to the very scientific laws which He established. God’s power is quite impressive when the unbeliever reads or hears the words, “Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and you are saved” (Acts 16:31) and then believes. Because, it is the Word of God which is alive and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the division of the soul and the spirit, and the joints and the marrow, and is able to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart (Heb. 4:12). There is no doubt power in signs and wonders which God has performed throughout the ages, but far more important than these things is God’s Word and His day to day function in our everyday lives.

Noah illustrates this point beautifully. Had Noah and his family been put into a spacecraft designed by God, and allowed to hover over the earth and watch the earth being flooded, this miracle would have been quite spectacular. However, since none of us saw it, the amount that we are impressed by this miracle would be inversely proportional to the phenomenal nature of the miracle itself. What is far more spectacular is presenting a very logical, reasonable means of salvation in the midst of an unimaginable flood. Did you realize that hundreds of books have been written about this one incident in the Bible (tens of thousands, if children’s books are included)?

Critics berate this narrative of the ark, which, in turn, forces believers to examine this event and to evaluate its reasonableness. Both believers and unbelievers have gone so far as to determine the number of animals brought onto the ark, what their size was, how much food and water would be required by them, how one could deal with their waste, etc. Every detail of the ark and the flood has been examined thoroughly, to determine, *is this even possible?* Gen. 6–8 has spawned millions of words and discussions and arguments—far more than would a miracle of shrinking Noah and his family and the animals to the size of mites and having them live in the mouth of a turtle while the rains fell. Could God have done this? Certainly. What would our response have been? We would have simply relegated that flood narrative with all of the flood stories which are, in part, myths.

Hundreds of thousands of people do not discuss or argue about the Epic of Gilgamesh. As soon as it is known that their ark measured 200' x 200' x 200', there are no more passionate arguments. What is to discuss? Those measurements for a sea-worthy craft are goofy. That epic may have had some historical impact and various peoples are various times might have taken parts of it seriously (like watching the movie *Star Wars*); however, any person who knows anything about boats and water would have just dismissed the Epic of Gilgamesh out of hand. In fact, despite there being dozens of flood myths from dozens of nations and peoples, no one argues about any of them and no one writes books about these myths as being historically accurate or historically inaccurate. The moment you know the dimensions of their ark (or some of the other improbable details), there is nothing more to discuss.

But, Noah's ark? People will argue this. And, what is most fascinating, is, those who will argue against it are often the ones making up the most absurd data. You have authors who argue that certain animals could not have been captured and kept—apparently authors who have never been to a zoo before. You have other authors who argue that the stench would have been too great—apparently authors who have never been inside a barn before. There are authors who argue that the ark would have been destroyed by lightning striking it, apparently unaware that ships travel the oceans daily without being destroyed by lightning. They argue that ship worms would have destroyed the ark or that a wooden ship would not have been sea-worthy.²² Anything and everything that you can imagine, associated with this narrative, has been argued again and again, and in surprising detail. This is all because God chose not to rescue Noah and his family and the animals of the earth by some miraculous means but instead tells Noah what to do and then leaves it up to Noah to take care of it. Noah does what God tells him to do because of the strength of Noah's soul.

Noah is going to come to the place where, virtually everyone in the world disagrees with him and thinks that he is a nut. Although God protected his family from physical harm, can you imagine the ridicule? There were perhaps billions of people on the earth at this time, and those who knew about Noah (most of them) ridiculed him. And for 120 years, Noah focused on building the ark, collecting the animals, and raising his sons to take care of these animals on board this ark. All this during a time when it had never rained before. No one had ever seen a drop of rain. That determined nature requires a powerful soul, not a plethora of miracles.

Furthermore, as has been discussed before, there is more to this than the narrative being reasonable and rational—what happens in these chapters is also meaningful. There are a number of spiritual principles which are connected to the ark and the flood, which were discussed in [Lesson #63](#).

Allow me a personal testimony here: when I first believed in Jesus Christ, I knew next to nothing about Jesus and about the Bible. It was, for all intents and purposes, blind faith. I read the words of the book of John, was convinced by the Holy Spirit, and I believed in Jesus. However, since then, God has allowed me the time to study His Word, and it has increased my faith and given substance and reason to my faith in Jesus. It is His Word which has been more depth to my faith; not a litany of miraculous experiences. In the year 1980, or thereabouts, I witnessed something which was quite amazing, something which I have not shared with more than 3 or 4 people because I knew no one would believe me. That incident did not strengthen my faith. That incident did not suddenly shift my spiritual life into 3rd gear. What was far more important was the Bible class that I went to an hour or two later. It is the **Word of God** which **is alive and powerful**, far more than signs and miracles and wonders.

²² These examples are taken from real critics of the historicity of the ark who actually have written books on this topic from John Woodmorappe's book *Noah's Ark: A Feasibility Study*. I do not recommend the book unless you, after studying the ark and the flood, believe this to be some made up story.

If you are reading this right now, you probably have already believed in Jesus Christ. However, what has possibly amazed you in this study is how many times Jesus has appeared to us in the first 6 chapters of Genesis in shadow form. The more you know the Word of God, the stronger will be your faith; and the more reasonable and logical Jesus will become. When the shadow image of Jesus Christ occurs again and again and again; you start to realize that the Bible is the Word of God and that Jesus is the Son of God, the God-man, the Revealed Member of the Trinity.

Lesson 66: Genesis 6:13–21

God's Covenant with Noah and with us

So far, in Gen. 6, all mankind has become corrupt, so almost all of those alive on the earth are part human, part angel. God has apparently designed the angelic body so that it can exhibit physical manifestations. The two angels who came to Lot appeared so human to the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, that they desired to rape them (Gen. 19:1–10). The angel at the tomb of Jesus Christ rolled away the stone to let the world in (Matt. 28:2). These events require that these angels possess some sort of physical manifestation, to be able to interact with the physical environment around them. So, throughout the Bible, angels are allowed human-like, physical manifestations. Therefore, Gen. 6:1–5 is in keeping with the rest of the Bible.

In Gen. 6:6–12, God pronounces judgment on the earth; however, Noah was spiritually mature (= complete, perfect) before Him. So God warns Noah that He is about to destroy all flesh from the earth, and that Noah must build an ark (Gen. 6:13–16).

Gen 6:17 [God is speaking to Noah] “And behold! I, even I, am bringing a flood of waters upon the earth in order to destroy all flesh (in which *is* the breath of life) from under the heavens. Everything which *is* in the earth shall die.

God promises a flood to kill all human and animal life (apart from the animals in the seas). God's judgment is clearly presented, there is a time clock for this judgment, and it is certain.

As presented in the Bible, God first told Noah what he was to do—build an ark according to the specifications which God gave him. Then God tells him *why* he needs to build an ark: “I am bringing a flood of waters upon the earth in order to destroy all flesh...” God has already spoken of the degeneracy on the earth and that He would destroy them, but this is where God first explains *how* He would judge them: with a *flood of waters*.

The word used here is mabbûwl (מַבְּבֹוּל) [pronounced *mahb-BOOL*], which means *flood, deluge, an inundation of water*. Strong's #3999 BDB #550. This word is only used for the great flood of Gen. 6–8 (it is also found in Psalm 29, but as a reference back to Gen. 6–8).

Gen 6:18 But I will establish My covenant with you. And you shall come into the ark, you and your sons and your wife and your sons' wives with you.

This is the first time we have the word *covenant*, which is a fundamental concept in Scripture—particularly in the Old Testament. We may reasonably refer to the Old and New Testaments as the Old and New Covenants (or, by the more modern-sounding Old and New Contracts). God lays down the agreement between Himself and Noah.

In modern times, we tend to view contracts as made between two equal parties. Charlie Brown wants to buy Lucy's house, so they enter into a written agreement concerning this transaction, which agreement is called an earnest money contract. Even though covenants (contracts) in the Bible can refer to similar arrangements, what we find more often is a contract made between a superior and his inferiors, known in ancient history as a suzerain-vassal treaty. A typical suzerain-vassal treaty may be established between a conquering general-king and the country he has just conquered. He promises not to invade this country again, not to level its houses and rape the women there; and, in return, the citizens of this country must raise up a few million dollars each year in order to pay him not to do this (and there are often protections from other kings included in this covenant).

This is how we should view the covenant between God and Noah (and Noah's family). God has certain things which He expects Noah to do (to build the ark, to gather up animals to preserve in the ark, and put his family inside before the rain begins to fall) and God promises that He will preserve them. This language here is very precise—God establishes His covenant with Noah only (in the Hebrew, *you* is a 2nd person masculine singular suffix).

Let's look at this passage as a whole, where God is speaking to Noah:

Gen. 6:13–21 And God said to Noah, “The end of all flesh has come before Me, for the earth is filled with violence because of them [the race of half-angel, half-man creatures]. Therefore, listen [carefully], I am destroying them with the earth. Construct for yourself an ark of cyprus timbers. You will construct rooms in the ark. Furthermore, you will pitch [= cover, atone] it inside and outside with pitch. And this is the way you will construct it: the length of the ark will be 450 feet; the width of it will be 75 feet; and its height 45 feet. You will make a window [opening?] in the ark, and you will finish it above within 18 inches. And you will set the door of the ark in the side of it. You will make it with lower, second and third stories. Now listen: I, even I, am bringing a [worldwide] flood of waters upon the earth in order to destroy all flesh (in which is the breath of life) from under the heavens. Everything which is in the earth will die. But I will establish My covenant [= contract, treaty] with you. And you will come into the ark, you and your sons and your wife and your sons' wives with you. And you will bring into the ark two of every kind, of every living thing of all flesh, to keep them alive with you. They will be male and female. Two of every kind will come to you to keep them alive; of fowls after their kind, and of cattle after their kind, of every creeping thing of the earth after its kind. And take for yourself all food that is eaten, and you will gather for yourself. And it will be for food, for you and for them [the animals].”

In reading this passage, it appears as if God is speaking to Noah all at once. However, there is nothing in the text which completely rules out God appearing to Noah on several subsequent occasions. The directions given here to Noah are not so complex as to require them to be given at different times. So, if this is spoken all at one time, that God would be

speaking 120 years before the flood, before Noah has these 3 sons and before these sons have wives. For all we know, Noah may not even be married at this time. In any case, God giving instructions about the future, with details from the future (Noah's sons, in this case), is not unusual. I have heard the figure that as much as a fifth of the Bible is prophetic. This would be very hard to quantify because there are a great many passages where one might argue as to their prophetic nature. You will recall the line of Adam as given in Gen. 5—it foretold the coming of Jesus Christ in the names of Adam's descendants. So, do you count that passage as prophetic or as merely a genealogy? If we include every passage where future things are taught in that passage, whether in shadow form, typology, or clearly given as prophetic, then 20% may even underestimate the amount of prophecy found in the Bible.

In any case, God is omniscient (Psalm 139:1–6, 12 Prov. 5:21), and this omniscience applies to time as well as to space, so God knows the end from the beginning. Therefore, it is not out of the question (or even out of the ordinary) for God to talk about Noah's sons even before they are born to him.

This almost takes us into the controversy between hyper-Calvinism and Arminianism. Calvinists see our point of contact with God as being His sovereignty, and that *everything* is a result of His sovereign decision to the point of *excluding* human free will. Therefore, if God wants you to be saved, you will be saved; and if God wants you to spend eternity in hell, you will spend eternity in hell. On the other end of the spectrum, in this theological debate, are the Arminians: and the free will of man to them is everything. Therefore, you can be saved on Monday, lose your salvation Monday night and then get it back on Tuesday. Not only is it possible for anyone to be saved, but it is possible for anyone to be lost as well (believers and unbelievers alike). No matter what you do in the Christian life, if you screw it up badly enough, the Arminian believes that you have lost your salvation (how bad is bad, depends upon the Arminian, who will, of course, always defer to God's opinion on these matters).

There is a better case to be made for God's sovereignty than for the idea that salvation is quite arbitrary, depending upon when you die; however, neither position is accurate. The key is the passage before us. God knows that Noah will have sons, that these sons will have wives, and that the sons and their wives will be believers and become a part of the new civilization. This is foreknowledge, not God forcing decisions upon the volition of Noah's sons. If you have your own child, you understand foreknowledge. You know that when you tell little Timmy not to touch the stove burner, the first thing he is going to do, when he sees his opening, is to drag a chair over to the stove and touch that burner. You know with little Amy, when you tell her to not touch the burner, she says, "Okay, Mom" and she means it. This does not mean that you control their free will and that they are completely subject to your sovereignty. You simply know your children and you can predict what they are going to do, based upon your knowledge of them. Therefore, you have free will (ideally speaking, you have sovereignty, in relationship to them); and they have free will as well. Their free will and your sovereignty coexist.

Rom. 8:29 describes the relationship between foreknowledge and predestination: **For the one He foreknew, [that one] He also predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son, to the end that He might be the firstborn among many brothers.** God has predestined for us to eventually be in the image of His Son, His Son Who would be the firstborn among many brothers (we are the *brothers*). This predestination is based upon His foreknowledge.

Ideally, what you want is for your children to make good decisions on their own, based upon the training which you give them. They are always your children; the familial relationship is never broken, no matter how they use their free will. However, unless you are insane, you want them to be able to use their own volition and enjoy (or, endure) the consequences of their decisions at some point in time (say, somewhere between age 18 and 21).

The relationship between man and God is quite similar. God is sovereign, but God has decreed (in His sovereignty) that man (and angels) would have free will. There are limitations on this free will (for instance, I cannot decide that tomorrow I will have a billion dollars or fly to the moon and back), but our will is truly free, within reasonable limitations (that is, I don't feel unnecessarily shackled by the fact that I cannot fly at will). So God is not ordering Noah to have children; God foreknows that Noah will have children and that they will join him on the ark. God is not applying overbearing sovereignty here upon Noah (or upon his children); God is simply telling Noah the parameters of what He expects, and God knows that Noah will fulfill these commands.

Before we leave this topic, let me speak to Arminianism: although we have free will, our free will is limited to what is possible. God has given us a *means* of salvation: we must believe in Jesus Christ (Jehovah Elohim in the Old Testament), and we are saved (Gen. 15:6 John 3:36). This faith is not the *basis* for our salvation, but it is the mechanics by which we are saved, as seen from the man-ward side.

Let me offer up an analogy: at your job, you are given an expense account of \$3000/month, which is a part of your contract. Now you may believe that this is true or not; and you may act upon this faith or not; but the availability of this expense account is there, whether you access it or not. Since this expense account is a matter of contract, you always have it, whether you draw upon this account or not. This expense account is maintained by the contract, not by your faith that you have an expense account.

Salvation is similar. The basis of our salvation is that Jesus Christ died for our sins; He took our place on the cross and bore the punishment for our sins (1Peter 2:24 = **He Himself bore our sins in His Own body on the tree, that dying to sins, we might live to righteousness; by Whose stripes you were healed**). God saves us if we believe in His Son and trust in His saving work. The basis for our salvation is Jesus' death on the cross; the man-ward side is faith in Him. However, once we believe in Jesus Christ, we have entered into a contract with God, and our salvation is always there. We do not lose that salvation. We are saved because Christ paid for our sins. In order to access this so great salvation, we trust in Jesus Christ and are thereby entered into a covenant (contract) with God. Our

entrance into salvation is not a matter of goodness or merit on our part; therefore, maintenance of this contract is not based upon our goodness or merit.

Faith is something which every person possesses and uses daily. Faith does not require intelligence, study, merit or goodness. We all have faith and we all exercise faith daily. So our entrance into the plan of God is a matter of a non-meritorious decision, faith in Jesus Christ, something which takes a few seconds. Once we enter into this contract with God, we certainly do not understand all the ramifications of that contract, but 2 parts of God's essence kick in at this point: His sovereignty and His eternal nature. Our salvation is not maintained by the mediocre life that we live as Christians; our salvation is maintained eternally by His sovereignty. Therefore, we can come to a point where we lose our faith, but we cannot lose our salvation. **If we are faithless, He remains faithful. He cannot deny Himself** (2Tim. 2:13). Our faith entered us into this contact with God, but the basis of our salvation is Christ's death on the cross, not our faith. Our subsequent failures and/or the mediocrity of our spiritual life do/does not affect, change, or abrogate our contact with God because we cannot undo what Christ did on the cross. We cannot override God's sovereignty, nor can we change or place some sort of time limit on the eternal nature of His contract with us.

God has allowed us the free will choice to believe in Him, and be saved forever; so once we have entered into this contract, His sovereignty maintains this contract. We still have free will, but this free will cannot break the bonds of the familial relationship. **You are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus** (Gal. 3:26). **"And I give eternal life to them, and they will not perish to perpetuity! Consequently, no one will pluck them out of My hand."** (John 10:28).

God's orders to Noah are based upon His foreknowledge of what Noah will do. God did not arbitrarily pick someone out of the crowd and say, "Hey, you; build Me an ark." God knew exactly how Noah would react and exactly what he would do. God is sovereign, but He allows Noah free will.

Lesson 67: Genesis 6:19–21

God's Instructions and Noah's Creativity

God has come to Noah, 120 years before the flood, and He enters into a contract (or, *covenant*) with Noah. In the previous lesson, we related God's orders to Noah to God's foreknowledge and to God's sovereignty.

Interestingly enough, we do not know how God appears to Noah. I would assume that God appeared to Noah much as He appeared to Adam—not in a dream or in a vision, but in a physical state of some sort, probably looking no different than any man. Before we proceed further in this narrative, let's think about that.

Religious literature and traditions are so much different from what we find in the Bible. There is absolutely no physical description of God in all the Bible unless He takes upon Himself a natural form (a cloud, a burning bush). No writer of Scripture ever tries to

describe what he sees when God takes on the physical form of a man. Can you imagine that? You meet God face to face, and you never describe how He appears to you. Every Old Testament writer who speaks to God remembers His words, but *never* gives a physical description of God Himself. There are more than a dozen men in the Old Testament who speak face to face with God, and not one of them describes what he sees. In fact, in many cases, it is even unclear as to how God communicated to them. They know the words of God, but some of them do not even tell us the circumstances by which these words come to them (which ought to indicate how important God's words are).

The same is true of Jesus. He appears to look so very average as to be nondescript. His enemies have so much difficulty in picking Him out from His disciples, that Judas must point Him out to His enemies (some of whom had already met Jesus and had spoken with Him). When the resurrected Christ appears to the two disciples on the Emmaus Road, they do not even know Who He is, at first (Luke 24:35). Somehow, their eyes were *prevented* from recognizing Him.

We only know one thing about the physical appearance of Jesus: He has a beard, which is based upon Old Testament prophecy in the psalms. We can ascertain one thing about our Lord's appearance—because He was physically very powerful, Jesus would have had a very good physic. However, apart from these two things, we have no physical description of Jesus except for His glorified state at the Mount of Transfiguration and a similar description in the book of Revelation. However, even in these descriptions, we do not have any sort of description of His human physical characteristics.

We would expect, with God appearing to dozens of men, that just one of them would give us a physical description of how He appears to them, but none of them do. We would think of the thousands of people who came into direct contact with Jesus that one of them would give us some sort of description of Him, but they never do. We have physical descriptions of David and Saul, for example; but none of God appearing as man in the Old Testament and none of Jesus. The pictures and statues that we see today are simply figments of various peoples' imaginations centuries later.

The Jews of the Old Testament were told not to attempt to make statues or any sort of image to represent God or that which is in heaven; and the Bible gives no description by which such a carved image could be made. This consistency is maintained beginning with Genesis 3 all the way to the end of the book of Revelation.

Back to our narrative, where God is speaking to Noah, giving him instructions:

Gen 6:19–20 “And you shall bring into the ark two of every *kind*, of every living thing of all flesh, to keep them alive with you. They shall be male and female. Two of every kind shall come to you to keep *them* alive; of fowls after their kind, and of cattle after their kind, of every creeping thing of the earth after its kind.

As a part of the covenant, Noah and his immediate family will enter the ark, along with representatives from the animal kingdom.

Noah is to bring two of every animal into the ark, along with enough food for them to all eat. Noah is instructed specifically to keep alive the male and female pairs of animals which come to him.

Now, take a moment and try to understand the actual mechanics and timing here. Noah will proclaim judgment upon the earth for 120 years by building the ark. Most people would have owned animals in this era, and Noah probably owned a lot of animals before God tapped him on the shoulder. Now, 20 years in, he has 3 children. While they are growing up, let me suggest what he does (and this is pure conjecture): Noah establishes an animal preserve which is in turn run by his sons. He and his sons collect animals of every type and they learn how to feed and to care for these animals. This verse indicates that these animals would come to him. Quite obviously, we all come upon various animals at various times: I have come across deer, squirrels, turtles, nutria, rabbits and all manner of birds when I jog. The other day, I heard something at the window, and went to look, and there was a racoon, who apparently wanted in, but changed his mind when he saw me. So, over the course of 120 years, it is reasonable that some animals will simply come to Noah.

However, here is another way Noah will get these animals—he will buy them from traveling caravans—a mobile pet store, if you will. Noah, the builder of the ark on land where it had never rained before, was no doubt well known in his era. People are going to find out about Noah, and some are simply going to bring him spec animals. “Do you have one of these, Noah?” And Noah will purchase the animals. It is reasonable to suppose that various caravans made special stops at Noah’s animal preserve with various animals they thought Noah did not have yet; and Noah would purchase or barter for these animals. The point is, none of this need be miraculous.

Undoubtedly, one of the earliest professions in that day was the buying and selling and trading of animals. People worked in this era, and jobs, for the most part, were related to plants or to animals. We are used to seeing animals being sold in a pet store today, but it is reasonable to suppose that animals were a part of traveling caravans and were sold as a part of their business venture. If you know your Bible history, you know that King Solomon had apes and peacocks.

Noah’s children will become accustomed to taking care of animals, even from a very young age. By the time they are born, Noah probably has collected a number of animals (not those who would go on the ark, but their progeny would). If this were the case (we are not given the specifics, so I am speculating here), having some modicum of control over these animals and having the ability to care for these animals for a year on the ark would have been doable. You give a farm boy some chickens, sheep and cattle, and these animals will flourish under his care; taking care of them is second nature to him, because this is how he was raised. The same is true of Noah’s sons. They were probably brought up from their earliest youth to capture, raise and care for animals, so that taking care of them under unusual circumstances was probably second nature to them.

The text here suggests that these animals simply came to Noah and his family. The word used here is the normal word for *to come, to go*. It is in the Qal imperfect, which indicates

a continual stream of animals over a period of time. Like many other theologians, I believed this to be supernatural when I first studied this passage. However, since then, I have changed my mind.

There is the question about animals from other continents—how did they get to Noah? We do not know what the world looked like in the time of Noah. Was there one continent which was divided by continental drift because of the flood? Because of the shapes of the various continents, many people—including geologists—believe in continent drift (that is, the continents were once one land mass which somehow separated). Many believe that it took place millions of years ago, and very slowly, but the flood may mark several events. The earth may have gone from little or no tilt to the axis it is on now, which may have been related to the flood itself. The result may have been both continental drift and a more pronounced landscape (deeper oceans and higher mountains). Apart from the deeper oceans and higher mountains (which is supported by Scripture), continental drift and a change of the earth's axis are theories.

However, dramatic things can take place, and then seem to fit right in. We have seen some dramatic floods and rains in the gulf coast; we have seen the great geographical event of Mount Saint Helens erupting; or the San Francisco-Oakland earthquake; but years or decades later, these are events of the past, and the changes which occurred in those areas are integrated into the overall landscape.

Gen 6:21 And take for yourself all food that is eaten, and you shall gather for yourself. And it shall be for food, for you and for them.”

I have mentioned Woodmorappe's book on several occasions, and he spends several chapters on the feeding of various animals, and what they will and will not eat. He cites various studies when it comes to animals with very specific diets, and how this can be dealt with. We do not know *when* animals became carnivores. This could have occurred after the flood, but with all of the violence on the earth, it is possible that some animals tasted flesh before the flood. In any case, Woodmorappe cites various studies about what animals will eat when they are hungry and how some specialized diets may not be as definitive as they are made out to be. This is not a matter of speculation on Woodmorappe's part, but he simply cites a variety of studies where various animals with specialized diets were kept and nourished with foods outside of their diet. The studies which he cites in his book are not done as research for his book specifically or as related to the concept of Noah's ark, but were done by a variety of scientists for completely different reasons, but with applicable data.

All of this makes more sense to me if Noah establishes an animal preserve, as I have suggested, and that his sons grow up raising all kinds of animals, all of which come to Noah's preserve over an extended period of time (which is in complete agreement with the text).

God designed us as living, breathing creatures with volition, intelligence and creativity. We are made in His image. Although God's instructions to Noah may have been more detailed

than we see here, God does not desire to make holy robots out of us. That is, God did not stand over Noah and say, “Drive 4 fasteners in right here; use this timber, not that. You need to pick up the pace. There is a clock ticking, you know.” God gave Noah a broad outline of what needed to be done, and then allowed Noah to complete the process. Noah, who may or may not have built a ship before, was assigned the task of building a ship which would preserve all above ground life from the antediluvian era. Because Noah was brilliant, he was able to do this.

My father, who was not as smart as Noah, built our swimming pool, even though he had never build a swimming pool before. He did everything except dig out the area where the pool was to go. I recall watching him do this (I was not much help as a son); and even though I did not appreciate it then, I look back with great awe that this man determined everything that he needed to do in order to build a swimming pool. There was not someone standing over his shoulder telling him each and every thing to do.

One of the reasons I enjoyed teaching so much is, I had a basic mission to accomplish, and a great deal of freedom in the classroom with which to accomplish that mission. The primary function of the principals outside of the classroom was to deal with those in the classroom who made teaching difficult. However, as time went on, principals became less concerned about facilitating teaching and far more specific about giving *me* guidance and instructions. The less creativity that I was able to use in the classroom, the less enjoyable the job became. There is, for each person, ideal parameters between structure and freedom when it comes to their jobs and to their lives in general. No one wants a boss standing over your shoulder and telling you every single move that you must make.

Noah was the same way—God gave him instructions and then allowed Noah the freedom to carry them out. God gave Noah a great deal of freedom to apply his volition, intelligence and creativity. This was a great time in Noah’s life—building the ark was not some awful chore to which he awoke each morning to do, but a great project which thoroughly engaged him and his creative nature.

As a personal illustration, I have added some square footage to my house and am, when I have the time, completing the interior. I get to choose what each room will be, and I am blessed enough to have the help of someone who can do the things which require skill and intelligence. This is a labor of love, and when I have the chance to work in this addition, it is quite enjoyable and fulfilling.

If your job is not fulfilling, you may have a hobby. You might work in your yard, restore antique furniture or older cars, you may enjoy photography, etc. There is likely some part of your life which engages your mind, your creative nature and your physicality, and it is easy to become passionate about this. I knew a guy who built dollhouses on the side, and, I thought to myself at the time, “That’s pretty goofy” until I saw the dollhouses which he made, and they were quite incredible. I was amazed at their quality and impressed by his obvious passion.

If you have something about which you are passionate, which causes you to fire on all cylinders, this is Noah's life at this time, and for the next 120 years. God knew the exact balance of guidance and direction, and then He let Noah take it from there. We are made in God's image, and that includes creativity. It is in our nature to create. Again—and this cannot be overemphasized—God does not want us to be holy robots. God is not interested in pod people. We are not designed like that. Despite the difficulties and heartaches in our lives, God has designed our life, even in this fallen world, to be good.

This is a lesson for us all—God has allotted a certain amount of time for us to do this and that, and it is important for us to become fully engaged in these activities (for most people, this is your work). As my first pastor said, “Do your job as unto the Lord.” Obey the authorities over you, apply all that you know, and allow your creativity to flow when your work calls for that. The end result can be very fulfilling; and God has only allotted us a certain amount of time for this endeavor, and we will not be able to repeat it. The same is true of your marriage; the same is true of your family and the raising of your children. Before Noah is this project of a lifetime, engaging his intelligence, creativity and strength in such a way that he is firing on all cylinders each and every day. Most days, you know that Noah could not wait to get out there and work on this tremendous project of building an ark.

If you are reading this and you have a job, that job can be the source of great personal fulfillment. Almost everyone has a boss that they don't like, a system which is unmanageable, coworkers who sometimes gossip and backbite, and a public which is not always appreciative of your efforts. And, of course, you are never paid enough nor does anyone fully appreciate all that you do. However, even in that maze of difficulties, you have a job which God has set before you and you do that job as unto Him. You can have great personal fulfillment in your job, your marriage and your family, as long as your focus is upon God's direction, which is found in the Word of God. Don't worry about what you are going to eat or what kind of clothes you will purchase; God has taken care of those things. Matt. 6:24–34: “No person can serve two masters at the same time. He will hate one master and love the other master. Or he will follow one master and refuse to follow the other master. So you cannot serve God and money at the same time. So I tell you, don't worry about the food you need to live. And don't worry about the clothes you need for your body. Life is more important than food. And the body is more important than clothes. Look at the birds. They don't plant or harvest or save food in barns. But your heavenly Father feeds those birds. And you know that you are worth much more than the birds. You cannot add any time to your life by worrying about it. And why do you worry about clothes? Look at the flowers in the field. See how they grow. They don't work or make clothes for themselves. But I tell you that even Solomon, the great and rich king, was not dressed as beautifully as one of these flowers. God clothes the grass in the field like that. That grass is living today, but tomorrow it is thrown into the fire to be burned. So you know that God will clothe you much more. Don't have so little faith! Don't worry and say, 'What will we eat?' or 'What will we drink?' or 'What will we wear?' All the people that don't know God try to get these things. Don't worry, because your Father in heaven knows that you need these things. The thing you should want most is God's kingdom and doing the good things God wants you to do. Then all these other things you need will be given to you. So don't

worry about tomorrow. Each day has enough trouble of its own. Tomorrow will have its own worries.”

You are not to simply grit your teeth and get through each day; that is not God’s plan for your life. Life is a great adventure, filled with personal satisfaction that you will receive in your work, in your marriage and in your family. If your focus is wrong, then life is a series of unpleasant events which you must endure; if your focus is right and you have a soul filled with doctrine, then your life is a great adventure, replete with meaning and great personal fulfillment.

This was Noah’s life and this ought to be our life.

Lesson 68: Genesis 6:13–22

Personal Faith and Action

God came to Noah and gave him specific directions:

Gen. 6:13–21 And God said to Noah, “The end of all flesh has come before Me, for the earth is filled with violence because of them [the race of half-angel, half-man creatures]. Therefore, listen [carefully], I am destroying them with the earth. Construct for yourself an ark of cyprus timbers. You will construct rooms in the ark. Furthermore, you will pitch [= cover, atone] it inside and outside with pitch. And this is the way you will construct it: the length of the ark will be 450 feet; the width of it will be 75 feet; and its height 45 feet. You will make a window [opening?] in the ark, and you will finish it above within 18 inches. And you will set the door of the ark in the side of it. You will make it with lower, second and third stories. Now listen: I, even I, am bringing a [worldwide] flood of waters upon the earth in order to destroy all flesh (in which is the breath of life) from under the heavens. Everything which is in the earth will die. But I will establish My covenant [= contract, treaty] with you. And you will come into the ark, you and your sons and your wife and your sons' wives with you. And you will bring into the ark two of every kind, of every living thing of all flesh, to keep them alive with you. They will be male and female. Two of every kind will come to you to keep them alive; of fowls after their kind, and of cattle after their kind, of every creeping thing of the earth after its kind. And take for yourself all food that is eaten, and you will gather for yourself. And it will be for food, for you and for them [the animals].”

And Noah’s response was:

Gen 6:22 Noah did so, according to all that God commanded him, so he did.

Noah puts his faith into action. God told him to build the ark according to the specifications, and that is what Noah does. It has never flooded before, and Noah may not have any sons when God speaks to him, but Noah starts building the ark, 120 years before the flood.

The application here is quite simple, but many Christians do not get it. You must have accurate information from God toward which to direct your faith. When you have accurate

information from God, you must exercise faith toward that information. This accurate information has but one source: the Bible. If God is speaking to you via dreams, personal appearances, email or phone, you have a genuine mental problem. God speaks to us through His Word.

This passage is parallel to the spiritual life. Noah has knowledge and information; and he acts upon this knowledge and information with faith. God tells him what to do and he does it. The spiritual life has been dramatically distorted in our era. The primary way it is distorted is, there is very little teaching of the Bible in church and even less teaching of mechanics from the Bible (with the exception of a small number of churches). Every person has faith—believers and unbelievers alike. The key is what you place your faith in.

Let me offer up a political illustration which is pertinent to these times: there are many people who support a government-run (managed, regulated) healthcare system in the United States and they believe that this system will be affordable, fair and reasonably efficient. The people who believe this—and they make up a significant portion of the population of the United States—have a tremendous faith in government. In their eyes, right now, healthcare is *broken* but if government steps in, it will become fair, organized, affordable, and fixed. This opinion requires great faith, and such people are adamant, committed and passionate about their faith in the innate goodness and organizational skills of our government. Their faith is almost impossible to puncture with examples to the contrary and many of them cannot be dissuaded with any sort of argument.

We have another illustration from today, and that is those who believe there is global warming going on today, that it is a long-term trend, that mankind is causing it (or is a significant contributing factor), and that by changing out the light bulbs in our houses and driving smaller, more fuel efficient cars (or even by abandoning the use of cars), that we can fix this problem. Even our president, who believes in man-made global warming, proclaimed that his election marked the day that the seas would stop rising (and I believe that he is sincere in his belief). Of course, government is seen by many of these adherents as the key to solving the global warming problem, and that the more that government collects by way of penalties and the more that government controls by way of regulation, the more likely that government will be able to avert the disaster which is global warming (and thus government will keep those seas from rising). This requires great faith to believe in man-caused global warming, and the faith of such people is also strong and passionate.

In fact, as a side-note, adherence to these principles is more important than one's actions (which is not unlike Christianity). I have had arguments with 2 people I know, and am pretty sure that I lead a more carbon-neutral or environmentally-friendly life than they do. However, since I do not adhere to the global warming religion, this causes them great consternation. This has the interesting parallel to Christianity insofar as, faith in Jesus Christ is foremost. Whether or not you lead a *good, Christian life*, is a secondary issue. You might become more overtly moral each and every day; however, if you do not believe in Jesus Christ, you are not saved. To the global warming enthusiast, faith in man-made global warming and having the desire for government to step in to make everything better

is often seen as more important than one's lifestyle. Therefore, people with a greater carbon footprint than I have are disconcerted by my lack of faith (in imminent disaster brought on by global warming).

My point here is not to disparage government-run healthcare or man-caused global warming, but to illustrate that all men, whether believers or unbelievers, have great faith. You may have to probe an individual, but you will eventually discover a basic and generally unshakeable core of faith. Even agnostics have basic tenets of faith, which can be found if they are questioned carefully enough.

The purpose of the Word of God is so that we have an object for our faith. The object is not nebulous, but very well-defined. To begin with, we place our faith in Jesus Christ, our Savior, because He took the penalty for our sins when on the cross. As we study the Bible (and, ideally speaking, this is not self-study, but as guided by a pastor-teacher), we find more and more reasons to believe in Jesus Christ. We are only 6 chapters into the first book of the Bible, and we have examined several times where God the Holy Spirit has revealed in the Bible shadow images of Jesus to come. This is unique to religious literature. This is unique to all literature.

Then, we learn to build upon Christ. We learn to name our sins to God; we learn that the most important thing to do in our lives is to **grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ**. We learn why we are here—to resolve the Angelic Conflict. After salvation, the key to all of this is the knowledge of the Word of God. Faith must have an object, and God wants that object to be truth. Again, we all have faith and we all exercise faith every single day of our lives. Faith is either going to be directed toward that which is true or that which is false; and Bible doctrine is the truth God wants us to place our faith in.

Noah has something toward which he can exercise his faith—the words of this chapter. God has laid out for him what he needs to do, and Noah will do it. You may think, “Well, God is not telling me to build an ark. I don't even know if I should make a left or a right turn up ahead.” From a personal standpoint, I can tell you that there have been very few times in my life where I have been flummoxed about what to do (or what not to do). However, for many believers, divine guidance is a mystery. I will cover this topic sometime in the next 20 or 30 lessons, but until then, the key is knowledge of Bible doctrine. The more you know the Word of God, the easier it is to discern the will of God. Divine guidance becomes as natural as walking, and requires about as much thought.

I have made reference to Heb. 11 in a previous lesson; it is, in part, about faith. However, the key is not simply having faith in *something* but having faith in the Word of God. **Now faith is the assurance [= the title deed] of things confidently expected, the conviction of things not [yet] seen. For by [means of] faith, Old Testament saints received their commendation [eternal recognition]. By faith we understand that the universe was created by the Word of God, so that [we know and believe that] what is seen was not made out of things that are visible (Heb. 11:1–3).**

Here, we have the importance of faith, but not simply faith in random things. The faith which is the basis for the eternal recognition of saints in the Old Testament, is the same faith which we possess when we believe that God made what we can see from what we cannot see. A Socratic approach might be: “Can you see me? Can you see the things around you? Do you believe that these things are real? Are you able to see molecules? Even though you cannot see molecules, do you believe that everything around you is made up of molecules?” We have faith in this. We believe this to be true. Even on the human level, we believe that the things which we see are made up from things that we do not see. Just as a scientist would get nowhere in the scientific community if he did not believe in molecular structure, so the believer and the Word of God—we will get nowhere spiritually without knowing and trusting in the Word of God.

Speaking of science and faith, a false dichotomy has been set up during our time, where there is religion on one side and science on the other; faith on one side and knowledge on the other. These things are presented as antithetical or warring concepts. The great scientists throughout the ages have believed in God—including those from the 20th century. Many scientists have been brought to faith in God through their own scientific discipline. The illustration I have used more than one in this study is our genetic code. In almost every cell of our body, we carry around the unique building plans for our body. Our bodies are amazing enough as it is, but for the cells of our bodies to carry in them the plans of how to build you and me is quite powerful a concept. Scientists in every discipline of science are brought to their knees by the complexity and beauty of whatever it is that they are studying. No matter what the discipline, science always discovers laws, design, great complexity and beauty.

Faith and knowledge are another false dichotomy. We have 3 systems of perception: faith, empiricism and rationalism, and they all act together, not as 3 discrete concepts but as an integral process. That is, no one spends much time thinking, *for this idea, I am operating on 90% faith, 9% empiricism and 1% rationalism*, even though this may be the mixture such a person is using.

This helps to explain why some people cannot be argued out of their views. You may be presenting what you believe to be true with very logical and rational arguments based upon clear and undisputable empirical evidence, but if another person’s views are based primarily on faith (which can include one’s value system—their sense of right and wrong), then your arguments will be unable to pierce their faith.

I know conservative Hispanics who are absolutely frustrated with their liberal brothers. They can go down a list of important political issues which many Hispanics adhere to (e.g., the primacy of family, the values of hard work and self-reliance, the importance of life), and many conservative and liberal Hispanics believe in these things with similar fervor due to their Catholic upbringing. However, when the conservative Hispanic explains, “And these values are more in line with the Republican party” the liberal Hispanic will still vote Democratic (and in larger numbers) because he has an innate faith in the Democratic party, even though this party often works against the family unit, supports the killing of fetuses as after-the-fact birth control, and promotes programs which lure people away from

working hard and being self-reliant (and encourages them to rely on the government). It makes some conservative Hispanics want to rip out their own hair in frustration, because a majority of their brothers and sisters vote for people who represents issues and interests opposite their own.

This leads us to the fact that, these systems of perception (faith, empiricism, and rationalism) can be in opposition to one another at times. One of the debates of this era in the United States is a universal healthcare system run by the government. There are people who have tremendous faith in our government, despite all empirical evidence to the contrary. They believe that a healthcare system run (regulated, overseen) by our government will be more fair, more easily obtainable, and less expensive than our present system. It does not matter that our government is a bloated, unfeeling bureaucracy about to go broke from all of the previous bureaucracies already put into place; many such people cannot have their faith in government's goodness shaken. Their faith is too strong. So, there are areas in the thinking of many people where their faith may be in opposition to logic and empiricism, but their faith is simply much stronger. That is, they can actually recognize from empiricism the ineptitude of government and yet still have faith that government can solve the fundamental problems of life.

On occasion, these systems of perception can act in tandem as well. Your faith can be changed by something you see or by a debate that you hear; and your faith may be override an argument you previously accepted because it becomes clear that the argument is faulty.

All that we *know* is based upon faith, empiricism and rationalism. For most people, *faith* makes up 70–95% of their thinking, and rationalism and empiricism takes up what remains. God chose faith to be the way by which He would reach us, because faith, of the 3 systems of perception, is non-meritorious and the most abundant. Faith is the key to our salvation, because it is a non-meritorious act to believe in Jesus Christ. God continues with this theme in our spiritual lives.

Where we first began to learn by faith was from Mom and Dad. The day we began to ask a million questions, and what our parents said that day (or during that week) were imprinted deeply onto our souls. And everything the parent does and says after that continues to be printed onto our souls—and it is by faith that this information is printed onto our little souls. They said it, and we believed it. The values and thinking of our parents is perhaps the most fundamental foundation of our entire system of thinking. They said something, and we believed it. This does not mean that we cannot change these fundamental values, but they are very hard to change. Again, it is why the most logical arguments based upon clear empirical evidence will not change the minds of some people.

This is why some people believe that Franklin Delano Roosevelt brought us out of the Great Depression and why a small number of people believe that FDR exacerbated the Great Depression—it is what they were taught from a very early age.

The key is not the system of perception used, but the direction of our faith. Is our faith in man or is it in God? Is our faith in the spiritual life or is it in a government system? Is our faith in the Bible or is it in the works of man which contradict the Bible? We all have an abundance of faith; the direction of the faith is what is key.

By faith Abel offered to God a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain, through which he was commended as righteous, God commending him by accepting his gifts And through his faith, though he died, he still speaks (Heb. 11:4). Abel had to have more than just faith; his faith had to be in an acceptable sacrifice. Both Cain and Abel had faith; but Abel's faith still stands as a testimony today, as he offered up the sacrifice of an innocent animal, which represents the death of Jesus Christ on the cross.

We have a great example of this here in the state of Texas. Running for governor, we have a TEA party candidate, and she expressed her faith the other day. When asked if she believed that the United States government was somehow involved with the 9/11 tragedy, she did not unequivocally say, *no*; she said that all of the facts were not out there yet, that the American people did not know enough, and that she had not made a determination yet. The fact that she has faith that it is *possible* that the United States government somehow timed explosions to occur in some Twin Tower buildings to coincide with a terrorist attack will cost her the election. Even though this faith is exercised only to believe that something is possible and even though this may not affect her function as a governor, she will not be elected because of where she has placed her faith. It is not the faith or lack of faith which is the issue; it is *where* or *in what* her faith is placed.

By faith Enoch was taken up so that he should not see death, and he was not found, because God had taken him. Now before he was taken he was commended as having pleased God. And without faith it is impossible to please him, for whoever would draw near to God must believe that He exists and that He rewards those who seek Him (Heb. 11:4–7). Again, there is more to *faith* than just *faith*. You have to *believe* that God exists and that He rewards those who seek Him. We all have faith and there is no merit in the act of faith by itself; the merit is in *where* we place our faith.

By faith Noah, being warned by God concerning events as yet unseen, in reverent fear constructed an ark for the saving of his household. By this he condemned the world and became an heir of the righteousness that comes by faith (Heb. 11:4–7). Noah's faith was not in random things; he did not take a little of this religion, a little of that philosophy, and put his trust in some kind of eclectic collection of doctrines. He believed in Jehovah Elohim and he believed Jehovah Elohim. Because of what Noah believed in, he acted; and his acting upon his faith is what earns him eternal commendation. *What* he placed his faith in was also the deliverance of his family. Your life, your well-being and the preservation and prosperity of your family all depends upon *what* you place your faith in.

There are times when our faith will cause us to [stand back and watch the deliverance of the Lord](#); and there are times when our faith is going to motivate us into some form of action. Divine guidance is what helps us to determine whether we should act or whether we should simply sit still and let God act.

The first third of Gen. 6 was about the corruption of mankind, which was why God would destroy almost all life upon the earth. Gen. 6 was also about God speaking to Noah and Noah placing his faith in God and doing what he was directed to do.

Gen. 8 will be the abatement of the waters. Gen. 7, the chapter which we have just begun, is all about the flood itself. All of Gen. 7 is devoted to the flood.

There are those—including Christians—who believe that this is just some story with the intent of teaching us something. If this is a teaching fable, then what exactly is it teaching? Why do we have 16 verses on entering the ark, the days numbered during which this flood occurs, and the death of all living things outside of the ark confirmed? As a real event, this tells us a lot about God, man, civilizations, the judgment of God, etc. As a teaching fable, it tells us very little. Surely you have heard various fables, like the goose that laid the golden eggs or the ant and the grasshopper (two fables very pertinent to today's political climate). These fables have 2 things in common: (1) they are clearly fables and (2) what they teach is obvious. This history of Noah and the ark does not fit into the pattern of a teaching fable. It is not clearly a fable and what it teaches, if the Noahic narrative is false, is not obvious.

Have you ever heard a parent threaten his child with ridiculous threats {"If you kids don't stop acting up, I am going to sell all of you to an orphanage"}? If Noah and the ark is some sort of a fable, then much of it is all about God threatening to do stuff that He is not ever going to do. If this flood is just astray to illustrate the surety of God's judgment, then it comes off like the parent who makes ridiculous threats. In fact, this approach to Gen. 6–8 makes out God to be a liar, among other things. God becomes that parent threatening to drop off his children at an orphanage. This approach nullifies all that God is. He is no longer Truth; His Word means nothing; and His threats mean even less—if this is just some Bible fable.

This, in part, helps to explain why we live in such a perverted, evil and hurtful world. We live in a world where man makes decisions which are perverted, evil and hurtful—and we see the results of these decisions in crime and in war. We live in a world where Satan rules (2Cor. 4:4 Eph. 2:2); the outcome of his rulership is going to involve pain and misery. One of the best examples of this is Communist China. Mao had in his mind the perfect society as guided from the top; he had to quash human freedom in order to bring this to pass, which meant killing millions of people. I know a Chinese woman who adores Mao and does not believe that he could be a heartless killer. However, in order to impose his philosophy of government, he needed to get rid of those who did not see things his way.

My point here is, if there was no evil in the world and no pain and suffering, we would not recognize the real drama in which we find ourselves. God has to allow the cruelty of man from two theological perspectives: (1) God has given us free will; what sense does that make if He does not allow us to use it? (2) We need to know what and what we are as

man, and where human viewpoint leads us. We know that nothing can be more cruel than man, and this ought to give us pause. If we recognize the inherent evil of man (and the inherent evil in ourselves), we are better prepared to be realistic about our lives.

If there was no real suffering in this world, and we hear the gospel of Jesus redeeming us from sin and death, we'd say, "We're doing pretty well right now. Not interested."

Or the old conundrum of people who are successful often pat themselves on the back because of their own brilliant choices; and those who are suffering blame God for their misery. At least these who blame God are thinking about Him.

Part of what we learn in the Bible is the surety of God's judgment. We do not have to theorize that God will allow suffering; we see it every day. If God allows suffering here on earth, how much more so will He allow suffering after the final judgment? Furthermore, we want God to judge mankind at the end—we do not want Hitler and Stalin and Mao to just simply die, and that is it. They should pay for their gross evil.

If Noah and the ark and the worldwide flood is just some meaningless fable, how can we believe in the surety of God's judgment? How can we believe that God will inevitably judge us? It makes little sense to teach that which is Christian truth, and to build it upon a foundation of made-up stories. Satanic doctrine is based upon lies, but not the Bible. The narratives of actual events is the basis for Bible doctrine. What sense does it make to develop spiritual and moral truth based upon a bunch of made-up stories?

Jesus will *teach* by parable, but it will be clear that these are parables. Furthermore, these parables, in order to have any meaning, are based upon common events in people's lives, things which the listeners have actually participated in (unlike a worldwide flood). God the Holy Spirit also teaches us such things through His Word, but based upon actual historical events. When there is teaching which can occur, God the Holy Spirit records the events in order to teach us this or that principle. The narratives must be true in order for the spiritual lessons to have a solid foundation upon which truth can be built.

And, as we have already examined, with some detail, is that everything about this event is reasonable—the size and dimensions of the boat with respect to the number of animals aboard and with respect to being sea worthy in the first place. The length of days required for the earth to flood is going to be reasonable, just as will the time it takes for these waters to abate will be reasonable.

Furthermore, there are volumes of books written both supporting and denying the historicity of this event. On any given day, people are posting things on the internet about the flood—both for and against. Take any other deluge account from any culture, and there are people who comment on these other accounts and read about them, from time to time, but no one is arguing about them, and certainly not every single day. No one is writing books about other deluge accounts saying, "This just can't be true, and here's why." No one is writing books about these other flood narratives saying, "Of course this makes

sense, and here's why..." But, in the book of Genesis, there is something to argue about—there is substance here. No other account of the flood is similar in that regard.

What is unique about most of Gen. 6–8 is, it is just too reasonable and it is just too possible. It is so reasonable and possible that men will write passionate books about how they don't think it could have happened; and how they think it is nonsense and a fable. It is their passion and need to berate the details of this event which confirms to us that, maybe this is true; maybe the Noahic flood did occur, just exactly like the Bible tells us it did. These same people do not write, *The Flood, Volume 2: Why the Akkadian Deluge Myth is False*—they have no passion to write such a book and, besides, no one would read it. But, Gen. 6–8 concerns them; the Biblical record of the deluge gets them both engaged and vexed.

Gen 7:1 And Jehovah said to Noah, "You and all your house come into the ark, for I have observed [lit., *seen*] you righteous before Me in this generation.

Noah and his family had all believed in Jehovah Elohim. They placed their trust in Him. This is what makes them righteous (Gen. 15:6). The verb here is the Qal perfect of the common verb *to see*. A Qal *imperfect* would have indicated that God watched over Noah for a long while and determined that he was righteous in his daily life. However, the Qal *perfect* is a completed action, not an ongoing action; implying that Noah was righteous at some point in time (when he believed in Jehovah Elohim). In other words, Noah's righteousness was a completed event, not an ongoing process.

The demonic infiltration of the rest of the human race was a result of their own free will choices and their negative volition toward Jehovah Elohim. Throughout, the Bible clearly teaches free will, for man and angels; and, therefore, this quality of being a free moral agent reasonably extends to those who are half and half.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, Noah is both righteous (justified by faith in Jehovah Elohim) and that he walks with God (he is maturing spiritually). Furthermore, Noah had not been corrupted (Gen. 6:9). This impacts his family.

One of the very important doctrines of the Bible is blessing by association, and here we find this doctrine hinted at; Noah, who is justified before God, will be saved (delivered), along with his house—God says to Noah, "You and all your house come into the ark, for I have observed [lit., *seen*] you righteous before Me in this generation." (*house* is a metonym for his family). We have a parallel passage in the New Testament: **And the jailer called for lights and rushed in, and trembling with fear he fell down before Paul and Silas. Then he brought them out and said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" And they said, "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and you will be saved, you and your household."** (Acts 16:29–31). The salvation of this jailer would impact his family.

God continues to give Noah direction. The ark is built, the rain will soon come, so God gives Noah the final few instructions before the deluge.

Gen 7:2 You shall take with you every clean animal by sevens, the male and his female. And take two of the animals that *are* not clean, the male and his female [literally, *the man and his woman*].

One of the things which we find in Gen. 7:2 (and often not translated) is the phrase, *the man and his woman* as applied to animals (that is the literal rendering from the Hebrew). The implication is, God even designed a system of right man/right woman in the animal kingdom. There was the 'ish and the 'ishshah. Although this system does not survive the entire animal kingdom, there are still certain species which often mate for life.

This is also the first time the Bible distinguishes between clean and unclean animals. Since God had not yet designated animals for food, the difference between clean and unclean must have been associated with which animals were sacrificed to God and which were not.

We are given scant information as to the spiritual life before the flood. God did speak to Adam and Eve after the fall, as well as to Cain and Abel. However, there did come a point where man began to call on the name of the Lord. We don't know if God generally removed His presence at that time or very nearly fully removed it. However, it is certain that animal sacrifices were a necessary spiritual function of that time, as they looked forward to Jesus Christ. It was a ritual which found its reality (its fulfillment) in the death of Jesus on the cross.

Gen 7:3 Also take of the birds of the air by sevens, the male and the female, to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth.

We have no idea how many birds are involved here and how much they subdivided into groups after the flood. However, the idea is, there needed to be enough to continue the bird population. Since birds are not tied to the earth, God begins the post-deluvian civilization with more of them.

Gen 7:4 For in seven more days I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights. And I will destroy from off the face of the earth every living thing that I have made.

Noah had 7 days to get all of the animals into the Ark and to be ready for the rains. This indicates that 120 years had passed since God spoke to Noah about building the ark, and that the ark had been completed. It would take 7 (or, perhaps 6?) days to fill the ark with animals and provisions for the animals.

I have observed some horrendous rains here in Texas. The worst rains here tend to be around 1–1½ inches/hour. In order for these rains to go as high as 1 mile in 40 days, the rainfall would need to be approximately 5.5 inches/hour (we will later find out that much of the water came from below). I have suggested that the earth did not have nearly the depths and heights then as it does today. I believe that tremendous differential in heights to have occurred due to the flood and subsequent volcanic and seismic activity.

The 40 days and 40 nights is not some arbitrary number. 40 is often associated, in the Bible, with judgment, testing and preparation. When Moses spoke to God on Mount Sinai, he was on the mountain for forty days (Ex. 24:18 Deut. 9:9). Israel, due to the apostasy of the first free generation, remained in the desert for forty years while God removed those who were unwilling to take the Land of Promise (Num. 14:32–35 Deut. 29:5). When a civil case was tried in court, the loser was not awarded forty million dollars in judgement but was struck up to forty times. Elijah went without food and fled Jezebel for forty days and nights (1Sam. 19:1–8). God judged Egypt by scattering its inhabitants and leaving the land fallow for forty years (Ezek. 29:1–13). Our Lord fasted and was tested by the devil for forty days and nights before He began His public ministry (Matt. 4:1–11).

Gen 7:5 And Noah did according to all that Jehovah commanded him.

Noah had authority orientation. There was no room for error here. God gave Noah specific directions, and Noah had to follow them exactly. As you will recall from the previous lesson, everyone has faith. What is important is where faith is directed. For faith to be meaningful, the object of faith must be true and accurate. Quite obviously, if instead of a world-wide flood, Noah built the ark just in time for a heavy 3-day rain, his faith would have been meaningless. He believed God and God brought it to pass.

It is also important to point out that Noah could not do a half-___ job here. He could not appear to be working on the ark, but was just sloughing off, putting in his time. This would not work. He knew that judgment was to come and that he needed to pull things together in 120 years in order to preserve mankind and animals. Obviously, Noah believed God.

As an application, so should the quality of your work be. God has given you a job and your labor ought to be as if God looked you in the eyes and told you what He expected you to do, and so you do it. You do not do your job in order to necessarily get ahead; you do not do your job so that your boss will be pleased with you; you do your job to the best of your ability because that is what God has given you to do. It does not matter if you are snaking out a toilet, sweeping a floor, asking someone if they want fries with their meal; it is the job God has given you to do. Furthermore, it does not matter if you have been given a two-weeks notice that you will be laid off; you still do your job as unto the Lord, without bitterness or rancor.

Lesson 70: Genesis 7:6–16

Noah, his Family, the Animals and the Flood

Gen 7:6–7 And Noah was six hundred years old when the flood of waters was upon the earth. And Noah went in. And his sons and his wife and his sons' wives went in with him into the ark, because of the waters of the flood.

This verse, along with a few others, lays out a simple timeline. God came to Noah when he was 480 years old and warned him of the coming flood, and told him to build an ark. 20 years later, Noah has 3 sons, who come on the scene after the ark-building project had begun (and probably when Noah was in the beginning stages of establishing an animal

preserve). So his sons, for 100 years, would grow up with this focus—to build the ark and to collect animals from all over the world. I have assumed that Noah collected the animals over a period of many years rather than having them all show up 7 days before the flood. If Noah's sons have been brought up around animals all of their lives, they certainly would have adjusted well to taking care of them. We have either known or have seen people who have a way with animals. It is very likely that Noah began an animal preserve and the building of the ark around the same time. When his children came along (20 years later), they would have been raised around animals, learning to care for and feed them.

One of the other aspects of this narrative, which is ignored by commentators, would have been the sheer joy of doing a project like this. God coming to Noah and telling him, "You are going to build a huge ark" is not necessarily a curse that God has laid upon Noah, which Noah, gritting his teeth, engages in for the next 120 years. This would have been a great challenge to Noah in every way—the design, the collection of tools and supplies, the taking raw resources and building this tremendous ark. This project would have thoroughly consumed Noah, causing him to fire on all cylinders, and every night, he went to bed tired—which is not a bad thing—and every day, he arose, excited about continuing this project.

Do you know that there are people who love to build stuff and others who love to care for animals? This project which God placed upon Noah and his family, although quite dramatic, was not a project outside of their skill set nor was it outside of their interests. This project was perfectly suited for Noah and sons.

Noah's marriage, his sons, this project and the animal preserve probably mark the highlight of his life. This 120 years was probably the greatest challenge that he faced, and there is no reason to think that this portion of his life was anything but exciting, fulfilling, dramatic, and, quite obviously, memorable.

Sometime during this 100 years, Noah's sons married. We are never given any information about their wives. Although they may have married the last uncorrupted 3 females on the earth; it is also possible that they married their sisters.

For 120 years, Noah evangelized the earth and warned the population of the coming judgment of God, and he was ignored by everyone except for his sons and the women whom they married. By God's standards, he was a faithful and successful evangelist.

Just as God called Noah to certain responsibilities, we also have spiritual responsibilities, which are not onerous or difficult. This is the promise of Jesus to those who hear Him: "Come to Me, all of you who are weary and burdened, and I will give you rest. All of you, take up My yoke and learn from Me, because I am gentle and humble in heart, and you will find rest for yourselves. For My yoke is easy and My burden is light." (Matt. 11:28–30). These responsibilities do not necessarily include results. Billy Graham may speak to hundreds of millions of people and millions come forward; we may speak to 20 people in our lifetimes, and only one or two of them may actually listen to us. Doing God's will merely requires us to know the Word of God and to walk by means of the Spirit.

Everything else has been worked out for us. We may have a ministry to millions of people or to a handful of people; it is our faithfulness in that ministry which is key. Charlie Brown, from Podunk, Iowa, who grows to become a mature believer through grace and doctrine, who is faithful in his job and in his marriage, and raises 2 believers in Jesus Christ, can receive the same rewards in heaven that Billy Graham does. And Charlie Brown may witness to 5 people in his entire life. God has provided a different sort of ministry for every believer—a ministry which requires spiritual maturity to execute—and this ministry is designed and suited for you, and your yoke will be easy and your burden light. Jesus Christ promised you this.

And so that there is no confusion, all believers today are in full-time service to God. God does not differentiate between those who work as or with missionaries, churches or evangelical ministries; and those who do not. God has a place and a function for every single one of us, although most of us will never be in what is seen as some sort of ministerial function. That does not mean that we are off the hook when it comes to our daily lives and our spiritual ministry, no matter how modest that ministry is (the ministry of 2 parents might be directed primarily to the raising of their children).

Whatever God has designed for you, it is specifically designed for you, knowing all there is to know about you. There is no benefit to living a mediocre Christian life, attending church on a weekly basis, just so that God does not put too much on you. What God has designed for you is perfect and you will like doing it. When I was a young Christian, I was worried that God was going to send me off to some place as a missionary, and I did not want to go. I had foolish thoughts like that because I did not know or understand Jesus promise: **“All of you, take up My yoke and learn from Me, because I am gentle and humble in heart, and you will find rest for yourselves. For My yoke is easy and My burden is light.”** (Matt. 11:29–30). God has a place and a purpose for every one of us, and we are going to enjoy it. However, you have to grow to spiritual adulthood in order to handle it and to appreciate it. You do not grow to spiritual adulthood merely by being a Christian for a long period of time. You grow to spiritual maturity by means of grace and doctrine (John 1:14 2Cor. 8:7 Col. 1:6 2Peter 1:2 3:18). And Jesus Christ, being fully human, as well as fully God, grew in the exact same manner (Luke 2:40, 52 John 1:14).

Gen 7:8–10 Of the clean animals, and of the animals that were not clean, and of the birds, and of everything that creeps on the earth, two *by two* they went in to Noah into the ark, male and female, as God had commanded Noah. And it happened after seven days that the waters of the flood were upon the earth.

Loading the animals (and possibly the food) upon the Ark was a process which took 7 days for them to do. Obviously, despite the fallen state of the earth, it is reasonable to assume that God took part in this process. We do not know at which point Noah and his family began to gather the animals together in one place. We do not know if God led the animals to the Ark or if Noah collected animals for 120 years (the latter seems most likely to me). However, the actual boarding process took 7 days. One more assumption I would make: the boarding process probably took 6 days followed by a day of rest.

Again, recall my hypothesis that Noah and his sons ran, for all intents and purposes, an animal preserve for several years (maybe as many as 120 years), so that Noah's entire family was experienced in the raising and feeding of all kinds of animals.

Was this boarding of the animals two by two miraculous? Although it is certainly possible that Jesus Christ led all of the animals to Noah and they obediently entered into the ark two by two, there is nothing in this narrative which suggests that is how it happened. The exact way that this happened is not given to us. However, just as circus trainers have control over their animals, Noah and his sons could have had the same sort of control over theirs, had they been raised up from youth.

There is a book called *Noah's Ark: A Feasibility Study*, wherein the author, John Woodmorappe (a pseudonym, I believe), takes the Bible literally (as I do) and examines the nuts and bolts of the Genesis account here, to determine whether it is even possible to do what we find in Gen. 7. This author estimates, that if animals were chosen at a young age (as *teens*, so to speak), the median size of an animal on the Ark would have been the size of a rat. Only 11% would have been larger than a sheep.²³

There is one area in which I have some uncertainties, and that is with respect to dinosaurs. Personally, I believe that dinosaurs were the animal life form on this planet when angels lived upon the earth (this would have taken place before Gen. 1:2). We studied this, briefly, back in [Lesson 2](#). If this is the case, then all of the animal and plant life which we associate with dinosaurs, would have been on this earth before it was encased in ice. Therefore, in the time of Noah, there are no dinosaurs. There are many Christians who believe otherwise—that dinosaurs were a part of the ante and post-deluvian civilizations, but which died out soon after the flood. I do not really have a set of pros and cons on this issue. Given that God created animal and plant life to be a part of man's existence on this earth (Gen. 1:11–26), and given the evidence for there being angelic life on this earth long before man came along (Gen. 1:2–3 properly exegeted Isa. 14:12–17 45:18 Ezek. 28:13–19), then it is reasonable to assume that there was plant and animal life suited for angelic existence.

About the only thing which I am fairly certain of is, oil is not the result of crushed dinosaurs, as I believe I was taught in my youth. Now, how much of a part decayed organic matter is a part of oil, I have no idea; but I would not be shocked to know that oil is created today under the surface of the earth, as a result of what is below the earth's surface along with the great pressure which exists there.

Back to Noah:

Gen 7:11 In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, in the seventeenth day of the month, in this day all the fountains of the great deep were broken into, and the windows of the [two] heavens were opened up.

²³ From <http://creation.com/images/pdfs/cabook/chapter13.pdf> accessed August 5, 2009.

Water came from two directions—from above and below. The literal translation is, *all the fountains [wells] of the great deep [or, subterranean waters] were broken into [split open, torn open]*. We do not know *how* this happened, just that it did. Somehow, for some reason, the waters from below were opened up, and they began to flood the earth from below.

Where I live, we have something called the Artesian Well, which, when I first observed it, appeared to be a leaky pipe which was sticking out of the ground. Later on, I found out that the piping was done for decorative effect, and that the water just came out of the ground on its own. The whole concept of drilling for a well is that there are underground streams and rivers, which can often provide enough water for a household to use for years.

Something brought these waters to the surface, and there are naturally occurring waters which come to the surface and burst out—geysers.

At the same time, *the windows of the [two] heavens were opened [or, loosened, freed]*. Both verbs are Niphal perfect verbs, which is a passive stem looked at as a completed or single action. This verse does not tell us about the entire period of time that the earth became covered with water, but views this as a particular event in human history when this suddenly occurred.

Although most geologists accept things like an *ice age* and the warming and cooling of the earth occurring over extended periods of time, it is harder for us to wrap our minds around a period of time when there was no rain, but that is antediluvian era—there was no rain (Gen. 2:5–6). Then came the deluge, and it was sudden—waters came from below the earth and from above. So there was a dramatic change in the earth which took place and it happened all at once. There was water vapor in the air; in fact, many believe, because of the description we find in the book of Genesis, that there was a water vapor canopy about the earth—much more water vapor in the atmosphere than there is today. But, for some reason, it never rained.

From what I have read—and I am certainly not an expert in the field of meteorology—there are several factors which produce rain. There must be relative humidity which is at or near 100% (which appears to be the condition of the earth throughout the antediluvian era). Sometimes, rain can be triggered by colder air but more often, from rising air. As air rises, it becomes cooler, because it expands as it rises (as one goes up, there is less atmospheric pressure, causing air molecules to spread out, which causes them to collide less, and therefore, become cooler). Interestingly enough, when H₂O goes from a vapor to water, it does not necessarily fall, but it begins to affix itself to other droplets of water and form clouds. Just because there are clouds and wind, does not mean that there will be rain (living in Texas, I have seen clouds move about like planes in the sky without it raining). So, somehow, by a combination of these factors—rising air and cooler air came into contact with a huge amount of water vapor and water droplets in the atmosphere and it began to rain, something which had never occurred before. I suspect that atmospheric pressure was a key factor in all of this. Here in Texas, the last place you want to be is

where the atmospheric pressure has suddenly dropped. That often acts as a magnet for high winds, heavy rain and sometimes lightning.

I also recall that particulate matter in the air is a factor related to causing it to rain. Could the restored earth be practically devoid of particulate matter in the atmosphere for 1600 years?

I would not be shocked to learn that some cataclysmic event (or set of events) occurred which jump-started all of this. Whether we are talking some sort of collision with comets, asteroids or meteors; or whether, for reasons unknown, the earth began to tilt on its axis, causing a dramatic change in winds and air pressure, I don't know. I would think that a meteorologist who believes in the Bible would have a ball trying to figure out how we could go from a time of no rain to a time when it will rain for 40 days and 40 nights.

I have read one web page which seemed reasonable, where the author suggested volcanic activity on the subsurface ocean ridges. The same author suggested a swarm of small ice comets entering our atmosphere as another scenario. This person presents some interesting theories, and offers actual observations which back up his theories:

<http://www.accuracyingenesis.com/flood.html>

One record for rain is 12 inches of rain to come down in 42 minutes in Holt, Missouri in 1947. Had that occurred today, global warming enthusiasts all over the world would point to global warming as the cause for such an astonishing event (as I write this, the great snowstorms of 2010 are being attributed to global warming, and recent flooding has also been said by Al Gore to be a result of global warming, which is apparently capable of causing just about anything).

If an unusually heated earth gave rise to the waters from the deep, this would have also pushed air upward, which would have opened the floodgates of the heavens.

Dr. Robert Dean has suggested that there were thousands of volcanic eruptions, which would have been related to the water coming from the deep; and then the volcanic ash in the air would have caused the rain to fall.²⁴ This would have brought in the factor of particulate matter.

Obviously, we do not know if there are a mixture of natural and supernatural causes for these wells to burst open and for the rain to come down—nor do we know how the rain had been restrained in the past. We have no idea as to what factors restrained rain from falling and then, suddenly, it came down for 40 days. All we have is the Biblical record which tells us that water came from above and below the ground.

²⁴ Robert Dean's Genesis series lesson #045.

The theory which makes most sense to me is, there was a great deal of water vapor in the air for these 1600 years, but no particulate matter; and great earthquakes and volcanic explosions suddenly filled the atmosphere with particulates, causing the rain to fall.

There are unusual weather events which still occur on this earth. *In Calama, Chile, no rain fell for 400 years, then, on February 10, 1972, the skies opened up during the mid-afternoon. Catastrophic floods and mudslides swept through that region.*²⁵

God is not constrained by His creation; but there are times that He chooses to constrain Himself in what He does. I am personally of the view that many (not all) of the *miracles* of the Bible were the result of natural phenomena which God caused to come to pass at just the right time. This is not because I view God as less powerful than others do. For God to set things into motion so that we might pray one day for such and such, and the next day it comes to pass, is far more amazing than our prayers being answered through some earth-shaking miracle. A process of normal events involving the volition of hundreds or thousands of individuals along with cause and effect, which culminates in that which glorifies God is far more incredible than God snapping His fingers and causing a miracle to occur. It is astonishing that God can take events of history, with the complexity of billions of people all with their individual thoughts and actions, all with their own volition, combine this with a very complex set of physical laws for the earth and its atmosphere; and cause all of these things to come out as He wants them to come out. **And we know that, for those who love God, all things work together for good, for those who are called according to his purpose** (Rom. 8:28).

Furthermore, as I have pointed out, it is the remarkable lack of miraculous things in the flood narrative of the Bible which has caused this epic to endure and be a subject of discussion and disagreement, even today.

Lesson 71: Genesis 7:6–16 The Deluge Begins/The Organization of Genesis 7

In the previous lesson, we studied these verses:

Gen. 7:6–10 Noah was six hundred years old when the flood of waters came upon the earth. And Noah and his sons and his wife and his sons' wives with him went into the ark to escape the waters of the flood. Of clean animals, and of animals that are not clean, and of birds, and of everything that creeps on the ground, two and two, male and female, went into the ark with Noah, as God had commanded Noah. And after seven days the waters of the flood came upon the earth.

For 6 or 7 days, the animals were loaded onto the ark, and after 7 days, the waters of the deluge begun to come upon the earth.

²⁵ From <http://www.infoplease.com/cig/weather/so-why-does-it-rain.html> accessed February 24, 2010. There are several dramatic rains of note on this page.

We are going to notice an odd thing in this chapter; the author seems to go over the same material 3 times. This will be explained a little later in this lesson.

Gen 7:11 In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, in the seventeenth day of the month, in this day all the fountains of the great deep were broken into, and the windows of the [two] heavens were opened up.

It is fascinating that the author chose to be as precise as this, to note the month and the day. In the next chapter, this narrative will continue with precise dates and time periods. We will know exactly how long Noah and his family were in the Ark and exactly the time frame of every single event of the deluge.

Quite obviously, the only people who could recall something like this would have been Noah or one of his sons. Since this is all tied to Noah's age, Noah is probably the one writing these words (or remembering these things).

As has been previously discussed, man had a much greater mental and physical capacity during the time of Noah than he does now, so it is not out of the question for Noah to have written the first 9 or 10 chapters of Genesis in his head, and for this to be taught from generation to generation. I would also not be surprised if there was a written language at this time as well as writing materials.

Gen 7:12 And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights.

If you will recall from Gen. 2:5, there had never been rain on the earth before (that there is no rain for all the antediluvian period only *seems* to be suggested by this verse). If there are a natural set of laws which God put into motion, which resulted in no rain for 1600 years and suddenly a 40 day rain, we do not know. We have already theorized some of what may have happened.

Gen 7:13 In this same day [the day the rain began], Noah and Shem and Ham and Japheth, the sons of Noah, and Noah's wife, and the three wives of his sons with them, entered into the ark.

On the same day that the rain began, Noah and his family all entered into the ark. To see water come from below and fall down as rain—things which Noah and his family had never seen before, must have been quite amazing, if not a little frightening. Furthermore, the rain must have been tremendous. When I first moved to Texas and saw a few real storms (as compared to the few raindrops that fall in California), I was quite amazed, if not a little unnerved. What Noah and his family witness here is far greater than any storm you or I have been in—and, they had never even seen rain before.

Gen 7:14–15 They went in, and every animal [lit., *living creature*] after its kind, and all the cattle after their kind, and every moving thing that moves upon the earth after its kind, and every fowl after its kind, every bird of every sort. And they went in to Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, in which is the breath of life.

As we have seen previously, the author of Genesis gives us the basic information and then goes back over this information. In vv. 7–10, Noah and his family and the animals go into the ark, beginning 7 days before the flood (as warned by God). In the first section, the time frame for loading the animals is given. In this 2nd section, what is emphasized is, these are the things with the breath of life in them. Those animals which breathe oxygen and live on land are the ones which Noah is specifically saving.

Kind is probably similar to our term *genus*, so that Noah did not bring a Zebra, a donkey and a horse into the ark, but whatever animal which is their common ancestor (we know by the breeding of dogs that we are able to develop a lot of very specific and different characteristics of different dog breeds, and that this is accomplished over a relatively short period of time (in less than 1000 years for dogs, if my memory of dog breeding history is correct).

I have mentioned Woodmorappe's book on several occasions. He also cited various studies which deal with a small founding population, speciation and inbreeding. Single-pair founders is not simply a theoretical possibility, but an established fact. Many bird populations in Australia were started with a single pair of birds. He lists several instances of just a few founders of this or that animal beginning an entire population in a new area. For instance, the American Gray Squirrel as started by one pair of founders in Victoria, Australia; as was the rock wallaby in Hawaii and rabbits in the Balearic Islands, etc. When there is abundant food and space and a lack of competition for that food and space, there can be explosive population growth rates (we will deal with the food situation in another lesson).

There are studies which show that many animals have a built-in mechanism to take advantage of empty niches, and therefore, to adapt quickly to a new environment. We have real examples of dramatic population growth of specific animals. The Collared Dove began in Britain as 4 birds and grew to at least 19,000 in 9 years. The same is true of larger animals (although the population growth is not quite as dramatic, of course. 5 feral cattle grew to 1500 on the Amsterdam Island in 60 years, despite non-ideal conditions. Woodmorappe gives many examples, and cites the studies from which these examples came. Again, I don't know that this book would really appeal to many people, unless you want to examine the reasonableness of Noah's flood. Woodmorappe takes pretty much every aspect of this event and looks at related studies which have been done, which prove that almost every aspect of Noah's ark, whether stated specifically or not, is within the realm of possibility. He also examines the problems of inbreeding and the ability of an animal to form new species over a relatively short period of time.

Gen 7:16 And they that entered, went in male and female of all flesh, as God had commanded him. And Jehovah closed up behind him.

Jesus Christ, the revealed member of the Godhead, was the One who shut the door behind them. Whether our Lord played a part in loading the ark, we do not know. Had Noah and his family collected and raised animals, this would not have been necessary. I would think it would be likely that Jehovah Elohim would have also applied a layer or two

of pitch on the door in order to seal it. We may reasonably see this as Jesus putting His seal of approval on the ark. As we have previously discussed, the covering of pitch is a symbol of atonement, where our sins are merely covered over temporarily (we studied the [Doctrine of Atonement](#) back in [Lesson #39](#)).

It may seem as if the author is rambling, but that is because we tend to think in a linear fashion—we tend to place things in chronological order. God the Holy Spirit, Who is not confined to time, and Who perceives all the events of time all at once, rather than as successive events, does not think in terms of chronology. However, there is great organization to be found in this 7th chapter of Genesis.

This is organized so that we first see Noah and his family; then the animals that they save, and then the destructive rains which come down.

The Organization of Genesis 7

You will note there will be a 3-fold repetition throughout this chapter:

Noah and his family

 The animals which Noah preserves

 The judgment of God; the rain and waters which God brings to cleanse the earth.

God's warnings to Noah:

Then the [Y^ehowah](#) said to **Noah**, "Go into the ark, you and all your **household**, for I have seen that you are righteous before me in this generation.

Take with you seven pairs of all clean **animals**, the male and his mate, and a pair of the **animals** that are not clean, the male and his mate, and seven pairs of the **birds of the heavens** also, male and female, to keep their offspring alive on the face of all the earth.

For in seven days I will send **rain** on the earth forty days and forty nights, and every living thing that I have made **I will blot out** from the face of the ground."

And Noah did all [that Y^ehowah had commanded him](#).

The timing in which this all took place.

The Organization of Genesis 7

Noah was six hundred years old when the flood of waters came upon the earth. And **Noah and his sons and his wife and his sons' wives** with him went into the ark to escape the waters of the flood.

Of clean **animals**, and of **animals** that are not clean, and of **birds**, and of everything that creeps on the ground, two and two, male and female, went into the ark with Noah, as God had commanded Noah.

And after seven days the waters of the **flood** came upon the earth. In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month, on that day all the fountains of the great deep burst forth, and the windows of the heavens were opened. And **rain** fell upon the earth forty days and forty nights.

God fulfills His promises and warnings:

On the very same day **Noah and his sons, Shem and Ham and Japheth, and Noah's wife and the three wives of his sons** with them entered the ark,

they and every **beast**, according to its kind, and all the **livestock** according to their kinds, and every creeping thing that creeps on the earth, according to its kind, and every **bird**, according to its kind, every winged creature. They went into the ark with Noah, two and two of all flesh in which there was the breath of life. And those that entered, male and female of all flesh, went in as God had commanded him. And the Y^ehowah shut him in.

The **flood** continued forty days on the earth. The **waters** increased and lifted up the ark, and it rose high above the earth. The **waters** prevailed and increased greatly on the earth, and the ark floated on the face of the waters. And the waters prevailed so mightily on the earth that all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered. The waters prevailed above the mountains, covering them fifteen cubits deep. And all flesh died that moved on the earth, birds, livestock, beasts, all swarming creatures that swarm on the earth, and all mankind. Everything on the dry land in whose nostrils was the breath of life died. **He blotted out every living thing that was on the face of the ground**, man and animals and creeping things and birds of the heavens. They were blotted out from the earth.

Only Noah was left, and those who were with him in the ark. And the waters prevailed on the earth 150 days.

You will note the two verses in this chapter which do not fit into this pattern, and so they stand out:

And Noah did all that the Y^ehowah had commanded him. This was incorporated into the 3-fold narrative. And:

Only Noah was left, and those who were with him in the ark. And the waters prevailed on the earth 150 days.

The Organization of Genesis 7

The final verse is an abbreviation or a summary of this 3-fold organization of chapter 7: **Noah, his family**, and the **animals** are delivered in the ark; and the **rains** then come down.

This leaves us with one verse that stands out from all of the others (and was later incorporated into the narrative):

[And Noah did all that the Y^ehowah had commanded him.](#)

The key to all of this coming to pass as it did is, Noah's obedience and Noah's action.

However, far more intricate than this is how Gen. 6–8 were organized. That is nothing short of amazing, and it will be covered in a future lesson.

Lesson 72: Genesis 7:17–20 Genesis 1:3–8

The Great Deluge

In the previous lesson, we touched on the final verses of this chapter, and the pattern which the writer had developed throughout this chapter.

What we will find to be remarkable, as we continue the Biblical flood narrative, is just how unremarkable this narrative is. Given the cataclysmic event before us, the language and description is rather low-key and understated.

[Gen 7:17 And the flood \[deluge\] was upon the earth forty days. And the waters increased and lifted up the ark, and it was raised up above the earth.](#)

First, we are given a time frame—the rains continue for 40 days and 40 nights, as does the water coming up from below. Noah built this ark on dry land, probably far from any body of water which could accommodate such a large vessel.

As I have mentioned before, Noah's name was probably a household word, and what he was doing was probably ridiculed at every dinner table, night after night. We do not know what system of communications existed in the antediluvian era, but I can speculate with a great deal of confidence that everyone knew who Noah was. He was the guy building this huge boat far inland and talking about this thing called rain.

In a previous lesson, I have given a few instances of tremendous rains to come upon the earth, and the example of one area which received no rain for 400 years, and suddenly, this area was flooded. However, quite obviously, these only occurred for a relatively short period of time. Now let me remind you of what the Bible said about the early meteorological conditions:

[Gen 1:3–8 And God said, "Let there be light," and there was light. And God saw that the light was good. And God separated the light from the darkness. God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And there was evening and there was morning, the first](#)

day. **And God said, "Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters."** And God made the expanse and separated the waters that were under the expanse from the waters that were above the expanse. And it was so. And God called the expanse Heaven. And there was evening and there was morning, the second day.

Recall what happened immediately before this:

Gen. 1:2 Yet the earth became a chaos and vacant, and darkness was on the surface of the submerged chaos. Yet the spirit of the Elohim is vibrating over the surface of the water. (Concordant Literal Version)

As you will recall from our study of these verses ([Lessons 3–9](#)), that it appeared as if the earth had been encased in ice and that the Holy Spirit warmed the surface waters, which would have filled the atmosphere with steam. Then God spends one entire day, making the atmosphere, a phenomenon that most writers would have taken for granted.

Not only does God create the atmosphere, which separates the waters from the waters (the water on land from the water in the atmosphere), but that these two sets of waters are treated equally. This does not mean that there was an equal amount of water above and below, but that does suggest that there was a tremendous amount of moisture in the atmosphere.

A *flatter* earth (where the oceans are not as deep nor the mountains as high) with a greater cloud cover would have affected the wind patterns on the earth, which are also a part of the water cycle; and this may have inhibited rain for a long period of time.

It has even been suggested by at least one person that there were ice rings about the earth (cirrus clouds are made up of billions of hexagonal ice crystals).

However, others have suggested that this sort of atmosphere would have kept the earth's surface temperature too high. Let me suggest two things—some of the sun's rays would have been deflected by ice crystals. We build certain kinds of roofs and use certain subroof materials in order to deflect heat, and such rings around the earth may have helped to maintain a fairly constant temperature, even more so than it is today. .

Furthermore, we always tend to associate the area where Adam and later Noah lived with the Middle East (as he will land on the Ararat Mountains); but the land mass that he lived on could have been further north or further south (vegetation has been found in the coal seams of the Antarctica; Greenland, at one time, was much greener). So we have no idea how far north or south Noah ended up traveling, nor do we know if continental drift occurred at the time of the flood.

As I mentioned before, one factor in the occurrence of rain is particulate matter. When a volcano erupts, it throws vast amounts of particulate matter into the atmosphere. Furthermore, about 70% of what comes out of a volcano is water, mostly in the form of

steam, which would *fuel* the rains, so to speak. So volcanic activity may have been related to the deluge.

There are a great many factors involved related to the temperature of the earth throughout human history. There appear to be some dramatic differences between the antediluvian era and the post-diluvian era. The Bible gives us only a few of them:

The Changing Conditions of the Earth	
Antediluvian Earth	Post-Diluvian Earth
The surface of the earth was less pronounced.	The mountains rose and the depths fell with the flood, making a future worldwide flood impossible (Psalm 104:5–9).
There was a great deal of moisture in the air; apparently more than there is now (Gen. 1:6–8). We do not know the form that it took, whether this included ice rings about the earth (Saturn has thousands of rings are made of ice and dust).	The amount of moisture in the air has apparently decreased.
There was no rain on the earth (Gen. 2:5–6).	Rain is a part of normal life.
The weather on earth was more temperate. Recall that Adam and Eve were naked when created and remained that way until the fall.	After the flood, the earth became more seasonal. Gen. 8:22
These are things which seem to be reasonably deduced from the Bible. However, there are additional differences between these 2 eras which are more theoretical.	

I have no idea if any of the following changes took place and if they are related to the deluge. Whether there was a cataclysmic event—e.g. a comet or an asteroid striking the earth—we do not know. Quite obviously, modeling something like this would be highly theoretical.

Theoretical Changing Conditions of the Earth	
Antediluvian Earth	Post-Diluvian Earth
The earth may not have rotated on an axis before, which could account for the more consistent temperatures.	Some of the changes noted, along with the great rains of the flood, could have been related to the earth being turned to rotate on an axis.

Theoretical Changing Conditions of the Earth

Antediluvian Earth	Post-Diluvian Earth
Particulate matter was thrown into the air, possibly by volcanic activity, which was a part of setting off the rains of Noah.	Particulate matter is commonly found in the earth's atmosphere.
Earthquakes and volcanic activity could have set off and perpetuated the rains during Noah's time.	Volcanos and earthquakes are a relatively common aspect of our lives today.
Noah and the antediluvian civilization could have lived further north or further south. Both plants and animals have been discovered preserved in ice far north and far south from what is common today.	There are regions of the Arctic and Antarctic where there is virtually no life.

Quite obviously, we can only speculate about many of these factors; however, what we have discovered in the arctic and antarctic suggests a far different climate for the earth at one time that we find today.

During the Tribulation, which will occur prior to the Millennium (the thousand year reign of Christ) (see [the Doctrine of Dispensations](#)), we have seismic events, including hail and fire being thrown to the earth (Rev. 8:5), being struck by a heavenly body (Rev. 8:10–11), along with severe earthquakes and extreme weather (Rev. 16:18–21).

Noah's ark, from its dry perch, now filled with animals and Noah's family, is lifted up by the waters beneath it. What had once been dry land had waters increasing upon it.

Gen 7:18 [And the waters prevailed and they greatly increased upon the earth. And the ark floated upon the face of the waters.](#)

The first verb in v. 18 is the Qal imperfect of *gâbar* (רָבַג) [pronounced *gaw^b-VAHR*], which means *to be strong, to be mighty, to exhibit greater strength than, to be stronger than, to prevail over*. Strong's #1396 BDB #149. The imperfect looks at this action as being continuous. The second verb *râbâh* (רָבַח) [pronounced *raw^b-VAWH*], means *to become much, to become many, to multiply, to increase in population and in whatever else*. Strong's #7235 BDB #915. This is followed by the adverb *exceedingly, greatly*. The waters overcome or prevail over the earth, and these waters continue to greatly increase.

The ark is no longer just lifted up, but now it is actually floating on the waters. Given the size of the ark, it seems reasonable that Noah may have built it in a valley, between two hills, in order to facilitate the building of it (I am speculating here). In any case, first the ark is lifted up, and then it begins to float.

Gen 7:19 [And the waters prevailed so mightily on the earth that all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered.](#)

The first verb in v. 19 is the Qal imperfect of *gâbar* (גָּבַר) [pronounced *gaw^b-VAHR*], which means *to be strong, to be mighty, to exhibit greater strength than, to be stronger than, to prevail over*. Strong's #1396 BDB #149. The imperfect looks at this action as being continuous. It is followed by the adverb *greatly, exceedingly*, which is repeated. *And the waters prevailed exceedingly greatly over the earth* is a fairly literal rendering of this first sentence.

The second phrase (or sentence) speaks of *all the high mountains which [are] under all the heavens*. If this were a local flood, the *high mountains in the land* might have been the subject of the verb; however, here, we are speaking of the mountains which are under all the heavens, which suggests that this flood is worldwide.

Gen 7:20 *The waters prevailed above the mountains, covering them fifteen cubits deep.*

For the 3rd time, we have the verb *to prevail*. In the Hebrew, this gives great emphasis to this verb, and in this great war between water and land, the waters have prevailed.

We have an estimation of how far up the waters have lifted the ark, and how far above even the mountains are these waters. I have no idea how much of the ark was above and below the waters; however, I am sure there was a great deal of turmoil in the waters over the land, and that this boat moved up and down, and sideways. However, there came a point at which this ark did not touch anything beneath it, meaning that the waters had to be at least 21.5 feet above the highest mountains (as the ark is 45 feet high). This almost, but not quite, allows the ark to float anywhere. If Noah had built the ark between 2 mountain ranges, no matter how far apart, he would have been confined to that area. That would have kept him from floating out to sea. Furthermore, even though these mountain ranges would have eventually been underwater, they would have also protected the ark, to some degree, from great tsunamis (again, this is all theoretical).

I do not know how Noah was able to come up with this particular figure—that the water covered the mountains by 15 cubits (21.5 ft.). I can offer two theoretical explanations for this figure: (1) God the Holy Spirit revealed this information to Noah, as he recorded it; or, (2) Noah knew how deep the ark was in the water; and he, from time to time, brushed up against mountain tops, where it could be estimated how far up was the contact between the ark and the mountain. This is because the ark was sitting deeper in the water than the heights of the mountains.

You will recall from [Gen. 1](#) that the earth was, at one time, packed in ice and that God the Holy Spirit warmed this ice, producing steam and water. The bringing together of various land masses and separating land from water would have been a result of this, as the water entered into the atmosphere as water vapor, land would have been exposed. Whether there were earthquakes and volcanic activity during the flood, we do not know, although that seems to be quite reasonable. As mentioned earlier, the steam and particulate matter that a volcano emits would have fueled the rains.

This is outside my area of expertise, but waters from below are coming to the surface, which empties out underground wells and rivers. Exactly what the mechanics of this is and what this leaves behind and how this affects what occurs under the surface of the earth, I do not know. Furthermore, this water, when it abates, is going to return to its underground wells and rivers, but it will be much cooler than it was originally.

Geysers today are generally found near active volcanoes. The water reaches a deep level in the earth, and it reacts with the tremendously hot temperatures below, causing the water to boil and expand, and finds its way quickly to the surface again. Again, based upon what we know today, earthquakes and volcanic activity again appear to have played some part in the Great Deluge.

Gen 7:19–20 And the waters prevailed so mightily on the earth that all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered. The waters prevailed above the mountains, covering them fifteen cubits deep.

The earth, as it is today, could not be covered with water—that would be an impossibility. The mountains are just too high and there just is not enough water. This suggests to us two possibilities: that the earth was flatter prior to the flood or that only the inhabited earth was covered with water. As has been earlier suggested, the earth's surface became more pronounced after the flood (Psalm 104:5–9, a passage we will look at in the next lesson). As to the second possibility, we will cover that in the next lesson, and why the Deluge of Noah was a worldwide phenomenon.

Lesson 73: Genesis 7:17–20

The Worldwide Deluge

In the previous lesson, we studied these verses:

Gen 7:17–20 And the flood was upon the earth forty days. And the waters increased and lifted up the ark, and it was raised up above the earth. And the waters prevailed and they greatly increased upon the earth. And the ark floated upon the face of the waters. And the waters prevailed so mightily on the earth that all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered. The waters prevailed above the mountains, covering them fifteen cubits deep.

However, we did not really complete the study of these verses.

Insofar as geological evidence is concerned, there is a difference of opinion concerning that. Several authors contend that there has been nothing discovered, as of yet, that would irrefutably indicate a flood of the disastrous proportions recorded in Genesis. Others, with less reliable archeological backgrounds, believe that there have been several discoveries that point to the flood of Genesis. There have been a dozen "ark sightings", but none have produced pictures or any other corroborating evidence. And, at this point in time, it is highly unlikely that an archeological team will be given the financial backing to search the mountains of Urartu for a ship. Furthermore, there is great prejudice on both

sides. Most geologists have a view of things which treat C-14 dating methods as infallible and they had a set of assumptions and beliefs under which they operate. On the other hand, the Christian community itself has a great deal of prejudice in this area.

Finally, there is the question as to how large an area was affected by the great flood. There are two basic viewpoints, one is that it was a world wide flood covering the entire earth to the highest mountain. This would require approximately eight times the amount of water than presently exists on the earth. Whether this water existed prior to the flood and was unleashed and then removed from the earth, we do not know. God is capable of effecting such an incredible miracle. It could have been a local flood, covering the entire populated earth. The word for land and earth are the same in the Hebrew and the word for heaven could mean the entire atmosphere of the earth, the heavens above or the general sky from horizon to horizon. One can even speculate as to whether God used a heavenly body, such as a comet, to have a tremendous gravitational pull upon the water to that portion of the world. We simply do not know and the Bible is not specific in this regard. What is clear in the recording of the flood is that it did destroy all flesh from the earth at that time.

For years, I will admit that I was somewhat skeptical of the notion of a worldwide flood. Like many others, I thought that perhaps it was a very dramatic, albeit, local flood. However, Robert Dean convinced me that it had to be a worldwide flood, with the following points:

Robert Dean on Why the Noahic Flood was Worldwide

- 1) The text itself tells us that the flood was universal. If the flood was local, why did Noah have to build an ark in the first place? Modern man did not build a ship equivalent to the size of the ark until 1856. It was a huge ship and it had more than enough room for the animals and the humans on board. So if the flood was local he had 120 years to walk to the other side of the mountains and miss the flood altogether.
- 2) If the flood was local, why did God send the animals to the ark so they would escape death. There would have been other animals to reproduce that particular kind of those who were the ones that died. They could have migrated another 100 miles and they would have been out of danger.
- 3) If the flood was local, why was the ark big enough to hold all the kinds of land vertebrate animals that have ever existed. If only the local Mesopotamian animals were threatened the ark could have been much smaller.
- 4) If the flood was local, why would birds have been sent on board. They could have easily flown across to a nearby mountain range.
- 5) If the flood was local, how could the waters rise to a height of fifteen cubits (21-22 feet) about the mountains-Genesis 7:20. We have to remember that water seeks its own level and couldn't rise to cover the local mountains and leave the rest of the world untouched.
- 6) If the flood was local, it would not have solved the problem of the corruption of the human race, which was itself a world-wide phenomenon. The cleansing of the

Robert Dean on Why the Noahic Flood was Worldwide

earth would have failed on both a real and a symbolic level, had the flood been local.

- 7) If the flood was local, people who did not happen to be living in the vicinity would not be affected by it. The words "[As it was in the days of Noah.](#)" are a prelude to Jesus describing the Tribulation (Mat. 24:37 Luke 17:26). If the flood was local then by analogy that would mean the Tribulation would also be partial. If the flood is reduced to a local situation it has implications for how we understand the Tribulation.
- 8) If the flood was local, then God has repeatedly broken His promise to never flood the earth again. Large local floods occur all of the time. To be consistent with God's promise, Noah's flood must be universal.
- 9) The words *all* and *every* and similar words are used more than 30 times in Gen. 6–9, which suggests the universality of this flood.
- 10) The Bible uses the double superlative in Gen. 7:19: [And the waters prevailed, exceedingly violent on the earth, and all the high mountains under all the heavens were covered.](#) This would reasonably refer to a worldwide flood and not to a local flood.
- 11) *All* which possessed the breath of life died (Gen. 7:22); which would certainly indicate worldwide flooding.
- 12) It takes over one full year for the inhabitants of the ark to be able to leave the ark, which is not typical of a local flood.
- 13) Even after the waters begin to abate and the ark grounded on the highest of the mountains, Ararat, it is another two and a half months before the tops of other mountains could be seen. That would not be true in a local flood.
- 14) Even after four months of receding flood waters the dove sent out by Noah could find no dry land on which to land.
- 15) It is an entire year or a little more before enough land had been exposed to permit the occupants to leave the ark.
- 16) The Hebrew word for *flood* used in this passage is never used except to refer to *Noah's flood*.
- 17) Similarly, The New Testament uses a unique term, kataklusmos (κατακλυσμός) [pronounced *kaht-ahk-looc-MOSS*] (from which we get the word *cataclysmic*), to describe the flood. Kataklusmos is not the usual Greek word for flood. So neither the Old Testament nor the New Testament use local flood terminology to describe Noah's flood.
- 18) There are new cosmological and meteorological conditions which come into existence after the flood. There are now sharply defined seasons, according to Genesis 8:22. There is now a rainbow that is a promise that God will not cause this kind of flood again.
- 19) Man's longevity began a long, slow decline immediately after the flood. This would not be the result of a local flood.
- 20) Later biblical writers accept the idea that this was a universal flood, both Old Testament writers and New Testament writers accept this as a world-wide flood, as did Jesus. If it is not, then that impugns the veracity of a lot of Scripture.

Robert Dean on Why the Noahic Flood was Worldwide

- 21) The Lord Jesus Christ accepted the historicity and universality of the world-wide flood, even making it the climactic sign and type of the coming world-wide judgment at the end of the Tribulation when He returns. Matthew 24:37-39
Luke 17:26–27.

Let me add a few points:

- 1) If this was a local flood, then corrupted mankind could have found some place to escape to. Recall, there were perhaps billions living on the earth at this time. If any place existed to which they could flee and have temporary safety, we may reasonably assume some would have done that, particularly taking into account the knowledge of those fallen angels who were there.
- 2) The verbiage also suggests a worldwide flood. We have the waters *prevailing* over the land, a phrase used 3 times in as many verses. 4 times in all, the waters are said *to prevail* over the earth (Gen. 7:18–20, 24). The strength of this verb of war along with the repetition of this verb are indicative of a worldwide flood.
- 3) It will take months for the waters to subside—the greater part of a year—which is hardly something which would have been true for a local flood, no matter how disastrous. I have lived near areas, where the water came up to the second floor of some houses. However, in less than a week, these waters subsided.
- 4) The mountains which are covered are not *the mountains of the land*, but ***all the high mountains under all the heavens***.

With respect to the Bible, this is quite clear—this was a flood which covered the entire earth. The Bible cannot be interpreted or understood in such a way as to allow for this to be a local flood, no matter how dramatic.

This comes from Dean's notes on his own lectures:

<http://phrasearch.com/Trans/DBM/setup/Genesis/Gen041.htm> (I edited the text)

The audio lecture is lesson #41 which can be downloaded from here:

<http://deanbible.org/andromeda.php?q=f&f=%2FAudio+Files%2F2003+-+Genesis>

Additional points are taken from <http://phrasearch.com/Trans/DBM/setup/Genesis/Gen045.htm>

I see no way of reasonably disputing these points. You may reject the universal flood on the basis of philosophical grounds, but that not only puts you at odds with the Bible, but with the Lord of Glory Himself.

I have had 2 basic concerns or questions which have occurred to me over the years, before studying the phenomenon of Noah's flood. *What about the heights of the mountains before and after the flood?* I have heard some make the assertion that there is not enough water on the earth to cover all of the mountains. If this is true, then the surface of the earth would have been less pronounced than it is today. Therefore, the mountains are higher today and the ocean valleys deeper today than before the flood. This would allow for the waters to cover the entire antediluvian earth and would also guarantee that no such flood could ever occur again. My experience with flooding, heavy rainstorms and hurricanes is, excess water tends to flatten a landscape more than leave

it more pronounced. This would require there to be a great deal of volcanic activity, both above and beneath the waters, as well as great seismic activity. We do not have a model for this and we have not observed such a thing to occur on a worldwide scale. Molten rock and matter shot from beneath the earth's surface would certainly allow room for surface water to escape to, as cavities beneath the earth are opened up. I do not know if any experimentation or observation along these lines has even been done (although the results of individual volcanic eruptions can be easily studied, as these eruptions occur reasonably frequently and the long term results can also be examined).

Given the power of huge amounts of moving water, it can certainly carve out canyons and the like.

Along these same lines, how long does it take for an active volcano to become inactive and leave no easy way to detect previous volcanic activity? Throughout California (and in many other places in the United States), there are fault lines, and these fault lines are related to earthquakes, which is a phenomenon closely related to volcanic activity.

The Bible actually speaks to the changes in latitude: **He [Yahweh] appointed [to] the earth its fixed, established place [i.e., its orbit] so that it would not totter [or, be shaken] forever and ever. You covered [Piel perfect, which is intensive completed action] the land with the sea, as with a garment. The waters were standing above the mountains [this is obviously the flood of Noah]. At Your rebuke, they [the waters] fled; at the sound of Your thunder, they hurried away. **The mountains [then] rose, the valleys sank down to the place which You had established for them.** You set a boundary so that they [the waters] may not pass over; that they may not return to cover the earth (Psalm 104:5–9).** This psalm tells us that God kept His promise to not flood the earth again by raising the mountains to greater heights and by lowering the valleys to a greater depth (which valleys, I would assume, are the ocean depths). The word for *thunder* in this verse can also refer to very loud sounds, as found in Job 39:25. So, this word could refer to the sounds of earthquakes and volcanos.

To me, it is fascinating that the Bible would speak of the mountains rising and the valleys falling, as this would not have concerned anyone until the modern era. Today, we can make estimates as to how much land could be covered by how much water, something which would possibly not have even been thought about in the ancient world. But, if the mountain rise up higher and the valleys drop down further, that would create a greater distance between the highest and lowest points on the earth, and result in an earth which cannot be completely covered with water. According to this psalm, God, in this way, set a boundary that the waters would not be able to pass over, so that they could not return to cover the earth. It is interesting that this thought would occur to me, but it seems doubtful that this thought would have occurred to some writer of Scripture 3000 years ago, so that they felt the need to write this down somewhere to help explain what God did in order to keep it from flooding again.

If there was a change in the height of the mountains and the depth of the valleys, that would explain how the earth could be covered by 22 feet of water at one time, but for such

a thing to be impossible today. According to Wikipedia, not always an accurate source, if the earth was completely flat, it would be covered by 2.7 km (1.7 miles) of water.²⁶ Therefore, it would be possible to cover the mountains with 22 ft. of water if they were lower than they are today.

Do we have any evidence of this apart from the Bible? We have reasonable evidence of land making dramatic upward and/or downward movements. For instance, there is an enormous fault line in the crust of the earth from northern Syria all the way through the Red Sea down the southeastern coast of Africa. On the western side of the arabah (a thin slice of land which extends from the Sea of Galilee down to the Red Sea, much of which is below sea level, there are limestone cliffs along the border which are 2000 to 3000 ft. high. On the other side are sandstone and granite rocks which are capped with limestone, which also rise up 2000 to 3000 feet. So, in between these sets of mountains, there has probably been a drop of 2000–3000 ft., which makes up this valley area in between, all of this being related to this great fault line. According to the Bible, this probably occurred at the end of the flood or soon thereafter.

Earthquakes have been shown to be a force which can change elevation. The New Madrid earthquakes of 1811–1812 both caused the Mississippi River to flow backwards for a time and established waterfalls on the Mississippi River as well.

So we may summarize that there was no rain upon the earth for 1600 years but there was a mist each morning. Then, waters came from below and from above and eventually covered the earth, whose surface was less pronounced then than it is today. During the flood, and possibly for years afterward, there was great seismic and volcanic activity, which resulted in higher mountains and lower oceans, giving water a place to go, and insuring that the earth could never be flooded in its entirety again. This may help to explain why, centuries later, sulphur was rained down from heaven on Sodom and Gomorrah (which itself may have been a volcanic event).

I, along with many theologians, believe that the turning of the earth on its axis and the flood were simultaneous events. The Bible seems to hint that this is true in Gen. 8:22 (“**While the earth remains, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night, shall not cease.**”), which verse introduces a plethora of new terms not seen before in the previous 7+ chapters of the Bible (which verse, of course, we will study in a future lesson). However, this is a speculative position.

My second question is this: *what about the salt in the saltwater? Did it not destroy the land?* According to Woodmorappe, who cites another study, one good rainfall (or good irrigation) can dramatically reduce the amount of salt in the soil.²⁷ Furthermore, we do not know how salty that the oceans were in the antediluvian era.

²⁶ From <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth> accessed January 19, 2010; their footnote refers back to Harrison, Roy M.; Hester, Ronald E. (2002). *Causes and Environmental Implications of Increased UV-B Radiation*. Royal Society of Chemistry.

²⁷ John Woodmorappe; *Noah's Ark: A Feasibility Study*; Institute for Creation Research, ©1996; p. 153.

Related to this are the saltwater and freshwater fish, and that some are able to adapt to saltier and less salty water (particularly if the saltiness is reduced or increased gradually). Salmon live in both saltwater and freshwater. If there came to be a more pronounced difference in fresh water and salt water, then the fish of Noah's era would have adapted to these changes (most Christians do believe in micro-evolution;²⁸ that is, that a breed of animal will adapt to its surroundings, and become even more adapted over several generations). I recall the first month I was in Texas and working underneath my car, I thought I was going to die because of the heat and humidity. Now, I work outside all of the time during the summer, and it is no big deal to me.

Woodmorappe actually spends much more time examining seeds, and how they were preserved, and cross-pollination concerns. He spends about 10 pages on the fauna of the land, the problems and concerns cited by others, and which studies and theories would answer those concerns. Again, this is not a book I recommend, unless you have an interest in all of the nuts and bolts of the flood and the repopulation of the earth. Woodmorappe considers a huge number of topics which had never occurred to me, and he references studies and research not done by creationists, but by scientists who have studied related topics.

Lesson 74: Genesis 7:17–24 Worldwide Destruction/Lessons from the Deluge

In the previous lesson, we studied these verses:

Gen 7:17–20 And the deluge [flood] was upon the earth forty days. And the waters increased and lifted up the ark, and it was raised up above the earth. And the waters prevailed and they greatly increased upon the earth. And the ark floated on top of the waters. And the waters prevailed so mightily on the earth that all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered. The waters prevailed above the mountains, covering them 21.5 ft. deep.

We also studied the reasons why this was a worldwide event and how God made it impossible for such a flood to reoccur (by deepening the valleys and raising up the mountains, as per Psalm 104:5–9. While studying the *Arabah*, I have come across some geological evidence that such things have taken place. There is an enormous fault line in the crust of the earth from northern Syria all the way through the Red Sea down the southeastern coast of Africa. On the western side of the arabah (a thin slice of land which extends from the Sea of Galilee down to the Red Sea, much of which is below sea level, there are limestone cliffs along the border which are 2000 to 3000 ft. high. On the other side are sandstone and granite rocks which are capped with limestone, which also rise up 2000 to 3000 feet. So, in between these sets of mountains, there has been an apparent drop of 2000–3000 ft., which makes up this valley area in between, all of this is related to this great fault line. According to the Bible, this probably occurred at the end of the flood

²⁸ Macroevolution, by contrast, is where one type of animal changes into another; like reptiles turning into birds.

or soon thereafter. Although this is just one example, we have fault lines all over the world which are still active even today. This example is a particularly good one, as we have enough movement which would approximate that needed to make this into a world which could not be subject to a complete and total flood again.

Gen 7:19–20 And the waters prevailed, exceedingly violent on the earth, and all the high mountains under the heavens were covered. The waters prevailed, 21.5 feet above, and the mountains were covered.

V. 21 then tells us what happened as a result.

Gen 7:21 And all flesh that moved upon the face of the earth died, of birds, of cattle, of animal, and of every moving thing that moves upon the earth; and every man, all who breathed the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died.

Recall that there was great unbelief on the earth at this time. Despite fallen angels knowing God, their sons—the Nephilim—did not believe in Jehovah Elohim. Therefore, while Noah built his ark, none of them chose to do likewise or to join with Noah. God provided one means of salvation, which was Noah's ark. The Nephilim chose not to believe God. The spiritual parallel ought to be obvious: God has provided one means of salvation, and that is Jesus Christ. We either believe God or we do not. If we choose not to believe God, the end result is death.

Gen 7:22 Everything on the dry land in whose nostrils was the breath of life died.

Some modern translations obscure what we find here. God's Word™ renders this **Everything on dry land (every living, breathing creature) died**. There are creatures on this earth which do not breathe through their nostrils: fish and insects. *Insects do not breathe through nostrils but through tiny pores ('tracheae') in their exterior skeleton ('shell').*²⁹ So, although many insects and fish and water mammals were destroyed in the flood, obviously, some of them survived. The idea is, those animals who principally live on dry ground were all killed by the flood.

With regards to insects, it is unclear whether they became a part of the ark's cargo, or whether they survived on rafts of vegetation. However, given the power of the flood waters, I would assume that insects were a part of the animal kingdom onboard the ark.

Fish and other marine life, survived, and some critics have made a big deal out of this. Quite obviously, there is a mixing of saltwater and freshwater here, although it is not clear at the beginning if the oceans were saltwater then as they are today (or if they were the same concentration).

There is a great adaptability factor in all animals (including man), which is called, by some, micro-evolution. Animals adapt to varying environmental circumstances and through

²⁹ From <http://creation.com/images/pdfs/cabook/chapter13.pdf> accessed August 5, 2009.

breeding and survival of the fittest, become even more adapted to their circumstances. It is reasonable to suppose that animals for the antediluvian era were even more adaptable than they are now.

Woodmorappe examines this question of freshwater fish and saltwater fish, and there have been a great many studies on this very subject. It is not that anyone had a burning desire to know about the marine life during the deluge, but these studies were made to see how adaptable animals are. Strictly saltwater fish can be gradually taken from present-day salt levels to half or less of a concentration of salt, and most do fine with that. There are many which tolerate even less salt. Freshwater fish can be adapted to brackish water (water with more dissolved salts in it) and most actually do better in brackish water (a trick of those who keep fresh water aquariums is to add a teaspoon of non-iodized salt per gallon; or a professionally mixed salt for salt-water, and this results in healthier fish). Woodmorappe goes into much greater detail on this subject; but the conclusion is antediluvian fish could have survived this, despite the change of the salt concentrate of the waters in which they lived. It should be clear that, from all of the rain and all of the underground water coming to the surface, the end result would have been saltwater would become less salty and freshwater would have been more salty, and that, many saltwater and freshwater fish and sea life would have survived.

Gen 7:23 And every living thing which was on the face of the earth was destroyed, from man to cattle, and to the creeping things, and the fowls of the heavens. And they were destroyed from the earth, and only Noah was left, and those that were with him in the ark.

Everything which lives on land was destroyed by the flood, apart from Noah and his family and the animals which they took with them upon the ark.

There is a very important doctrine suggested by this verse, and that is the doctrine of blessing by association. Noah is a mature believer, and Noah's family is blessed because of their association with Noah. No doubt, they are all believers, but the Bible only features Noah prominently, which suggests that he is the only mature believer of the family. However, there is not enough in this passage to teach this doctrine; there is just enough to make you aware that it exists.

So, according to Genesis 7:23, a massive number of animals were killed suddenly and the earth was covered in water. This would suggest that we ought to find massive sea life graveyards all over, even in mountains; and massive animal graveyards as well. Given the briefness of this flood event (brief, comparatively speaking, to the age many scientists suggest for the earth), this evidence ought to be fossilized and worldwide.

Fossil Evidence for Massive Animal Graveyards

Billions of straight-shelled, chambered nautiloids are found fossilized with other marine creatures in a 7 foot (2 m) thick layer within the Redwall Limestone of Grand Canyon .¹ This fossil graveyard stretches for 180 miles (290 km) across northern Arizona and into southern Nevada, covering an area of at least 10,500 square miles (30,000 km²). These squid-like fossils are all different sizes, from small, young nautiloids to their bigger, older relatives. To form such a vast fossil graveyard required 24 cubic miles (100 km³) of lime sand and silt, flowing in a thick, soup-like slurry at more than 16 feet (5 m) per second (more than 11 mph [18 km/h]) to catastrophically overwhelm and bury this huge, living population of nautiloids.

Hundreds of thousands of marine creatures were buried with amphibians, spiders, scorpions, millipedes, insects, and reptiles in a fossil graveyard at Montceau-les-Mines, France.²

More than 100,000 fossil specimens, representing more than 400 species, have been recovered from a shale layer associated with coal beds in the Mazon Creek area near Chicago.³ This spectacular fossil graveyard includes ferns, insects, scorpions, and tetrapods buried with jellyfish, mollusks, crustaceans, and fish, often with soft parts exquisitely preserved.

At Florissant, Colorado, a wide variety of insects, freshwater mollusks, fish, birds, and several hundred plant species (including nuts and blossoms) are buried together.⁴ Bees and birds have to be buried rapidly in order to be so well preserved.

Alligator, fish (including sunfish, deep sea bass, chubs, pickerel, herring, and garpike 3-7 feet [1-2 m] long), birds, turtles, mammals, mollusks, crustaceans, many varieties of insects, and palm leaves (7-9 feet [2-2.5 m] long) were buried together in the vast Green River Formation of Wyoming.⁵

All of this comes from <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v3/n2/world-graveyard>, which is an article by Andrew A. Snelling, who holds a PhD in geology from the University of Sydney and has worked as a consultant research geologist to organizations in both Australia and America. Author of numerous scientific articles, Dr. Snelling is now the head of the Research Division at Answers in Genesis-USA.

¹ Steven Austin, "Nautiloid Mass Kill and Burial Event, Redwall Limestone (Lower Mississippian), Grand Canyon Region, Arizona and Nevada," in Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Creationism, ed. R. L. Ivey (Pittsburgh: Creation Science Fellowship, 2003), pp. 55-99.

² Daniel Heyler and Cecile M. Poplin, "The Fossils of Montceau-les-Mines," Scientific American, September 1988, pp. 70-76.

³ Charles Shabika and Andrew Hay, eds. Richardson's Guide to the Fossil Fauna of Mazon Creek (Chicago: Northeastern Illinois University, 1997). Back

⁴ Theodore Cockerell, "The Fossil Flora and Fauna of the Florissant Shales," University of Colorado Studies 3 (1906): 157-176; Theodore Cockerell, "The Fossil Flora of Florissant, Colorado," Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History, 24 (1908): 71-110. Back

⁵ Lance Grande, "Paleontology of the Green River Formation with a Review of the Fish Fauna," The Geological Survey of Wyoming Bulletin 63 (1984).

This is just a small portion of what is available. You can simply google *scientific evidence for the Genesis flood* (or words to that effect), and you will find a massive amount of evidence.

You may say, *I've taken a number of science and geology courses, and I have never heard these things*. We are in a spiritual battle. Part of this spiritual battle involves truth. What you studied in high school and college was not necessarily the truth. Most often, many things are simply edited out. We find this in our history books and in our newspapers. A good recent example of this was the first wave of TEA parties across the United States. Most news organizations, although aware of these TEA parties, completely ignored them. Not a single photo, no line of copy, no footage on television (with the notable exception of one particular news organization). During the second wave of TEA parties, these news organizations realized that they could not ignore them again, so they then presented these demonstrators in the worst light possible. This sort of thing exists in every level, whether we are talking about science, history or current events. Those who are supposed to be disseminating the truth, don't. Therefore, do not expect to walk into an historical geology class, and for the professor to say, "There are two very different approaches to the history of the earth; creationism and evolution. There are learned scientists with excellent credentials and good reputations who believe that there exists strong scientific evidence for both views, and we will examine this evidence in this course." That is just not going to happen in 99% of our schools.

Gen 7:24 And the waters prevailed upon the earth a hundred and fifty days.

After 40 days of rain and water coming from down below, there are an additional 150 days where the waters prevail over the earth. As we have observed on numerous occasions, once a heavy rain stops, that is not necessarily the end of all the flooding. On the Mississippi river, people had hours and some had days to prepare for the coming flooding during the devastating rains which we had in the early summer of 2008.

In the great deluge, the land was covered by 21.5 feet of water, so it would take time for the water to subside, to be sucked back into the ground or to evaporate. It is my theory that there would have been underwater earthquakes, tsunamis, and volcanic activity, which would result in land masses being formed. Simultaneously, as volcanoes shot out lava, water would be pulled down into the vacuum which was underground. This cooler water being sucked down into such a heated interior likely resulted in more violent geological activity (when a volcano erupts, much of what comes out of the volcano is steam).

Although most colleges and universities reject out of hand the idea of a recent world-wide flood in favor of a very slowly changing earth, the Institute for Creation Research studies various theories based upon their assumptions of the truth of the Bible. Modern geology presupposes gradualism and incrementalism (i.e., what has happened to the earth took place over a long period of time) while the ICR does not make those assumptions.

Their webpage is <http://www.icr.org/>

One of the evidences which appears to favor a catastrophic world-wide flood is the widespread strata blankets. John Morris: *The Sauk Sequence extends throughout North America and appears to extend into Europe. The Tippecanoe Sequence also covers much of North America and may well extend into Europe and Africa. There are also intercontinental redbed sequences, intercontinental tuff beds, and coal-bearing strata cycles.*³⁰

An evidence of volcanic activity is that we have volcanic rock found throughout the various strata.

Robert Dean gives us 4 principles based upon what we have studied so far, to which I added 4 more:

Dean's Lessons from the Deluge

- 1) God provided a way of salvation (deliverance) prior to judgment. He announces the judgment but He also provides a way of salvation (deliverance). This counters all the arguments from unbelievers that God is too harsh. God provides a perfect way of salvation that deals with all the problems and if it is rejected then there will be judgment.
- 2) God's way of salvation (deliverance) is determined by Him alone. Man does not decide what the basis of his salvation is. God is exclusive in the way He deals with salvation, there is only one way of salvation. There is only one ark; there is only one door on the ark; and there is only one way of eternal salvation and that is through Jesus Christ who said: **"I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man comes to the Father, but by Me."**
- 3) God is capable of delivering us in any set of circumstances. There is no set of circumstances in one's life that is more powerful than the grace of God. It should be clear that a flood which lasts for a year is an impossible set of circumstances.
- 4) Noah knows about the upcoming flood because God told him it was coming. Everyone else knows about this because Noah is building this ark. Some believe that God's judgment is coming and some do not (or, they choose to ignore it). Judgment is revealed by divine revelation.
- 5) The issue in the post-salvation life is to apply the doctrine we know to advance in the Christian life. In the Old Testament the spiritual life operated on the basis of the faith-rest drill (something we have not studied yet), applying the promises and principles of the Old Testament to the spiritual life.

³⁰ <http://www.icr.org/geological-strata/> accessed January 19, 2010.

Dean's Lessons from the Deluge

- 6) In the Church Age (the period of time in which we live) there is the additional dynamic of living under the filling of the Holy Spirit, that our spiritual growth is based on the ability to apply doctrine while we are walking in the Spirit. It is the Holy Spirit who produces spiritual growth, and as we persevere in the midst of testing then God the Holy Spirit uses that doctrine that we are applying to develop spiritual growth and spiritual maturity.
- 7) In this life, whether saved or not, we are without excuse. If we are unsaved, we are without excuse of the judgment to come; if we are saved, we are without excuse as to the mechanics of the spiritual life. **For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who by their unrighteousness suppress the truth. For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. For his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived, ever since the creation of the world, in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse. For although they knew God, they did not honor Him as God or give thanks to Him, but they became futile in their thinking, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Claiming to be wise, they became fools** (Rom. 1:18–23).
 - (1) As a sub-point, the more we know about science the more our faith ought to be strengthened.
 - (2) Superficially, this appears to be a random world, filled with random events; however, the more we know, the more complex and orderly we find this universe to be.
- 8) If you are a believer in Jesus Christ (and I would assume that to be so, if you have read this far), then you have no excuse to be confused by the whirl of events around you. You have no reason to think that God has abandoned you here without resources or guidance. Every believer has just as much direction in his life as Noah has had in these chapters of the Word of God.

This came from Robert Dean's notes on Genesis, Lesson Genesis-046 located at: <http://phrasearch.com/Trans/DBM/setup/Genesis/Gen046.htm> (I edited and appended the text, doubling the number of points). The audio lecture is lesson #46 which can be downloaded from here: <http://deanbible.org/andromeda.php?q=f&f=%2FAudio+Files%2F2003+-+Genesis>

Lesson 75: Genesis 7 The Deluge Compared to Ancient Myths and Traditions

Nearly every ancient culture has a story of a great flood, not unlike what we find here in the Bible. This, in itself, is quite amazing, inasmuch as we are quite limited in how much we know about each culture. The Sumerians speak of a god telling Zi-ud-sura that there would be a flood which would come and destroy all mankind. He was instructed to build a huge boat. This was a 7-day flood.

The Akkadian epic has one god sending the flood upon the earth and another god who comes to warn Atrahasis of the coming flood, and he is told to build a huge ship. The

The table below (The Principal Features of the Biblical Record) is fascinating, because it takes the flood traditions from 40 different cultures and compares them to the historical world flood of Genesis.

I took this from: <http://www.accuracyingenesis.com/flood.html> who took this from Byron C. Nelson, *The Deluge Story in Stone* (Augsburg, Minneapolis, 1931), Appendix II, Flood Traditions, Figure 38.

It might also be worthwhile to compare the worldwide flood of Genesis and compare this to the very famous Gilgamesh epic (which I have also seen spelled *Gilgamesh* and *Galgamesh*).

Similarities between Genesis and Gilgamesh

Superficially, the flood accounts appear to be similar:

1. The principle action related to the flood occurs in the Mesopotamian plain.
2. The main character is warned to build a boat to escape the flood
3. The main character is told to save himself, his family, and a sampling of animals
4. The boats were sealed with tar
5. The boats came to rest on a mountain
6. Birds were released to determine if the waters receded
7. The main character sacrificed an offering

From <http://www.godandscience.org/apologetics/gilgamesh.html> accessed December 16, 2009.

The references to other websites are not included so as to recommend these websites or the information contained therein. However, these charts I found to be of particular importance with regards to the historicity of the Noahic flood.

I have found that a number of sources, even those which are not doctrinally correct in the realm of theology, produce good material when it comes to apologetics. I was first exposed to very good arguments against evolution, for instance, from the Jehovah's witnesses and from the Worldwide Church of God (back when this church taught a lot of false doctrine).

Another author gives a more extensive list of similarities:

In both the Genesis and Galgamesh stories:

1. The Genesis story describes how mankind had become repugnant to God; they were hopelessly sinful and wicked. In the Babylonian story, man had become too numerous and too noisy.
2. The gods (or God) decided to send a worldwide flood. This would drown men, women, children, babies and infants, as well as eliminate all of the land animals and birds.
3. The gods (or God) knew of one righteous man, Ut-Napishtim or Noah.

In both the Genesis and Galgamesh stories:

4. The gods (or God) ordered the hero to build a multi-story wooden ark (called a chest or box in the original Hebrew).
5. The ark would be sealed with pitch.
6. The ark would have with many internal compartments
7. It would have a single door
8. It would have at least one window.
9. The ark was built and loaded with the hero, a few other humans, and samples from all species of other land animals.
10. A great rain covered the land with water.
11. The mountains were initially covered with water.
12. The ark landed on a mountain in the Middle East.
13. The hero sent out birds at regular intervals to find if any dry land was in the vicinity.
14. The first two birds returned to the ark. The third bird apparently found dry land because it did not return.
15. The hero and his family left the ark, ritually killed an animal, offered it as a sacrifice.
16. God (or the Gods in the Epic of Gilgamesh) smelled the roasted meat of the sacrifice.
17. The hero was blessed.
18. The Babylonian gods seemed genuinely sorry for the genocide that they had created. The God of Noah appears to have regretted his actions as well, because he promised never to do it again.

Taken from http://www.religioustolerance.org/noah_com.htm accessed December 16, 2009.

In neither the Genesis flood account nor the Galgamesh story can we attribute this to a really dramatic local flood. None of the places where these traditions intersect, could one reasonably suggest that we are speaking of a local flood.

Significant Differences Between Genesis and Epic of Gilgamesh		
Characteristic	Genesis	Gilgamesh
Reason for flood	Human wickedness and corruption (Gen. 6:4–5)	Excessive human noisiness and over population
Response of deity	The Lord was sorry He made man because of his wickedness (Gen. 6:5–6, 11)	The gods could not sleep

Significant Differences Between Genesis and Epic of Gilgamesh

Characteristic	Genesis	Gilgamesh
Warned by	Y ^e howah (Yahweh-Elohim) (Gen. 6:3, 7)	Ea (which may be pronounced quite similarly to <i>Y^ehowah</i>); this may be closely related to the word for <i>earth</i> as well.
Main character	Noah ("rest") (Gen. 6:8)	Utnapishtim ("finder of life")
Why character chosen	A righteous man (Gen. 6:9)	No reason given
Intended for	All humans except Noah and his family (Gen. 6:7, 13 7:2, 7, 23)	All humans
Decision to send flood	Yahweh (God) (Gen. 6:13 7:4)	Council of the gods (primarily Enlil)
Builders	Noah and family (Gen. 6:14–22)	Utnapishtim, his family, and many craftsmen from city
Character's response	Noah warned his neighbors of upcoming judgment as "Proclaimer of righteousness" (2Peter 2:4–5)	Told by Ea to lie to neighbors so that they would help him build the boat
Building time	100–120 years (Gen. 5:32 6:3 7:6)	7 days
Boat size	450x75x45 feet (Gen. 6:15)	200x200x200 feet (which is a very unseaworthy cube)
Boat roof	Wood (Gen. 6:14)	Slate (top heavy?)
# Decks	3 (Gen. 6:16)	6
Humans	Noah and family (Gen. 7:1, 7, 13, 23)	Utnapishtim, his family, and craftsmen from city
Cargo	Animals and food (Gen. 6:19, 21)	Animals, food, gold jewels, and other valuables
Launching	By the flood waters (Gen. 7:17)	Pushed to the river
Door closed by	Yahweh (God) (Gen. 7:16)	Utnapishtim

Significant Differences Between Genesis and Epic of Gilgamesh

Characteristic	Genesis	Gilgamesh
Sign of coming flood	None, apart from God's Word	Extremely bright light sent by the Annanuki (collection of Sumerian gods)
Waters sent by	Yahweh (God) (Gen. 6:17–18)	Adad, with help from gods Shamash, Shullat, Hanish, Erragal, Ninurta
Reaction of deity to flood	In control of waters (Gen. 7:2)	Gods scrambled to get away from water like "whipped dogs"
Duration of rain	40 days (Gen. 7:12)	7 days
Duration of flooding	370 days (Gen. 7:11–12 8:4, 14)	14 days
Boat landing	Mt. Ararat (Armenia?) (Gen. 8:4)	Mt. Nisir
Deity's reaction to human deaths	No regret mentioned (however, there was some expressed regret with respect to making man in the first place)	Regretted that they had killed all the humans
Birds sent out	Raven returns, dove returns second time with olive branch, then leaves (Gen. 8:7–12)	Dove returns, swallow returns, raven does not return
Offering after flood	One of every clean animal and bird (Gen. 8:20)	Wines and a sheep
Aftermath	God promises not to destroy humanity by flood again (Gen. 9:8–11)	Gods quarrel among themselves, god Ea lies to Enlil. Utnapishtim and wife given immortality like the gods
Repopulation	Noah and family told to multiply and repopulate the earth (Gen. 9:1)	Ea and Mami created 14 human beings to help repopulate the earth

You will note that, every time the Gilgamesh epic diverges from the Genesis record, the latter account is always the more reasonable.

Information about the Noachic flood came from Gen. 6–9; information about the Gilgamesh epic came from the [Epic of Gilgamesh Tablet XI](#).

Overall table from <http://www.godandscience.org/apologetics/gilgamesh.html> accessed December 16, 2009 and slightly edited.

Apart from the Biblical record, the Gilgamesh epic appears to be the most rational of the ancient flood myths, and certainly the most detailed.

If you were to search the internet for serious debate about Noah's ark and the Genesis flood, you would find this occurring in dozens upon dozens of places. It would not be unusual to come across a discussion which is going on right now, with people making impassioned arguments about the accuracy of the Biblical account of the flood and equally impassioned arguments from the other side. More than likely, there will be name calling and even cursing involved.

On the other hand, if you were to search for discussions of Gilgamesh (or of any other flood myth), you might find it sandwiched into arguments over the Genesis account, but you will not find people separately arguing as to its historicity. There is no reason to.

Numerous authors have written about the Noahic flood, both pro and con. Entire books have been written about Noah's ark and the Biblical account of the flood. In fact, entering *Noah's Ark* into Amazon's search engine yields over 32,000 books. A similar search for *Gilgamesh* yields about a 4th as many. As I began to look through the books on Gilgamesh, I found the word *myth* occurring again and again; and I saw no books which appeared to be either *for* or *against* the Gilgamesh epic (in terms of its accuracy). In the first 100 listings for *Noah's Ark*, 6 books were clearly apologetical in nature (that is, they were affirming this historicity of the Biblical account) and 1 opposed the Biblical account as fallacious (the bulk of the listings for *Noah's Ark* were children's books).

Woodmorappe's book lists about 1600 references, and about 1 out of 20 of these are authors who wrote seriously either for or against the Genesis account of the flood. There has to be something here in this historical account of the flood in order to inspire so many people to write seriously on this particular topic.

Lesson 76: Genesis 8:1-3

The Flood Subsides/The Omniscience of God

In the previous lesson, we briefly examined some of the flood myths which have come down to us from dozens of cultures and peoples, and we saw some of the similarities and differences between the Noahic flood and the other flood traditions.

In the lessons previous to that, we examined the record of the Genesis flood in fairly great detail. Gen. 7 was about Noah and his family entering into the ark; Gen. 8 will have them exiting the ark. Gen. 7 was about the great war between the earth and the sea, where the sea continued to prevail; Gen. 8 is about the subsidence of the flood waters, where, finally, land will dominate.

Gen. 8:1 is the center of this narrative—a narrative which we will later see is very carefully structured to make v. 1 its center.

Gen 8:1a And God remembered Noah, and every living thing, and all the cattle which were with him in the ark.

We have discussed anthropopathisms before, which is the assignment of human feelings or passions or human limitations to God. The Bible reads: **And God remembered Noah.** God was not busy making a sandwich one day, and then suddenly said to Himself, “Oh, crap, I forgot all about Noah. I had better go check up on him. Hope he is okay” However, we have the verb *to remember* here used, ascribing to God a characteristic which He does not actually possess; God does not need *to remember* something. God knows all that is going on.

A fair question would be, *how do we know that this is an anthropopathism? How do we know to take one part of the Bible literally, and then, when we come to this verse, we determine, its an anthropopathism?*

Let's look at what the Bible says about the Omniscience of God.

The Omniscience of God

1. The definition of God's omniscience: God knows all things, past, present and future, real and potential, and He understands all these things simultaneously. He not only knows what was, and what is, he also knows what will be. Time was invented by God, so God is not subject to time. So, knowing all events—past, present and future—is a part of God's knowledge, because God is not confined to time as we are. More than that, God knows all that is and all that *could* be.
2. *Omniscience* is derived from two Latin words: *omnis* means *all*; and *sciens* means *knowing*.
3. Scriptural documentation for God's omniscience:
 - 1) **Whenever our heart condemns us, God is greater than our heart; He knows everything** (1John 3:20).
 - 2) **Great is our LORD, and of great power; There is no limit to His understanding** (Psalm 147:5).
 - 3) **Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in His sight, but all things are naked and opened to the eyes of Him with whom we have to do** (Heb. 4:13).
 - 4) **There is none holy as Jehovah, for there is none beside You. Neither is there any rock like our God. Talk no more so very proudly. Remove arrogance out of your mouth, for **Jehovah is a God of knowledge**, and by Him actions are weighed** (1Sam. 2:2–3).
 - 5) No thought or purpose is withheld from God. Job 42:2b
 - 6) Psalm 139:1–6 is all about God's omniscience: **O Jehovah, You have searched me and have known me. You know my sitting down and my rising up; You understand my thought afar off. You search my path and**

The Omniscience of God

my lying down, and are acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue, but, lo, O Jehovah, You know it altogether. You have closed me in behind and in front, and laid Your hand on me. Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot go up to it.

4. Other Biblical statements which indicate that God is omniscient:
 - 1) God numbers the hairs on your head. Luke 12:7
 - 2) He knows your words before you speak them. Psalm 139:4
 - 3) He knows your thoughts before you think them. Psalm 139:2
 - 4) He knows your prayers before you pray them. Matt. 6:8
 - 5) He knows everything you are going to do tomorrow, next week, next month, next year, and every moment of every day until the moment of your death. Psalm 139:16
 - 6) He sees everything you do in secret—both the good and the bad. Matt. 6:4
5. God's knowledge is *complete*. Job 37:16
6. God knows the end from the beginning, which explains why there is so much prophecy in the Bible (some estimate that 20% of the Bible's content is prophetic). Isa. 41:26 42:9 46:10
7. God knows everything there is to know about us (and everyone else, good and evil). Job 31:4 34:21 Jer. 16:17
8. Jesus Christ, as the Son of God, is omniscient (Matt. 9:4 11:27 John 2:25 11:11–14 18:4).
9. The Holy Spirit is omniscient, for **no one knows the thinking of God except the Spirit of God** (1Cor. 2:10–11).
10. Because God foreknew us, He predestined us to be conformed to the image of His Son. Rom. 8:29
11. God is outside of time. Therefore, God's knowledge is not dependent upon time. Consequently, God does not have to learn things, and, furthermore, His knowledge is not subject to forgetfulness.
12. See also Psalm 139:12 147:4 Isa. 43:9 Nahum 1:7 Acts 2:23 15:18

Some of these points came from:

<http://www.keepbelieving.com/sermon/1997-02-16-His-Eye-Is-On-the-Sparrow-The-Doctrine-of-Gods-Omniscience/> (which sermon appears to be quite accurate and worth reading, if this subject interests you). See also R. B. Thieme, Jr., *Divine Essence*; ©1973 by R. B. Thieme, Jr.; pp. 11–12.

Based upon this doctrine, of which doctrine I have only scratched the surface, we know that God did not *forget* about Noah.

However, the idea is, Noah is in this ark for a year with his family and all of those animals, and I am sure that even he begins to wonder when he will see land again, and if God remembers that he and his family are floating around in the ark.

This word *remember* is often used when God delivers someone from judgment or answers a petition made to Him (Gen. 19:29 30:22 Ex. 2:24). God has perfect timing. Often when we pray for something, we want it right then or awhile ago. However, if God answers

yes to that prayer, that does not mean that He gives this to us right then and there. When God grants us a petition, He gives it to us on His Own time, which is perfect timing.

Essentially, God is *remembering* His covenant with Noah, which is Gen. 6:13–21. He told Noah exactly what to do, and now God must fulfill His part of the covenant, to ultimately deliver Noah, his family and the animals to a land which has been both cleansed and devastated (not unlike the implied devastation between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2). We know that, by this time, everything that lived on dry land and breathes air has died (Gen. 7:22–23). Now God has to prepare the world for Noah and all that is in his ark.

Gen 8:1b And God made a wind [or, a Spirit] to pass over the earth, and the waters subsided.

The first verb is the Hiphil imperfect (causative extended or future action) of *ʿâbar* (עָבַר) [pronounced *gaw^b-VAHR*], which means *to pass over, to pass through, to pass on, to pass, to go over*. In the causative stem, it means *to cause [make] to pass over, to cause [allow] to pass through, to bring [over, to]; to transmit, to send over*. Strong's #5674 BDB #716. What God *causes to pass over* is *rûwach* (רוּחַ) [pronounced *ROO-ahkh*], which means *wind, breath, spirit, apparition*. This is the word used to refer both to the *Holy Spirit* and to the *spirit* of man, as well as to *wind* and *breath*. Strong's #7307 BDB #924. You cannot see the wind (or the spirit), but its affects are clearly seen.

Having lived in Texas for the past 30 or so years, I have experienced the wind. If memory serves, I have been in at least 4 hurricanes, some of which were at full force (for this far inland) and some of which were petering out by the time they got to my house. I have never seen the wind, but I sincerely and adamantly believe in it. One of the most amazing sights I have seen, and I am sorry I did not take a photo of this, is a 70–80 ft. pine tree which had been picked up and laid end-to-end length-wise along the very top of a house, with the roots hanging over one end of the house and the crown of the tree hanging over the other end of the house, perfectly balanced across the roof. I became a firm believer in the wind after seeing that with my own eyes (I did not see the process, but only the end result). Even if I had been there at the time, I would not have been able to see the wind which caused this event—which uprooted a huge pine tree, lifted it up 25' or more in the air, and then laid it gently upon this house, all along the very crest of the roof. But I believe in that wind; I know it was real, even though I did not see that wind and have never seen wind before. At best, I can see the effects of the wind, but the wind itself is invisible (which explains why the Hebrews used the same word to describe both the *wind* and the *Holy Spirit*).

John Morris suggests³¹ that one effect of the wind would be to dry out the saturated earth. There would have been considerable water run off, as well as evaporation which would be taking place after 150 days (the length of time that the waters prevailed over the earth). Morris also suggests that this would have triggered a mini-ice age, which would not have seriously affected Noah and his family, who are near the equator. He writes *A hot ocean*

³¹ <http://www.icr.org/article/providential-wind/> accessed January 19, 2010.

*(more evaporation)--coupled with cold continents (greater temperature differential, sending the moisture inland) and an atmosphere filled with volcanic debris (less snowmelt due to decreased sunlight)--would have triggered staggering storms and immense snow buildup.*³²

The subsidence (abating or decreasing) of the waters was a process which took time. Whether it is the Holy Spirit or the wind being involved in this abatement is open for debate. However, given the parallels between this passage and Gen. 1, I would maintain that this is God the Holy Spirit.

Gen 8:2 Also the fountains of the deep and the windows of heaven were stopped, and rain from heaven was restrained.

What we have here is a parallel to Gen. 1:1–2 *In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. Now the earth was chaotic and desolate. Darkness was on the surface of the deep. God's Spirit was hovering over the surface of the waters.* The earth cannot be inhabited because it is *chaotic and desolate* (tohu waw bohu), so that God sends the Holy Spirit to restore the earth so that it can be inhabited once again. You will recall that we theorized then that the earth was encased in ice, and here, it is covered with water. In both cases, the earth is uninhabitable. We know the evil which preceded the flood; we have theorized the evil which preceded the earth being incased in ice. In both cases, there was a temporary cleansing of the earth.

What events are associated with the stopping of the waters from below and above are not explained in any detail. *God made a wind [or, a Spirit] to pass over the earth, and the waters subsided. Also the fountains of the deep and the windows of heaven were stopped, and rain from heaven was restrained.* Being *stopped* means, the water from above and below stopped coming; and *restrained* means that it did not start up again. As we have studied before, the Holy Spirit functions as the power or the energy of God

V. 2 marks the end of day 40. In vv. 3–5, the author will talk about what has happened to the waters.

Gen 8:3 And the waters returned from off the earth continually. And after the end of 150 days the waters had gone down.

I live in a place where we occasionally get a lot of rain, and the results of a heavy rain continue for days after the rain itself. After a heavy rain, this rain moves toward the streams and rivers, and that water starts moving downstream; the end result is, we can have flooding days after torrential rains have stopped.

At this juncture in Genesis, we are looking at the aftermath of the great worldwide flood. Many of the waters are returning into the earth, back to the underground streams and rivers which are there.

³² Ibid.

My semi-educated guess would be, there are earthquakes and volcanos, both of which open up caverns underground, into which these waters are pulled. The force of the moving waters underground would have carved out underground rivers as well as moved debris for great distances.

The cold water entering into a very warm earth must have also caused more unsettling in the earth, all of this occurring beneath the surface of the waters.

Lesson 77: Genesis 8:4–14**The Flood Subsides/The Flood Timeline**

In vv. 1–3, God remembers Noah and the waters have begun to recede, and the rain is restrained.

Gen 8:4 And in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, the ark rested upon the mountains of Ararat.

The ark, like all ships, is mostly under the water; so it is possible for this to come to rest on a mountain, and yet for no other mountains to be yet visible. The mountains upon which the ark is caught do not need to be the highest mountains in the region. This can occur, and yet other mountains can still not be seen. However, they would have to be nearly the highest mountains in that immediate region.

This is occurring exactly 150 days after the rains began. The ark comes to rest on the mountain tops of Ararat. There are a number of theories as to where exactly this is; some place it between Kurdistan and Armenia. The proper noun translated *Ararat* here is translated *Armenia* elsewhere (2Kings 19:37 Isa. 37:38).

Map of Armenia

The area where Armenia is, is also the location of ancient kingdom of Urartu in which is Mount Ararat. Many of the Semitic peoples (those descended from Shem, one of Noah's sons) would have moved southward into Iraq, into what is known as the fertile crescent, which is one of the centers of ancient civilization.



There are disagreements as to the final resting place of the ark. Josephus claimed that pieces of the ark could be seen during his time (from what I have read, he did not personally see the ark).

There are people who believe that they have found the ark today, and in reading through their websites, they do not sound completely crazy (it is not the entire ark, but small pieces of the ark—petrified wood, if I recall correctly, including some metal). I have never put in enough study to form my own opinion on this matter.

One site which seems reasonable: http://www.arkdiscovery.com/noah%27s_ark.htm

Map from: http://mapsof.net/uploads/static-maps/the_caucasus_and_central_asia_political_map.jpg

Gen 8:5 And the waters decreased continually until the tenth *month*. And the tops of the mountains were seen in the tenth *month* on the first *day* of the month.

Dry land could be observed in several places 240 days after the rain began. Since Noah's ark is now caught on a mountain, he then has a place of reference. He can tell that he has stopped moving; they can look outside—something which I am sure that they did every single morning—to see anything off in the distance. At day 240, they get up, look out, and they can see mountain tops off in the distance.

Because the ark has stopped upon a mountain, and now, Noah can look out and see other mountains, this tells us that Noah is in a mountain range.

In the next verse, Noah is going to open a window, so how does he see mountains in this verse? What appears to be the case is, Noah built a roof for the ark and it came down to being within 18 inches from the top of the ark (Gen. 6:16). This would have been an opening around the ark, which would have provided ventilation. They certainly could have affixed a ladder to the side of the ark so that they could climb up and look out through this opening.

Gen 8:6 And it happened, at the end of forty days Noah opens the window of the ark which he had made.

Whereas, the word sometimes translated *window* back in Gen. 6:16 has a meaning which is uncertain, here, the phrase *Noah opens the window of the ark* is not in dispute as to the meanings of those words. Noah opens the window. Or, probably more accurately, he probably cut out a window (he probably had a window which was “boarded up” and sealed with pitch which he just needed to knock out).

This is 40 days after Noah was able to observe mountain tops from the ark, rather than 40 days after the flood began. This would take us to day 264. I will make a chart of the timeline in this lesson.

Gen 8:7 And he sent forth a raven, and it went out, going out and returning until the waters were dried up from off the earth.

The raven appears to have been sent out on several occasions (the verb *to send forth* is in the imperfect tense), to locate any dry ground. If the raven returns to the ark, then it was unable to find any ground to land upon. If he does not return, Noah would assume that somewhere, out there, is ground.

We have black ravens here in Texas, and they will eat just about anything, and if there is a dead animal carcass on the road, ravens will pick away at it, moving aside on occasion for cars which speed by.

This particular raven seems to be fairly domesticated, probably flying out to feast on floating carrion and then returning to the ark.

Gen 8:8–9 He also sent forth a dove from him, to see if the waters had gone down from off the face of the earth. But the dove found no rest for the sole of her foot. And she returned to him into the ark, for the waters *were* on the face of the whole earth. Then he put out his hand and took her, and pulled her in to him into the ark.

This is apparently day 264, over 200 days after the rain had stopped and the water had been subsiding for months. From the ventilation opening, Noah was able to see mountain tops, but these birds—particularly the doves—needed some kind of tree or bush upon which to perch. A raven is more comfortable with being on the ground whereas a dove prefers to have something above the ground upon which to perch.

Noah, having probably raised and kept these animals in an animal preserve, was quite familiar with the peculiarities of these birds, and he had a reasonable idea as to how they would react to the world out there.

Gen 8:10–12 And he waited yet another seven days. And again he sent forth the dove out of the ark. And the dove came in to him in the evening. And, lo, in her mouth was an olive leaf plucked off. So Noah knew that the waters had gone down from off the earth. And he waited yet another seven days, and sent forth the dove. And she did not return again to him any more.

This account is interesting, in that it lacks weirdness. If you go to any of the other flood legends, there are monsters, laughing frogs, black pelicans that paint themselves white and men who preserve themselves from the flood by hiding in huge reeds. However, what we find here is Noah doing what a normal person would do, in very abnormal circumstances. He is trying to determine if the outside can be inhabited by human and animal life.

Noah sends out a dove, which remains in the world for most of the day, but returns with an olive leaf in her beak. So there are bushes and trees which are beginning to grow, but none are high up enough for the dove to feel comfortable perching upon. A week later, Noah sends the dove out again, and it remains in the world.

Gen 8:13 And it happened in the six hundred and first year, at the beginning, on the first of the month, that the waters were dried up from off the earth. And Noah removed the covering of the ark and looked. And, behold, the face of the earth was desolate!

Noah was 600 when he entered into the ark; so this 601st year refers to his age. This personal reference, seamlessly integrated into the narrative, indicates that Noah wrote (or composed) this information himself. Had someone else done this, they would have written, “And it happened when Noah was 601 years old,…” However, Noah, recording this information himself, presents the information as related to his own age, but without specifically stating that this is his age. There are several clues in the book of Genesis as to who wrote which section, and this indicates to us that Noah wrote these words himself.

As an aside, despite the fact that 1000's of books have been written about Genesis, I am not aware of anyone else making this observation. What I have found, since I decided to spend the latter half of my life devoted to the study of the Bible (2–4 hours each day) is, there are still uncharted waters and there are still things to discover. The thrust of the ministry of the late R. B. Thieme, Jr. was a verse-by-verse study of the Bible, which was almost revolutionary (you may think that most churches *teach the Bible*, but most barely skim the surface of what is there; and there are many churches which teach the exact opposite of what is in the Bible).

However, do not misunderstand me on this point: the fundamentals of the faith still abide; Jerome, Luther, Augustine, Billy Graham, and every church council in the first few centuries would have been in 95–100% agreement with Berachah Church's statement of

faith at <http://www.berachah.org/Doctrinal%20Statement.htm> (as well in agreement with the statements of faith for any church listed here: <http://kukis.org/Links/thelist.htm> My point being, the fundamentals of the faith were taught from the very beginning and known throughout every generation; but there are a lot of tertiary doctrines and details being discovered and developed even today. The fact that Noah composed this himself is one of those details.

Noah finally opens up the ark and the ground had dried.

Gen 8:13 And it happened in the six hundred and first year, at the beginning, on the first of the month, that the waters **were dried up** from off the earth. And Noah removed the covering of the ark and looked. And, behold, the face of the earth **was desolate!**

The word *to be dried* is the Qal perfect of *chârab* (בָּרַח) [pronounced *KHAW-rahb*], which means *to be dry, to be dried up; to be [make] wasted; to be [made] desolate*. Strong's #2717 BDB #351. The first set of meanings (*to make dry*) are appropriate here. The subject is *waters* and the tense is perfect, indicating a completed action. It is true that the waters had wasted the land (earth), but the preposition in front of earth means *from upon*, so *the waters were dried up from upon the earth (or, ground)*. The verb suggests that water both seeped down into the ground and much of the moisture evaporated. The subject and the preposition indicate the meaning of the verb which is appropriate. The perfect tense, indicates that we are seeing this as a completed process and not as a continuing process (even though, quite obviously, evaporation is a continuing process).

This exact same word occurs again at the end of v. 13 and again in the Qal perfect, but this time, there is no preposition. Noah and his family look out at the surface of the ground, and it is *desolate*; the flood waters have *laid waste* the face of the earth. I have awakened after a great storm here—hurricane Ike, for instance—and there are trees all over, laying on the roads. I have a friend who lives about 2 miles away in the same neighborhood. It took me about 30 minutes to drive from my house to his, trying to avoid deep water and fallen trees. Hurricane Ike lasted for maybe 6 hours, and it devastated a lot. However, this was a 40-day rainstorm where the waters were on the earth for the better part of a year. The devastation must have been incredible to behold. Every manmade structure was certainly razed and taken away in the storm. The great forests which Noah had grown up in were gone. There was no sign of life, apart from a few bushes and very small, baby trees and grasses, all barely beginning to break the surface.

So, the writer is not repeating himself when he uses the same verb twice. Two different things are being said, but using the same verb in the same stem and tense. This verb can be seen to mean *to dry* in this passages: Judges 16:7–8 2Kings 19:24 Psalm 106:9; and to mean *to lay waste, to make desolate* in these passages: Isa. 34:10 37:18 Jer. 50:21 Ezek. 6:6. Here we find this word used in both ways in the same verse. Noah looks out and the waters have dried up and the surface of the earth was desolate and devastated.

We are told in this verse that **Noah removed the covering of the ark**. The word *covering* usually refers to animal skins (Ex. 26:14 36:19 39:34). We are only told about

this here. We don't know if this covering was over the window or covering the vent, which appeared to go around the entire ark (Gen. 6:16).

Wherever these animals skins were used, the representation here is the same as we observed back in Gen. 3: the animal killed represents Jesus Christ in His death, and the covering of the skin represents the temporary covering over of our sins (the word often used in the Old Testament for this is *atonement*). Noah and his family, in the ark, were protected from flood (the judgment of God) because of this covering, this atonement. We do not find the word usually translated *atonement* here; but the concept is here, first observed in Gen. 3:21, when God clothed Adam and the woman with animal skins.

Gen 8:14 And in the second month, on the twenty-seventh day of the month, the earth was dry.

Recall that Noah entered into the ark in the 2nd month, 17th day. So v. 14 is 370 days later (the Hebrews functioned on a 360 day calendar). I have often wondered about this. 360 is a nice round number, and it approximates the length of a year; but quite obviously, it does not match up with a year. Is it possible that, prior to the flood, that the earth was not on a tilted axis, and that a year was exactly 360 days? I am only speculating here. I have often wondered if the earth on its axis was a relatively recent thing—that is, did it occur when God the Holy Spirit warmed the surface of the earth (Gen. 1:2) or is it related to the flood in some way?

Quite obviously, the entire earth is not dry, as that is never the case. However, it is nearly a month after Noah looked out and observed that the earth was beginning to dry, and now it is dry enough for him and his family to actually live outside of the ark.

Since the Hebrews functioned on 30 day months, we will assume that this is the case (and it is borne out by some of the passages). # of days will be based upon the beginning of the flood as being day 0.

The Deluge Time Frame			
Month	Day	# of Days	Text/Commentary/Passage
2	17	0	The rains begin. Gen. 7:11
3	27	40	There are 40 days of rain. Gen. 7:12
7	17	150	The waters prevail over the earth for 150 days. Every living thing on the face of the earth that breathes air is destroyed. The ark comes to rest on Mount Ararat. God sends a great wind over the earth, and the waters begin to subside. Gen. 7:23–24 8:2–4
10	1	224	Mountain tops become visible from the ark. Gen. 8:5

The Deluge Time Frame

Month	Day	# of Days	Text/Commentary/Passage
11	11	264	40 days later, Noah opens a window and sends out a raven. He also sends out a dove, and the dove returns to him, not finding a place to rest. Gen. 8:6–9
11	18	271	The dove is sent out again, 7 days later, and returns to Noah that evening with a olive leaf in its beak. Gen. 8:10–11
11	25	278	The dove is sent out again, again, 7 days later, but this time it does not return. Gen. 8:12
1	1	344	In year 601 (Noah is using himself—his own age—as the measure of time), Noah removes the covering of the ark, and observes that the ground had dried up around the ark. Gen. 8:13
2	27	370	The earth is beginning to dry. God speaks to Noah and tells him to disembark. Gen. 8:14–19

In some cases, the month and day are given; in others, the number of days is given. I simply filled in what was missing.

Lesson 78: Genesis 8:15–21

Noah and Company Exit the Ark

Gen 8:15–16 And God spoke to Noah, saying, “Go out of the ark, you and your wife and your sons and your sons’ wives with you.

We are finding more and more imperatives at this point. God tells Noah to exit the ark with his entire family. God first told Noah to build the ark (Gen. 6:14), to bring all of the animals aboard (Gen. 6:19; which is an imperfect), and now He is telling Noah and company to exit the ark.

Gen 8:17 Bring out with you every living thing that is with you, of all flesh, of fowl, of cattle, and of every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth, so that they may breed abundantly in the earth, and be fruitful and multiply upon the earth.”

God continues with the imperatives.

By this time, some vegetation would have sprung up, and there would have been food for the animals to eat. Compared to the world that was there when Noah first stepped into the ark, the land would now be quite desolate, however. The forests and all manmade structures were gone. When Hurricane Ike came ashore, it razed entire neighborhoods—in a few hours, where there had once been hundreds of houses, all that was left were cement

foundations and debris. Here is a photo of one coastal neighborhood after the storm: http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Hurricane_Ike_Gilchrist_damage.jpg. So all that Noah had known would have been completely gone after a 40 day storm.

God tells Noah to bring out the animals so that they may breed and cover the earth. Perhaps Noah looks out at all of this desolation, and is thinking, "Maybe we need to stay inside of this ark for another 6 months or so." Whatever the case, God tells Noah to get everyone and everything off the ark and to begin repopulating the earth.

Interestingly enough, the final 3 verbs are in the perfect tense. God looks upon the action from the standpoint of completed action. Noah sees all of this as a future tense (one use of the imperfect) and we might see this as a continuing action (one use of the participle or the imperfect tense), but God views this actions as a completed result (perfect tense). Literally, this reads, "And they have bred abundantly on the earth, and they have been fruitful and they have multiplied upon the earth." However, because we see this through our own eyes, it is highly unlikely that we will find a translation which properly translates this (*Young's Literal translation* is one of the few which does this). Most translations present this in the future tense and/or in some sort of optative mood.

Gen 8:18–19 And Noah went out, and his sons and his wife and his sons' wives with him. Every animal, every fowl, and every moving thing, all which moves upon the earth after their families, went forth out of the ark.

The word *families* is quite interesting. The Hebrew word is mish^epâchâh (משפחה) [pronounced *mish-paw-KHAWH*], which means *family, clan, sub-tribe, class (of people), species (of animals), or sort (of things)*. Strong's #4940 BDB #1046. This is the first time that this term occurs. Recall how the animals entered the ark? They entered principally by twos, and here they are exiting by families. This indicates that some breeding took place on the ark and that many of the animals aboard the ark went from being paired up to having families. Having owned guinea pigs at one time, I can testify that breeding for some animals occurs fairly often, and that families are the result.

We do not know what occurred at this point. You will recall, I have suggested the Noah had an animal preserve prior to the completion of the ark. Whether he continued with this preserve, to breed the animals before letting them loose; or if he tried to preserve some in this fashion; or if he let them all loose from the beginning, we do not know. What seems to be the most logical is, there is nothing but devastation before Noah and his family and if God is telling him to unload the ark, then this means that the animals will exit the ark and go their separate ways.

No doubt, Noah and his family were conservationists (in the traditional sense; not in the wacky political sense of today), and that they intelligently dealt with the animals which had been under their care for the past year. They likely had cages within the ark and may have used them when exiting.

Noah also had his family to think about, and when they exited the ark, there was no shelter to be found. Since the ark was the only remaining structure, Noah and his family might have dismantled it and built shelters from the wood of the ark. This is another of the many details which we might find fascinating, but has no real spiritual relevance.

You may be thinking about the big picture, and you are wondering, *what relevance is any of this?* There are parallels throughout man's history, and there will be a *new heavens and a new earth* (Isa. 66:22 2Peter 3:13) and God will populate the new earth with what He has already created. God wants us to know Who He is. He expects us to understand His Word and to understand Him through His Word. Therefore, we may draw the reasonable conclusion that, when God creates a new heavens and a new earth, that the life He has created before will seed the population for this new heaven and new earth.

Gen 8:20 And Noah built an altar to Jehovah. And he took of every clean animal, and of every clean bird, and offered burnt offerings on the altar.

First steps out of the ark, and Noah takes one of each of the clean animals and offers them as burnt offerings to Jehovah (therefore, not every animal exited the ark and scattered). From the 3rd chapter of Genesis and forward, blood sacrifices are an integral part of the relationship between God and His people. That is, once man sinned, he needed a Savior, and these animal sacrifices point toward our Savior, Jesus.

The deliverance (salvation) of Noah and his family is the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and it is portrayed by the offering up of the clean animals which Noah had preserved through the flood. We never go very far into the Old Testament without a reminder that the basis for our salvation is Jesus Christ.

Note Noah's priorities. He doesn't begin building shelters; he does not send his family out to forage for food; his priority is offering up an animal sacrifice.

During the time of Noah, there appears to have been a family priesthood. A priest is one who represents man before God, and the priesthoods in the Old Testament look forward to Jesus Christ.

A priest represents himself and/or others before God. Part of the function of the priesthood is to offer up animal sacrifices to God. Until the cross, the priesthood looked forward to the cross, the individual priests being a type (representation) of Christ. The animal sacrifices were a shadow image of His crucifixion.

The Priesthoods	
Time	Revealed Priesthood
Antediluvian era	It is unclear whether heads of families did this or everyone did. We only know that Abel offered up an animal sacrifice.

The Priesthoods

Time	Revealed Priesthood
Post-diluvian era	This appears to be a family priesthood; the patriarch of a family seemed to also be some sort of a spiritual leader, as we have here with Noah. Although we have animal sacrifices offered up (Gen. 8:20), the word <i>priest</i> is not used.
The time of Abraham	Abraham will pay tithes to Melchizedek, who is a priest in that era (before the giving of the Law). Melchizedek is the first person called a <i>priest</i> in the Bible. Gen. 14:18 Heb. 5:10 6:20 7:2, 17 Abraham himself also offers up animal sacrifices (as do his descendants).
The time of the Mosaic Law	A specialized priesthood was adopted at the giving of the Law, incorrectly called the Levitical priesthood, and more correctly called the Aaronic priesthood. Only those who had descended from Aaron (who was a Levite) could become priests to God. Lev. 8–9 Heb. 5:1–4 7:5, 11
The Church Age	In the Church Age, we are a kingdom of priests, meaning that each one of us represents ourselves before God. 1Peter 2:5, 9 Rev. 1:6 Jesus Christ is our true High Priest and previous priests were shadow images of Him. Jesus is principally called a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, but He is also closely related to the duties of the Aaronic priesthood. Heb. 5:7–10 7:23–28 9:11–15 10:4–22

Since we no longer look forward to the coming of the Messiah, the True High Priest, the priesthood takes on a slightly different meaning in the Church Age. It recognizes the substitutionary sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross as an historical event; and the universal priesthood of the believer recognizes that we have access to God the Father through Jesus the Son. It is through Jesus that we have direct communion with God the Father.

The specialized priesthood of the Catholic church, made up of a lot of celibate men (or men who are trying to be celibate) has no justification in the Bible. There is no establishment of such a system anywhere in the Bible; there is no particular hierarchy of Church Age priests given in the Bible (e.g., *priests, bishops, popes*); and there is no particular pattern given to how one becomes a priest which matches the Catholic traditions. Furthermore, the various traditions associated with the Catholic priesthood (their *modus operandi*) are just that—traditions. At a time when Jesus has given us access to God, the Catholic church is saying, “No you don’t; you must go through us.”

In ancient times, as well as in other cultures, man tended to be more demonstrative. That is, what is occurring inside in their souls is expressed through externals. I have been brought up in a more stoic culture, so part of being civilized is not expressing one’s every thought and emotion on one’s sleeve. The sacrifice of the animals indicates that Noah was

occupied with the preincarnate Christ. This was a testimony to his family and to the angels; and it is a testimony to us today. As Jesus said, “**seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things will be added to you.**” (Matt. 6:33). The priority is the spiritual in this life, then the soulish matters and the material.

That which is spiritual is not simply having nice thoughts about God (or mystical thoughts or whatever). What the spiritual life is for us in the Church Age is laid out clearly in the epistles (letters) of the New Testament. We have gone over these [mechanics](#) in a previous lesson ([lesson #61](#)). We may reasonably assume that the mechanics of Noah’s spiritual life were also clearly revealed to him (but not so much to us). However, quite obviously, the sacrifice of clean animals was a part of that spiritual life.

Gen 8:21a And Jehovah smelled a sweet [soothing, tranquilizing] odor.

The word translated *sweet* is nîychôach (נִיחֹחַ) [pronounced *nee-KHOH-ahkh*], which means *tranquilizing, soothing, quieting; sweet, pleasant*. Strong #5207 BDB #629. Each sacrifice of an animal speaks of the death of our Lord Jesus Christ and the judgement for our sins by God the Father on the cross. This cannot be a *pleasing, pleasant or sweet* odor to God; however, because it does speak of our Lord's efficacious work on our behalf, it is a *tranquilizing and quieting smell*. Rather than looking down upon our sins and evil nature and wanting to judge us for this, God is tranquilized and quieted by this odor. God *smelling a sweat odor* simply indicates that the sacrifices propitiated (or, *satisfied*) God. Until Jesus comes in time and dies for our sins, these animal sacrifices will be repeated again and again, in order to teach how God will be able to forgive us for our sins.

Gen 8:21b And Jehovah said in His heart, “I will never again curse the ground for man's sake, because the imagination [or, *thinking*] of man's heart is evil from his youth. And I will not again strike down every living thing as [= *in the manner as*] I have done.”

God promises that He would never again destroy virtually all life from the planet earth in the manner in which He did here. The key words here are the kaph pronoun and the relative pronoun ʾăsher, which together mean *as which, as one who, as, like as, just as; because; according to what manner, in a manner as*. The language used in the Bible—even the very poetic Hebrew language—is always very precise. God is not saying that He will never, ever again destroy huge numbers of living creatures on this earth; He is saying that He will not destroy them in the way that He did—by means of a worldwide flood.

Also, interestingly enough, this is not a promise which God makes to Noah, but He says this in His heart; that is, He thinks this and God the Holy Spirit reveals this information to Noah, who either memorizes it or writes it down.

We ought not be guilty of ascribing to God our own thinking. That is, God is not reacting to the devastation with human regret, thinking, “Maybe I was too harsh.” God simply decrees that the entire earth will never be flooded again. In the next civilization, the unbelievers will be taken from the earth, and the believers will be left (Matt. 24:32–42).

One of the similarities between the Noahic flood and the baptism of fire (when all unbelievers are removed from the earth), is the concept of a civilization beginning with believers only. “As the days of Noah, so also will be the coming of the Son of Man,” Jesus told His disciples (Matt. 24:37). These are similar events in chiefly 3 ways: people, despite all of the warnings, will carry on with their day-to-day lives; there will be great violence in the earth; and all unbelievers will be removed from the earth, and only believers will remain.

It is believed by some that Genesis existed primarily in oral form, and was committed to writing sometime later. If this is the case, the concept of inspiration is not changed. The inspiration of Scriptures is essentially an inhale and exhale process. The inhale involves the Holy Spirit communicating to human authors His complete and coherent message (2Peter 1:20–21). The exhale is, the human author records (without waiving his human intellect, feelings, literary style, personality, vocabulary, or individuality) God's complete message with complete accuracy in the original autographs.³³ Man's mental capacity was such that, the exact words that we find in our chapters of Genesis were memorized generation after generation, with additional information added as God spoke through those entrusted with this responsibility. We covered this doctrine in detail back in [introductory lesson #8](#). Whether this exhale was verbal or whether it was written down, we do not know. However, the actual form of God's inspired Word does not detract from it being His Word. In other words, the entire book of Genesis could have been passed down in oral form, and this does not take away from it being the Word of God, every bit as inspired as any other passage of Scripture.

This would be a good place for the doctrine of Noah, including all of the later passages where he is named.

Lesson 79: Genesis 8:1a, 22

The Cyclical Nature of the Earth

The Holman Christian Standard Bible translates the final verse of Gen. 8 as follows:

Gen. 8:22 As long as the earth endures, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, and day and night will not cease.

The final verse of this chapter is very difficult to translate. Your Bible probably has something like this: **While the earth remains, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease.** Many very literal translations begin with *while the earth remains*, or words to that effect. However, there is no word *while* and there is no word *remains* (in fact, there is no verb at the beginning of this verse). The first word of this verse is ὄωδ (οἰτ) [pronounced *gohd*], which is the infinitive absolute of the verb *to*

³³ Taken from <http://www.versebyverse.org/doctrine/inspire.html> but the concept goes back for hundreds of years. This particular definition likely goes back at least to L. S. Chafer.

go over again, to repeat.³⁴ This word is used either as a substantive (*continuing, continuation, continuance, persistence; a going round*) or, more often, as an adverb (*still, yet, again, again and again, repeatedly, in addition to; more, farther, besides; as yet, even yet*). What follows is, literally, *all days of the earth*. Do we make that first word an adverb or a substantive? The translators of the Septuagint were so flummoxed by this problem, they simply left this word out (which is unusual for the Septuagint, which is generally a good word-for-wood translation). The easy way out is to make this an adverb, and the first few words would be translated *Even yet, all days of the earth,...* This word is used in the previous verse, and what follows seems to indicate a continuous cycling of activity. Taking this to be a substantive and as an implied predicate nominative, we might render this *All the days of the earth [are] a continuation (a repetition, cyclical)...*

Given the words which follow, the writer is clearly speaking the cyclical nature of the earth, and I would take this to mean that, this is a new thing. Whatever happened which triggered the rain and the rising of the waters in the first place, must have been such a cataclysmic event, as to begin these cycles (although, quite obviously, *day and night* have been with us since the restoration of the earth). Whatever happened may have even changed the length of a year (the amount of time that is required for the earth to travel around the sun). If I was to theorize, I would say that, before the flood, something set off the rain, tilted the earth on its axis and divided the land into the continents—that these events are all interrelated. If we were struck by a belt of asteroids, perhaps that made all of these changes. Or God could have miraculously changed the tilt of the axis of the earth, which set all of this off. This is clearly speculation, on my part. The cyclical nature of the earth is not; that this is a new thing, is at the very least, implied.

Although I came to these ideas independently, there are apparently a lot of people who have also associated these things together

Associating Continental Drift, the Tilting of the Earth's Axis and the Great Flood

Here are some web sites which discuss the relationship of these things. I offer these up by way of interest, and not as resources which I have necessarily studied carefully and/or agree with:

³⁴ Technically, this does not function as a verb.

Associating Continental Drift, the Tilting of the Earth's Axis and the Great Flood

<http://ldolphin.org/setterfield/supplement.html>

<http://ldolphin.org/setterfield/report.html>

The implication is that the earth, acting like a top or gyrostat, received a massive impact from an asteroidal body and heeled over. The core moved in the opposite direction to maintain angular momentum and assisted the precession in returning the axis tilt to an equilibrium position. The impact itself set up a ripple structure in the crust and mantle as well as tilting the Earth's axis. The writers of this paper (Barry Setterfield and Trevor Norman) see the flood as occurring first, and then the tilting of the earth's axis and continental drift occur later. The research and speculation was done many years prior to the internet, and the physical laws found in the original paper are beyond my capability to understand. In any case, this paper appears to be a serious, scientific work.

This person is more *out there*:

<http://www.endtimeprophecy.net/Articles/noahark3.html>

Noah's calendar was different from both the present lunar calendar (354.53 days), and present solar calendar (365.24 days). Something occurred about the time of the flood that altered the calendar, making it necessary to add an intercalary month every 2 or 3 years to keep the lunar calendar in sync with the seasons.

Tim Warner, the author, explores the difference in the solar and lunar years, and what could have happened to bring this to pass. He also proposes some of the physical changes which will come to pass in the end times (the increase in the earth's wobble, which would necessarily increase earthquakes, floods and other natural disasters). Warner justifies this with Scripture (the verses from Isaiah and Luke are compelling; but not so much, the passage from the Psalms).

<http://www.oasischristianchurch.org/air/flood.pdf>

This article lays out a scientific basis for the flood by 6 PhD's. *We believe that rapid tectonics provides a successful and innovative framework for young-age creation modeling of earth history. We feel that this model uniquely incorporates a wide variety of creationist and non-creationist thinking. It explains evidence from a wide spectrum of earth science fields—including evidence not heretofore well explained by any other earth history models..*

<http://static.icr.org/i/pdf/technical/Catastrophic-Plate-Tectonics-A-Global-Flood-Model.pdf>

Associating Continental Drift, the Tilting of the Earth's Axis and the Great Flood

Whatever the cause, something triggered a cataclysm. If the earth was suddenly tipped, as it is now 23.5 degrees from the vertical, this would unleash tremendous gyroscopic forces. The single continent would rip apart. The pressure ten miles down, based on oil well experience, is about 250 thousand pounds per square inch. Tensile cracks in brittle solids[9] propagate at about half the velocity of sound, or about 2.6 KM per second.[10] The cracking would circle the earth in just over four hours. This would release water stored ten miles deep. As we have said, the pressure at the bottom of a gas well only five miles deep exceeds 125,000 pounds per square inch. At ten miles deep the pressure would exceed 200,000 pounds per square inch, far more than enough to spout water miles high. This hot water would boil into vapor immediately as the pressure dropped to atmospheric. This water vapor would become clouds which would transport massive quantities of water to the polar regions where the precipitation would become permanent snow and ice.

http://www.bibleonly.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&catid=57%3Agenesis-corner&id=888%3Ais-the-biblical-history-of-the-earth-plausible-&Itemid=88

Recent ice ages -- ten periods of glaciation in the past million years -- are caused by changes in the tilt of the Earth's orbit, according to research published in the July 11 issue of Science magazine. The article in Science magazine is not written by someone trying to relate this to the book of Genesis, but as someone offering an explanation for various ice ages in our past.

<http://www.thechristmyth.com/iceage.htm>

Again, this is highly speculative in nature. However, the scientific rigor of the first resource combined with similar theories found in Science magazine (the last reference) suggest this interrelationship is possible.

The cause and effect which seems logical to me is, we enter into an asteroid belt, and the earth is pummeled by asteroids, which sets off the water from below, the tilting of the axis and the rain. During and following the flood, there are great movements in the earth's crust, which raises the mountains, lowers the seas, and divides the continent. Although this is pure speculation; the Bible confirms the water from below, the flood and the raising of the mountains and lowering of the seas. It implies a change to a cyclical earth and it implies that, at one time, we may have been on true 360 day year, where there was a true solar and lunar match.

Enough of the speculation and back to the text:

If we were to take some liberties with the translation of Gen. 8:22a, we might render it as:
All the days of the earth [will be] cyclical [in nature]...

There is a verb in this verse, and it occurs at the end of this verse. This final verb is familiar to most of you: shâbath (שָׁבַת) [pronounced *shaw-BAHTH*], which means *to rest, to keep a day of rest, to celebrate the Sabbath; to sit down [still]; to cease, to desist, to leave off, to discontinue*. Strong's #7673 BDB #992. There is a negative with this verb. Therefore, we will render this verse:

Gen 8:22 All the days of the earth [will] continue [in a cyclical fashion]: seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, and day and night will not cease [or, rest].

Many of these words in v. 22 are occurring for the first time in the Bible: ...seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter,... are almost all new words (with the exception of *seedtime*, which is really just the word *seed*; however, here, it is used in a slightly different way than its first use in Gen. 3). All of these words indicate a set of cycles which occur, which is consistent with the first word in this verse: *a continuing, a continuance; again and again; repeatedly..*

Although day and night have been in place from Gen. 1:5, we do not know if, prior to this, there were these other cycles of the earth. One of the theories I have suggested is, the earth was not on an axis until the flood, and it is the axis which sets up the cycles of seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter. In other words, this verse *implies* the earth becoming tilted.

The key difference between summer and winter is not the distance the earth is from the sun (as we experience summer when the Aussies endure winter), but the angle at which the sun's rays strike the earth. I would assume that the length of daylight would have some affect as well. For the portion of the year that we are struck more directly by the sun (the closer the sun's rays are to forming a right angle with the ground), the warmer it is. In order for this angle to vary, the earth must be rotating on an axis as it circles about the sun.

In this and other lessons, I have suggested that there may be a tie-in between asteroids striking the earth, the flood, the shifting of the earth's axis, as well as the deepening of the seas and the raising of mountains (which you may have dismissed as rationalizing poppycock).

Axis-Shift Addendum

The March 11th, 2010 issue of Science@NASA asks the question *can an earthquake really change the Earth's rotation?* From the MENSA bulletin June 2010 issue: *According to NASA, the massive 8.8 Chilean quake on February 27 **could have shifted the Earth's "figure axis" about three inches, or eight centimeters. Impressive? Sure. But consider that the figure axis shifts 10 centimeters per year just because the land is still rising after the last glacial maximum. Although the big quake could have caused a shift, no one has any measurements to prove it actually happened. Scientists are preparing to attempt such measurements by using GPS satellites, whose precise timing could make it possible. A similar attempt failed to measure an axial change after the 9.1 magnitude Sumatra quake of 2004.***

From *Mensa Bulletin*, June 2010, p.54. Emphasis mine.

Several news services reported this story in early March of 2010; among them:

<http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2010/03/100302-chile-earthquake-earth-axis-shortened-day/>

<http://www.homelandsecuritynewswire.com/chile-earthquake-shifted-earths-axis-3-inches>

<http://boingboing.net/2010/03/01/nasa-chile-quake-sho.html>

Interestingly enough, the news sources did not, at least in their headlines, indicate that there was any uncertainty here.

In any case, this begins a new civilization. Like all civilizations, which we studied back in [lesson #59](#), the post-diluvian (i.e., *after the deluge*) civilization begins only with believers in Jesus Christ.

Now, compare the record of the Genesis flood to the Akkadian account: *The Akkadian Atrahasis Epic* (written no later than 1700 B.C., the name Atrahasis means "exceedingly wise"), gives human overpopulation as the cause for the great flood. After 1200 years of human fertility, the god Enlil felt disturbed in his sleep due to the noise and ruckus caused by the growing population of mankind. He turned for help to the divine assembly who then sent a plague, then a drought, then a famine, and then saline soil, all in an attempt to reduce the numbers of mankind. All these were temporary fixes. 1200 years after each solution, the original problem returned. When the gods decided on a final solution, to send a flood, the god Enki, who had a moral objection to this solution, disclosed the plan to Atrahasis, who then built a survival vessel according to divinely given measurements.

To prevent the other gods from bringing such another harsh calamity, Enki created new solutions in the form of social phenomena such as non-marrying women, barrenness, miscarriages and infant mortality, to help keep the population from growing out of control.³⁵

There are certain aspects of this narrative which fascinate me. The first thing that jumps out at me is, *human overpopulation*, which is portrayed in a negative light. Mathematically, where men and women live more than a millennium and families might consist of 10–20 children, it is quite possible for the antediluvian population to number in the billions (in fact, it is very likely).

When we think of the ancient world, the concept of overpopulation does not come to most people's minds. However, human overpopulation is a central theme to this Akkadian myth. That is the motivation given for the gods sending a plague, a drought, etc. No overpopulation renders this myth meaningless. You can alter or remove almost any part of this myth except for human overpopulation, and this myth would still stand. So, from where did the Akkadians get the idea of human overpopulation? Even in myths, there is some grain of truth, and the foundational element of this myth is human overpopulation.

The second thing which is fascinating, is the time frame—it is not that far off from the time frame found in the Bible. 1200 years as opposed to 1600+ years.

³⁵ From http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deluge_%28mythology%29 accessed June 23, 2008.

Thirdly, we have people cause a ruckus, which parallels the Bible account as well. God said that the earth was filled with violence (Gen. 6:13).

Finally, the disasters which befall mankind include a plague, drought, a famine and saline soil. It is likely that all of these things occurred after the flood. The Akkadian account may be inaccurate in its numbers, in its timing, as the motivation of the gods; but all of these are possible elements for this era.

Of the flood accounts, this Akkadian narrative is actually one of the most sensible. The Indian account is more typical: *According to the Matsya Purana and Shatapatha Brahmana (1-8, 1-6), the mantri to the king of pre-ancient Dravida, Satyavata who later becomes known as Manu was washing his hands in a river when a little fish swam into his hands and begged him to save its life. He put it in a jar, which it soon outgrew; he successively moved it to a tank, a river and then the ocean. The fish then warned him that a deluge would occur in a week that would destroy all life. Manu therefore built a boat which the fish towed to a mountaintop when the flood came, and thus he survived along with some "seeds of life" to re-establish life on earth.*³⁶

Other accounts mention laughing frogs, the world on the back of a giant snake, 4 monsters who grow so large as to touch the sky, and the great war god Tu, who was so upset over what his sister said, that he started crying, causing the flood.

On the other hand, the Genesis flood has the following fantastic elements: (1) A race of half-human/half-angelic beings populating the earth (very similar to mythology, but never sensationalised in the text). (2) Noah and the people of the earth were given 120 years to change their minds (God issues a warning through Noah). (3) Noah brought representatives from the entire animal kingdom aboard the ark. (4) God personally closes up the ark. (5) The rain continues for 40 days. (6) Even the tops of mountains are covered with water. (7) There is again direct contact between God and Noah after the flood. (8) It is later stated in the Psalms that the mountains became higher and the sea valleys became lower. Even the most phenomenal elements of the Genesis account of the flood are simple and straightforward, and surprisingly non-weird. They are phenomenal, yes; but they are not goofy-weird or sensationalised. Furthermore, scientifically, the idea of the cyclical nature of the earth, the earth being knocked off of its axis, the tremendous rain and water from below, and even continental drift may be all related.

You will notice, in almost every flood account, no matter how weird or mystical, there are similarities to and overlaps with the Genesis account. One mentions the earth being repopulated by 4 men and 4 women. Another mentions 40 days. Several recount great wickedness among men. These flood legends seem to almost all intersect at Genesis. Many of them speak of the flood as being universal. And, if a great flood did occur, then we would expect to find it in the history of almost every ancient culture, with some elements of truth as a part of this remembrance, and that is what it is the case.

³⁶ From http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deluge_%28mythology%29 accessed June 23, 2008.

Some may want to say that myths are nothing but a bunch of made-up stories, without a grain of truth to them, made up, in most instances, simply to explain this or that natural phenomenon. However, others, like myself, believe that almost all myths have some grain of truth in them, and, in this case, give us some information about a worldwide flood.

Lesson 80: Genesis 6–8 and 8:1a

The Organization of Genesis 6–8

Several lessons ago, I pointed out the organization found in the first half of Gen. 6 and later of Gen. 7. The Bible is filled with various sections which have a very specific organization (which is sometimes key in understanding that portion of Scripture). That found in Gen. 6–8 is a particular type is called a chiasmus, after the Greek letter chi (χ). The first section matches with the last, the second with the second-to-the-last, etc. It is called a chiasmus, because the inverted parallelism looks like a chi (actually, half a chi) when one sees it from its organizational standpoint.

As a person who does a lot of writing, I find this to be the most phenomenal literary aspect to the history of the flood.

The Organization of Genesis 6–8 (from Robert Dean)

Section 1: Gen. 6:1–12 God promises to destroy the corrupt human race

Section 2: Gen. 6:13–22 Noah builds an Ark (in which he and his family will be saved).

Section 3: Gen. 7:1–9 God orders Noah and his family enter the ark

Section 4: Gen. 7:10–16 The beginning of the flood.

Section 5: Gen. 7:17–24 The flood covers the mountains

Section 6: Gen. 8:1 God remembers Noah, which is the center point of this narrative.

Section 7: Gen. 8:2–5 The flood recedes for 150 days and the mountains become visible.

Section 8: 8:6–14 The earth dries out; the flood ends

Section 9: 8:15–19 God orders Noah and his family to leave the Ark

Section 10: Gen. 8:20 Noah builds an altar (by which he and his family will be saved)

Section 11: Gen. 8:21–22 God promises never again to destroy mankind with a worldwide flood.

There is an integral unity in the text; one author put this together. Every time I read this outline, I am more amazed.

You will notice how each section at the beginning matches its corresponding section at the end. This kind of organization, which is found throughout the book of Genesis and elsewhere (often in the psalms), both testifies to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and the mental capacity of those writing (or memorizing) these historical narratives. We have had the Old Testament for about 3000 years, and there are still portions of the Old Testament which have not been completely and totally scrutinized or whose organization has yet to be recognized.

A chiasmus sometimes will help us to understand a passage or a word. If you are confused about the second section, then you look at the second to the last section, and one informs the other.

Another thing a chiasmus will do is, tell you what is most important in the narrative. If there is only one section in the center of the chiasmus, that is what is most important.

If this does not impress you, try to write out the events of your day or this past week or the past year in this format—and remember, Noah did not have a word processor (recall that we have determined that Noah originally wrote this).

Don't misunderstand me; I am not saying that this is impossible to do. For instance, "I got up out of bed this morning, had breakfast, went to work, ate lunch, returned from work, had dinner and went to bed." That is a very mundane chiasmus. However, what we find in Scripture is often more intricate, and fraught with meaning.

From Robbie Dean's lecture Genesis-041 The Flood: Grace Gen. 6 2003 (somewhat edited).
The audio for this: <http://deanbible.org/Media/Audio%20Files/2003%20-%20Genesis/Genesis-041.mp3>
His online notes: <http://phrasearch.com/Trans/DBM/setup/Genesis/Gen041.htm>

Entire psalms are written in a chiasmus format. Various narratives in the gospels are written like this as well. However, there are even short passages in the epistles which are organized as a chiasmus. Let's look at an example from the New Testament.

Galatians 2:15–17a as a Chiasmus

You may have read this a dozen times and never recognized its structure before:

We ourselves are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners; yet we know that a person is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, so we also have believed in Christ Jesus, in order to be justified by faith in Christ and not by works of the law, because by works of the law no one will be justified. But if, in our endeavor to be justified in Christ, we too were found to be sinners,...

Now look at this passage and the way it is organized:

Galatians 2:15–17a as a Chiasmus

- A| We ourselves are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners
B| yet we know that a person is not justified
C| by works of the law
D| but through faith in Jesus Christ,
D| so we also have believed in Christ Jesus,
C| and not by works of the law,
B| because by works of the law no one will be justified.
A| But if, in our endeavor to be justified in Christ, we too were found to be sinners,...

This sort of organization (along with other even more complex forms of organization) are found throughout the Bible. Bullinger spends only 44 pages on various ways the Scripture is organized, and he barely skims the surface of this topic.

From *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*; E. W. Bullinger; ©originally 1898; reprinted 1968 Baker Books; p 378.

The entire letter from Paul to Philemon is a chiasmus.

Although Bullinger and others have begun to uncover the poetic nature and organizational structure of various portions of Scripture, this is a relatively unexplored area of Scripture. These are not just little cool literary factors, but they actually have a point to them. If you will recall the organization of Gen. 6, Noah fell outside of the organization. The earth was filled with violence, God saw this, and God said, “I will bring a deluge upon the earth.” However, the person of Noah stood outside of the organization of the narrative, just as Noah himself was not a part of the violent world; furthermore, he was not judged by God. He was protected in the ark, which was *covered over with pitch*, which is derived from the word *atonement*.

In the organization of Gen. 6–8 above, the key factor is the center point, which is, God remembered Noah and his family. This is the key to the entire narrative.

“But, this is the year 2010; so how does any of this apply to me?” you ask. If you are a believer in Jesus Christ and you are growing in grace and in the knowledge of God’s Word, God has you personally on His mind. He is thinking about you. For those of us who live in the United States, the precariousness of our nation is dramatic, and we could, at any point in the future, fall under great judgment, judgment as this nation has never seen before. Most people do not have a clue as to the place we are in, in this year of our Lord 2010. We have a nation hostile to us, which is extremely overpopulated with males (China). They could lose 1,000,000 men in a war, and it would mean nothing to them—absolutely nothing. Our national computer system is tested and attacked regularly from the outside—probably by the Chinese. We have a debt problem not unlike that in Greece, and there is great rioting and chaos in Greece right at this time. Weapons exist which could disable electronics all across the United States, which would virtually shut down our military and all communications. At any point in time, we could fall into spiraling inflation (which, from a federal standpoint, would solve 2 problems: our debt to other

nations and the extremely excessive federal and state pensions which have been promised). However, inflation would wreak havoc in many individual lives. There are a plethora of nations where at least 20% or more of the population absolutely hate us, and many of them would be willing to die, if it meant taking an American with them. All they lack is transportation to get here. We have nations in the south who are quite hostile to us as well. Our immediate southern border is erupting in chaos, which could result in great chaos in our border states. Furthermore, a communist or socialist government could be the end result in Mexico, as civil unrest has been used by communism over and over.

If the nations which hate the United States banded together, we would not stand a chance, militarily speaking, against them, even with the support of our allies. The war machines in China, North Korea and Iran alone dwarf our own military—and their leaders are willing to sacrifice millions of lives. What about our allies? The military in allied nations is pathetic. When a dozen British military types were captured by Iran a few years ago, they psychologically caved in less than 48 hours! The only thing standing between us and national destruction is the fact that, Jesus Christ is thinking about us. Jesus Christ remembers us, just as He remembers Noah in our passage.

Never forget that we are in spiritual warfare, and that it will never cease. The United States is a force for good in this world, insofar as, we teach the gospel, a few handfuls of churches actually teach the Bible, we send out missionaries, and we publish and distribute more Bibles each year than any other nation on earth. Furthermore, we treat the Jews within our own borders well, and we are strongly allied with Israel. These things are hated by Satan and he motivates hatred by others for the United States.

As a result, we should expect animosity from godless communist nations; we should expect continual attacks from Satan's religion, Islam; and we should expect great moral corruption to erupt within our own country. As a nation, as long as we lead the world in spiritual production, we will be hated and attacked. The only reason that we have not been destroyed is, Jesus Christ controls history.

Now, why did God remember Noah? Noah *knew* God's will, and he knew God's will because his soul was filled with Bible doctrine (apart from Bible doctrine, trying to operate your life based upon the way that you feel is emotional imbalance, not spiritual guidance). Secondly, Noah did what God told him to do—obedience.

As Americans, we have become quite complacent, having been on the receiving end of such tremendous blessings from God for most of our nation's history. A significant number of Americans do not realize that we are blessed more than any nation in the history of man; and a significant number of Americans do not realize that this blessing is from God. We continue in our daily lives, eating, drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, having no clue as to the precipice that we are on. The economic downtown we are in the midst of right now, is nothing; it is less than nothing, compared to what could easily come to pass.

Therefore, we want to be on God's mind; we want to be remembered by God. We do not want to be a lost soul in a flood of judgment. No matter what happens to our nation, we

do not want God to simply forget about us. We do not want to end up as collateral damage if a wave of judgment passes over our nation. Noah is the key: Noah is saved by faith in Jehovah Elohim, as illustrated by the altar in Gen. 8:20 (today, we are saved by faith in Jesus Christ); and Noah listened to God and obeyed Him, as illustrated by Noah building the ark that God required him to build (today, that means to listen to the teaching of the Word of God, which is how we learn the will of God).

Gen 8:1a And God remembered Noah... This is the key to every believer's life, and therefore, the central point of this great chiasm. When you are suffering great difficulties, you can always depend upon, And God remembered _____ (and place your own name into that blank). This may seem corny, but if we enter into a time of national disaster, this may be the only Bible verse you are able to remember. This may be the half of a verse you have memorized and upon which you depend. If we suffer a great national disaster or if you face some personal disaster, you will no longer think of this verse and its application as corny. These few words will be your strength.

Those who fear (and respect) You will see me and rejoice, because I have confidence in Your Word (Psalm 119:74). Your Word is a lamp to my feet and a light to my path (Psalm 119:105). Let my plea come before You; deliver me according to Your Word (Psalm 119:170). "I [Jesus] have given them [His disciples] Your Word [the Word of God], and the world has hated them because they are not of the world, just as I am not of the world (John 17:14). Set them apart in the truth; Your Word is truth (John 17:17).

Lesson 81: Genesis 9:1–7

God's Commandments to Noah and Company

In the previous chapters, the earth has suffered a worldwide flood, and Noah and his family have been in an ark for over a year with representative members of the various animal families. The rain has stopped, the waters have subsided, dry land has begun to appear, and God has ordered Noah and company to exit the ark.

In Gen. 9, God appears to speak to Noah and his sons on 1 or 2 occasions. He first speaks to Noah and his sons after they exit the ark, and lays down a few rules (vv. 1–7). Then God speaks to Noah and his sons, and makes a covenant with them (vv. 8–17). Whether this second conversation³⁷ is a continuation of the first, or occurs an hour later, a day later or a month later, we do not know. Most approach these conversations as if God just started talking in v. 1 and He stops in v. 17.

Even though it is a fairly minor thing, whether there are 2 separate conversations or whether God said this to Noah and company upon exiting the ark, this has bothered me for over a month now, and so far, I have not come up with any satisfactory explanation or understanding of this on my own or through the reading and studying that I do.

³⁷ I say *conversation*; but this is a one-way conversation; God does all of the talking.

In any case, here is my take on these conversations (and I have changed my mind on this several times). At the end of the flood, when the waters subsided, and it was possible to live outside of the ark, God first tells Noah to exit the ark (Gen. 8:15–17). Noah and company exit the ark and offer up some animal sacrifices (recall that they took 7 of each of the clean animals with them into the ark—Gen. 7:2). After these animal sacrifices, which portray the death of Christ on the cross, God lays down the basic ground rules of this new dispensation and this new civilization, explaining to them their responsibilities (Gen. 9:1–7). What God tells Noah and his sons is, what has changed since the flood. Prior to the flood, it does not appear as if there was any formal governance or any formal law (what we know about these 1600+ years is covered in only 6 chapters). Then, after laying down the changes, which includes at least one prohibition, God makes a covenant with Noah and his sons, which appears to be a continuation of this. “These are your responsibilities (vv. 1–7) and this is My promise (vv. 8–17),” seems to be the gist of what is being said here.

In the first 7 verses, there are 7 verbs in the imperative mood and 5 in the imperfect tense, which essentially function as imperatives (the Ten Commandments are given in imperfect tenses rather than in the imperative mood). So God, after Noah and company have exited the ark, will lay down a few requirements and mandates which they are to follow.

Gen 9:1 And God blessed Noah and his sons. And He said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth.

God tells Noah and his 3 sons to be fruitful and multiply, which means to have a lot of children. Noah is apparently out of that business now, but his 3 sons will propagate the human race.

The verb *to be fruitful* is the Qal imperative of *pârâh* (פָּרָה) [pronounced *paw-RAW*], which means *to bear fruit, to be fruitful; to bear young, to have lots of children*. Strong's #6509 BDB #826. This word is used more often for humans and for animals than it is for plants. God is ordering Noah's sons to have a lot of children.

The second Qal imperative is *râbâh* (רָבָה) [pronounced *raw^h-VAWH*], which means *to become much, to become many, to multiply, to increase in population and in whatever else*. Strong's #7235 BDB #915. So God is telling them to have a lot of children and to continue to increase the number of people on the earth.

The third verb is the Qal imperative of *mâlê'* (מָלֵא) [pronounced *maw-LAY*], which means *to fill, to make full, to be full*. Strong's #4390 BDB #569. The earth is to be made full of people.

Gen 9:1 And God blessed Noah and his sons. And He said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth.

This parallels another verse which we have studied: **And God blessed them. And God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it and have dominion over**

the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth." (Gen. 1:28). The difference in these commandments is, Adam and the woman were without sin natures when God told them to be fruitful and multiply. God told Noah's son to be fruitful and multiply, and they possessed one each, a sin nature.

This is a fascinating command, as God does not abrogate this command nor does He restate it in the New Testament. For most of my lifetime, I have heard dire warnings of human overpopulation—that there would not be enough food to go around, that there would not be enough energy to power everything, but, throughout my lifetime, I have also observed population growth without out-of-control hunger (there are areas of the world where starvation occurs, but there is no indication that the percentages of starving people have increased when populations increase).

There are about 6 billion people in this world today, and if they all decided to move to Texas, that would put them on 268,600 sq. miles of land, that would make our population density here around 22,000 people/sq. mile, leaving the rest of the world unpopulated. In the year 2000, the population density of New York City was 26,000 people/sq. mile, and there are about 20 other cities in the world today with a population density greater than New York City. Therefore, it ought to be obvious that we can add a few more people to the earth and still be okay.

There is something which is not revealed here: how did God reveal Himself to Noah? In what form was God? It is reasonable to assume that He took upon the form of a man or an angel. Whatever form God takes, this is called a *theophany* when God appears to man in some form (like the burning bush to Moses; as angels to Abraham). Many theologians believe that this is a *Christophany*; that is, an appearance of Jesus Christ in some form before the incarnation.

I personally believe that all theophanies are Christophanies; that is, every appearance of God to man is actually the revealed member of the Trinity, Jesus Christ, in a pre-incarnate form. In most cases, I would guess that Jesus takes the form of a man, and, for this reason, the writer of Scripture does not go on and on and on about how Jesus looks (even in the New Testament, the only physical description of Jesus is when He is in His glorified state).

Gen 9:2 And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon the animals of the earth, and upon every bird of the air, upon all that moves on the earth, and upon all the fish of the sea. Into your hand they are given.

This is a new thing, for the animals to be afraid of man. We do not really have many details of man and animal relationships before the flood. This would suggest that there was not a natural timidity in the animals with respect to man in the antediluvian state.

However, Noah and his family brought these animals aboard the ark and they were under Noah's watch for these past several months. Just as a certain breeds of dogs inherit specific personalities (the personality of a black lab is much different than that of a wire

haired terrier), the animals which Noah brought upon board would have a fear of man, to some degree. That is, for the most part, these animals would not view man as food and many would come to view man as their natural enemy, or, at least something to be afraid of. Domesticated animals would view man as their superior, which is a different form of fear.

There are many dogs capable of killing men—German shepherds and pit bulls come to mind. What restrains them is often a fear of man. I have a cousin who loves big dogs, and she is able to control animals who are capable of killing a man twice her size. These dogs learn respect and fear for her, which becomes the basis of their love for her (and why she has some control over them).

My point in all of this is, wild and domesticated animals both have a fear of man. It is when this fear/respect is diminished that our lives are in danger.

Gen 9:2 And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon the animals of the earth, and upon every bird of the air, upon all that moves on the earth, and upon all the fish of the sea. Into your hand they are given.

Giving all of these animals into the hand of Noah and his sons (*your* is the 2nd person masculine plural suffix), simply means that they are given to Noah and his sons. Animals can be eaten, they can be tamed, they can be used as beasts of burden, they can be preserved—man has authority over these animals.

Gen 9:3 Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you. I have given you all things, even as the green herb.

This is also a change: man is allowed to be a carnivore at this point. Before the flood, man was not given permission to eat meat, even that of an animal sacrifice. It is possible that some of the half-men/half-angels in the pre-deluvian (pre-flood) civilization ate meat. However, this is not something which we can state with any dogmatism one way or the other.

There is an interesting parallel here between what God decided for Adam and what God is here telling Noah.

God Blesses Adam and the Woman	
God Blesses Noah and his Sons	
Genesis 1:28–30	Genesis 9:1–4
Gen 1:28a And God blessed them [Adam and the woman]. And God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it.	Gen 9:1 And God blessed Noah and his sons. And He said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth.

God Blesses Adam and the Woman God Blesses Noah and his Sons

Genesis 1:28–30

Gen 1:28b And you will have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth."

Gen 1:29 And God said, "Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is on the face of all the earth, and every tree with seed in its fruit. You shall have them for food. Men were supposed to be herbivores before the flood.

Gen 1:30 And to every beast of the earth and to every bird of the heavens and to everything that creeps on the earth, everything that has the breath of life, I have given every green plant for food." And it was so. Animals were also limited to eating only from plants.

Genesis 9:1–4

Gen 9:2 And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon the animals of the earth, and upon every bird of the air, upon all that moves on the earth, and upon all the fish of the sea. Into your hand they are delivered.

Gen 9:3 Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you. I have given you all things, even as the green herb. After the flood, God allowed man to eat meat and plants.

Gen 9:4 But you shall not eat of flesh with the life in it, *or* the blood of it. Man was limited to not eating live flesh or drinking the blood of animals.

So we find an exact parallel with Gen. 9:1–3 and Gen. 1:28–29.

Gen 9:4 But you shall not eat of flesh with the life in it—its blood.

I did not carefully read this verse in the Hebrew, and misinterpreted it the first time through. Literally, this reads, *Only flesh in its life—its blood—you will not eat*. This prohibits us from eating the blood of an animal or eating an animal with its blood remaining in it.

One of the things which can be noted in God's instructions to man about foods is, often, the result preserves the human race. A lot of diseases are carried in the blood, as well as in the live flesh of animals. Cooking the meat without the blood reduces the chances of man becoming ill.

Gen 9:5 And surely the blood of your lives will I require. At the hand of every animal will I require it, and at the hand of man. At the hand of every man's brother I will require the life of man.

Blood is a central theme of Scripture, occurring again and again. What is being said here deals with the death penalty for murder, which apparently was not a specified law from God

prior to the flood (recall that Cain killed Abel, but then he just left the area in order to stay alive, and God did not command anyone to go after him).

The final verb here is rather difficult; it is: *dârash* (דָּרַשׁ) [pronounced *daw-RAHSH*], and in the Qal stem, it means *to seek, to make inquiries concerning, to consult, to investigate, to study, to follow, to inquire; to require*. Strong's #1875 BDB #205. This verb is used 3 times in Gen. 9:5.

Verses 5–6 should not have been separated; the entire thought is:

Gen 9:5 And surely the blood of your lives will I require. At the hand of every animal will I require it, and at the hand of man. At the hand of every man's brother I will require the life of man.

Gen 9:6 Whoever sheds man's blood, his blood shall be shed by man; for He made man in the image of God.

God here requires, at the hand of every man's brother, the life of a man (with respect to his brother's life). That is, there is a responsibility here being set up, which is the opposite of Cain's assertion ("Am I my brother's keeper?"). Here is how this works: If Charlie Brown kills Linus, then a close relative of Linus is to kill Charlie Brown. This is his solemn responsibility before God. I know that you want to bring in, "**Vengeance is Mine, I will repay,**" says the Lord; and that is true, *after* the Mosaic Law is given. However, part of this was retained; executioners in the Old Testament, insofar as I am able to discover, are close relatives of the person killed.

One of the first laws laid down by God is, a murderer ought to be executed. This was not the case in the antediluvian civilization. There was murder and there was revenge for murder (Gen. 4:15), but God did not require execution of murderers at that time, insofar as we know. Cain would have been a prime example, and yet God did not impel anyone to execute Cain for his sin of murder.

I realize that the first 3 points of this doctrine are going to be controversial.

The [Short] Doctrine of Murder

1. In the antediluvian civilization, God does not require anyone to execute Cain, although it is clear that he is guilty of murder. Cain was banished as a result, but he was not executed. Gen. 4:1–16
2. In the antediluvian civilization, there was, apparently, revenge for murder, but we do not clearly see it brought to pass, nor do we see any divine codification of such a penalty for murder. Gen. 4:23–24
3. In the post-diluvian society, prior to the Mosaic Law, God required the execution of a murderer by the next-of-kin of the victim. Gen. 9:5–6
4. We may reasonably assume that God's requirement of *blood for blood* was codified by law, as societies became larger and better organized. Because man

The [Short] Doctrine of Murder

- was made in the image of God, he had an organized framework of law within his soul. Rom. 1:18–20, 32
5. Historically, a number of law codes will emerge, which would culminate in the Mosaic Law, the Law of God, specifically given to the people of Israel directly from God.
 - 1) Codes of law which are known to us today include the Code of Hammurabi (circa 1790 B.C.), the Code of Ur-Nammu, king of Ur (circa 2050 B.C.) the Laws of Eshnunna (circa 1930 B.C.) and the codex of Lipit-Ishtar of Isin (circa 1870 B.C.).
 - 2) As man formed national entities, which is God's design, he also establishes laws (or traditions), because man is made in the image of God. It is our nature, when gathered into groups, to develop some sort of organization or structure, which includes laws.
 - 3) As a side note, the Law of Moses was not some offshoot of the Code of Hammurabi.
 6. The Ten Commandments, often called codex I of the Mosaic Law, forbade murder (not killing, but murder).
 - 1) There are about a half-dozen Hebrew words which are various translated *to murder, to kill, to strike down*. The word used in the Ten Commandments specifically means *to murder* (2nd or 3rd degree murder). Ex. 20:13
 - 2) The Bible clearly presents killing which is not murder: manslaughter (Ex. 21:12–13), execution for the violation of certain laws (Ex. 21:14–17), and killing in war (Ex. 23:20–23 Num. 31:1–8 Joshua 6:21 8:24 Psalm 144:1).
 - 3) In other words, *thou shalt not kill* is properly translated, *you will not murder*. This commandment is not an absolute prohibition against all killing in all circumstances. God will give direct orders for Moses or Joshua, for instance, to completely destroy this or that group of people, because their degeneracy was so ingrained.
 7. Murder continues to be a sin in the New Testament, and in the Church Age, and it is punishable by death. Matt. 26:52 Rom. 1:21 13:1–4

I do not doubt that you have problems with #1–3, but those were different times, and not applicable to today.

For further study, let me recommend:

http://www.answerbag.com/q_view/1249061

<http://www.westbankbiblechurch.com/LGMerrittBooks/100425Doctrine%20of%20Murder.pdf>

<http://www.angelfire.com/mi/universe/jude.glossary3.html>

Some of these Scriptural references are from: http://www.answerbag.com/q_view/1249061 (Moosemose posts in answerbag quite often, giving his notes from Bible class as the answer to many questions posed there. My assumption is, these are notes from Bible classes at Berachah Church.

Also, hidden within Gen. 9:5–6 is the death penalty for animals which kill man. Whether God was more explicit with Noah and his sons, we do not know; but when God gives Moses the Law, it will include the killing of animals which kill man. There are a number of animals which are capable of killing man, but their fear/respect for man prevents them from doing so. However, whenever that fear/respect diminishes to a point where these animals will kill, that animal needs to die, so that it cannot influence other animals and so that it cannot breed (e.g., Ex. 21:28).

Gen 9:7 And you be fruitful and multiply. Bring forth abundantly in the earth, and increase in it.”

Again, God tells Noah’s family to have lots of children. I do not know why this mandate is repeated, apart from that being God’s emphasis in the matter. In contrast to killing and to executing murderers, God’s plan is for man to fill the earth.

Lesson 82: Genesis 9:8

Covenant Theology versus Dispensations

I should warn you up front that this lesson will be very theological in nature.

Gen 9:8 And God spoke to Noah, and to his sons with him, saying,

What will follow is known as the Noahic Covenant. A covenant is a contract or agreement between two parties, although some of these covenants are called unconditional covenants, meaning that God promises some things without conditions. It would have been reasonable to entitle the Bible as the New Covenant and the Old Covenant.

There are 2 dramatically different ways of organizing the Bible: by Dispensations and by Covenant Theology. The first is correct and Biblical and the second is a distortion of Biblical truth. Since we are going to talk about the Noahic Covenant, it might be a good idea to differentiate between Dispensationalism and Covenant Theology.

Although we have already covered dispensations in the past, this is a very brief review:

A Review of Dispensations

1. The word *dispensation* refers to the administration of a household.
2. God organizes and administers His household here on earth in different ways through the ages.
3. There are 7 dispensations throughout human history:
 - 1) Innocence: this is Adam and the woman in the garden
 - 2) The Age of the Gentiles is broken down into 2 parts
 - (1) The antediluvian era: from the Fall to the flood
 - (2) Post-diluvian era: from the flood to Abraham
 - 3) The Age of the Jews is broken down into 3 parts
 - (1) The Age of the Patriarchs

A Review of Dispensations

- (2) The nation Israel
 - (3) The Tribulation, which is future, and marks the resumption of the Jewish Age
 - 4) The Dispensation of the Hypostatic Union (also known as the First Advent of Jesus Christ)
 - (1) This short period of time acts as the hinge between the Church Age and the Age of Israel.
 - (2) Jesus Christ lived under the Law in the nation Israel. At no time did He violate the Law of Moses and He fulfilled all of the Messianic prophecies pertinent to the first advent.
 - (3) However, Jesus primarily functioned as a man under the power of the Holy Spirit, test-driving, so to speak, the life of the Church Age believer.
 - 5) The Church Age or the Intercalated Age (the Church Age is intercalated between the 1st and 2nd advents of Jesus Christ). The Church Age was unknown to previous dispensations, and it is a part of the mystery doctrine which Jesus taught in the Upper Room and the Apostles taught in the epistles (particularly Paul).
 - (1) The pre-canon period began with signs and miracles, which conferred upon the Apostles the authority to teach and to write Scripture (the canon refers to the completed Word of God).
 - (2) The post-canon period; the Bible is complete, all of the doctrine that we need has been recorded, and now, the authority of God is in the completed Word of God. Signs and miracles are no longer needed in order to confer authority on this or that person; because, if they teach the Word of God accurately, we place ourselves under their authority. Furthermore, our faith is strengthened by the Word of God, and not by witnessing some random miracle.
 - 6) The Millennium is a literal 1000 year reign of Jesus Christ on the earth, during which we will enjoy perfect environment. This will end with a revolt against God.
 - 7) The Eternal State, in which there is a new heavens and a new earth.
4. Dispensations allows us to give the most literal interpretation to the Bible. God's promises to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (in the Book of Genesis) will mean exactly what they appear to mean. All of the New Testament references to dispensations, mystery doctrine, and the times and the seasons all make perfect sense as well.
 5. Dispensations do teach that man is saved the same way in every dispensation: by placing one's faith in the 2nd person of the Trinity (Jehovah Elohim in the Old Testament and Jesus Christ in the New). Gen. 15:6 John 3:36

We have previously studied [dispensations](#) back in [Introductory Lesson 6](#). This is covered in even greater detail in the [Doctrine of Dispensations](#). Please refer to the links for further information, including Biblical documentation for this correct interpretation of the Bible.

The reason that one would apply the dispensational framework to the Bible is, this allows for the most literal interpretation of all Scripture. Jews are Jews; the land of Israel is the land of Israel; God's promises to the patriarchs mean exactly what they seem to mean; and the church (the body of believers) is treated as a separate, but closely related entity.

I am going to briefly cover Covenant Theology and what is wrong with it. If you are not getting the contrast between these theologies, then you need to go back to links above.

I have made references to Covenant Theology throughout this study of Genesis without ever properly defining it. Let me emphasize up front that this is a false theology. Like all false systems of interpretation, this will have some truth in it.

Covenant Theology

1. The general idea is, God has a relationship with man through covenants (by contract). This is not in dispute by any theologian of any stripe.
2. Covenant Theology provides a framework within which we interpret the Bible. This approach is what is in dispute.
3. There are 3 basic covenants: a covenant of works, a covenant of redemption and a covenant of grace. These definitions come from the Theopedia¹:
 - 1) *The first covenant in logical order, usually called the Covenant of Redemption, is the agreement within the Godhead that the Father would appoint his son Jesus to give up his life for mankind and that Jesus would do so (cf. Titus 1:1-3).*
 - 2) *The second, called the Covenant of Works, was made in the Garden of Eden between God and Adam and promised life for obedience and death for disobedience. Adam disobeyed God and broke the covenant, and so the third covenant was made between God and all of mankind, who also fell with Adam according to Romans 5:12-21.*
 - 3) *This third covenant, the Covenant of Grace, promised eternal blessing for belief in Christ and obedience to God's word. It is thus seen as the basis for all biblical covenants that God made individually with Noah, Abraham, and David, nationally with O.T. Israel as a people, and universally with man in the New Covenant. These individual covenants are called the "Biblical covenants" because they are explicitly described as such in the Bible.*
 - 4) Sometimes, covenant theology speaks only of the latter 2 covenants, as they are the general covenants between man and God.

Covenant Theology

4. These covenants are not found specifically named anywhere in the Bible; they are inferred from the Bible, and then used as a framework for Biblical interpretation.
5. The general idea is, God was working through the nation Israel and through the race of the Jews, and they failed so badly, that God began working with a new entity, believers in Jesus Christ (and the church), who then became the spiritual heirs of Abraham. Since the Jews now rejected the covenant of grace, God offered this covenant of grace to the Gentiles, the spiritual heirs of Abraham. In Covenant Theology, there is no real difference between Israel and the church.
6. In Covenant Theology, the covenant of grace is the constant, and those with whom God makes this covenant are believers in Jesus Christ.
7. Covenant Theology takes all of the promises which God made to Israel (to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—men we will study in Genesis) along with the covenants made with Moses, with the Jews and with David, and *spiritualizes* these covenants.
8. That is, the actual words of these covenants are no longer precise. Abraham's seed no longer refers to those physically descended from Abraham but those who are *spiritually* descended from Abraham.
9. The covenants made previously to Israel and to various patriarchs of Israel are no longer applicable to that particular plot of ground nor are they applicable to that particular race of people.
10. All of these promises are *spiritualized*, which, of course, calls into question exactly what these promises really mean.
11. The reason that this happened is, Israel screwed up so many times, again and again and again, that God just decided, "These people are just not working out. I need a new group of people who are better and more faithful." That turns out to be us, believers in the Church Age (however, covenant theologians do not recognize the Church Age as a separate dispensation).
12. Covenant theologians do not recognize a substantive difference between the church and Israel; the latter morphed into the former.
13. Israel, as a people and as a nation, was simply too disobedient and they rejected the covenant of grace at the advent of Jesus Christ.
14. There is also a new covenant theology which has sprung up, which seems to try to find a place in between dispensational theology and covenant theology.

¹ From http://www.theopedia.com/Covenant_theology accessed May 12, 2010.

I should point out that, most people who believe in covenant theology are believers in Jesus Christ. That is, at some point in their lives, they exercised faith in Jesus Christ, and they are eternally saved. Believing a false doctrine does not remove someone's salvation. We are saved based upon what Jesus did for us on the cross; not based upon our lives as Christians (most of us can give testimony as to the sub-standard way that we conduct ourselves from time to time).

Although I have implied that there are problems with covenant theology, let me enumerate them:

Problems with Covenant Theology

1. God's promises are not what they seem. God made many specific promises to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, to the nation Israel and to David. These promises involve a specific bloodline and a specific plot of ground. If the nation Israel is no longer a part of God's plan and if the Jews are no longer God's people, then dozens of promises directly to various Jews from God make very little sense.
2. According to Covenant Theology, there is a limit to God's patience. The Old Testament is a book which testifies to Jewish failure more than almost anything else, yet God is with the Jews throughout the Old Testament. The book of the Judges is remarkable as to how many times Israel would go astray, and yet God was always faithful to them. In Covenant Theology, God's patience has limits; you can fail enough times where God removes you completely from His plan.
3. Most people who believe in covenant theology do not believe in eternal security (which means, once you have believed in Jesus Christ, you cannot lose this salvation).
4. The Jews failed so spectacularly, that God, for all intents and purposes, withdrew His specific promises from the Jews, and has substituted a *spiritualized* meaning and understanding of these promises. Or, more accurately, covenant theology always believes that these promises were spiritual promises.
5. Covenant Theology takes two very different entities—the church and the nation Israel—and says that they are, in essence, the same thing.
6. Dan Smedra writes: *With all varieties of Covenant theology, there is an obsession for an overriding continuity or unified purpose for the sixty-six books (Canon) which comprise Holy Scriptures. Rather than having wisdom to discern the real difference among things which resemble one another, the covenantist is driven to find an "integrating" principle to produce theological uniformity, in hope of discovering "what the Bible is really all about." Their "key" is the erroneous concept that every relationship between God and man must take the form of a covenant or legal agreement. From this notion, albeit logical, has arisen their apocryphal and overarching Covenant of Works and Covenant of Grace.*¹
7. Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, a dispensationalist, writes:²
 - 1) *A theology which penetrates no further into Scripture than to discover that in all ages God is immutable in His grace toward penitent sinners, and constructs the idea of a universal church, continuing through the ages, on the one truth of immutable grace, is not only disregarding vast spheres of revelation but is reaping the unavoidable confusion [fog] and misdirection which part-truth engenders. The outworking of divine grace is not standardized, though the Covenant idea of theology would make it so...*
 - 2) *A form of Covenant Theology which would thread all of Jehovah's purposes and undertakings upon His one attribute of grace could hardly avoid confusion of mind [fog] in matters related to His varied objectives. Covenant Theology, in consistency with its man-made premise, asserts its*

Problems with Covenant Theology

inventions respecting an Old Testament church, which, it is claimed, is an integral part of the New Testament Church and on the ground that, since God's grace is one unchanging attribute, its accomplishments must be the realization of one standardized ideal.

- 3) *A Covenant Theology engenders the notion that there is but one soteriology and one eschatology, and that ecclesiology, such as it is conceived to be, extends from the Garden of Eden to the Great White Throne. The insuperable problems in exegesis which such fanciful suppositions create are easily disposed of by ignoring them.*
- 4) *Covenantism, which has molded the major theological concepts for many generations, recognizes no distinction as to ages, therefore can allow for no distinctions between law and grace. This dominating attitude of Covenantism must account for the utter neglect of life-truth in all their works of theology. No more representative theological dictum from the Covenant viewpoint has been formed than the Westminster Confession of Faith, which valuable and important document recognizes life-truth only to the point of imposing the Ten Commandments on Christians as their sole obligation, this in spite of the teachings of the Pauline Church Epistles which assert that the law was never given to Gentiles or Christians, and that the latter has been saved and delivered from it--actually dead to it (Gal. 2:19).*
8. In short, covenant theology takes something which is clearly found in the Bible (covenants between God and man), and from this, infers 2 or 3 overarching covenants (which are not found in the Bible), and then superimposes the inferred covenants over all of Scripture, in order to give it a unifying set of factors.
9. Covenant theologians must therefore go back and interpret all of the covenants which appear to have a clear meaning, and yet that meaning must be reinterpreted to fit within the umbrella of covenant theology. The end result is, many of God's promises are not what they seem.
10. Therefore, those who believe in covenant theology often reject God using Jews in the future; they reject the importance of the nation Israel (although it is found in prophecy); and they reject the millennial rule of Jesus Christ. Again, promises and prophecies which appear to have clear meanings must be reinterpreted to fit into covenant theology.

¹ From <http://withchrist.org/covtheo.htm> accessed May 12, 2010.

² From Lewis Sperry Chafer, Systematic Theology, Volume IV (Dallas, Texas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948) pp. 156, 311; Vol. VI, p. 167.

The very fact that we find covenants in the Bible (particularly in the Old Testament), does not *prove* that Covenant Theology is correct and Dispensationalism is not.

Dispensationalism versus Covenant Theology

Characteristic	Covenant Theology	Dispensationalism
The Framework of Biblical Interpretation	There are 2 overarching covenants and God's relationship to man is interpreted according to those covenants. The church is not a separate entity from Israel but a new or evolved Israel. Or, Israel 2.0.	The Bible is interpreted with respect to the outline of dispensations. What is done in one era is not necessarily repeated in another era.
Pattern of History	A Covenant of Works is established with Adam (but not specifically called this in Scripture); and a Covenant of Grace between Christ and the elect (one might interpret this as the gospel).	Divided into dispensations (usually seven); e.g., Innocence (pre-Fall), Conscience (Adam), Human Government (Noah), the Age of Israel (which is further subdivided into the time of the patriarchs, the time of the Law and the Tribulation); the Age of the Hypostatic Union; the Church Age; and the Millennium.
View of History	Optimistic: God is extending His kingdom. Some even have an evolutionary view of man and God.	Pessimistic: the Last Days are marked by increasingly worse wickedness in the world and by apostasy in the church. Things get worse in the end times, not better.
God's Purpose in History	There is a unified redemptive purpose.	There are two distinct organizations, one earthly (Israel), one heavenly (church). However, the gospel is constant in relationship to Israel and the church. God furthers His purpose in human history primarily through these 2 institutions.

Dispensationalism versus Covenant Theology

Characteristic	Covenant Theology	Dispensationalism
View of the Biblical Covenants	They are different administrations of the Covenant of Grace.	They mark off periods of time during which God's specific demands of man differ. God works through various institutions, and one might see this as a covenant relationship in many of these cases, but with varying covenants (however, salvation is always through faith in Christ).
Relationship of Old Testament to New Testament	Acceptance of Old Testament teaching required unless specifically abrogated by New Testament.	Old Testament prescriptions are not binding unless reaffirmed in New Testament.
Relationship Between Israel and the Church	The church is spiritual Israel, in continuity with true Israel of Old Testament.	The church is the spiritual people of God, distinct from Israel, the physical people of God.
Israel	This can refer to the literal seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob or to their spiritual seed, depending upon the context.	Israel is a literal nation with Jews who are genetically descended from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (and Gentiles could choose to become a part of Israel). The church is not spiritual Israel and the church does not replace Israel. Israel is temporarily set aside during the Church Age.
Old Testament Law	In effect unless specifically abrogated in the New Testament.	Not in effect unless specifically reaffirmed in the New Testament.
The Mosaic Law	The Mosaic Law still stands as the Law of God, except for ceremonial laws and some civil laws.	The Mosaic Law has been replaced by the law of the Spirit and life. The Mosaic Law remains as an excellent guide to human freedom.

Dispensationalism versus Covenant Theology

Characteristic	Covenant Theology	Dispensationalism
Old Testament Prophecy	Some refer to a literal Israel and some refer to God's people, the church, which is spiritual Israel.	Refers to ethnic Israel. All prophecy pertaining to the church is given either during the Age of the Hypostatic Union or during the Church Age.
Jesus offering of the kingdom	This spiritual kingdom was rejected by Israel, but will later be accepted by spiritual Israel.	When Israel rejected the Kingdom of God, a bona fide offer from the Person of Jesus Christ, God turned to the Gentiles, who, along with Jewish believers, make up the church.
Interpretation of History and Prophecy	Promises to Israel as well as the identity of Israel is generally spiritualized. .	Accepts both literal and figurative interpretation of the Bible. The Jews are seen as a literal race which will exist throughout human history; and the nation Israel is seen as a literal nation. However, God works through regenerate Israel.
Prophecies of the Church Age	There are prophecies of the church and the time of the church throughout the Old Testament.	There are no Old Testament prophecies which deal with the church directly.
The Indwelling and Filling of the Holy Spirit	God indwelt and filled both Old and New Testament saints.	God only indwells and fills Church Age believers. This is a part of the mystery doctrine. Some believers in the Old Testament had the Holy Spirit, but this could be lost (David, for instance, prayed, "Do not take Your Spirit from me.").
The Body of Christ	Believers of all ages are in Christ and make up the body of Christ.	Church Age believers are the body of Christ. This is a part of the mystery doctrine.
Doctrine of the Church Age	Doctrine related to the church is found throughout the Bible.	Church Age doctrine is found in the Upper Room Discourse (in the book of John) and in the epistles.

Dispensationalism versus Covenant Theology

Characteristic	Covenant Theology	Dispensationalism
The Church	The church began in Abraham's tent. It finds its complete fulfillment in the New Testament. Acts 7:38	This entity known as the church was born on the Day of Pentecost around A.D. 33.
The Place of the Church	The church is simply the evolution from Israel.	The Church Age is parenthetical, and separate from the Age of Israel. God works through the church (the body of believers) similar to how He worked through Israel, but these are separate entities.
Church Age	God's redemptive purpose continued to unfold. There has been little or no change from God working through the nation Israel.	There is a parenthesis between past and future manifestations of the kingdom (Israel is the past manifestation of His kingdom; and the millennial rule of Jesus Christ will be the future manifestation of His kingdom).
Role of Holy Spirit	The Holy Spirit indwells God's people throughout history.	The Holy Spirit indwells God's people only from Pentecost to the Rapture. There are differing opinions when it comes to the Tribulation and the Millennium.
Baptism	Unified covenant generally used to support infant baptism.	Israel/church distinction often (but not always) used to support believers' baptism.
Social Implications	Emphasizes "cultural mandate."	The only way to save the world is to save individuals; therefore evangelism takes precedence over "social action."
Eschatology	Usually amillennial (there is no millennium); rarely postmillennial; occasionally pre-millennial (there will be a tribulation before the millennial kingdom).	Pre-millennial, usually pretribulational. The Age of Israel is completed by the Tribulation, which is then followed by the Millennium. The church is removed before the Tribulation.

Dispensationalism versus Covenant Theology

Characteristic	Covenant Theology	Dispensationalism
The Kingdom of God	Represents heaven, for the most part.	The Millennium (1000 year reign of Jesus Christ on earth) is seen as the literal Kingdom of God on earth.
Millennium	Symbolic, often identified with present age. This could be identified with heaven.	Literal, earthly 1000-year reign of Jesus Christ after the Tribulation and the Great White Throne.
Animal Sacrifices	Fulfilled in Jesus Christ and never to be repeated.	Animal sacrifices will resume in the Millennium as a testimony to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ for our sins.

Taken from: <http://reformed-theology.org/html/c-vs-dis.htm> accessed May 19, 2010 and from <http://faithbibleonline.net/MiscDoctrine/DispCov.htm> accessed May 19, 2010. Both sources are edited.

Covering both of these topics in a single lesson is impossible. In this, we are barely skimming the surface of these two theologies. Luckily, the internet provides a wealth of information.

Additional Reading on Dispensations and Covenant Theology

Dispensations:

http://kukis.org/Important_Topics/dispensations.htm (or)
http://kukis.org/Important_Topics/dispensations.pdf

<http://www.gbible.org/index.php?proc=d4d&sf=rea&did=8>
<http://dtbrents.wordpress.com/category/doctrine-of-dispensations/> (same as above but a better format)

<http://www.christiandoctrinediscussion.com/doctrine-debate-forum/1411-7-dispensations.html> (Scofield's notes on dispensations)

<http://www.versebyverse.org/doctrine/dispensations.html>

<http://www.churchofhopeontheweb.org/archives/218> (a 10 minute video covering dispensations by a missionary in the Philippines; who is a student of R. B. Theme, Jr.)

<http://www.spokanebiblechurch.com/study/Bible%20Doctrines/dispensations-definitio ns-explanation.htm>

Dispensations and the gospel:

<http://www.brethrenonline.org/articles/disp Gosp.htm>

Covenant Theology:

Additional Reading on Dispensations and Covenant Theology

<http://withchrist.org/covtheo.htm>

<http://www.ukapologetics.net/07/COVENANTTHEOLOGY.htm>

Dispensations and Covenant Theology Contrasted:

<http://www.4himnet.com/bnyberg/dispensationalism02.html>

<http://www.4himnet.com/bnyberg/dispensationalism01.html> (to be read in that order)

<http://www.christinyou.net/pages/dthcthchth.html> (this article gives some of the historical background of both theologies).

<http://www.xenos.org/essays/covdisp.htm>

New Covenant Theology:

<http://www.mbbc.edu/download/Fundamentalism/2008/OatsNewCovenantTheology.pdf>

Covenant Theology versus New Covenant Theology

http://www.mountainretreatorg.net/faq/covenant_theol.html

All 3 Systems Contrasted

http://pressiechurch.org/Theol_1/a_comparison_of_three_systems.htm

Listing these sites does not constitute approval of all that is found on these sites.

In summary, the correct interpretation of human history is, God divides our history into different epochs, ages or periods of time, which we often call dispensations (which, admittedly, slightly distorts the actual meaning of the word *oikonomos*,³⁸ which is translated *dispensation*, and means *the administration of a household*). There are certain truths which transcend all dispensations: *that Jesus Christ dies for our sins and we are saved by faith in Him*, is one of these truths. This was taught in the Old Testament, although quite obviously, OT believers did not have a clear understanding of what they were believing in (which is true of NT believers, who first believe in Jesus Christ, and then find out exactly what it is they signed up for).

Dispensationalism simply provides the most literal interpretation of the Bible and dispensationalists believe that Jews have a specific future in God's plan, which involves very specific promises which include a very specific place.

³⁸ This means, *the management of a household*.

In vv. 1–7, God spoke to Noah and his sons, and told them that animals would fear them; that they could eat meat (but not blood or living flesh); when a man is killed, his nearest of kin should execute the murderer; and twice, God told Noah's sons to be fruitful and multiply.

What follows will be an unconditional covenant from God; God will make a promise to Noah and his family (and to all mankind), but without a need for any sort of reciprocation.

Gen 9:8 And God speaks to Noah, and to his sons with him, saying,

In whatever form God presents Himself, Noah and his sons clearly recognize Him and accept His authority.

The Noahic Covenant is an unconditional covenant, which God will lay out below. *Unconditional* means that Noah and his sons will not have to do anything in order for this covenant to be fulfilled by God. This covenant will be a promise that God will not ever again destroy the earth with a flood. The words *conditional* and *unconditional* do not occur in Scripture in association with the word covenant. Theologians have used these words to classify the types of covenants which are found in Scripture.

Gen 9:9 "Behold! I, even I, am establishing My covenant with you, and with your seed after you;

God states the parties to the covenant: Himself, Noah and his sons and all of their descendants. Let me re-emphasize last week's lesson: the fact that God established contracts with man throughout human history, this does not make valid the false doctrine of covenant theology.

Although some of this came from Robby Dean's own notes, I have changed up this doctrine quite a bit.

Points on Covenants

- 1) In Genesis 6:18 we have this first mention of the word "covenant." And in this passage God says, "I will establish my covenant with you." What follows is a promise that God would bring a flood upon the earth and that there would be one way of salvation, which is the ark that God would have Noah build. You will recall that there were a number of parallels between Jesus Christ and the ark in which Noah's family was saved.
- 2) This same language will be repeated here in Gen. 9:11. What we find here is the hiphil stem of the Hebrew verb qum (קום) [pronounced *koom*], which means *to set in place or to establish*. In the hiphil stem it means *to cause to be in place* and it can have the connotation of confirming something that is already in existence.

Points on Covenants

- 3) Even though the word *covenant* is new verbiage in Gen. 6:18, we read in Hosea 6:7a: **But, like Adam, they have broken the covenant.** Therefore, Adam was subject to a contract of some sort with God.
- 4) In Gen. 1:28–30, we read: **And God blessed them; and God said to them, Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it, and rule over the fish of the seas, and over birds of the heavens, and over all beasts creeping on the earth. And God said, Behold, I have given you every plant seeding seed which is on the face of all the earth, and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree seeding seed; it shall be food for you. And to every beast of the earth, and to all birds of the heavens, and to every creeper on the earth which has in it a living soul, every green plant is for food. And it was so. You will note how close this is to Gen. 9:1–7.**
- 5) God also said, **“Eating you may eat of every tree in the garden; but of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil you may not eat, for in the day that you eat of it, dying you shall die.”** (Gen. 2:16b–17). This would have been the covenant which Adam violated. I would think that this would have been accompanied with God allowing Adam and the woman to eat from every tree of the garden, as the woman later confirmed: **“We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden, but of the fruit of the tree in the middle of the garden, God has said, You shall not eat of it, nor shall you touch it, lest you die.”** (Gen. 3:3b–4). Although the woman appears to have embellished God’s covenant somewhat, the standing contract between man and God was, Adam and the woman could eat from every tree in the garden, except for the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. This is the covenant which Adam violated. Often, this is called the Edenic Covenant (the Covenant of Eden). Some call this the Adamic Covenant as well (because it is made with Adam). These are logical and reasonable theological designations which do not appear in Scripture.

Points on Covenants

- 6) Later, after Adam and the woman sinned, breaking the Edenic covenant, God gave them the repercussions of violating this covenant, which consequences contained a promise: **And Jehovah God said to the serpent, "Because you have done this, you are cursed above all beasts, and above every animal of the field. You shall go on your belly, and you shall eat dust all the days of your life. And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her Seed; He will bruise your head, and you shall bruise His heel. He said to the woman, I will greatly increase your sorrow and your conception; you shall bear sons in sorrow, and your desire shall be toward your husband; and he shall rule over you. And He said to the man, Because you have listened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten of the tree about which I commanded you, saying, You shall not eat from it, the ground shall be cursed because of you; you shall eat of it in sorrow all the days of your life. And it shall bring forth thorns and thistles for you, and you shall eat the plant of the field. By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread until your return to the ground. For you have been taken out of it; for you are dust, and to dust you shall return."** (Gen. 3:14–19). God promises what will happen in the future. Because they violated the original covenant (Hosea 6:7), God, in Gen. 3:14–19, explains to them what He means when He warned them, *in dying, you will die*. These are the consequences of violating the Edenic Covenant. Buried within this curse is the promise of the Seed of the Woman, an early example of cursing turned to blessing.
- 7) A covenant often (but not always) implies that there are responsibilities on the part of man as a covenant partner. That is what we see played out all through Genesis. A covenant establishes the way God is going to interact with man and man's responsibilities, if any, in association with the covenant.
- 8) God, being God, can define the exact terms of the covenant. God, being God, can require man to fulfill certain conditions or not.
- 9) Since God is God, we can hold Him to the covenants which He makes with us. If you should ever doubt your salvation, then you hold God to His promise: **Believe in the Son and you will have eternal life** (John 3:16, 36). God cannot lie (Num. 23:19 Heb. 6:18).
- 10) In most cases, each new covenant may be seen as a furtherance of each previous covenant. God will make several covenants with Abraham, which indicates that God is reaffirming or amending the original contract (however, the original contract is never abrogated). This is because God is immutable (He does not change) and He does not lie.
- 11) In Gen. 9, we have a new covenant made with Noah, but it does not abrogate the results of violating the Edenic Covenant. The promise of the Seed of the Woman still stands, and this was well understood throughout the ages, and more well-defined as time went on. He was called the seed of Abraham (Gal. 3:16–19 Heb. 2:16) and the Seed of David (Rom. 1:3 2Tim. 2:8).

Points on Covenants

- 12) When we get to Abraham, there will be some additional vocabulary words associated with covenants, which we will discuss then.
- 13) A covenant is essentially a legal contract. That implies several things.
 - (1) First, there are two parties involved. There is God who is the party of the first part, and man or a group of men, who are parties of the second part. This implies that for there to be a legal contract that both parties are persons. You can't have a covenant between a thing or an impersonal force or a non-person. So this implies that the God who gives this covenant or contract is a personal entity, an individual. The Bible clearly indicates that God is a Person who is capable of relationships.
 - (2) Secondly, a covenant or contract implies that the person who establishes the contract is able to guarantee what he promises in the contract. He is able to control the situation and circumstances and all of the details of history to be able to fulfill what He, God, has promised. That tells us things about God's character. It implies that one who makes this contract is sovereign; He is ultimately in charge. It relates to His immutability. If God is not immutable, if He is going to change His mind tomorrow, then is that contract any good? It implies His love. One of the key words that we find over and over in the Old Testament is the Hebrew word chesed, a word that is a little difficult to translate into English, but it is usually translated "loving kindness." But it means much more than that, it has to do with loyalty, faithfulness. It is love that is faithful to a free, established contract. God honors His obligations even when we don't.
- 14) The covenant relationship which we find here is not a contract between equals; God made us, God made the world, and He has the authority to establish whatever contract He chooses. We don't get to come back and negotiate this contract with Him. If this bothers you in any way, then recognize God's character; God may be sovereign, but He is also just and righteous. Therefore, we may be assured, on the basis of His essence, that any contract which he establishes will be righteous and just as well.
- 15) The giving of a covenant is the expression of God's grace to fallen man and provides the guidelines for the relationship.
- 16) The very fact that God enters into a covenant with us shows that man's relationship with God is always based on immutable legal principles that are articulated in specific written regulations. That has implications for understanding the inerrancy of the Bible. This is the old covenant and the new covenant. God writes down and signs the contract. The terms aren't going to change, they are inviolable.

Originally taken from Robby Dean's Genesis series, lesson #047, and greatly edited. His notes are found here: <http://phrasearch.com/Trans/DBM/setup/Genesis/Gen047.htm> The audio lesson may be downloaded from here: <http://deanbible.org/Media/Audio%20Files/2003%20-%20Genesis/Genesis-047b.mp3>

Sadly, contrast this with man's approach to a covenant. At one time in this country, two men could come to an agreement, shake hands, and that was the end of it. Today, we can sign 10 or 20 page contracts, and our signatures mean nothing to us. Our signature often means, *I will agree to the terms of this contract as long as I want to; if keeping this contract becomes difficult or to my disadvantage to keep my half of the contract, then I will break it without any moral qualms.* I have dealt with real estate for the past 30 years, and I have seen hundreds of people break leases or walk away from mortgages because they have no personal integrity. And sadly enough, in many cases, these are believers in Jesus Christ.

Gen 9:8–9 And God speaks to Noah, and to his sons with him, to say, “Behold! I, even I, am establishing My covenant with you, and with your seed after you;...

Most people understand all of Gen. 9 to be the Noahic Covenant, and the tenses of the verbs in vv. 8–9 do not contradict that. Above, I have translated the verbs very literally, as per the tense (*speaks* is the imperfect tense; *to say* is an infinitive; and *am establishing* is a participle). So, this is consistent with all of Gen. 9 being a part of the covenant, even though I don't believe that these things were spoken at the same time. In any case, it is important to note that this is not a conditional covenant. That is, God defines the specific responsibilities of man after the flood in vv. 1–7. Then God will give a promise to Noah and his family. This promise is not based upon Noah and his descendants fulfilling the requirements of vv. 1–7. Some men will eat blood; some men and some murderers will be set free or they will not be executed but imprisoned instead. However, despite this, God still guarantees that He will not flood the entire earth again in judgment. Therefore, this is why there is a separation between vv. 1–7 and 10–17; so that we do not mistakenly think that this is a conditional covenant. We may understand all of it to be the Noahic Covenant; with 2 separate and distinct parts, one of which does not depend upon the other. Part I: man's responsibilities in the post-diluvian era; and Part II: God's unconditional promise never to destroy all life on earth again with a flood.

Gen 9:10 ...and with every living creature that *is* with you, of the birds, of the cattle, and of every animal of the earth with you; from all that go out from the ark, to every animal of the earth.

God makes this covenant with every living creature as well.

God is establishing this covenant with *you all* (the southern plural of *you*). Verbs, in the Hebrew, come in a variety of stems, and the stem of the verb further modifies the meaning of the verb. The basic meaning of this verb (*to establish*) in the Qal stem, is *to arise, to stand, to set in place*. Here, this verb is in the Hiphil stem, which is known as the causative stem, and it means *to establish, to cause to stand, to make binding, to carry out*.

Gen 9:11 And I have [caused to be] established My covenant with you [all]. Neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood. Neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth.

God is making His covenant known to Noah and He will make this covenant stand. God guarantees that the earth will never again be destroyed by a flood. In fact, such a thing is impossible today. The mountains are too high and the oceans too deep for a flood to cover all the earth. We do not have enough water on this earth to cover it anymore.

Now take note of the verb's tense: *perfect tense*. This is not something which God is doing right at that moment; this is not something which God will do in the future; he has, in a point of time in the past, caused this promise to be established. During the flood, God changed the height of the mountains and the depths of the seas to make a second worldwide flood impossible. There is no reason to understand this as some form of magic or a miracle, but this could have been accomplished through natural processes.

I still find it fascinating that, if the earth was a perfect sphere, that we would be way, way underwater; that the Bible testifies to there having been a worldwide flood (as do dozens of ancient myths), that the Bible also speaks of mountains being raised up and valleys being lowered, that God promises that He will never again flood the entire earth, and that today, a worldwide flood is physically impossible. This all fits quite nicely together. Furthermore, it fits together nicely with this verb, which is a causative perfect. God caused a future worldwide flood to be impossible, and He caused this to happen previous to the giving of this covenant.

So, in the pre-deluvian state, the mountains were not as tall nor were the ocean floors as deep. The effect of the tremendous amount of water on the earth was to cause great movements of the earth, both up and down, the end result being more dramatic. All of the forces at work are perhaps not given to us.

We are not given much by way of details when it comes to the earth. It is logical that, after 40 days of rain, the earth would have been pounded down more. The only thing which I can come up with, which would have an opposite effect, are great earthquakes and volcanic activity. Possibly huge quantities of water filling up cavernous areas underground set a great many earthquakes and volcanoes into motion. We have all witnessed, either in person, or by television or the print media, just how devastating a hurricane can be. The flood was far and away much more dramatic than any hurricane that man has ever witnessed, with huge amounts of water coming up from under the ground, which then, in huge quantities, begins to recede back into the ground.

One source, and I do not know how credible they are, suggests that the tremendous weight of the water would have caused massive earth movements as well as unprecedented volcanic activity. More on this particular topic:

<http://creation.com/images/pdfs/cabook/chapter14.pdf>

In any case, God promises Noah and his family and all of their descendants that there would never again be a flood to devastate the entire earth. Furthermore, we know that it would be impossible for the earth to be flooded entirely today.

In the previous lesson, we studied.

Gen 9:8–11 And God speaks to Noah, and to his sons with him, saying, “Behold! I, even I, am establishing My covenant with you, and with your seed after you; and with every living creature that *is* with you, of the birds, of the cattle, and of every animal of the earth with you; from all that go out from the ark, to every animal of the earth. And I have [caused to be] established My covenant with you [all]. Neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood. Neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth.

You will recall that this is an unconditional covenant, meaning that there is nothing which Noah or his family must do in order to fulfill the terms of this covenant. That is, Noah does not have to promise to be good, or else, God will flood the earth. God’s promise not to flood the earth is unconditional.

As I have pointed out, God made it impossible for the earth to be flooded. The mountains were raised and the valleys were lowered (Psalm 104:5–9), the end result being, the earth is now unable to suffer a worldwide flood.

I tend toward naturalism; that is, I believe that much of God’s interaction with man is a result of normal and natural occurrences, and the function of cause and effect. This does not mean that God cannot or does not do miracles (in the sense of defying the laws of nature), but that He chooses, almost all of the time, not to defy His Own physical, chemical and biological laws. As we saw with the flood of Noah and God saving Noah in the flood through very natural means, that the end result was a much more powerful historical account, one which is being debated even today, whether in person or by a letter to some periodical, or in some online discussion site. Literally, every single day, Noah and the great flood is in some person’s mind, and many times, it becomes a point of debate. Thousands of books have already been written about the flood; thousands more are yet to be written; and it is all because the flood was a series of natural events (for the most part).

None of this means that God is incapable of defying His Own laws, something which He has clearly done in the past (e.g., the turning of water into wine); but God’s power is far more dramatic with far greater historical impact, *if* it conforms to the laws of His creation.

Is it within the bounds of physics for valleys to sink deeper and for mountains to be raised up? Of course; we have observed this. We see sinkholes on land all of the time, and they happen suddenly, without warning. There have been earthquakes where the ground opens up, where one plate is forced against another, and one moves upward and another down. There is an entire scientific discipline, plate tectonics, based upon these occurrences in nature. In the great flood of Noah, apparently the water coming up from down below was part of the cause of the dramatic shifting of plates which must have taken place before, during and/or after the flood.

Gen 9:12–14 And God said, This is the token [or, sign, remembrance] of the covenant which I make between Me and you and every living creature with you, for everlasting generations: I set my rainbow in the cloud. And it shall be a token of a covenant between Me and the earth. And it shall be, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the rainbow shall be seen in the cloud.

The word *rainbow* is qesheth (קֶשֶׁת) [pronounced *KEH-sheth*], which means *bow; bowman, archer; strength, power; rainbow*. Strong's #7198 BDB #905. This is the first time that this word occurs; yet, most of the later occurrences will refer to *bow* or *archers*.

The rainbow would be a token of God's covenant with all who live on the earth. The implication is, that before the flood, there were no rainbows; that there was a different sort of atmosphere, which did not allow for that, which is suggested by the study which we have done in Genesis (the water canopy).

Why does God make this promise, never to flood the entire earth again? There would be a change in the earth—the earth would be watered by rain (which will allow man to populate more areas on the earth). After being in a storm unlike anything we could imagine, God wants Noah and his family to know that the next rainstorm will not flood the earth; nor the one after that. They heard thunder and saw lightning unlike anything we have ever observed. After the flood, they emerged from the ark to see a dramatic destruction which is hard to even imagine. If such a promise was not made, there would have been great panic with every rainstorm (which was also a new thing). This would have affected Noah's immediate family greatly, so that their confidence, when hearing thunder, would have to be in this promise made to them by God. This promise is extremely important for their peace of mind.

There is a minor figure of speech found here, and found throughout the Bible: a metonym. The word *earth* is a *metonym* for *all of the inhabitants of the earth*. Now and again, you will find a word used, but it stands for something else. This is common in most languages, and in most cases, like this one, we often need to have it pointed out to us that the figure of speech is here. Most people read this verse, and automatically, understand that God is not making a covenant with planet earth but that He is making a covenant with those who live upon the earth.

Another example: God may say, "I will make a covenant with the *house of David*." God is not making a covenant with the literal building that David lives in, but with David and those in David's home (and this could be further applied to David's descendants).

Gen 9:15 And I will remember My covenant which is between Me and you and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters will no more become a flood to destroy all flesh.

We have what is called an anthropathism here—a characteristic of man is applied to God so that we may better understand God—even though this is not an actual characteristic of God's. God does not need to search his memory to find something which He said several hundred years ago. God does not have to *remember* anything. God

knows everything, past, present and future, simultaneously (this characteristic is called omniscience). He knows at one time, all that ever was and all that will be. God says that He will *remember* His covenant, meaning that He will stand by this covenant forever—He will never call upon a flood to destroy all flesh from the earth ever again.

The Bible is clear when it comes to God's ability to perceive and understand all things at once.

God's Omniscience

1. Definition: *Omniscience* is a part of the essence of God; it means that He knows all things—past, present and future—simultaneously, which knowledge includes all things which could have happened. God knows all that has happened, what is occurring right now, what will happen, and all that could have happened, had this or that alternate choice been made. Our very thoughts are subject to His scrutiny. The word *omniscience* is derived from the Latin meaning *all-knowing*. Although the word *omniscience* is not found in the Bible, the doctrine of God's omniscience is.
2. God is a God of knowledge. 1Sam. 2:3
3. While this attribute is closely associated with Omnipresence, God's knowledge is not restricted to "being there." Job 28:24 Psalm 33:13–14
4. God's knowledge exists in eternity past, eternally preexisting all things. 1Peter 1:20
5. God's knowledge is complete, whole, and entire. Job 37:16 Acts 15:18
6. God's knowledge cannot be enumerated (God's knowledge *is beyond measure*). God's knowledge is infinite. He knows everything. Psalm 139:17–18 147:5 1John 3:2
7. There is nothing hidden from the knowledge of God; there is no place where we can go which is outside of His knowledge. Psalm 139:5–12 (it ought to becoming clear that Psalm 139 is a psalm all about God's omniscience)
8. Omniscience knows all that was, is, or can ever be. God knows that which is actual, or probable, or possible. Matt. 11:21-24
 - 1) A good illustration which I came upon, with regards to God knowing all that is possible, is an excellent chess player. Professional chess players can see 5 or 10 or even more moves ahead, along with the reaction of their opponent. I once followed a profession chess match on my own chess set, and it appeared as though the winner made the winning moves 12 or more moves in advance. At that point, his opponent was set up to lose, and his opponent could, at best, forestall his defeat.
 - 2) If a chess player can see many moves into the future, it is reasonable that God, Who knows all things which are, were and will be, would also know all that it is possible to know.
9. Every detail of human and angelic history is before God at all times. He knows the end as well as the beginning, and He so declares this in the Word of God. "Remember the former things of old; for I am God, and there is no other; I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning and from

God's Omniscience

ancient times things not yet done, saying, 'My counsel shall stand, and I will accomplish all my purpose,' calling a bird of prey from the east, the man of my counsel from a far country. I have spoken, and I will bring it to pass; I have purposed, and I will do it." (Isa. 46:9–11).

10. God does not learn, forget, remember, or acquire knowledge; He knows all things perfectly. No one taught God anything. Isa. 40:13–14
11. God's knowledge includes cognizance of all mankind, what they think, say, or do, even before they do it. God knows every detail of our lives, including what we will say before we say it (which implies, He knows all that we will do in the future). O LORD, You have searched me and known me! You know when I sit down and when I rise up; You discern my thoughts from afar. You search out my path and my lying down and You are acquainted with all my ways. Even before a word is on my tongue, behold, O LORD, You know it altogether (Psalm 139:1–4). There is nothing hidden from Him. Psalm 33:13–15 Prov. 15:3, 10 Luke 12:3 Heb. 4:13
 - 1) Knowing every detail of our lives, even before it happens is not the same as God coercing us to do anything. That is, we remain free moral agents.
 - 2) God knowing *how* we will act does not mean that He has predetermined our actions. Our free will is a part of His plan.
 - 3) The simplest example of this is, you have your own 5 year old child. There are circumstances and situations where you know what he will do. You may or may not like what you know that he is going to do, and you may take steps to curb his behavior. However, what is key is, you know your child, so you know his behavior in advance.
12. God knows everything there is to know about us, which knowledge God possessed even before we were born. Psalm 139:13–16 Matt. 10:30
13. God even knows the motives behind everything that we do. 1Chron. 28:9
14. God knows our needs before we ask for them. Matt. 6:8
15. God sees everything, indicating that He has knowledge of all that occurs throughout human history. Job 34:21 Psalm 33:13-15 Jer. 16:17
16. Even though God is Omniscient, His knowledge is not causative. What God foreknows and what He predestines are not precisely the same things, even though these are related concepts. Rom. 8:29–30

Oh, the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments and how inscrutable His ways! "For who has known the mind of the Lord, or who has been His counselor?" "Or who has given a gift to Him that He might be repaid?" For from Him and through Him and to Him are all things. To Him be glory forever. Amen (Rom. 11:33–36; Isa. 40:13 Job 41:11). .

See also <http://www.versebyverse.org/doctrine/divessence.html> which appears to have come from notes come from Maranatha church, and are quite similar to those given by R. B. Thieme, Jr. in Berachah Church and to those given by L. S. Chafer of Dallas Theological Seminary. Accessed June 22, 2010.

Other suggested readings:

http://www.pbministries.org/books/gill/Doctrinal_Divinity/Book_1/book1_09.htm

http://www.whatthebibleteaches.com/wbt_070.htm

<http://blogs.nlcfonline.com/mark/2011/02/06/a-deeper-look-into-the-heart-of-god-gods-omniscience/>

The clear teaching of Scripture is that God is omniscient. Therefore, when the Bible says that *He remembers* something, bear in mind, that is a figure of speech, an anthropopathism, ascribing to God a characteristic which He does not possess. I hope that, by this time, these figures of speech make sense to you, that they are clearly in the text, and that they do not violate the simple reading or understanding of the text. It is possible to understand something literally, and yet, to incorporate common figures of speech.

Gen 9:16 And the rainbow 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.

The idea is, God will look at the cloud and see the rainbow, and He will recall this covenant which He is making to Noah and all of Noah's descendants. However, God is not forgetful; God knew that He would make this covenant with Noah in eternity past, and God will always be cognizant of this covenant with all mankind. This actually tells us that God is always aware of His covenant and that He will stand by it forever.

Gen 9:17 And God said to Noah, *This is the token [or, sign, remembrance] of the covenant which I have established between Me and all flesh that is upon the earth.*

God repeats that the rainbow guarantees you that He will never destroy all flesh from the earth with a flood.

The Noahic covenant is quite simple, and, it should be obvious to even the non-theologian among you that it has absolutely nothing to do with covenant theology.

Covenants, or contracts, as clearly a part of God's relationship to man, and they are found throughout the Bible. Therefore, it would be a good idea to summarize the contract between God and Noah's descendants.

Summary Points on the Noahic Covenant

1. God makes 2 covenants with Noah and his family. He speaks to these covenants at separate times or He otherwise keeps these covenants separate.
 2. The idea is, man's obedience (or, lack thereof) to the first half of the covenant (vv. 1–7) will not affect God's guarantee of the second half of the covenant (vv. 10–17).
 3. Man is given several responsibilities:
-

Summary Points on the Noahic Covenant

- 1) To have a lot of children and to fill up the earth (v. 1);
 - 2) Man is now authorized to eat animal flesh, but not blood or flesh with the blood in it (vv. 3–4);
 - 3) Animals or men which kill other men will be executed (vv. 5–6);
 - 4) And man is told once again to have a lot of children and to fill up the earth (v. 7).
4. God promises that the dread of man (fear and/or respect of man) will be a part of the animal psyche.
 5. God promises never to flood the earth again; and offers a rainbow as a guarantee of this.
 6. The separation between these 2 parts of the covenant indicates that God's promise is unconditional—despite what man does, God will not flood the earth.
 7. The stem and tense of *to establish a covenant* is quite fascinating. The verb is the in the Hiphil (causative) perfect. This promise is something which God caused, probably in the past, previous to the giving of this promise. God is not just giving Noah and his family this promise and promising to fulfill this promise in the future; God has caused something in the past in order to make this promise stand.
 8. Two unanswered questions:
 - 1) Why does God repeat, “**Be fruitful and multiply**”?
 - 2) Is the existence of the rainbow related to the change which God caused in the atmosphere, related to the flood? Somehow, the meteorological conditions of the antediluvian era were such that, rainbows were precluded, even though there was moisture in the air. After the flood, the conditions were such that, after a rain, it is common to see rainbows in the air. Exactly what that change was is difficult to determine.

Every time that I exegete a chapter in the Bible, questions occur to me; sometimes these are answered and sometimes not.

With regards to the final sub-point, there are a number of people who have theorized as to what the conditions were before the flood and how those conditions changed after the flood. The basic notion is, the earth was surrounded by a mass of water vapor (or even ice?) in the atmosphere prior to the flood. We have been able to observe similar atmospheric conditions on Venus and, if memory serves, one of the moons of Saturn (they are completely enveloped by a thick atmosphere—not necessarily one of water). The Bible speaks of this enveloping atmosphere in Gen. 1:6–7 (And God said, "Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters." And God made the expanse and separated the waters that were under the expanse from the waters that were above the expanse. And it was so.) and in Gen. 2:5–6 (When no bush of the field was yet in the land and no small plant of the field had yet sprung up—for the LORD God had not caused it to rain on the land, and there was no man to work the ground, and a mist was going up from the land and was watering the whole face of the ground--). Admittedly, these are both very unusual statements. If someone were writing science

fiction today, and speaking of such conditions upon the earth, we have enough scientific discovery which has taken place (most in the past 300 years) which would give scientific credence to such literature. However, it is fascinating to find such statements in Scripture undeniably written thousands of years prior to such scientific knowledge. The basic idea is, the sunlight was filtered by the atmosphere in such a way that, there could be no rainbow. The change of the atmosphere allowed for the sun's rays to directly strike the moisture in the air and for the result to be a rainbow.

There are those who have studied this in far greater detail than I have presented here.

Additional References to Antediluvian Meteorological Conditions

http://www.one-gospel.org/thebible/i_thebible_02.htm

<http://www.godsoutreachministryint.org/SCIENCENoahFloodPREFLOODCONDITIONS.htm>

<http://www.creationism.org/patten/PattenBibFlood/PattenBibFlood09.htm>

This is one of the best papers I have read on antediluvian conditions:

<http://www.bibleframework.com/bf-notes/Bible-Framework-Part-3.pdf>

A discussion of the canopy theory:

<http://www.creationconversations.com/forum/topics/canopy-theory>

A discussion of the flood:

<http://holyyrollerz.org/forums/viewtopic.php?f=31&t=4632>

Here is a website which is quite fascinating, and covers many aspects of the Noahic flood:

<http://www.worldwideflood.com/default.htm>

Evidence for the flood:

http://www.calvaryag.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=73&Itemid=46

Additional References to Antediluvian Meteorological Conditions

And one site on creationism in general:

<http://www.creationism.org/index.htm>

<http://www.creationresource.org/>

<http://www.creationworldview.org/>

One who opposes this idea:

<http://home.entouch.net/dmd/canopy.htm>

Interestingly enough, one of these sources asserts that Newton first proposed the idea of a water canopy about the earth in 1874.

Lesson 85: Genesis 9:18–29

The Progeny of Noah

At v. 18, we essentially begin an entirely new chapter.

Gen 9:18–19 And the sons of Noah that went out of the ark were Shem, Ham, and Japheth. And Ham is the father of Canaan. These *are* the three sons of Noah, and from them the whole earth was populated.

Noah had 3 very different sons, and from them was the entire world populated. This will be an amazing thing, to define all of the nations on the earth as having come from these 3 men. There are so many things in the Bible which we take for granted, because they have been there for centuries. However, the idea of someone taking 3 men and then defining the nations and people which came from these 3 men is quite remarkable.

Early on in the ancient world, the Canaanites were a major factor, and so, they are mentioned here as originating from Ham (and because God will curse Canaan because of Ham).

Gen 9:20 And Noah begins *to be* a man of the soil, and so he plants a vineyard.

Noah had spent a great deal of his final few years of the pre-deluvian age building the Ark and, apparently, warning anyone who would listen to him. I suggested that he also kept and collected animals, although the Scripture is not clear on that theory. Now Noah tries his hand at grapes. Noah, like all men, is under the curse of Adam, to work the earth in some way for sustenance.

Gen 9:21 And he drinks of the wine and is drunk. And he is uncovered inside his tent.

In order to make alcohol, grape juice must be fermented, and this apparently happened. That requires bacteria. Many have suggested that, after the flood, bacteria became more widespread, and it is possible that this is a result of Noah's family and all of these animals living on the same Ark for about a year. It could be a result of the rotting vegetation and corpses from the flood waters.

Most authors and theologians make an attempt to excuse Noah here, and say that the grape juice fermented on its own, and when Noah drank it, he did not realize what he was drinking. Personally, I've drunk grape juice and I have drunk wine, and I notice quite a difference between the two. I have never confused one for the other. Furthermore, I had to develop a taste for wine, but I liked grape juice from the get go. The first time that Noah ended up with fermented grape juice, it may have been an accident, but there is no reason to suppose that Noah accidentally got drunk or that he did it on purpose. There is no clear indication one way or the other. It is possible that Noah is the first man to get drunk and that this is the first wine which was made. It is also possible that Noah did this on purpose and that this was one of many benders that he went on. Whether this is intentional or not; whether this is the first production of wine or not, is not really the thrust of this narrative. The curse of Canaan is the emphasis of this narrative, which is why we find his name back in v. 18.

No matter what the case, Noah gets so drunk that he is falling down drunk in his tent and naked. In the ancient world, man was generally much more modest than he is today. So, Noah falling asleep naked after a bender, was a big deal. That drunkenness lowered his inhibitions should not be a shock to anyone.

What is *not* occurring here is some incestuous homosexual act. Some people like to mix what they read with their impressions and wild imagination, and so they come up with some far-fetched notions.

Dr. Robert Dean gives the most cogent explanation of the verbs here: *The phrase that Noah uncovered himself indicates what the key issue is in this whole thing. The allegation is that it was some kind of sexual sin, that Ham commits toward Noah, because it says that Noah awoke and knew what his younger son had done to him. But the point is that the verb used in v. 21 is the hithpael stem of the verb which means to uncover or to lay bare. The hithpael stem is a reflexive stem, so this is accurately translated he "uncovered himself." Then in v. 22 Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father. The phrase "saw the nakedness" expresses Ham's action. The phrase in the Hebrew comprises the verb to see in the perfect tense, indicating past action [he saw], and nakedness is what he saw. In Leviticus chapters 18 and 20 there are numerous statements describing the sexual sins and perversions of the Canaanites. In all of those passages there is a different phrase. In Genesis there is the phrase to look upon or to see and a phrase in Leviticus 18:19 is a parallelism. Some people say that this shows that seeing the nakedness is the same as uncovering the nakedness. No it is not. The key controlling thought in the Leviticus passages is different and has to do with sexual perversion. So it is an extremely weak argument to say that to see the nakedness implies some sort of sexual sin. We have to remember that nakedness in the ancient world represented a loss of human dignity and to*

*look upon someone in such a state of vulnerability was a sign of a lack of respect, a lack of personal dignity, and they had the person in a position where they lacked protection and were vulnerable. It was considered an extreme cultural sin to do that. What Ham did shows a moral flaw, and so this represents the first stage in the process of abandoning the moral code that has been stated in the Noahic covenant. It is already breaking down. Ham's lack of respect for his father represents the first stage in this abandonment. What happens is that Noah in his perceptiveness of what is going on with his sons recognizes that Ham's problem is already evident in the behavior of his son, Canaan, and he prophesies that this will lead to a complete breakdown of sexual morality among the descendants of Canaan.*³⁹

In summation, this is not some weird, deviant sexual sin, but simply a matter of modesty and lack of respect, which, in many ways, will characterize the descendants of Ham. As we go through this narrative—particularly the next few verses—it will be obvious that there is no deviant homosexual, improper familial relationship here, but that this is all about modesty and Ham's lack of respect for his father.

Gen 9:22–23 And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brothers outside. And Shem and Japheth took a garment and laid it upon both their shoulders. And they went backwards and covered the nakedness of their father. And their faces were turned the other way, so that they did not see their father's nakedness.

Apparently, in the ancient world, people were a great deal more proper. Ham should have simply covered up his father and not mentioned it to anyone. He did not, but instead broadcast this news to the entire world (which consisted, essentially, of his two brothers). Bear in mind that these are not kids. We are not talking about 3 teen pranksters here; these are men who are at least 100 years old, with wives and probably children at this point. So we are not observing goofy teen behavior here. What we are observing is an adult son who has disrespected his own father.

It is interesting that Ham is called the father of Canaan here—again—and he will be called the father of Canaan again later; and it is his son who will be cursed.

So, Ham walks in on his father, finds it to be quite amusing that his father is laying down naked in a drunken stupor, so that he runs and tells his 2 brothers. His two brothers, understanding the shame that their father would feel, cover him up without looking. This simply affords us a look into the psyche of ancient man. We are told by anthropologists and historians that man from this era is not far from the cave man era; however, they apparently had a much more profound sense of morality and shame than we can imagine. In fact, their sense of morality is so much more pronounced than our own, so that many make up their own sins and insert them here (which is done often with the Bible).

Robby Dean comments about this: *Noah lived about 350 years after the flood and has only one thing told to us after the flood, and that is the episode*

³⁹ Taken from <http://phrasearch.com/Trans/DBM/setup/Genesis/Gen052.htm> accessed November 10, 2009.

where he got drunk and then pronounced the curse. Don't you think that some other interesting things happened in Noah's life over that 350-year period. Why is it that the Holy Spirit only picks out this one episode that He is going to put into the Scriptures? We ought to ask the question many times: Why of all the things that happen in history is this included in the Scripture and so many other things not included in the Scripture? God is using that episode with Noah and his sons because that sets up in a microscopic way the pattern of all civilization in human history. It is demonstrated in this event through the behavior of these three sons. Shem is noted because he has a devotion to God, positive volition. Japheth is noted and blessed because he will be enlarged, and that has not only to do with physical expansion but also intellectual expansion. Ham is passed over. He is neither blessed nor cursed but his son Canaan receives a cursing. As has been pointed out, that has special reference if you are a Jew about to go and wipe out the Canaanites. Now you know why the Canaanites are cursed, that they have carried these sinful dispositions of their fore bearer to such a horrible conclusion and God has allowed that evil to ripen to such a degree that now their destruction is necessary for the preservation of the human race. This is structure for understanding the background for Genesis chapter 10, known as the table of nations.⁴⁰

In the same lesson, Dean pointed out that, we need to look at this information as if we are Jews. God is going to have the Jews march into the land of Canaan and to kill perhaps 100,000 or more Canaanites. That requires more of a background than God simply ordering the Jews to kill those Canaanites. To some degree, what follows gives us some of the background of the Canaanites.

Gen 9:24 And Noah awoke from his wine, and came to know what his younger son had done to him.

Noah eventually wakes up from tying one on, and finds out what had happened. Either that, or he was in a semi-conscious stupor when Ham walked in, and then later, when his other two sons walked in. Drunks tend to have fitful sleeps, so Noah may have had some clue as to what transpired that night.

Many translators render the verb *to know* as *came to know* because it is a Qal imperfect verb. The imperfect means continuous, extended or future action. So this is just as much interpretation as it is a translation at this point—but a reasonable interpretation. Noah wakes up, he has some memory of the night before, and he is covered. Now, had he awakened and immediately knew what had taken place, the verb would be a Qal perfect, as we would be speaking of a completed action.

⁴⁰ From Robby Dean's notes <http://phrasearch.com/Trans/DBM/setup/Genesis/Gen055.htm> (lesson 55 of his Genesis series).

Since Noah did not immediately figure out what had happened to him, he remembers enough to ask. Bear in mind *who* Noah is. He is not just some drunk, but he is the patriarch of the world. He was alive when Seth, Adam's son, was alive. Noah has seen changes in the world that no one else had ever seen; so that he would be the most important man on earth, because he was everyone's father or grandfather (although we are not certain about the wives of his 3 sons).

In any case, Noah gets to the bottom of what happened and then he pronounces a curse.

Gen 9:25 And he said, "Cursed *be* Canaan. He will be a servant of servants to his brothers."

I want you to understand what has happened here, because most people do not get this. There are only 4 men on earth (and, at least Ham had one male child, Canaan) and their wives. Noah is a man of God and what Noah says has impact. As a man of God, Noah can call upon God to bless some and curse others. A mature believer has the ability to pray for the blessing or cursing of another person, and God pays attention to what this mature believer says.

Here, this would be akin to an imprecatory prayer (where you pray against someone who has wronged you). However, instead of being prayed in private, this curse is done publically and it is a curse which is fulfilled.

There is also a new thing here—previous to this, God has cursed the serpent and the ground, but we don't have one man pronouncing a curse upon another. This is the first recorded instance of that occurring in the Bible, and it is significant (far more significant than Noah getting drunk).

Churches rarely teach anything about imprecatory prayer, because that just seems to be too mean, but you, as a believer, are allowed to pray for God to curse a particular person or that person's family or business. Understand, you are not allowed to hate that person, to be bitter toward them, to feel or exhibit anger toward them; you cannot gossip about them to anyone who will listen, and you cannot take out revenge against them—but you can pray for God to deal with them harshly. There are a number of instances in the Psalms where this occurs.

If you are maltreated, then there are a number of things which you are prohibited from doing, one of which includes revenge, but you may ask God to deal with that person.

The end result is not that each and every descendant of Canaan, Ham's son, is cursed and Noah says that He will be the servant to Shem and Japheth. This does set up a pattern throughout history where the descendants of Shem and Japheth often enslaved the sons of Canaan. We have observed this curse to be fulfilled throughout history.

Quite obviously, there are a lot of people who will object to this, but this is a cursing which was laid upon Canaan, has been fulfilled innumerable times in the history of man. The

problem was Ham's attitude; the problem was Ham's lack of respect; the problem was Ham found it great fun to make fun of his father, and Ham is an adult. So Noah curses Ham's son Canaan. Just as Ham is a shame to his father Noah, so will Canaan be a shame to his father Ham.

Just as Ham, as an adult, showed disrespect to his father, he would instill this same attitude in his sons—particularly in Canaan. As a teacher, when dealing with a problem kid, I often became frustrated with the child, until I met the parents, and then his faults became quite clear—he learned these things from his parents. Canaan is cursed, on the one hand, because of Ham's lack of respect and, on the other hand, because this same lack of respect was instilled in Canaan through his upbringing.

[Gen 9:26–27](#) And he said, “Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant. God will enlarge Japheth, and he will dwell in the tents of Shem. And Canaan will be their servant.”

Shem is the father of the Jews and all Semitic groups (the word *Semitic* comes from the proper name *Shem*). Japheth appears to be the father of the lighter skinned races and Ham the father of the darker skinned races. Noah says that God will enlarge (*to make spacious, to open up*) the descendants of Japheth, and, much of history seems to be about the descendants of Japheth.

Canaan is said to be their servant. This does not mean that each and every descendant of Canaan will be in servitude to all of the descendants of Shem and Japheth; however, this is going to be a general trend throughout much of history.

Furthermore, when it comes to the concept of *servant*, this does not mean that Hamitic nations would all be forced into slavery. However, quite often, a Japhetic nation would conquer a Hamitic nation, and the people of Ham would pay tribute to the people of Japheth (which was very common when a nation was conquered). That is another form of servitude. Again, these are general historical trends, and this does not mean that there would not be some exceptions.

There is a simple human explanation for this as well: authority orientation. Ham, by his behavior, indicated that he did not really respect his father. This lack of respect would have been taught to his own children, if not directly, then by example.

I can testify to this sort of behavior as a teacher; some of my students immediately showed me respect, and with others, I had to earn it, and only if they gave me a chance to earn it. I had some students that, from day one, had made a choice not to respect me, many of them the descendants of Ham.

Here is how this works when it comes to national interaction: an army where there is a clear chain of command and authority orientation is going to be superior to an army where there is no respect for one's commanding officers. A Japhetic army, where these men have learned authority orientation from a young age, could outmaneuver an Hamitic army

which lacked discipline and authority orientation. A Japhetic army can function as a unit; but, in a Hamitic army, they might even frag their own officers if they are mad at them or mad at the way the war is going.

Again, these are generalities; there are individuals who go against the grain of the trends of their fathers.

Gen 9:26–27 And he [Noah] said, “Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant. God will enlarge Japheth, and he will dwell in the tents of Shem. And Canaan will be their servant.”

That Japheth will be enlarged refers to the initial movement of his descendants and the large amount of territory he takes; and, most importantly, to the earthly prominence that his descendants will have the Hiphil imperfect of *pâthâh* (פָּתַח) [pronounced *paw-THAW*], which means *to make spacious, to cause to be open*. Strong’s #6601 BDB #834. The Hiphil is the causative stem (God will cause this to happen), and the imperfect tense is used for as a future tense and for continuous action. So, for the most part, the sons of Japheth have not simply spread out, but they have founded cities and nations, oft times when the sons of Ham were there already.

Most commentators see a spiritual connotation with Japheth living in the tents of Shem. That is, God’s true character will be revealed through the descendants of Shem (all Old Testament saints and Jesus are from the line of Shem), but that the Japhethites will benefit from God’s relationship to the Jews. As a Japhethite, I can testify to this.

So, what has happened throughout history? Jesus was descended from Shem. The sons of Japheth are blessed because of their relationship to Jesus. The sons of Japheth make up the greatest nations throughout human history (there are exceptions, of course); and the largest proportion of slaves over time were descendants of Canaan. It does not matter whether you believe the Bible is the Word of God or not; this is a pretty amazing call to make. And subsequent to this, we do not have an exchange of power between Japhetic, Hamitic and Semitic nations; we have is history filled with great Japhetic nations, some of which conquered much of the known world in their time. In their wake are hundreds of conquered and/or absorbed Hamitic nations. Furthermore, we have contemporary history to tell us what happens when Japhetic people rule over a nation of Hamites and what happens when the children of Ham are then given the freedom to steer the destiny of their own nation (e.g., South Africa and Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe). It is the curse of Noah, of maybe 4–5000 years ago.

The tents of Shem? There is no Jesus and no Christianity except through the Jews. Noah pronounced the words “Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant. God will enlarge Japheth, and he will dwell in the tents of Shem. And Canaan will be their servant.” and God brought this to pass throughout human history.

Gen 9:28–29 And Noah lived three hundred and fifty years after the flood. And all the days of Noah were nine hundred and fifty years. And he died.

God designed our bodies not to wear out. Adam, apart from sin, would have lived forever. In fact, we do not know exactly why we get old, as our cells are replaced every 7 years (if memory serves). However, sin infected Adam's soul and body, as it does ours. So, even though our bodies are in a constant state of regeneration, they wear out anyway.

Since man's body was much healthier in that era, it would be reasonable to assume that man intelligence was much greater then (compared to man today).

Of course, some men scoff at this, but ask yourself, *you eat new food everyday, and your body automatically develops new cells systematically, everywhere—so how is it that you grow old?* The Bible tells us: we have bodies of sin, bodies of corruption, and our bodies are therefore subject to death.

Lesson 86: Genesis 10:1–5 The Founding Nations Descended from Japheth

The Bible is filled with a number of things—some of them quite unexpected. I often find myself asking, “Okay, why is *this* in the Bible?” Answering that question often is the key to understanding the passage itself.

Some of the links below note related studies which we have already done. Many of those studies did not cover this or that topic completely.

What is the Purpose of the Bible?

1. First of all, the Bible is a product of God the Holy Spirit and man. Several dozen human authors from all walks of life, from various nationalities, on 3 different continents, record the Word of God, over a period of time I believe is more than 3000 years (even the most *conservative* estimates have this occurring over a 1500 year period of time). What we have are the writings of men, in their style of writing, reflecting their thoughts, vocabulary and emotions; and yet, simultaneously, the Bible is the Word of God. Although there is some dictation in the Bible (God dictating directly to man; which passages are mostly found in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers), most of what is written in the Bible is clearly written by man. Yet, simultaneously, the Scriptures are God-breathed. In this way, the written Word of God is a reflection of the Jesus Christ, the Living Word of God, fully man and yet, fully God.
2. The primary purpose of the Bible is to reveal Jesus Christ. We encounter Jesus Christ in Gen. 1–2 as the Creator of all things; in Gen. 3 as both a Promise (the Seed of the Woman) and a Judge (the revealed member of the Trinity Who spoke to Adam and the woman). The very nature of the Bible itself—being God-breathed and yet, completely a product of man—illustrates the nature of Jesus Christ, the God-man, equal to both God and to man. Therefore, both the Bible and Jesus Christ are called the *Word of God* (see John 1:1–14 and Heb. 4:12 13:7 Rev. 19:13 20:4).
3. The Bible reveals the character and essence of God.

What is the Purpose of the Bible?

4. It reveals God's plan.
5. The Bible teaches [dispensations](#), which is how God interacts with man during various periods of time and how God moves His plan forward in each epoch.
6. The Bible reveals the [Angelic Conflict](#).
7. The Bible reveals our purpose on this earth, which is to resolve the Angelic Conflict.
8. The Bible is given to us so that we have food to grow spiritually from. We grow in grace and the *knowledge* of our Lord Jesus Christ (2Peter 3:18).
9. The Bible contains proofs of its divine nature. I have already given examples of this:
 - 1) Statements related to the [science](#) contained in Scripture.
 - 2) There are a host of unusual topics found in the Bible, which stand out much more prominently than found in other books.
 - 3) The historical nature of the Bible.
 - 4) Fulfilled prophecy of the Bible. These include prophecies about [Israel](#), about other [nations](#) and trends and about [Jesus Christ](#).
10. Prophets spoke to Israel during very problematic times. They told the people what they were doing wrong and what they needed to do in order to reverse their historical decline. This was often closely associated with prophecies, some of which were very short term (to come true in the near future) and some of which would come to pass in the far future (and some remain unfulfilled even to this day). Often these prophecies were parallel; that is, the same words could be understood to describe both the near and far future.
 - 1) Although these prophetic words are not addressed to us, we learn from the historical trends found therein.
11. The Bible contains real historical incidents and actual historical figures, many of which point toward the Person and work of Jesus Christ. These are called types and Jesus is called the antitype.
 - 1) We first covered the concept of [type and antitype](#) back in lesson 39.
 - 2) Animal sacrifices were a type, which was mentioned in the [Doctrine of Atonement](#).
 - 3) Both the Ark of God in the Tabernacle (spoken of in [Doctrine of Atonement](#)) and [Noah's Ark](#) are types.
12. The Bible reveals the creation and restoration of the earth ([Gen. 1](#)), something we would know nothing about, apart from the Bible.
 - 1) No other religious book or human tradition has any sort of origin of the earth and man which anyone takes seriously.
 - 2) The most popular scientific theory of origins is the *Big Bang theory*, which is very likely, the scientific explanation of what God did in Gen. 1:1.
 - (1) Gen. 1:1 reads: [In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth](#).
 - (2) The verb *created* is in the perfect tense, indicating a past event and an event seen (in most cases) as a singular event, as opposed to an ongoing event.

What is the Purpose of the Bible?

13. The Bible reveals important human history.
14. The Bible contains the accurate history of man as related to God and God's plan.
15. There are many chapters and passages which are directed toward a specific audience, long-dead, but which has some application to us. The five cycles of discipline, for instance, found in Lev. 26, is very important for the members of a client nation to understand (a client nation is a nation through which God works).
16. We understand God's view of history and the interrelationship of nations; and how God has dealt with nations in the past. This gives us an idea of how we ought to relate to other nations. The keys to when we ought to, as a nation, go to war, are found in the Bible.
17. Sometimes, the words we find in one verse, and how they are used, help to explain the meaning of these words in another verse.
18. One of the most instructive aspects of the New Testament is how Old Testament verses are quoted and used. Even though many verses from the Old Testament are cited as being fulfilled in the New, the NT writers use OT Scripture in far more imaginative ways than that.
19. The Bible is our guide, whether from a personal standpoint, from a family perspective, or as a nation.
20. And Gen. 10 tells us which nations came from which sons, so that we would be able to trace out in history, the descendants of Shem, Ham and Japheth, and how they continue to fulfill the Noahic pronouncement: "Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant. God will enlarge Japheth, and he will dwell in the tents of Shem. And Canaan will be their servant." That is what Gen. 10 is all about.

I assume that I (or someone else) will add to this list in the future.

In this lesson, I am going to do something which I rarely do, I will quote many additional sources for much of the information contained in the next few lessons. Like much of the Bible, this is a phenomenal chapter but rarely appreciated.

C. I. Scofield: This chapter contains the earliest ethnological table in the literature of the ancient world, compiled centuries before the Homeric writings. In this table of nations there is a remarkable perception of the ethnic and linguistic situation of the age of Noah and his descendants. Virtually all the names here have been found in archaeological discoveries of the past century.⁴¹

Gen 10:1a Now these are *the* generations of the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth.

⁴¹ *The New Scofield Reference Bible*; Dr. C.I. Scofield; ©1967 New York-Oxford University Press; p. 15 (footnote).

Generations is the Hebrew word *tôwl^edôth* (תּוֹלְדוֹת) [pronounced *tohl^e-DOHTH*], which means *generations, results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history*. We find this word used in conjunction with the genealogies (e.g., Gen. 5:1 6:9 Ex. 6:16). Strong's #8435 BDB #410. Dr. Robert Dean calls these the *toledot* sections (which is the singular, vocabulary form of this word, transliterated into English). Dr. Dean simplifies the translation to *This is what happened to the sons of Noah: [to] Shem, Ham and Japheth*. Although this is clearly more of an interpretation than translation, it conveys what is going on with a more common, English phrase.

Gen 10:1b–4 And sons were born to them after the flood. The sons of Japheth: Gomer and Magog and Madai and Javan and Tubal and Meshech and Tiras. And the sons of Gomer: Ashkenaz and Riphath and Togarmah. And the sons of Javan: Elishah and Tarshish and Kittim and Dodanim. By these were the regions of the nations divided in their lands, every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations.

These are the descendants of Japheth, the lighter-skinned son of Noah.

The information below was taken from <http://creation.com/the-sixteen-grandsons-of-noah> which was accessed August 26, 2009 (I have italicized the direct quotations).

Gomer, his first named son, moved northward (Ezek. 38:6), and some of his descendants probably settled *Galatia*. *The Jewish historian Flavius Josephus records that the people who were called Galatians or Gauls in his day (c. AD 93) were previously called Gomerites.*⁴²

They also migrated westward to what are now called France and Spain. For many centuries France was called Gaul, after the descendants of Gomer. North-west Spain is called Galicia to this day.

Some of the Gomerites migrated further to what is now called Wales. The Welsh historian, Davis, records a traditional Welsh belief that the descendants of Gomer 'landed on the Isle of Britain from France, about three hundred years after the flood'.⁴³ He also records that the Welsh language is called Gomeraeg (after their ancestor Gomer).

Other members of their clan settled along the way, including in Armenia. The sons of Gomer were 'Ashkenaz, and Riphath, and Togarmah' (Genesis 10:3). Encyclopedia Britannica says that the Armenians traditionally claim to be descended from Togarmah and Ashkenaz.⁴⁴ Ancient Armenia reached into Turkey. The name Turkey probably comes from Togarmah. Others of them migrated to Germany. Ashkenaz is the Hebrew word for Germany.

⁴² Josephus: Complete Works, Kregal Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 'Antiquities of the Jews', 1:6:1 (i.e. book 1, chapter 6, section 1).

⁴³ J. Davis, *History of the Welsh Baptists from the Year Sixty-three to the Year One Thousand Seven Hundred and Seventy*, D.M. Hogan, Pittsburgh, 1835, republished by The Baptist, Aberdeen, Mississippi, p. 1, 1976.

⁴⁴ *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 2:422, 1967.

The next grandson mentioned is Magog. According to Ezekiel, Magog lived in the north parts (Ezek. 38:15 39:2). Josephus records that those whom he called Magogites, the Greeks called Scythians.⁴⁵ According to Encyclopedia Britannica, the ancient name for the region which now includes part of Romania and the Ukraine was Scythia.⁴⁶

The next grandson is Madai. Along with Shem's son Elam, Madai is the ancestor of our modern-day Iranians. Josephus says that the descendants of Madai were called Medes by the Greeks.⁴⁷ Every time the Medes are mentioned in the Old Testament, the word used is the Hebrew word Madai. After the time of Cyrus, the Medes are always (with one exception) mentioned along with the Persians. They became one kingdom with one law-*'the law of the Medes and Persians'* (Daniel 6:8, 12, 15). Later they were simply called Persians. Since 1935 they have called their country Iran. The Medes also 'settled India'.⁴⁸

The name of the next grandson, Javan, is the Hebrew word for Greece. Greece, Grecia, or Grecians appears five times in the Old Testament, and is always the Hebrew word Javan. Daniel refers to *'the king of Grecia'* (Daniel 8:21), literally *'the king of Javan'*. Javan's sons were Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim (Genesis 10:4), all of whom have connections with the Greek people. The Elysians (an ancient Greek people) obviously received their name from Elishah. Tarshish or Tarsus was located in the region of Cilicia (modern Turkey). The Encyclopedia Britannica says that Kittim is the Biblical name for Cyprus.⁴⁹ The people who initially settled around the area of Troy worshipped Jupiter under the name of Jupiter Dodonaeus, possibly a reference to the fourth son of Javan, with Jupiter a derivative of Japheth. His oracle was at Dodona. The Greeks worshipped this god but called him Zeus.

Next is Tubal. Ezekiel mentions him along with Gog and Meshech (Ezek. 39:1). Tiglath-pileser I, king of Assyria in about 1100 B.C. refers to the descendants of Tubal as the Tabali. Josephus recorded their name as the Thobelites, who were later known as Iberes.⁵⁰ 'Their land, in Josephus' day, was called by the Romans Iberia, and covered what is now (the former Soviet State of) Georgia whose capital to this day bears the name Tubal as Tbilisi. From here, having crossed the Caucasus mountains, this people migrated due north-east, giving their tribal name to the river Tobol, and hence to the famous city of Tobolsk.'⁵¹

⁴⁵ Josephus: Complete Works, Kregal Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 'Antiquities of the Jews', 1:6:1 (i.e. book 1, chapter 6, section 1).

⁴⁶ Encyclopedia Britannica, 20:116, 1967.

⁴⁷ Josephus: Complete Works, Kregal Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 'Antiquities of the Jews', 1:6:1 (i.e. book 1, chapter 6, section 1).

⁴⁸ A.C. Custance, Noah's Three Sons, Vol.1, 'The Doorway Papers', Zondervan, Michigan, p. 92, 1975.

⁴⁹ Encyclopedia Britannica 3:332, 1992.

⁵⁰ Josephus: Complete Works, Kregal Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 'Antiquities of the Jews', 1:6:1 (i.e. book 1, chapter 6, section 1).

⁵¹ Bill Cooper, After the Flood, New Wine Press, Chichester, England, p. 203, 1995.

Meshech, the name of the next grandson, is the ancient name for Moscow. Moscow is both the capital of Russia, and the region that surrounds the city. To this day, one section, the Meschera Lowland, still carries the name of Meshech, virtually unchanged by the ages.

According to Josephus, the descendants of grandson Tiras were called Thirasians. The Greeks changed their name to Thracians.⁵² Thrace reached from Macedonia on the south to the Danube River on the north to the Black Sea on the east. It took in much of what became Yugoslavia. World Book Encyclopedia says: 'The people of Thrace were savage Indo-Europeans, who liked warfare and looting.'⁵³ Tiras was worshipped by his descendants as Thuras, or Thor, the god of thunder.

As we have seen before, these various lines will be followed out to sons and grandsons; but, one only particular line will be continued to be followed in later Scripture. That is, in a majority of cases, any given line is followed out 2, 3 or maybe even 4 generations. However, only in the rarest of cases are there more generations than these given (the first third of 1Chronicles contains these exceptions, where the lines of the 12 sons of Israel [Jacob] are followed).

Gen 10:5 By these were the regions of the nations divided in their lands, every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations.

We have an interesting phrase at the end, that these make up the various nations, who are divided by geography, language and family. At this point, there is only one language; however, this verse anticipates the division of man by language. Recall that the Bible is not completely chronological and it is a common Hebraism to give a general statement and then to later follow up that statement with details.

Japheth was one of the 3 sons of Noah; the lighter-skinned son.

The Sons of Japheth and their Ancestors

1. Gomer: Galatia, France, Spain and Wales [Germany, Crimea, Cambrai, Celts]
 - 1) Ashkenaz: Armenia [Germany, Saxons, Scandinavia]
 - 2) Riphath [Carpathians]
 - 3) Togarmah: Armenia [Armenians]
2. Magog: Magogites (also known as the Scythians); Romania, the Ukraine [Georgia, Scythians]
3. Madai: Mede, Iran, India [Medes, Aryans, Indians]
4. Javan: Greece [Ionians, Greeks, the coastlands]
 - 1) Elishah: Greece (*Elysians*) [Hellas]
 - 2) Tarshish: Greece (the city Tarshish or Tarsus is located in the region of

⁵² *Josephus: Complete Works*, Kregal Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 'Antiquities of the Jews', 1:6:1 (i.e. book 1, chapter 6, section 1).

⁵³ *World Book Encyclopedia*, Vol. 18, p. 207, 1968.

The Sons of Japheth and their Ancestors

- Cilicia (modern Turkey) [Spain]
- 3) Kittim: Greece (Kittim is the Biblical name for Cypress) [Cypress]
- 4) Dodanim: Greece [Rhodes]
5. Tubal: the Thobelites, who were later known as Iberes. They occupied what the Romans called Iberia, which is not (the former Soviet State) of Georgia. The cities Tbilisi and Tobolsk and the Tobol River all come from Tubal's name. [Tobolsk]
6. Meshech: Moscow (both the city and the region around the city). The Meschera Lowland still bears his name. [Moscow]
7. Tiras: worshiped by his ancestors as Thuras or Thor [Thrace, Teutons]

The big picture is, those descended from Japheth settled Europe, Russia, India and Iran. It is unclear whether or not these moved into the Orient.

It is not an anomaly for two or more lines to later intersect or band together (as did the Medes and the Persians).

The information below was taken from <http://creation.com/the-sixteen-grandsons-of-noah> which was accessed August 26, 2009 (I have italicized the direct quotations).

The bracketed information came from <http://ldolphin.org/shj.jpg> accessed August 27, 2009.

What I have not given is some of the justification for this. The various names of these patriarchs are continued in the nations given, and remain significant names—sometimes slightly altered in form—for hundreds and even thousands of years.

Let's turn to Dr. Robert Dean for this: *Gomer, when you take out the vowels is GMR. If the G hardens to a C or a K you have the word CMR. This is related to the Cimerians who were related to the Cythians, the people who inhabited the central part of Turkey in the period right after the flood. Eventually those people moved north and west into Europe. The Assyrians listed them as the Gamaria, and in Greek they were called the Kemarioi. Notice how the G becomes a C and then becomes a K. Also, sometimes when a word goes from one language to another language the consonants will shift. Think about that: GMR, can we think of a country that instead of having as its root consonants GMR it has its root consonants as GRM? Germany! The descendants of Gomer through Ashkenaz (there is a lake Ashkenaz up in northern Germany): the Germanic tribes ultimately derived from the descendants of Gomer, and, of course, many, many others because he is so far back. Other names that are etymologically related to Gomer are Umber in Italy—the G in Gomer softens to O, and then U in Umber. That also shows up in the English North Umberland. Related to Gomer: the Gauls, the Celts, Galatia, etc. Ireland was also known as Ibernai or Hybernia, which again is etymologically related to the word Gomer. All of these are related to Gomer. So we end up with the Irish, the Scots, the Germans, Brits, some tribal groups in northern Italy, the Gauls in France; all are descendants from*

Gomer.⁵⁴ This matching of the sons of Japheth through the Bible, through ancient history and through logistic tools could be done in almost every single case. However, doing so would make your eyes glaze over.

Gen. 10:2–5 Japheth's descendants were Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras. Gomer's descendants were Ashkenaz, Riphath, and Togarmah. Javan's descendants were the people from Elishah, Tarshish, Cyprus, and Rhodes. From these descendants the people of the coastlands spread into their own countries. Each nation had its own language and families.

From BibleBelievers.org in Australian: *History has recorded Japheth's geographical enlargement. The entire Western hemisphere of our globe is settled by Japhetic peoples, and East Indians are of the same stock. The record of Japheth's spread (enlargement) over the earth has been marred consistently by his destruction of the cultures which were already in existence wherever he arrived in sufficient force to achieve dominion. It happened in the Americas, Africa, Asia, Australia, and only numerical superiority of the native population has hitherto preserved parts of Africa from the same fate. Indeed, in early historic times the pattern of events is repeated again and again, whatever cultural advances the pioneering Hamites had achieved tended to be swallowed up by the succeeding Japhethites. The "enlargement" of Japheth has continued to this day, an enlargement greatly accelerated geographically in the last few centuries-frequently at the expense of the Hamites (or Canaanites) who first possessed the land.*⁵⁵

I should point out that, although most of these identifications of Noah's descendants with the lands they eventually assembled in is reasonably, but not necessarily 100%, accurate. Historians have studied such things for thousands of years without being in complete agreement. I have simply passed along what seems reasonable to me.

To me, it is rather an amazing thing for this ancient book to just lay out all of the principle families, which became peoples and nations. How they came to have their own languages will be discussed in Gen. 11.

Lesson 87: Genesis 10:6–20

The Founding Nations Descended from Ham

Ham's family is next.

Gen 10:6–7 And the sons of Ham: Cush and Mizraim and Phut and Canaan. And the sons of Cush: Seba and Havilah and Sabtah and Raamah and Sabtecha. And the sons of Raamah: Sheba and Dedan.

⁵⁴ From Dr. Robert Dean's study of Genesis, Lesson #52. The notes for this can be located here: <http://phrasearch.com/Trans/DBM/setup/Genesis/Gen052.htm> and the recording of this lesson is found here: <http://deanbible.org/Media/Audio%20Files/2003%20-%20Genesis/Genesis-052b.mp3>

⁵⁵ From <http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/bb000319.htm> accessed July 13, 2010.

The descendants of Ham live mainly in south-west Asia and Africa. The Bible often refers to Africa as the land of Ham (Psalm 105:23,27 106:22). The name of Noah's grandson Cush is the Hebrew word for old Ethiopia (from Aswan south to Khartoum). Without exception, the word Ethiopia in the English Bible is always a translation of the Hebrew word Cush. Josephus rendered the name as Chus, and says that the Ethiopians 'are even at this day, both by themselves and by all men in Asia, called Chusites'.⁵⁶

Cush apparently first moved southwest from the Euphrates valley into Arabia and kept going to the Red Sea, which they crossed, settling into the modern-day Ethiopia.

Phut, the name of Noah's next grandson is the Hebrew name for Libya. It is so translated three times in the Old Testament. The ancient river Phut was in Libya. By Daniel's day, the name had been changed to Libya (Daniel 11:43). Josephus says, 'Phut also was the founder of Libia [sic], and called the inhabitants Phutites, from himself'.⁵⁷

What follows is Ham and his sons, and which groups of people were probably descended from him (which information was put together by Tim Osterholm).

Hamite Descendants by Tim Osterholm			
Progenitor	Meanings	Sons	Descendants
Ham (Also Cham or Kham)	<i>passionate, hot, burnt or dark</i>	Cush, Mizraim, Phut and Canaan	He is the father of the Australoid, Negroid and Mongoloid people groups - Hamites. He was the progenitor of...
Cush (also Chus, Kush, Kosh, Cushaeon)	<i>black</i>	Seba, Havilah, Sabta, Raama and Satecha	Cushites, Nubians, Ethiopians, Ghanaians, Africans, Bushmen, Pygmies, Australian Aboriginies, New Guineans, other related groups.
Mizraim (also Masr, Misr, Misraim, Mitzraim, Mizraite, Mitsrayim)	<i>double straits</i>	Lud, Anom, Pathros, Chasloth and Chapthor.	Egyptians, Khemets, Copts, other related groups.

⁵⁶ Taken from <http://creation.com/the-sixteen-grandsons-of-noah> accessed August 27, 2009. He is quoting Josephus: Complete Works, Kregal Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 'Antiquities of the Jews', 1:6:2.

⁵⁷ From <http://creation.com/the-sixteen-grandsons-of-noah> accessed August 27, 2009; he is quoting Josephus: Complete Works, Kregal Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 'Antiquities of the Jews', 1:6:2.

Hamite Descendants by Tim Osterholm

Progenitor	Meanings	Sons	Descendants
Phut (also Punt, Puta, Put, Puni, Phoud, Pul, Fula, Putaya, Putiya, Libia, Libya)	<i>a bow</i>	Gebul, Hadan, Benah and Adan	Libyans, Cyrenacians, Tunisians, Berbers, Somalians, Sudanese, North Africans, other related groups. Some current historians are drawing links between Phut and Phœnicians.
Canaan (also Canaanites, Cana, Chna, Chanani, Chanana, Canaana, Kana, Kenaanah, Kena'ani, Kena'an, Kn'nw, Kyn'nw, Kinnahu, Kinahhi, Kinahni, Kinahna, Kinahne)	<i>down low</i>	Zidon, Heth, Amori, Gergashi, Hivi, Arkee, Seni, Arodi, Zimodi and Chamothi	Mongols, Asians, Orientals, Chinese, Tibetans, Taiwanese, Thais, Vietnamese, Laotians, Cambodians, Japanese, Eskimos, American Indians, Malayasians, Indonesians, Filipinos, Hawaiians, Maoris, Polynesians, Tahitians, Guamanians, Samoans, Fijians, Tongans, Tokelauans, Tuvaluans, Pacific Islanders and related groups.

Tribes in other parts of Africa, Arabia and Asia, aboriginal groups in Australia, native Pacific Islanders, American Indians and Eskimos were birthed from descendants of Canaan, Cush, Mizraim and Phut.

Taken from <http://www.soundchristian.com/man/> and he footnotes several of his sources as well (which footnotes are found on that page). Part of Osterholm's approach is to look at this genetically.

Gen 10:8–9 And Cush fathered Nimrod. He began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before Jehovah. Therefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before Jehovah.

Nimrod appears to be the first human celebrity in that, people who did not know him personally, talked about him. There seems to be a much different attitude today, where the expression *what a Nimrod* has found its way into the American language.

In any case, this indicates a change. The first 2 ancient professions were farmer and rancher (animals were used for animal sacrifices before the flood, but there was no authorization to eat them). After a certain point in time, animal populations began to grow and spread out, and Nimrod apparently originated and defined the profession of hunting (now that animals could be eaten).

Gen 10:10–12 And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar. Out of that land he went forth to Asshur. And he built

Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah, which *is* a great city.

Nimrod apparently fathered those who founded the cities of Babel and Accad, among others.

We will, further down in this lesson, identify each of these men with the area that they settled.

Gen 10:13–14 And Mizraim fathered Ludim and Anamim and Lehabim and Naphtuhim, and Pathrusim and Casluhim (from whom came the Philistines) and Caphtorim.

Mizraim was the second son of Ham. Extremely famous and well-known cities and peoples were descended from Mizraim. Mizraim is often translated Egypt (depending upon your English translation), which is one of the greatest ancient nations.

Gen 10:15–18 And Canaan fathered Sidon, his first-born, and Heth, and the Jebusite and the Amorite, and the Girgashite, and the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite, and the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hamathite. And afterward the families of the Canaanites were spread abroad.

Several extremely important peoples were descended from Canaan. These are not names just pulled out of a hat or made up; we can trace almost every one of these names to well-known peoples of the ancient world.

Gen 10:19 And the border of the Canaanites was from Sidon (as you come to Gerar) to Gaza, as you go in towards Sodom and Gomorrah and Admah and Zeboim, even to Lasha.

We are even given the location of these peoples. Canaan is the land which God will give to the Jews, and modern-day Israel covers a very small portion of that land today.

When I originally read this passage, decades ago, I took it for granted. Now, in retrospect, it is quite amazing that God tells us which families populate which portions of the world.

Ham and his Descendants (who Primarily Occupy Southwest Asia and Africa)

1. Cush: Old Ethiopia [Ethiopia] The Empire of Kush to the south of Egypt is known from at least 1970 B.C., but this name has also been associated by some with the Kassites who inhabited the Zagros -Kurdistan- area of Mesopotamia, the Sumerian city of Kish.
 - 1) Seba [Meroe] Seba has been connected with both Yemen and Eritrea, with much confusion with Sheba below. The Shibboleth-like division amongst the Sabaeans into Sheba and Seba is acknowledged elsewhere,

Ham and his Descendants (who Primarily Occupy Southwest Asia and Africa)

for example in Psalm 72, leading scholars to suspect that this is not a mistaken duplication of the same name, but a genuine historical division. The significance of this division is not yet completely understood, though it may simply reflect which side of the sea each was on.

- 2) Havilah [Arabia] Usually considered to be a part of the Arabian peninsula near the Red Sea.
 - 3) Sabtah [Sabeans] Sometimes connected with Hadhramis (their ancient capital being Saubatha) in eastern Yemen.
 - 4) Raamah [Arabia] has been connected with Rhammanitae mentioned by Strabo in the southwest Arabian peninsula, and with an Arabian city of Regmah at the head of Persian Gulf.
 - (1) Sheba has been connected with Sabaeans and peoples on either side of the narrowest part of the Red Sea, in both Yemen/South Arabia, and Eritrea/Ethiopia/Somalia.
 - (2) and Dedan, which is apparently a region of the Tabuk Province of Saudi Arabia.
 - 5) Sabteca may possibly refer to Sabaiticum Ostium, Sabaeans living around a specific harbour in Eritrea. .
 - 6) Nimrod: Babylon, Erech, Accad, and Calneh in Shinar [Babylonia]. He went from that area to Assyria and built Nineveh, Rehoboth Ir, Calah, and Resen. [Babylon, Ninevah]. Nimrod is also identified as a mighty hunter before God, and the founder of ancient Babel, Akkad, Sumer, and possibly cities in Assyria. The Hebrew wording of Genesis 10:11 has led to some ambiguity as to whether Asshur here is the son of Shem or a city built by Nimrod; either interpretation can be found in various modern versions.
2. Egypt (Hebrew = Mizraim): Egypt. Mizraim is a name for Upper and Lower Egypt and literally translates as Ta-Wy in Ancient Egyptian ("The Two Lands"). Ancient Egypt was divided into two regions known as Upper Egypt and Lower Egypt. The -aim in Mizraim represents dual number. Arabic-speaking modern Egyptians refer to their country as Misr.
- 1) Ludites (or, Ludim) is sometimes considered a scribal error for Lubim, a reference to the Lebu of Eastern Libya.
 - 2) Anamites (or, Anamim). There is a reference in an Assyrian inscription from Sargon II's time to Anami, a tribe located in Cyrene, Libya.
 - 3) Lehabites (or, Lehabim) may possibly be identified with Libya, but that is uncertain.
 - 4) Naphtuhites (or Naphtuhim) has been connected with Na-Ptah, the Egyptian form of Memphis.
 - 5) Pathrusites (or, Pathrusim): [Pathros] are possibly connected with Egyptian word Pa-To-Ris meaning southerners.
 - 6) Casluhites (or, Casluhim): [Philistines]
 - 7) Caphtorites (or, Caphtorum) [Crete] are associated with Caphtor, probably Crete, Cyprus, or both.

Ham and his Descendants (who Primarily Occupy Southwest Asia and Africa)

3. Put (or Phut): Libya; the ancient river Phut is in Libya.
4. Canaan's descendants were early settlers of Palestine; also known today as Israel, Lebanon and Jordan.
 - 1) Sidon is associated with the ancient city Sidon
 - 2) Heth [Hittites, Cathay] and possibly associated with the Hatti, a powerful entity in Anatolia.
 - 3) The Jebusites settled Jerusalem
 - 4) The Amorites settled Canaan. They were a people living between the Jordan and Euphrates rivers by at least 2000 B.C., known as Amurru to the Akkadians and Egyptians.
 - 5) The Girgashites settled Canaan. They were known to the Egyptians as the Kirkash. Some suggest that they settled east of the Jordan River between Lake Kinneret and the Dead Sea
 - 6) The Hivites settled Canaan
 - 7) The Arkites settled Canaan [they might be related to the Phœnicians]. Some suggest that they founded the city-state of Arqa in Phœnicia.
 - 8) The Sinites settled Canaan [but appear to be associated with Sino, China]. They may be originally associated with the Wilderness of Sin, or the Sinn river in Syria.
 - 9) Arvadites settled in Canaan and possibly refers to the Phœnician city-state of Arwad.
 - 10) Zemarites settled Canaan and are possibly founders of the Phœnician city-state of Zemar.
 - 11) Hamathite settled Canaan and possibly founded the Syrian city of Ramath.

How many ancient historians sat down and laid out all of the ancient nations along with their founders? As far as I know, only the Bible and Josephus, and Josephus used the Bible extensively.

Will Durant (1885–1981) is one of the greatest historians of all time. He wrote an 11 volume historical set beginning with established civilization (as he sees it) and going to the era of Napoleon, approximately 11,000 pages, called *The Story of Civilization*. My understanding is, Durant was an unbeliever (although he does have a Catholic upbringing). When making a Biblical reference to Ur in Sumeria, Durant footnotes this with *The discoveries here summarized have restored considerable credit to those chapters of Genesis that record the early traditions of the Jews. In its outlines, and barring supernatural incidents, the story of the Jews as unfolded in the Old Testament has stood the test of criticism and archeology; every year adds corroboration from documents, monuments, or excavations. E.g., potsherds unearthed at Tel Ad-Duweir in 1935 bore Hebrew inscriptions confirming part of the narrative of the Books of Kings. We must accept the Biblical account provisionally until it is disproved.*⁵⁸ This quotation indicates that Durant apparently does not believe the Bible to be the Word of God, but still accepts it as very accurate history.

Another one of the amazing things in the Bible is, its theology is tied directly to historical narrative; if the history is incorrect, then the theology is as well. I know there are books and websites which all discuss the contradictions and the inaccuracies in the Bible, but the ones I have examined often list things which I am able to answer without research. So, if the great historian Will Durant—who is far more learned than me or the editors of any of these anti-Bible websites—tells me that every new archeological discovery confirms Biblical history, then it is more reasonable for me to side with him.

Most of the associations with nations taken from <http://creation.com/the-sixteen-grandsons-of-noah> accessed August 27, 2009.

Countries in brackets are from <http://ldolphin.org/shj.jpg> accessed August 27, 2009.

Additional information taken from http://www.citizendia.org/Sons_of_Noah accessed July 13, 2010.


I recently picked up a set of the Time-Life books which deal with the history of man, and came across an interesting statement in the introduction to *Cradle of Civilization: No civilization existed anywhere on the earth's surface before 3000 B.C. Only then did one develop, first in Mesopotamia, a little later in Egypt.*⁵⁹ In other words, this is exactly how the Bible lays this out, even though we may be a few hundred years off when it comes to an agreement on the timeline.

⁵⁸ *The Story of Civilization; 1. Our Oriental Heritage*, by Will Durant; MJF Books, ©1963; p. 300 (footnote).

⁵⁹ *Great Ages of Man: Cradle of Civilization*; by Samuel Noah Kramer and the Editors of Time-Life books; Time-Life Books, ©1967; Time Incorporated, New York; p. 7.

Sometimes, it is easier to see some of this on a map, and we have the early settlements of Ham shown on the map to your right.

Great empires of the past: Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, and Persia all have strong historical links to the Biblical figures connected with the



From

<http://billygambelaafroasiaticanthropology.files.wordpress.com/2009/04/land-of-ham-and-shem-map1.jpg>

*sons of Noah. Most, if not all, tribes and nations can be traced to these men through their descendants.*⁶⁰

Gen 10:20 These were the sons of Ham, after their families, after their tongues, in their countries, and in their nations.

There has been a pattern, repeated many times in history. The descendants of Japheth would continue to expand and explore, often conquering lands far and wide which were often settled originally by descendants of Ham. This has occurred in both North and South America, Asia, Australia, Africa and Europe. It is a pattern of history, and an interesting one, but not one for us to feel guilty about. When it comes to geography and nations, virtually every nation was taken from someone else, who took it from someone else, who took it from someone else. The primary reasons the borders are what they are, is the military strength of the nation presently holding on to the territory that it has. Having lived nearly 60 years, I can testify that the maps of my youth are quite different from the maps

⁶⁰ From <http://creation.com/the-sixteen-grandsons-of-noah> accessed August 27, 2009.

of today; particularly with regards to Russia and Africa. Once a people conquer an area, then that area belongs to them for as long as they can hold on to it.

Feelings of guilt, revenge or hatred because of what has occurred in the past are just sins which need to be confessed (the actions of the past don't need to be confessed, those accompanying emotions of guilt, revenge and/or hatred need to be confessed). As Paul said to the Athenians: "And God made every nation of men of one blood, to live on all the face of the earth, preordaining specific time periods as well as boundaries of their dwelling, to seek the Lord, if perhaps they might feel after Him and might find Him, though indeed He not being far from each one of us. For in Him we live and move and exist, as also some of the poets among you have said, 'For we are also His offspring.' Then being offspring of God, we ought not to suppose that the Godhead is like gold or silver or stone, engraved by art and the imagination of man." (Acts 17:26–29). God devised nationalism with the result man might be evangelized and know the truth.

Gen 10:20 These were the sons of Ham, after their families, after their tongues, in their countries, and in their nations.

As before, the Hamites are separated by nationality (families), by language and by geography (countries).

Lesson 88: Genesis 10:21–32 The Founding Nations Descended from Shem

Noah is only said to have 3 sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth. For all we know, he could have had 10 sons, but only 3 went with him into the ark. What seems to be clearly the case is, Noah has no more children after the flood, as we will examine the descendants only of those who come from his 3 sons. From these 3, the entire earth was populated. In the previous 2 lessons, we studied Ham and Japheth. This is the 3rd son, Shem, in whose tents, Japheth would dwell (indicating a spiritual link between Shem and Japheth).

Gen 10:21–30 And to Shem were born, even him, the father of all the sons of Eber, the brother of Japheth the elder. The sons of Shem [were] Elam and Asshur and Arpachshad and Lud and Aram. And the sons of Aram [were] Uz and Hul and Gether and Mash, and Arpachshad fathered [Cainan, and Cainan fathered] Salah; and Salah fathered Eber. And two sons were born to Eber. The name of the one was Peleg, for in his days the earth was divided. And his brother's name was Joktan. And Joktan fathered Almodad and Sheleph and Hazarmaveth and Jerah, and Hadoram and Uzal and Diklah, and Obal and Abimael and Sheba, and Ophir and Havilah, and Jobab. All these were the sons of Joktan and their dwelling was from Mesha, as you go to Sephar, a mountain of the east.

These are properly called the Semitic peoples (this designation is based upon the name of *Shem*).

Who Cainan is, will be explained further on down.

Elam is the ancient name for Persia, which is itself the ancient name for Iran. Until the time of Cyrus the people here were called Elamites, and they were still often called that even in New Testament times. In Acts 2:9, the Jews from Persia who were present at Pentecost were called Elamites. The Persians are thus descended from both Elam, the son of Shem, and from Madai, the son of Japheth (see above). Since the 1930s they have called their country Iran.

It is interesting to note that the word 'Aryan', which so fascinated Adolf Hitler, is a form of the word 'Iran'. Hitler wanted to produce a pure Aryan 'race' of supermen. But the very term 'Aryan' signifies a mixed line of Semites and Japhethites!

Asshur is the Hebrew word for Assyria. Assyria was one of the great ancient empires. Every time the words Assyria or Assyrian appear in the Old Testament, they are translated from the word Asshur. He was worshipped by his descendants.

'Indeed, as long as Assyria lasted, that is until 612 B.C., accounts of battles, diplomatic affairs and foreign bulletins were daily read out to his image; and every Assyrian king held that he wore the crown only with the express permission of Asshur's deified ghost.'⁶¹

Arphaxad was the progenitor of the Chaldeans. This is confirmed by the Hurrian (Nuzi) tablets, which render the name as Arip-hurra-the founder of Chaldea.⁶² His descendant, Eber, gave his name to the Hebrew people via the line of Eber-Peleg-Reu-Serug-Nahor-Terah-Abram (Genesis 11:16-26). Eber's other son, Joktan, had 13 sons (Genesis 10:26-30), all of whom appear to have settled in Arabia.⁶³

Lud was the ancestor of the Lydians. Lydia was in what is now Western Turkey. Their capital was Sardis-one of the seven churches of Asia was at Sardis (Revelation 3:1).

Aram is the Hebrew word for Syria. Whenever the word Syria appears in the Old Testament it is a translation of the word Aram. The Syrians call themselves Aramæans, and their language is called Aramaic. Before the spread of the Greek Empire, Aramaic was the international language (2 Kings 18:26 ff). On the cross, when Jesus cried out, 'Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani' (Mark 15:34),¹³ He was speaking Aramaic, the language of the common people.⁶⁴

⁶¹ From <http://creation.com/the-sixteen-grandsons-of-noah> accessed August 27, 2009. He is quoting from Bill Cooper, *After the Flood*, New Wine Press, Chichester, England, p. 170, 1995.

⁶² From <http://creation.com/the-sixteen-grandsons-of-noah> accessed August 27, 2009. He is quoting from Bill Cooper, *After the Flood*, New Wine Press, Chichester, England, p. 172, 1995.

⁶³ From <http://creation.com/the-sixteen-grandsons-of-noah> accessed August 27, 2009. He is quoting from A.C. Custance, *Noah's Three Sons*, Vol.1, 'The Doorway Papers', Zondervan, Michigan, p. 117, 1975.

⁶⁴ This is all from <http://creation.com/the-sixteen-grandsons-of-noah> accessed August 27, 2009.

We have only taken the briefest glance at Noah's sixteen grandsons, but enough has been said to show that they really did live, that they were who the Bible says they were, and that their descendants are identifiable on the pages of history. Not only is the Bible not a collection of myths and legends, but it stands alone as the key to the history of the earliest ages of human civilization.

This final line is Shem's (Genesis 10:21–30). His 5 sons and their descendants are listed below.

Like the lines of Japheth and Ham, we will follow these out for 2 or 3 or 4 generations; but, without any explanation given, one line will be followed out specifically for 10 generations—the line from Shem to Abram.

The Descendants of Shem who Occupy the Middle East

1. Elam: Persia (now called Iran) *The first of Shem's sons listed is Elam. Elam is the forerunner of the Elamites. The Elamites are recurrent throughout Scripture, and many monuments attest to their prominence in the region. The Elamite capital city was Susa, or Shushan. This archaic city was located east of Mesopotamia. One of the great ancient empires was formed from those descended from Elam (the Persians) and those descendants of Japheth (the Medes).*
 2. Asshur: [Assyria] *Asshur was the original founder of the Assyrians, though Nimrod later invaded the area and established his own empire. Thus, the Assyrians were a combination of Semitic and Hamitic characteristics. The natives of Assyria, those living in the area before Nimrod, were racially of Shem. Yet, after the invasion and subsequent settlement by Nimrod and his people, the Assyrians adopted Hamitic culture, language, and religion. Again, two sons of Noah are seen helping to shape and form a nation which would lead to yet another powerful ancient empire, the Assyrian Empire. According to Citizendia, the Assyrians traced themselves to the god-ancestor Ashur and the city he founded by that name on the Tigris. Seeing Asshur as some kind of a god is reasonable. Noah's 3 sons and their children will outlive several subsequent generations. Shem, for instance, will live for the next 9 or 10 generations, and he will outlive many of those from the subsequent 8 generation. So, such a man would be highly venerated, and this would tie in neatly with ancestral worship in some Asian countries.*
 3. Arpachshad (also, Arphaxad): Chaldeans *Albeit very little is known of Arphaxad, he is one of the most important sons of Shem in regards to the "seed of the woman". God had promised Noah to increase his seed upon the earth, and Shem was that son of Noah through which God would bring forth the Jews and Arabs. Arphaxad, son of Shem, is in the direct line leading to Abraham. Thus, he is an early ancestor of the Israelite people. A region in Assyria known as Arrapachitis may have originated from Arphaxad's name, though this is not known for certain. Though Arphaxad probably had more than one son, only one son is listed, Salah. A possible, and indeed the most probable, explanation for this*
-

The Descendants of Shem who Occupy the Middle East

would be that it was from Arphaxad to Salah that the "seed of the woman" was transmitted to the next generation. *Sons of Noah: Map of Shem's descendants in the Sinai Likewise, only one son of Salah is mentioned, Eber. Eber, like his father before him, was chosen to carry the "seed of the woman" through to the next generation. In all, twenty three verses in Scripture are dedicated to Arphaxad and his descendants. This is more than any other of the sons of Noah and their descendants. Obviously, there was something very special and important about Arphaxad, even though he is the least known about of Shem's sons. Citizendia tells us: He or his immediate descendants are credited in Jewish tradition with founding the city of Ur of the Chaldees, possibly Urfa Kurdish city in modern southeastern Turkey, although it has also been identified by some (following the archaeologist Wooley) with the Sumerian city of Ur on the south bank of the Euphrates. .*

- 1) Cainan is not listed in the Masoretic text (the Hebrew manuscript). However, his name is found in the Septuagint (the Greek translation of the Old Testament) and in the line to Jesus in Luke 3:36. If you have Brenton's translation or the Complete Apostles' Bible (e-sword has modules for both of these), you will find his name in Gen. 10:24 11:13. For most timelines, including some which I may have used, this pushes Noah, Shem and Arpachshad back 130 years. With Cainan and his son Salah, below, there will be a sudden change in this genealogy; we will go from a cluster genealogy (one which includes 2–4 generations) to a linear genealogy, wherein the line of one particular person is followed out (insofar as I know, the designations *cluster genealogy* and *linear genealogy* are original with me).

- (1) Salah

- i Eber [Hebrews]

- i) Peleg is known for the *division of the earth*, which took place in his time (Gen. 10:25). *There is a chance that the Pelasgians are derived from Peleg, but this seems to be the only people ascribed to him.* Citizendia suggests that Peleg is sometimes connected to Phalgu, an ancient town located where the Euphrates and Chaboras meet.

- (i) Reu → Serug → Nabor → Terah → Abram (Israel)

- ii) Joktan possibly Arabia. Citizendia: *Sometimes identified with Jectan, an ancient town near Mecca..* One of the fascinating things about these genealogies is, there are often these points of divergence, and many times, the less likely line will be followed out. Joktan here has a bunchy of son, many of whom can be associations with certain

The Descendants of Shem who Occupy the Middle East

places and peoples (all listed below). So we might expect Joktan to head the important line; however, instead, the line of Peleg (above) is followed out.

- (i) Almodad *has been identified with al-Morad, somewhere in Yemen (Citizendia).*
- (ii) Sheleph is *Identified with Salif, Northwest Yemen. The capital of the Salif was Sulaf (Citizendia).*
- (iii) Hazarmaveth is *identified with Hadhramaut in East Yemen (Citizendia).*
- (iv) Jerah is *identified with Jerakon Kome in South central Yemen (Citizendia).*
- (v) Hadoram *Identification has been proposed with Hurarina, a town of Southern Arabia mentioned in Assyrian inscriptions of Ashurbanipal. Ashurbanipal (Akkadian: Assur-bani-apli, " Ashur has made a son" or "Ashur created an heir" (b Hurarina also happens to be the name of a fruit tree exclusive to Shewa, Ethiopia (Citizendia).*
- (vi) Uzal is *identified with Azalla in Central west Yemen. Azal is the ancient name of San'a (Citizendia).*
- (vii) Diklah's *identification is uncertain, although a connection with Deqlath (the Syriac form of Tigris) has been suggested (Citizendia).*
- (viii) Obal has been *identified with the Abil in Central west Yemen. The Abil are, according to ancient inscriptions, placed west of the Azalla (Citizendia).*
- (ix) Abimael *Though Abimael is unidentified as a tribe it has traditionally been considered to be a northern Arabian group (Citizendia).*
- (x) Sheba, *like Sheba son of Raamah and Seba son of Cush, identified with Sabaeans of Southern Yemen/Coastal Eritrea (Citizendia).*
- (xi) Ophir is *Identified with Afir of Southwest Yemen. Ancient inscriptions place them between the Huwailah and Sabaeans (roughly where Ma'afir is now) (Citizendia).*
- (xii) Havilah is *identified with Huwailah and Kwahlans of Northwest Yemen (Citizendia).*

The Descendants of Shem who Occupy the Middle East

- (xiii) Joab is *identified with Labibi of Southwest Saudi Arabia. Their capital was Juhaibab, which ancient inscriptions locate near Mecca (Citizendia).*
4. Lud: [Lydia] From Citizendia: *Most ancient authorities assign this name to the Lydians of Eastern Anatolia (Luddu in Assyrian inscriptions from circa 700 B.C.). This name may also be connected with the earlier Luwians who lived in approximately the same area.*
5. Aram *It is interesting that four children of Aram are mentioned in this passage, even though three of Shem's sons have no descendants listed under their names. Scholars and historians suggest that this may be because the children of Aram had more interaction and contact with the descendants of Abraham. This would seem like a reasonable assumption, yet should not be taken as indisputable fact. Citizendia tells us: There are references to a campaign against 'Aram' as early as 2300 B.C. in the inscriptions of Naram-Sin of Akkad. The Aramaeans (also Aramæans, Arameans) were known in earliest times as Aram-Naharaim, and were centered on the Balikh river in northwestern Mesopotamia (modern Turkey). His descendants settled in the city of Haran.*
- 1) Uz [the land of Job (Job 1:1)? Perhaps 2800 B.C.] From Citizendia: *Possibly the ancestors of the Nabataeans, extending from Southern Jordan to Northwestern Saudi Arabia; also mentioned in Job.*
 - 2) Hul is an offshoot we know nothing about. Citizendia suggests that there is possible connection with Lake known in Aramaic as Hulata.
 - 3) Gether According to Arabic tradition (this comes from Citizendia), he may be the father of the Thamud, a people of ancient Arabia who were known from the 1st millennium B.C. to near the time of Muhammad.
 - 4) Mash is listed in 1Chornicles as Meshech. Citizendia: *[His descendants are] unknown; [however] suggestions include Mashu, an unknown region of cedars mentioned in the Epic of Gilgamesh (possibly Lebanon), and E-Mash-Mash, the main temple at Ninevah in Assyria.*

Although the basic line was taken out of the Bible, the additional material came from:
<http://www.israel-a-history-of.com/sons-of-noah.html> (and that which is italicized was taken directly from that page). I should again add that, some of the identifications are disputed.
The Citizendia quotes are from: http://www.citizendia.org/Sons_of_Noah accessed July 20, 2010.

Josephus was one of the first historians to tie Gen. 10 to historic peoples; and Hippolytus did as well. Other ancient historians did the same thing, and a summary of their results is found here:


http://www.citizendia.org/Sons_of_Noah

Original references for the past 3 lessons.

1. *Josephus: Complete Works*, Kregal Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 'Antiquities of the Jews', 1:6:1 (i.e. book 1, chapter 6, section 1).
2. J. Davis, *History of the Welsh Baptists from the Year Sixty-three to the Year One Thousand Seven Hundred and Seventy*, D.M. Hogan, Pittsburgh, 1835, republished by The Baptist, Aberdeen, Mississippi, p. 1, 1976.
3. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 2:422, 1967.
4. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 20:116, 1967.
5. A.C. Custance, *Noah's Three Sons*, Vol.1, 'The Doorway Papers', Zondervan, Michigan, p. 92, 1975.
6. *Encyclopedia Britannica* 3:332, 1992.
7. Bill Cooper, *After the Flood*, New Wine Press, Chichester, England, p. 203, 1995.
8. *World Book Encyclopedia*, Vol. 18, p. 207, 1968.
9. *Josephus: Complete Works*, Kregal Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 'Antiquities of the Jews', 1:6:2.
10. Bill Cooper, *After the Flood*, New Wine Press, Chichester, England, p. 170, 1995.
11. Bill Cooper, *After the Flood*, New Wine Press, Chichester, England, p. 172, 1995.
12. A.C. Custance, *Noah's Three Sons*, Vol.1, 'The Doorway Papers', Zondervan, Michigan, p. 117, 1975.
13. Matthew 27:46 and Mark 15:34 quote the Aramaic form of Psalm 22:1, but Matthew reconvered Eloi to the Hebrew Eli.
14. For example, we made no attempt here to trace the origins of the Chinese. For evidence on this subject see 'The original, "unknown" God of China', *Creation* 20(3):50-54, 1998. See also how ancient Chinese Characters show that the ancient Chinese knew the Gospel message found in the book of Genesis.

I found a pretty good chart at

<http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/en/2/2d/Oldtestamentgenealogy.gif>



Noah's Descendants

You may need to go to this chart in order to read the names, but it simply shows some of the lines of Shem, Ham and Japheth, and who is associated with what city or country.

We sum up this section with:

[Gen 10:32](#) These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations. And from these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood.


The Map of Noah's Son's Sons



The map above is from <http://www.israel-a-history-of.com/images/TableOfNations12.jpg>. The names in **Green** are descendants of Ham, those in **Red** are descendants of Shem and those in **Black** are descendants of Japheth. This map gives us a quick look of the initial distribution of these 3 sets of people.

There is another chart, which I have seen in several places, with the names of the sons of Noah, their sons, and where they all ended up, generally speaking:

Noah, His Descendants, and their Distribution:



The chart to above came from:

http://wwwFOUNDATIONSforfreedom.net/References/OT/Pentateuch/Genesis/09TowerofBabel/resGen10-11/Noah_descendants-3_Sons.jpg

This chart provides us with a quick and easy view of the original distribution of Noah's sons. Quite obviously, when one nation conquers another, the end result is often a mixing of the two nations, which can often be a mixing of these lines. Although, by all accounts, I am nearly 100% Japhetic, I have cousins who are part American Indian, which means

that they have some Hamitic *blood* in them (I always wondered what was wrong with that part of the family ☺).

Even though there are various people who object to various portions of the Bible, and claim that they are inaccurate or that they offend their sensibilities, or whatever, it should be interesting to you that no contemporary historian looks upon this chapter of Genesis and proclaims it as poppycock, meaningless or as just a list of made-up names. There may be some disagreements as to this or that son, but what we do not find is, large groups of historians protesting, saying that the distribution of these descendants of Noah, their languages or subsequent nations bear no relationship to the truth. In other words, it is clear that some ancient writer did not just start writing down a bunch of names as they popped into his head. From Josephus to Durant, ancient historians are far more likely to embrace Gen. 10 than to whisk it away as someone's fertile imagination.

Gen 10:31 *These are the sons of Shem, after their families, after their tongues, in their lands, and after their nations.*

Thrice in this chapter, there has been a reference to language (vv. 5, 20, 31), and in the next chapter of Genesis, we deal with this language barrier and its origins.

Lesson 89: Genesis 10:1, 32 11:1–2

The Movement of Noah's Family

In the previous chapter, 3 times the author referenced these things: the families, their tongues, their lands and their nations.

The first verse of Gen. 10 is:

Gen 10:1 *These are the generations of the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. Sons were born to them after the flood.*

Again, *generations* is the Hebrew word *tôwl^edôth* (תולדות) [pronounced *toh^e-DOHTH*], which means *generations, results, proceedings, genealogies, course of history*. We find this word used in conjunction with the genealogies (e.g., Gen. 5:1 6:9 Ex. 6:16). Strong's #8435 BDB #410. What is often suggested by the use of this word is, we are moving into a new time period and a new generation.

The final verse reads:

Gen 10:32 *These [are] the clans [or, families] of the sons of Noah, according to [or, with respect to] their genealogies, in their nations, and from these the nations spread abroad on the earth after the flood.*

This is the concluding verse which sums up the sections we just studied in the past 3 lessons. The second word in this verse is *mish^epâchâh* (משפחה) [pronounced *mish-paw-KHAWH*], which means, in the plural, *families, clans, sub-tribes, classes (of people)*,

species (of animals), or sort (of things). Strong's #4940 BDB #1046. We looked at each son of Noah and followed them out for several generations. What is probably the case is, only those sons and grandsons and great grandsons who actually founded a people were examined. Whether there were more sons of Shem, Ham or Japheth, we do not know. However, there were certainly more grandsons than we find listed. It is reasonable to conclude that the author, inspired by God the Holy Spirit, primarily listed those who became nations and peoples. These seem to be based upon genealogical records rather than working from the various nations backwards to their founders. The author makes little attempt to connect this or that son with this or that people (although many people, both Biblical exegetes and ancient historians, have done that).

The author listed these families *according to (or, with respect to) their generations*, which is tôwl°dôth again.

This is followed by the phrase *in their nations*, the latter word being gôwyîm (גוֹיִם) [pronounced *goh-YIHM*], which means *Gentiles, [Gentile] nations, people, peoples, nations*. Strong's #1471 BDB #156. The author is acknowledging that these became various nations, but did not really explore that as we have.

From these refers back to the clans or families of Noah (his grandsons and great grandsons, for the most part) *the nations spread abroad in the earth after the flood*. Chapter 11 explains exactly how these families, which became nations, spread abroad on the earth after the flood.

Let me remind you of 4 verses which we have already studied:

Gen 10:25 To Eber were born two sons: the name of the one was Peleg, for in his days the earth was divided, and his brother's name was Joktan.

Following the families of Japheth, we have:

Gen 10:5 From these the coastland peoples spread in their lands, each with his own language, by their clans, in their nations.

Once 3 generations of Japheth are mentioned (including Japheth), but they are said to *spread out* here, suggesting that they went further out than did the other sons of Noah.

Following the families of Ham, we read:

Gen 10:20 These are the sons of Ham, by their clans, their languages, their lands, and their nations.

The line of Ham includes sons, grandsons and a couple of great grandsons. They are not said to *spread out*, and, according to historians, they stayed close to one another, although they moved out of the Tigris-Euphrates valley, for the most part, going into Egypt and Africa.

And following the line of Shem, we read:

Gen 10:31 These are the sons of Shem, by their clans, their languages, their lands, and their nations.

Shem's line was different. Although his sons are named, we followed out one particular line of Shem, going out 10 generations from Noah (which includes Shem). This pattern is seen a lot in the Bible. Various lines are followed out for 1, 2 and sometimes 3 generations; but then, the Bible focuses on one particular line and follows *that* line out. The author, of whatever section we are talking about, seems to know which line is important, and he follows out that particular line.

Literally, v. 31 reads: **These are the sons of Shem, with respect to their clans [or, families], with respect to their languages, in their lands, and with respect to their nations.**

There is a fourfold division given each time: *families, languages, lands and nations*. This describes the concept of *nationalism*. Throughout the Bible, we find the concept of nationalism, from the very beginning to the very end. Nationalism, on the one hand, protects freedom, evangelism and Bible teaching; and, on the other hand, isolates people who are negative toward the truth. There will always be internationalist movements—like the International Workers of the World, Communism and Islam—and all such movements are evil and anti-God. We know this because in Gen. 11, God will personally separate the nations.

Gen 11:1 And the whole earth was of one language and of one speech.

As is often the case in Bible narratives, not everything is in a strict chronological order. In the previous chapter, there are hints that somehow, different languages developed, but the details are given to us in this chapter. In the previous chapter, the genealogies of Shem, Ham and Japheth were covered, and three times, languages are mentioned, even though, quite obviously, these three men, and their father and their children would have all spoken one language. However, at some point in time, this changed, and this is what we will study in Gen. 11. This change will establish nationalism as a divine institution (the 5 divine institutions are the souls of the individual, employment, marriage, family, and nationalism—and each has its own system of authority).

Gen 11:2 And it happened, as they traveled from the east, they found a valley in the land of Shinar. And they lived there.

Shinar means *country of two rivers*. Most believe this to be the intersection of the Euphrates and the Tigris Rivers. Given that there must have been a radically different topology then as opposed to today, these rivers may have intersected at that point at one time, or had been closer together. Today, they do intersect or come close to intersecting until the Persian Gulf. This suggests that the population moved from the mountains of Iran into the Euphrates River valley. This would make perfect sense, as the Ark of Noah came to rest on Mount Ararat (Gen. 8:4), which most scholars place in Eastern Turkey, near the

border of Iran (between Georgia and Iraq). Although the exact location of Mount Ararat is disputed, this is the general area that it is thought to be in.

Let me suggest the following scenario. Noah and his family are up in the Armenia area, at first (a map will follow, to help you here). Although the waters from the flood are receding, going due south would have put them in the fertile crescent area (eventually) which would be relatively low land and possibly still flooded or prone to flooding. At the very least, this would have been marshland. So, for 100 years or so, Noah and his extended family move southeast, remaining in the mountain ranges for the most part. The lower land was probably saturated with water at this time. There is a mountain range which extends from Armenia in a southeasterly direction down into Iran into the Zagros Mountains (which are near the border of Iraq and Iran). The reason for them to move along this pathway is to move toward warmer weather, and remain in the mountains and out of the swamps. Most assuredly, various members of the family explored the land going in various directions, but basically remaining on the mountains.

A Modern Map of Iraq and Iran (which includes the journey of Noah's Family):



If you look in the upper left-hand corner of the map, that is the Armenia area, which is likely where the ark came to sit. Noah and his sons would have moved diagonally through the Zagros Mountains, as the flatter area of Iraq would have been marshy and partially underwater. As Iraq began to dry, Noah and company would have been in the mountains near Ahvaz, and from there, they would move westward to the meeting of the two rivers (the Tigris and the Euphrates).

This map is taken from: <http://www.blythe.org/afghan-maps/Mideast-NAfrica-area-relief2000.jpg>

At some point in time, it would be clear that the waters had fully receded from the Tigris and Euphrates valley and that this area would have been seen as quite fertile (hence, the name, the fertile crescent)

In order to plant and farm, Noah and his sons needed water. As the water continued to recede, they would have moved to follow the receding waters. At first, they moved in a

southeasterly direction, remaining in the mountains (for 10, 20, 30 years?). There came to be less and less water in the mountainous region, so they then moved westward (from the east), which would take them to where the Tigris and the Euphrates meet, which is also the general location of Babylon.

Accepting this direction of travel (not recorded in the Bible), the landing of the ark in Armenia does not contradict Gen. 11:2, where they are said to travel from the east into a plain, level valley. Their movement in a southeasterly direction places them east of the two rivers.

Gen 11:2 And it happened, as they traveled from the east, they found a valley in the land of Shinar. And they lived there.

By this point in time, there would have been a sizable population, and they all traveled together. In the antediluvian civilization, Cain was sent packing, and there appeared to be 2 separate lines of people in different areas increasing in size (Adam's and Cain's). Here, it appears as though there is just one large group of people, and they are choosing to stick together.

Most believe that Noah and his sons are now living in the Tigris-Euphrates valley, as *Shinar* means *country of two rivers*, which was the ancient name for Babylonia (later called Chaldea). The name *Babel* is consonantly equivalent to *Babylon* as well, so, historically, they have been considered to refer to the same area. There are several places along the Tigris River where, presumably, two rivers intersected and there were ancient cities founded near these places (Nineveh, Asshur, Accad, Ur). Babylon is not located near two rivers, but, bear in mind that this is not long after the flood, and that there were probably a number of rivers in this general area which have since dried up.

The photos which we see of these areas is much different from what that area was probably like then. Back then, there would have been more water, larger rivers, more rivers; and therefore, more rain and more cloud cover. Water tends to reduce and stabilize the temperature of an area, so that this was probably a much more temperate climate at this time. Furthermore, there would have been much more fauna at this time. Photos of this area for the first 1000–2000 years after the flood would have looked much different than this area looks today.

Not only does the Bible seem to point to civilization as beginning in the Tigris-Euphrates valley, but archeology believes that this is where the first cities were built.

From the Cradle of Civilization: Before archeologists began to dig in Mesopotamia, almost nothing was known of the empires that flourished there 4,500 years ago. The Bible and works of Greek and Roman historians had made brief mention of the Babylonians and the Assyrians, but the information was vague and contradictory. Of a still older people, the Sumerians, nothing at all was known—not even the fact that they had existed.

The main reason the peoples of Mesopotamia remained forgotten for so long was that they, unlike the Egyptians and other ancient empire-builders, had not build in enduring stone but in Mediterranean brick. Rain, annual floods and shifting sands slowly leveled the bricks and buried the towers and palaces, leaving only shapeless mounds. For thousands of years no one was aware of the secrets these mounds concealed, but in the middle of the 19th century, French, German and English archeologists started to explore them. Within a few years the spade revealed some remarkable facts: Mesopotamian were the first people on earth to live in cities, study the stars, use the arch and wheeled vehicles, write epic poetry and compile a legal code.⁶⁵

And the Bible essentially tells us this fact of the first city here in Gen. 10.

Lesson 90: Genesis 10:5, 20, 31–32 11:1–2 The Divine Institutions/Nationalism

Gen. 10:5, 20, 31–32 define nationalism, the 4th divine institution, the national entity:

Gen 10:5 From these the coastland peoples spread in their lands, each with his own language, by their clans, in their nations.

Gen 10:20 These are the sons of Ham, by their clans, their languages, their lands, and their nations.

Gen 10:31 These are the sons of Shem, with respect to their clans [or, *families*], with respect to their languages, in their lands, and with respect to their nations.

Gen 10:32 These [are] the clans [or, *families*] of the sons of Noah, according to [or, *with respect to*] their genealogies, in their nations, and from these the nations spread abroad on the earth after the flood.

The Bible defines and establishes 5 divine institutions. A *divine institution* speaks of the absolute social structures that have been instituted by God for the entire human race—for believers and unbelievers alike. The term *divine* emphasizes the fact that they have their origin in God. These are social structures that have been built into creation and into the nature of man by God. These divine institutions provide protection, perpetuation, orderly function, survival and blessing of the human race, and allow for the teaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ *Great Ages of Man: Cradle of Civilization*; by Samuel Noah Kramer and the Editors of Time-Life books; Time-Life Books, ©1967; Time Incorporated, New York; p. 17.

⁶⁶ A portion of this definition comes from: <http://www.phrasearch.com/Trans/DBM/setup/Genesis/Gen026.htm>

The 5 Divine Institutions

Divine Institution	Defined	Defined Authority	Scripture
The individual (or, the human soul)	Established by the creation of man with free will.	God's laws and mandates as revealed in the correct dispensation. For those without God's laws, God provides an interior compass (the conscience). Each individual is responsible for their own decisions.	Gen. 2:15–17 3:8–13, 16–17 Rom. 1:16–32
Work	God had man working from the very beginning; man named the animals and he worked in the garden of God. After man sinned, God promised man that he would have to work hard for basic sustenance.	Employers over employees; masters over slaves.	Gen. 1:28 2:5, 15 3:17–19 Matt. 20:1–15 Eph. 6:5–9 Col. 3:22–24
Marriage	A precedent was set by the creation of Adam and the woman.	The husband is the defined authority. However, the husband has the responsibility of loving his wife.	Gen 1:26–28 2:18–25 Matt. 19:4–6 Eph. 5:22–25 Col. 3:18–19
Family	Defined by Adam, the woman and their children.	The parents are the authorities. However, the father is not to provoke a child to wrath nor beat him down until he is dispirited.	Gen. 3:20 4:1–2 Col. 3:20–21
Nation	Defined by families, language, land and some sort of understood grouping (which usually includes government).	The laws of the nation define the various authorities.	Gen. 10:5, 20, 31–32 Acts 17:26–27 Rom. 13:1–7

Although the Bible chronicles some polygamous marriages, they are never portrayed as congenial arrangements nor is polygamy ever promoted in Scripture. The marriage between one man and one woman is always presented as God’s design and is often used to illustrate various spiritual principles. .

A nation controls however much land its army can defend. A nation expanding its territory or its influence is not generally presented as a sinful or evil thing in the Bible. There are exceptions to this: any people that tried to subjugate Israel was usually—but not always—cursed by God.

The first divine institution can be an individual witness to God while the other divine institutions can be corporate witnesses to God. This concept will be covered in more detail later on.

One doctrinal teachers (Ron Adema) adds *employment* to the set of divine institutions, something which I finally added to this list, because it seems quite reasonable.

It is important to emphasize that these divine institutions are designed for the human race, not just for believers in Jesus Christ. However, because these institutions are designed by God, they will be under attack throughout human history.

Because these are divine institutions designed for the entire human race, there will be attacks against them. Examples of these attacks are listed below.

Attacks Against the Divine Institutions	
Divine Institutions	Attacks from Within and Without
The individual (or, the human soul)	Sin in all 3 categories (mental attitude sins, verbal sins and overt sins), arrogance, various addictions (alcohol, drug, sexual), reluctance to take responsibility for one’s own actions, animosity toward God, idolatry, false religions, paganism, polytheism, the theory of evolution.
Work	Communism, socialism, cruel employers, unions, and the welfare state.
Marriage	Promiscuity, polygamy, adultery, divorce, homosexuality, lesbianism, same-sex marriage, the homosexual political agenda, hate crimes legislation.
Family	Those things named above, which include treating a union of homosexuals as being equivalent to the union of a man and a woman by government fiat; governmental attempts to separate parents from children (e.g., through education or through political movements), propaganda in the schools (sex education, so-called bullying programs).

Attacks Against the Divine Institutions

Divine Institutions

Attacks from Within and Without

Nation

International movements (communism, socialism, Islam, any form of one-worldism); anarchy, attacks against the police or the military or other figures of authority; appeals to external laws and regulations; the international green movement, courts looking to international laws for validation, a federal attack upon the church or a federal union with the church.

These attacks will be provocative, unrelenting and often made palatable through propaganda, social action, law and social norms.

Despite these references to languages and different territories, it is quite obvious that Noah and his 3 sons, and their families would all speak the same language and that they first traveled as a group.

What we have here is a typical Semitic approach to the recording of history. We just finished looking at the sons of Noah, and their sons, and how these various men founded the nations of the earth, and how they were distinguished by their languages, families and geographical locations. Now, we go back, and look at one part of human history; how man went from being one family—the family of Noah—and morphed into a world of national entities.

Let's step back for a moment and see the overall organization. Noah and his sons get off the ark, and of all the historical events which occurred in Noah's life, only one is recorded: Noah getting drunk and laying around naked in his tent (how would you like something like this to be one of the defining events of your life?). The reactions of his sons provided the historical trends of their descendants. That logically led us to defining exactly who descended from whom, which is Gen. 10. However, that required the author to record a pivotal event in human history, which explains how one family stepping off the ark became a world of national entities. That takes us to Gen. 11:1–9, to the first human attempt at internationalism, the Tower of Babel.

Gen 11:1–2 And the whole earth was of one language and of one speech. And it happened, as they traveled from the east, they found a valley in the land of Shinar. And they lived there.

As we saw, the ark probably came to rest in the mountains of Armenia, and the ever-expanding clan of Noah first traveled southeast through the mountain ranges, and then, as the earth continued to dry, moved westward from these mountains into the Euphrates valley.

Language is fundamental to a people, a culture and to technological growth. We have found, through the study of wild children, that if language is not developed at a very crucial stage—in both written and spoken form—it may never develop completely. In the study

of wild children—children who have been fundamentally deprived in their developmental years—there is no making this up. A child whose language is not developed by age 7 or 8 will never catch up. Children who have been locked away in closets and rooms in their developmental years (or are raised by animals during this time) never develop their language or their thinking. It is not uncommon for a wild child, even when brought into some semblance of normality at, say, age 10, to be unable to develop a working vocabulary of even 30 words.

In our present-day culture—and I don't think any studies have been done on this—we have many children being raised in homes where there is no reading material whatsoever, and their first exposure to a written language is not until their first week at school (apart from what they see on television). Such children are able to develop a speaking vocabulary, but they seem to be forever behind in school due to their struggling with reading.

Specific vocabularies are necessary for technological development. Advances in science go hand-in-hand with a technologically-specific vocabulary. Even spiritual growth requires one to develop a spiritual vocabulary. I don't mean that, periodically, you bust out with a *praise God* or a *Lord willing*; but you develop concepts and attach to them a specific vocabulary (e.g., the phrase *divine institution*). In past lessons, we have studied *redemption*, *dispensations* and the *Angelic Conflict*. If these words mean something to you, then that probably indicates spiritual growth. No area of thought advances without a specific vocabulary, so you should not resist developing a spiritual vocabulary.

My point in this tangent is, language is fundamental to the human race, and it must be developed when a child is young. A technical language is required for any discipline.

Also important is control and saturation of the language: I write this in 2010 in the United States: who has not heard *tax cuts for the rich*, *institutional racism*, *[social] justice*, *cap and tax*? Simply establishing a vocabulary in the minds of the electorate—even when the vocabulary is essentially meaningless—can change the direction of a nation. A significant number of people in our 2008 election voted for the words *hope and change*, even though these words were intentionally undefined (this is not to say every Obama voter voted for those words, but a significant number did; I have spoken with college graduates who voted for Obama because *we needed a change*). Controlling the language means, in many cases, influencing (and sometimes controlling) the thinking and volition of others. This is why, in the abortion debate, one side is pro-choice and the other side is pro-life. Neither side wants the other side to define them.

Gen 11:1–2 And the whole earth was of one language and of one speech. And it happened, as they traveled from the east, they found a valley in the land of Shinar. And they lived there.

The sons of Noah all spoke the same language.

In this passage, which we are about ready to delve into, there is the false interpretation and the correct interpretation. Liberal theologians teach that this is a myth designed to explain

the existence of different human languages. The correct interpretation is, God has commanded man multiply and to spread out across the earth. [God said to the man and the woman, “Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth \[with people\] and subdue the earth and exert dominance over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth.”](#) (Gen. 1:28b; compare Gen. 8:17 9:1, 7). The natural result of man spreading throughout the earth would be nations and, eventually, a separation of languages.

The emphasis here is upon nationalism and God’s disapproval of all international movements. God does not like Communism, socialism, Islam, international green movements, the UN, the League of Nations, etc., because all of these movements and institutions operate in opposition to God.

Most of these are easy to see as being anti-God and, ultimately, anti-human. Communism looks upon man’s function as part of a great economic scheme, separate from God, with dramatic limitations upon human freedom. This is why Communist dictatorships will, upon taking control, kill masses of people, including the *useful idiots* who helped to put them into power in the first place. This is why people are, en masse, subject to re-education camps, when they are borderline in their commitment to communism.

Islam is the merging of church and state. I recall one person⁶⁷ explaining the difference between Judaism, Christianity and Islam: Judaism is both religious and political, but it is not universal. Therefore, Judaism does not seek to subjugate others. Christianity is religious and universal, but not political. For this reason, Christianity does not seek to subjugate others (bastardizations of Christianity have). Furthermore, free will is important to both Judaism and Christianity, so neither seeks to remove a person’s free will (ideally speaking). However, Islam is religious, political and universal. Therefore, its goal is to subjugate all mankind (just as the goal of communism is world subjugation to a network of communist nations—no communist movement will ever morph into a system which lacks a ruling class).

The problem with the UN is more subtle. This brings with it the concept of international law, authorities outside of a national entity, and, as we have seen on numerous occasions, it often gives international voice to tyrants.

What will happen in Gen. 11 is, man will want to cluster into a single nation, and God will make certain that man is dispersed into national entities. This will be brought about by one of the few true miracles in the Bible.

Lesson 91 Genesis 11:1–4

The Tower of Babel

So far, we have studied the first two verses of Gen. 11:

⁶⁷ Michael Medved, although I do not know if it was original with him.

Gen. 11:1–2 And the whole earth was of one language and of one speech [lit., *one word*]. And it happened, as they traveled from the east, they found a valley in the land of Shinar. And they lived there.

We have already tracked Noah's likely movements, first southeast, through the mountains, as the waters continued to recede, and then due east, into the fertile valley of the Euphrates. Obviously, being from the same father, they all spoke the same language.

V. 1 provides an excellent example of a metonym. It says that the whole earth was of one language and one dialect. The earth does not have a human language. The earth is huge and mankind upon it is a very small thing living on the earth (particularly, at this point in time). Yet the passage reads, *And the whole earth was of one language and one speech* [lit., *one word; one dialect, one vocabulary?*]. It is this group of men traveling together who all speak the same language. However, the intent here is to indicate that there are no other groups of people on this earth. The families which we are talking about—named in Gen. 10—is it, and, at this point in time, they all speak one language. Obviously, we are backtracking now, as a differentiation of language was alluded to 3 times back in Gen. 10.

Gen 11:3 And they say to one another, “Come, let us make brick and burn them thoroughly.” And they had brick for stone, and they had asphalt for mortar.

They say to one another indicates that there is no clearly established authority at this time. That is, there is not one particular person calling the shots here. According to the Masoretic text, this is about 100 years after the flood, where Noah and his 3 sons would all still be alive; but, according to the Greek text, this is about 500 years after the flood, which would be after Noah has died (we will examine this time frame more precisely in the second half of this chapter). At one time, at least among his 3 sons, Noah was their clear, established authority. He said that they were going to build an ark and fill it with animals (at the direction of God), and so they did. However, we do not have a clear authority here; we have what appears to various people at various times urging others into a specific course of action. The verb *to say* is a Qal imperfect, indicating that this discussion was ongoing. This may have been one meeting where several people suggested this course of action; or, this may have been informally, while the people were encamped in Shinar, thinking about their next move.

So, for whatever reason, Noah is no longer the undisputed leader who sets the agenda. Whether he is alive and irrelevant (for instance, Noah, for all we know, could be an alcoholic at this time), or whether he has died, we do not know. We simply know that there are going to be decisions made which affect everyone in Noah's family, and that these decisions will be made apart from Noah and, apparently, apart from God (in fact, this will be a human viewpoint, anti-God decision). What we have here is the first committee decision recorded in the Bible.

At the beginning of each quotation in vv. 3–4, we have the Qal imperative of the verb *yâhab* (יָהַב) [pronounced *yaw-HAWB^V*]. The form of this verb in the text is *hâbâh* (הִבְּהוּ) [pronounced *haw^b-VAW*], which, although this is said by Owen to be a 2nd person masculine singular, Qal imperative of *yâhab*, it is not the standard form of an imperative (which is often just a shortened

verb). It is used here as a stand-alone adverb of exhortation, meaning *come! come on! come now, go to*. Properly speaking, this ought to have its own Strong's #, but it is incorporated as a form of the verb. We find it used this way in Gen. 11:3–4, 7 38:16 Ex. 1:10; therefore, we have plenty substantiating passages for this understanding. Furthermore, this verb/adverb is found alone and always in the same form (the 2nd person, masculine singular), even when the speaker is clearly speaking to a number of people (as is the case in our passage). Strong's #3051 BDB #396.

You will note that they have bricks and asphalt. The former was likely made from clay, probably found throughout this water-rich valley, and fired. They understood that a fired clay product was quite superior to the simple clay version. The asphalt was probably a petroleum product, also common to that area.

Let me add that, I believe this is the first time in the Bible where fire is mentioned. It is not presented as some great discovery, but as a means to an end. Recall that, in Cain's line, there were metal workers, which implies the use of fire.

Bear in mind that, at this time, man's lifespan, after the flood, was a few hundred years and he had a much stronger and healthier body (obviously) as well as a sharper mind than we do today. Also recall that our modern technological explosion is a little over 300 years old (the patent for the first crude steam engine is 1698).⁶⁸

Our actual time frame is about 100 years, according to the Hebrew text, and about 500 years, according to the Greek text. The Old Testament was originally written in Hebrew and Aramaic. Around 200 B.C. (give or take a century), the Bible was translated into Greek, as most of that part of the world spoke Greek, including the Hebrews (who apparently spoke both Greek and Aramaic). This became the Bible used by Jesus and by the Apostles, for the most part (although, I am unsure which version was read in the synagogues).⁶⁹ One great area of disagreement is the ages of the men in Shem's line in the latter half of this chapter, which line helps us to fix the time of the Tower of Babel.

Gen 11:4 And they said, "Come, let us build us a city and a tower, and its top in the heavens. And let us make a name for ourselves, so that we are not scattered upon the face of the whole earth."

Men decided, in this ancient time, to congregate in this area near the two rivers, and to build a city. One purpose of a high tower would be that, no matter which direction someone traveled, they could look around, find the tower, and return to their settlements. It would act as a beacon commemorating the center of civilization—or, more accurately, commemorating the center of humanity.

⁶⁸ The key to our technological advance is energy.

⁶⁹ Because of one incident in the gospels, my guess is, Greek, as the people understood Jesus' reading of Isaiah in one very dramatic passage.

My educated guess is, that, once they had moved to Shinar, they began to experiment with various types of building materials. Over some period of time (100–500 years after the flood), they have determined that they have 2 abundant raw materials to work with: bricks and a petroleum mortar. Within a few decades, they figure out how to fire bricks and to design and build very durable buildings.

In building this tower, there is an undefined pseudo-spiritual quality here. Literally, the phrase is: *...and a tower and its head [will be] in the [two] heavens...* Throughout the Bible, *narrative* is just like this—we are told what this or that person says or does, but there is rarely an accompanying moral judgment. Rarely is narrative ever stopped, and the writer inserts, “And God thought that was a very bad thing.” Therefore, in order to get the full impact of a passage, we have to look for clues. First of all, we can infer, simply because God’s name is not found here, that this is a pseudo-religious approach, which combined architecture, technological achievement and this tower has some undefined religious quality (*its head will be in the heavens*). Exactly what this meant to the people who built it, is not revealed. However, God will put a stop to this singular, centralized institution, which does give us God’s opinion of this matter (again, a rare thing to find in most narrative passages).

Gen 11:4 And they said, “Come, let us build us a city and a tower, and its top [head] [will be] in the heavens. And let us make a name for ourselves, so that we are not scattered upon the face of the whole earth.”

They urge one another, “**Let us make a name for ourselves.**” Upon leaving the ark, the first thing that Noah does is, he offers up a sacrifice to God. Here, these men—Noah’s descendants—want to glorify themselves. They want to make a name for themselves. We do not know exactly how they will make a name for themselves. Let me suggest that, Noah has died (or is drunk in his tent), and they all understand, to some degree, their impermanence on this earth. It is normal for man to ignore death for much of his life. However, this would be even more so for this group of men who have not really observed much death.

This tower is going to be a permanent achievement, because, over a few decades, they have figured out how to fire brick and to build structures which withstand rain and the elements. So, perhaps a part of what is happening—and I take this from today’s politician’s incessant need to name every building, bridge or structure after himself—perhaps they will inscribe their names and exploits and contributions on the inside of this great tower.

Today, there are going to be times when a governmental building must be built—or, maybe I should say, will be built. Wouldn’t it be refreshing for a politician to take the name of a medal of honor winner and put his name upon that building, and, on the entryway of that building, have the text permanently set in stone along the wall?

Back to reality: Then these men indicate the reason for building this city and this tower: *“...so that we are not scattered upon the face of the whole earth.”*

Recall God's command to Noah and his sons: "But you, be fruitful and multiply; spread out over the earth and multiply on it." (Gen. 9:7). However, just 3 or 4 generations later, their mantra was "Let's build a city for ourselves and a tower with its top in the sky. Let us make a name for ourselves so that we won't become scattered all over the face of the earth." These men are exalting themselves—"Let us make a name for ourselves"—and they have decided that, becoming scattered throughout the earth, separated from one another, is a bad thing.

You will note that this came about from discussions, where they urged one another, and did so totally apart from the Word of God. This was the decision of a committee. These men are not far removed from the flood, however, for the vast majority of mankind, the flood was some event in the distant past (for most people, whatever happened before they were born is the distant past). We know that antediluvian information was passed along—from parents to their children—because we have Gen. 1–9 today and we have both mythology and the story of the flood, which is a part of nearly every culture. However, even though Shem is definitely alive at this time, civilization is quickly moving away from God.

You may wonder, how is this possible? We are a 100–500 years out from the flood; how can man be this negative? Only 4 men actually witnessed the flood. Only 4 men have even seen the ark. It is now 5 or 6 generations later (this is not a guess on my part, but will be confirmed in the second half of this chapter—Gen. 11:17–19). If every family had 10 children, there could be as many as 300,000 people alive at this point in time, which is Peleg's generation (who Peleg is, is coming up in a few lessons). Only 10 people saw the ark, lived in the ark and endured the flood (2 of them may even be dead by this time). For 300,000 people, it is just something their great, great, great, great grandparents talk about. They did not see the flood. They did not hear the voice of God. These old people have told them all kinds of things. I suspect that most of these people believed that a flood took place, but, still, they are the new generation, and they have a new way of thinking and a new way of doing things.

So they actually begin to build this city and this tower, which marks the center of humanity—a tower which reaches into the heavens and a city which establishes, in their minds, the greatness of mankind.

The narrative tells us that man is building this city and this tower, and that God doesn't like it (we haven't gotten to that yet). This would lead us to ask the question...

What is the problem with this tower?

- The average reader has no concept of what is occurring here. God has mandated that man fill to the earth (Gen. 1:28 9:1). They are choosing to remain in one place.
- Instead of building an altar to God, as did Noah (Gen. 8:20–21), they built a monument to themselves (Gen. 11:4). Therefore, they were glorifying themselves, not God.
- This tower and city are all about the glorification of mankind. "Let us make a

What is the problem with this tower?

- **name for ourselves,”** is part of the urging which first took place.
- The tower references heaven rather than God. Controlling the vocabulary means that you can control the thinking of a people. The idea behind this tower sounds holy, but it is not. As I write these words, there is a parallel to this in the news. There is an Islamic imam who is behind building a 13 story mosque/community center in New York City within a block or so of the fallen Twin Towers. This imam says that he is all about *building bridges* (whatever that means), so the mosque is presented as one thing, but its purpose is something entirely different (it clearly marks and celebrates the killing of 3000 Americans by Muslims).
- Often towers were built for pagan deity worship; archeology has discovered in Mesopotamia terraced towers, ziggurats, designed for that purpose. It is possible that they had this in mind, to worship the deities of the antediluvian era.
- Why does this tower have to reach into the heavens? This is so they have a place to flee in case there is another flood, which God has promised them that there would not be. They are building this because they do not believe God's Word.
- God's geographical will is for them to spread out across the earth. God's will is for them to establish individual and independent entities throughout the earth (marriage is an example of this, where the couple leave their mothers and fathers and establish themselves as a separate corporate unity). It is not God's will for them to all remain in one geographical area. However, regardless of what God's plan is, they chose to remain there, centered around this great tower.

Despite the sparseness of this narrative, we can get a good idea as to the thinking of mankind.

For additional reading on the Tower of Babel and ziggurats in general, let me suggest this webpage:

<http://www.christiananswers.net/q-abr/abr-a021.html>

Lesson 92: Genesis 11:1–9

God Confuses the Languages

So far, we have studied the first 4 verses of this chapter:

Gen 11:1–4 And the whole earth was of one language and of one speech. And it happened, as they traveled from the east, they found a plain in the land of Shinar. And they lived there. And they said to one another, “Come, let us make brick and burn them thoroughly.” And they had brick for stone, and they had asphalt for mortar. And they said, “Come, let us build us a city and a tower, and its top [head] [will be] in the heavens. And let us make a name for ourselves, so that we are not scattered upon the face of the whole earth.”

We found that, even though this is narrative, we were able to determine what the problem was with this tower. It represented the glorification of man; it was to be a rallying point in order to keep the human race together; it was man's distrust of God's promise not to flood the earth again, and there was an undefined heathenistic religious quality to it.

Now God enters into the picture. Insofar as we know, over a period of 100–500 years, God has had direct contact with man on only one previous occasion after the flood—when Noah and his family exited the ark, God spoke to Noah. I mention this because there are a plethora of people who write about their frequent interactions directly with God (hopefully, you don't know that these people even exist, because they are either delusional, liars or both).

Gen 11:5 And Jehovah came down to see the city and the tower which the sons of Adam [or, *the sons of man*] had built.

You recall that I mentioned anthropopathisms, where a characteristic of man is applied to God. God is omnipresent, so that He does not have to go from point A to point B in order to observe something. However, such language (called language of accommodation) is used in order to explain what God is doing. It is stated in terms that we understand.

There is probably more to this first verb than a simple anthropathism. Throughout human history, God demonstrates His character and essence to angelic creation, to both fallen and elect angels. As we previously saw, in the [Doctrine of the Angelic Conflict](#), Satan is not now in the Lake of Fire, even though he has been judged and sentenced, because the verdict of his trial is likely being appealed. The basic grounds for appeal is God character and essence. God's wisdom and foresight are at play here. So, what appears to be occurring here is, God brings the angels to observe His next act. Therefore, they all come down to earth to this partially-built city and tower and what God will do. Recall, God told man to spread out throughout the earth, and man has said, "We like it right here, just fine; so we're going to stay right here."

Gen 11:6 And Jehovah said, "Listen, the people *are* one and they all have one language. And this [the building of the city and tower] they begin to do. And now nothing which they have imagined to do will be restrained from them.

Who is God talking to? God could be talking to God (God the Father I speaking to the other members of the Godhead), just as we find in Gen. 1:26 2:18 Psalm 2:7 110:1. I believe this is literal speech, and that the purpose here is to inform the angels, both fallen and elect, of what God is doing. So I believe that God is talking to angelic creation. The first word of this sentence tells us why this is God speaking to angels and not God speaking to God. In fact, many times that God speaks, it is for the benefit of angelic creation.

The first word used here is the demonstrative adverb/interjection *hên* (הֵן) [pronounced *hayn*], which means *lo!, behold, observe, look, look here, get this, listen, listen up*. This is the kind of word that you use when speaking to another person or to a group, and you either want

their attention, you want them to take a look at something, or you are making a salient point. I often watch a panel of commentators on FoxNews on Special Report, and they use this word all of the time. Several times, in the same segment, you will hear one or more of them say, "Look..." That is exactly what God is saying here (I would not be surprised if a young Charles Krauthammer did not read this passage and say to himself, "I like the sound of that word; it is concise and grabs the attention of others, so that I can make a salient point."). Strong's #2005 BDB #243. Because of the use of this word, let me suggest that this tells us that God is speaking to someone else, outside of the Godhead, and He is drawing their attention to something and to make an important point. God the Father does not need to say to God the Son, "Listen up, [I am about to say something important]..." But God may need to do this when speaking to fallen angels.

Gen 11:6 And Jehovah said, "Listen, the people *are one* and they all have one language. And this they begin to do. And now nothing which they have imagined to do will be restrained from them.

God says that the people *are one*. This indicates that they are able to form a consensus and to move in the same direction. They have one language, so that everyone is able to contribute. What they have begun to do is build this city and this tower.

The phrase *imagined to do* is 2 verbs separated by a lamed preposition. The first verb is the Qal imperfect of *zâmam* (זָמַם) [pronounced *zaw-MAHM*], which means *to consider, to purpose, to devise [a plot]; to plot [evil]; to imagine*. Strong's #2161 BDB #273. The second verb is the Qal infinitive of a very common verb which means *to do, to work, to make, to produce*. In the situation which mankind finds itself, there are no restraints upon them. Almost anything that they can conceive of, they can do.

God is very cognizant of human knowledge and the ability of man to make huge leaps in technology in a very short amount of time. In the end times, Daniel records that, "**Many will travel everywhere, and knowledge will increase.**" (Daniel 8:4b). One of the characteristics of the end times is a dramatic increase in the ability to travel and the dramatic increase of knowledge.

If we can go from a crude steam engine to computers in 300 years, mankind at that point in time could have easily accomplished as much, and in a shorter period of time. God has a plan for mankind, and this plan has a timeline over which, the history of man will run its course. Man's age will gradually be reduced, from generation to generation, as will his mental capabilities. God will see to it that the intellects will be separated by language and geography, and, eventually, by specific racial characteristics.

The importance of having just the right men working together can be seen in our own development of atomic weapons, which was dependent upon Enrico Fermi, an Italian-born scientist and Albert Einstein, a German-born scientist. One may argue that, apart from these two men, born in 2 different countries, and collaborating in a 3rd country (the U.S.), atomic energy and atomic weapons may not have been developed. Both atomic energy and atomic weapons have dramatically changed human history. I could be wrong here,

but I don't know if other countries came up with this technology on their own, or whether it was exported (legally or illegally) from the United States.

Equally important to man's abilities when working together is, man's united ability to work against God. We see that in international systems of communism and Islam, 2 systems which are fanatically anti-God (Islam worships Satan, although they do not realize it). Paul wrote **They profess to know God, but they deny Him by their works. They are detestable, disobedient [and stubborn], and disqualified from [doing] any good work** (Titus 1:16). And **[Satan's] ministers transform themselves as ministers of righteousness, whose end will be according to their works** (2Cor. 11:15b).

It is fundamental for the believer in Jesus Christ to recognize, God chose to separate mankind into nations. There could have been one nation in the world, and God specifically chose for that not to happen. That should tell you God's opinion of the U.N., of Islam, of communism and of internationalist movements in general.

Gen 11:7 Come, let Us go down and let Us confuse their language there, so that they cannot understand one another's speech."

In vv. 3–4, men twice saying to one another, *come, let us do thus and so*. So now God becomes involved, and He uses the exact same verb/adverb as man used.

We will notice here that, the Trinity is suggested, as Jehovah God is speaking to someone, and He says, "Let Us go down there..." God, as a Trinity, will take action at this point in time. Again, this is spoken aloud for the benefit of angelic creation.

In v. 5, God is said to *come down*, which normally, we would understand as language of accommodation. Here, it is different. We have the same verb in both verses, but in v. 7, it is a 1st person plural with a cohortative *hê* at the end. That means that God is urging those with Him to come down to earth to observe what He is about to do. I would think that those *coming down* would be the Godhead and all angelic creation.

What the Godhead will do is, the 1st person plural, Qal imperfect with the cohortative *hê* of the verb *bâlal* (לָלַב) [pronounced *baw-LAL*] which means to *mingle, mix, confuse, confound*. Strong's #1101 BDB #117. Recall that the imperfect tense can refer to a future act or a process. Here, both concepts are probably at play. From the time that this was spoken, *confusing* the languages would be a future occurrence. However, there seemed to be the added component of languages which caused them to continue to become confounded. This is why we could gather young African Americans into a room with young Irish, and for them to have a very difficult time communicating, even though they all speak English.

We tend to view the Bible as a book which is filled with miracles, and there are undoubtedly miracles found in the Word of God. However, they are rare and more spread out in time than most people realize. At this point in time, after 2000 years of human history, I can think of 2 miracles (after the earth is created): God taking Enoch

(Gen. 5:21–22) and here, the confusion of languages (as has been previously discussed, there is no reason to assume that the flood was a miraculous event).

What we might better understand is, the Bible records God's interaction with man, and these interactions will include instances which appear to be miraculous and other instances where an actual miracle occurs.

A lot of things seem quite miraculous to me: television, computers and airplanes. I have accepted by faith that planes work, and even though I have had the aerodynamics explained to me—the shape of the wings, and how this causes the air to lift it up—the whole concept of tons of steel and personage flying through the air still seems pretty dubious to me (and yet, I still fly). I apparently have great faith in this area.

Since creation, we have had the flood, which could have been miraculous; however, it could have been the result of a convergence of a variety of weather variables set into motion by God (we have already discussed some of these theories).

However, what we have in this chapter is undoubtedly a miracle. At one point in time, men were speaking with one language; and in the next point of time, they were not. I do not see any other reasonable options. Whether they woke up one day, all speaking different languages, or if this occurred instantaneously, in the midst of many conversations, we do not know.

Gen 11:8 So Jehovah scattered them abroad from that place upon the face of all the earth. And they quit building the city.

I have mentioned the Hebrew stems. Here, *to scatter* is in the Hiphil stem, which is the causative stem. This means that God, through this action of confounding their languages, *caused* man to scatter from this place. The imperfect tense indicates that this was a process, and that it did not occur all at once. In other words, the men in this city did not, on day 1, have their languages confused, and, on day 2, go their separate ways. The changing of the languages was probably sudden, but the separation was more gradual.

Since groups of men could not communicate with one another, they could no longer share their knowledge. Therefore, they voluntarily separated from one another. Mechanically, what seems to be the case is, when Charley Brown spoke to Lucy, in his own mind, he was still speaking and thinking in the language that he had always used. Lucy could not understand a word that Charley said, and, in her mind, she believed her thinking and language to remain unchanged as well. For several days, the Hamites walked around this city, and they found that other Hamites spoke their language; but they had no idea what was up with the Semites or the Japhethites. As a result, cooperation was no longer possible, because the speakers of one language would have seen the others as stupid, babbling like idiots for no reason.

The ancient word *Babel* means *to confuse by mixing*. We have retained some of that meaning in our own word *babble*. People all over Babel were babbling, and this no doubt

resulted in fistfights which escalated into feuds, which resulted in a separation of the peoples. Given what we have read in Gen. 10, the language barriers would have been along family lines. Whether God broke them into 3 fundamentally different languages, I could not say; or perhaps He divided them further into clans, which eventually scattered, separating from one another, as per Gen. 10.

If you have ever been in a foreign country, and the people there did not speak English, when you come across someone who does, there is an immediate bond which develops. Furthermore, these groups had natural bonds based upon their familial relationships. So, just as Noah and company all traveled together as a group; smaller groups were formed, based upon their clan and language. These clans decided to spread out, because all around them was confusion and babbling.

The final sentence is, literally, [And so they are ceasing to build the city](#). The verb *to cease, to stop, to leave off* is a Qal imperfect, indicating that building did not stop all at once. So, some people, who were speaking the same language, then moved to the southern section of town, but right next to them would be someone speaking a different language, which would lead to disputes which could not be easily settled. So, over a period of time, the building of this city ceased, as groups of men became frustrated and finally just left.

[Gen 11:9](#) Therefore the name of it is called Babel; because Jehovah confused the language of all the earth there. And from there Jehovah scattered them abroad on the face of all the earth.

Babel means *confusion* and it is similar to the verb found in this verse. *Babel* (like most proper nouns) is transliterated from the Hebrew to English, which means that the spelling and pronunciation is very similar in the two languages. We get from this word *babble* (note the consonantal equivalence), which describes how the other languages would have sounded to the people there. Babel is an onomatopoeic word, describing what one language sounds like to a person who does not speak it: babble, babble, babble. The word *Barbarian* is built upon the same concept, where the language of the foreigner sounded like *bar, bar, bar* to other nationalities.

The name of the city, Babel, is based upon the verb in this verse, which is *bâlal* (בלל) [pronounced *baw-LAL*]; and it means to *minge, mix, confuse, confound*. Strong's #1101 BDB #117.

You may choose to doubt what is in the Bible. You may choose to believe that this is just some made-up story. God gave us free will, to think and believe as we choose to. However, why would *Babel*, the most ancient city in the world, at the center of the cradle of civilization, have that name? Its name and meaning are so lacking in dispute that our own language even today reflects its original meaning.

This confusion of the languages was a miracle, meaning that it occurred outside of the laws of science (which is, by the way, a misnomer, as science does not establish or enforce scientific laws; science merely observes and classifies the laws of God).

Gen 11:9 Therefore the name of it is called Babel; because Jehovah confused the language of all the earth there. And from there Jehovah scattered them abroad on the face of all the earth.

This final sentence, where Jehovah scatters them upon the face of the earth, *scatter* is a Qal perfect, indicating that the writer now looks at this as a completed event.

What follows was interesting to me. I do not know exactly how factual all of this is, not being an expert in philology, but it is fascinating if true.

Philology from Bible Believers . Org

"Philology," which is the science of the structure and development of language, has discovered three parent groups of languages and peoples: Aryan, Semitic, and Turanian (who are Asiatic and neither Aryan nor Semitic)-Japheth, Shem, and Ham. Family traits are evident in the languages of the different groups as language determines or reflects the way men conceive of things.

The Japhetic or the Indo-Europeans have maintained the evident relationships in their particular family of languages. And the same observation applies to the Semitic languages. Even though they have spread so widely, they have continued to share a certain way of viewing things. Indo-Europeans philosophically with an emphasis on the abstract, and the Semites with their emphasis upon behavior from a more transcendental point of view.

From all over the world, wherever Ham and Canaan are found, the witness is to an entirely practical view of the world, rooted in the present, wise in a canny sort of way, specific, particular, uninterested in the abstract, always inventing new words or new terms for things, interested in particulars rather than categories, earthy, and very largely disinterested in unlikely possibilities.

The family of the Indo-European languages is readily identifiable as a family, as are the Semitic tongues. The Hamites, however, have been so inventive, they devise terms with equal facility and their languages are in such a state of flux that within a few generations, even tribes living just across the river will find themselves scarcely able to converse.

This strange tendency which has prevented the Egyptians, Hittites, Sumerians, Chinese and Central American Indians from developing an alphabetical script may have been Providence, guaranteeing the quick dispersal of Ham all over the world. Many cuneiform scholars have noted the similarities between Sumerian and Chinese. "Civilization has traveled with the sun, from the east, coming west. . . . The oldest civilization is China, . . . And sin has traveled with civilization" (We Have Seen His Star and Have Come to Worship Him, 28:188).

What divided the Hamites in this way was not a difference in language structure, for the philosophy of their languages remained remarkably similar, so that the ways of thinking of the African native, the Chinese peasant, and the American Indian have remained for a very long time comparable: it was the vocabularies which changed.

Philology from Bible Believers . Org

According to Genesis 10:32, the families of the sons of Noah are divided or separated by languages into tribes and nations. These boundaries also knit them together in their generic group. This is a protective measure to ensure each people would be separate yet interdependent in order to realize the maximum capacity of man with his tremendous creative potential.

Any attempt to unify the world's language, to co-mingle the races or nations with the overt intention of making all men share equally in this potential will only serve to defeat its own purpose in the end. Thus Esperanto, "multiculturalism," gender equality, the UN, WCC and "the brotherhood of all mankind", are artificial, in direct opposition to God's purposes, and in a manner of speaking, a repetition of the hubris of Babel (Genesis 11:1-6 Matthew 24:37-38)

Taken from: <http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/bb000319.htm>

Lesson 93: Genesis 11

Archaeology, Primitive Man and Evolution

At this point, we are in the middle of Gen. 11. We have just covered the Tower of Babel, and the indirect scattering of man due to the confusion of the languages. In the chapter previous, we studied the families of man, and which people came from which person (or family). We are about ready to study a straight-line genealogy which fixes the time when man began on this earth. We will actually be able to place some fairly hard dates on the flood itself, although there will end up being a range of 875 years because of the differences between the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts. Therefore, it will be helpful for us to take a look at archaeology.

It is important that we have some kind of an idea as to what life was like during these times insofar as ancient history and archeology reveal to us. Due to preconceived ideas, most modern scholars see this period of time as being exceptionally primitive, which contradicts the Bible. We have a change in the languages for a majority of the population of the earth, as well as some physical and mental degeneration after the flood, which would require a new written language for them.

Two common archeological assumptions which contradict the Bible are: (1) early man was more primitive back then, than he is today; and (2) early man worshipped a pantheon of gods, and later *evolved* to worshipping one God.

Never underestimate the power of a philosophy and approach which is anti-God and, particularly, anti-Bible. You must recognize that there are those who will favor theory and philosophy above truth and actual scientific discovery.

Let me give you some examples where science has favored theory and philosophy over truth: man is said to have walked the earth 3 million years ago as homo habilis, then 2 million years ago as homo erectus, and then 1 million years ago as homo sapiens (if my

memory of such things can be depended upon). We would expect the fossil evidence to support this general classification of the evolution of man. However, it does not—all these various forms of man are found all over the time-map (placed there by paleontologists by their own dates), with no regards to this long-standing evolutionary classification. So, even though the actual evidence accepted by paleontologists contradicts this evolutionary progression of man, these groupings are taught virtually everywhere to have evolved one from the other.

Marvin Lubenow, who wrote the excellent book, *Bones of Contention*, tells about one of his classes at a Christian college, where he assigned each student 5 human or australopithecine (our supposed ancestors) fossils to research (for a total of 150 human and pre-human fossils). The students were to spend no less than 8 hours each on this research, they needed to study at least 5 separate sources on each fossil, and they needed to find an agreed upon date for each fossil. The students found out that there was very little agreement among evolutionists, so they were allowed to assign a date to a fossil if they could find two independent sources who agreed upon a date for that fossil. Then, part of the assignment included the students affixing their fossils to a timeline (obviously, not the actual fossil itself). What would have been expected is, australopithecine fossils could be found clustering around 4 to 5 million years ago, homo habilis 3 mya, homo erectus 2 mya, and homo sapiens 1 mya. No such clustering takes place. Using the numbers which *evolutionists* give to these various fossils, there was no such organization occurring on the human timeline.

Lubenow admits that he loaded the dice, to some degree, and included some of the more obscure human fossils—those about which, very little has been written, but have been discovered and classified by evolutionary scientists. There are some fossils which receive a lot of press, but the majority of human and pre-human fossils are unknown to the general public. This latter group of fossils are known within the archaeological community, their findings having been written up in various archaeological journals and studies, but they are not known to the outside world. We don't find them in textbooks or in Time Magazine articles about the latest discovery in evolution. In fact, there are a lot of these fossils which do not fit into evolutionary theory.

This resulting timeline always has quite an impact upon the students, who do their own independent research, where the results are always the same—there is no clustering of our ancestors as evolutionary science tells us.⁷⁰ They find out other things as well. An ancient fossil is discovered, classified as one kind of human; and dated; and then, if the date is not right, this fossil is often *reclassified*. Everything I have read in evolution books indicates that homo habilis, homo erectus and homo sapiens are distinct evolutionary families of man. Therefore, how do you take a fossil which is clearly determined to be a homo sapiens and then, suddenly determine that, it is a homo habilis fossil? This happens a lot in evolution, because theory is more important than truth.

⁷⁰ This is from Marvin Lubenow's *Bones of Contention*, Baker Books, ©2004, pp. 17–20

I have previously mentioned that I have taught my students about the population growth curve and the associated exponential growth curve, and, armed with calculators and their notes, I then take them to the library and ask them to determine at what point in time were there 100 people on this earth, according to any population figures which they want to use (this assignment requires 2 sets of world population figures from any point in time in human history). I always remind them that, according to evolution, man is a million years old. Most of them believe in evolution. Consequently, they are quite surprised when their mathematical calculations lead them to answers of man being a few thousand years old, as opposed to their answers being in the hundreds of thousands or millions of years. Like Lubenow, I simply give the assignment. They use a human population growth formula found in virtually every Calculus and Pre-Calculus book in the world (and, at one time, found in nearly every Algebra II book) and they are free, in the library, to get their figures from any book they choose. What is even better, is when I get the precocious student, who checked with his older brother or sister, and knows that this assignment is coming up, and they figure out how to choose numbers which yield the oldest age for man. If memory serves, by their intentional loading of the dice in order to get the oldest age for man possible, a couple of my students came up with 20,000 or 25,000 years. As I found out, independent of Lubenow, when the child does the work himself, it is often more effective, and it stays with him longer.

Mathematically, there is no way to match up mathematical population models with human evolution. We have discussed this before. Mankind being less than 10,000 years old matches up nicely with mathematical population growth models; Homo sapiens being 1 million years old does not match up with any population growth model. Is this mentioned in any college or high school course or textbook? Hardly. That is because theory is more important than evidence, and contrary evidence is set aside.

Ask yourself that, in an age where you can find a summary of every television show along with the plotlines and cast for each episode on the internet, why don't we find the same thing for human fossils? Why can't we go to Evolution.com or Evolution.org and find a list of every single ancient human who has been unearthed, all of the pertinent information about this fossil (e.g., where is it, who has it, what does it consist of, photographs, when was this fossil alive, who discovered it, how its age and classification was determined, etc.), along with any pictures of same. And then, on some timeline, have these human fossils placed. The problem would be, according to the data of evolutionary scientists, there would not be this nice grouping of 3 kinds of man, but they would be scattered willy nilly on such a timeline. Homo sapiens would be too old, homo habilis would be too recent, and it would not conform to this model which evolutionary science has given us. This is why we do not even have a reference book on fossil man where all of the fossils are listed, with all of their pertinent information, which these individual fossil being dropped onto a timeline according to scientific consensus. Such a reference book seems like it would be fundamental to the study of evolution, and yet, this reference book does not exist. You will find a greater variety of human and pre-human fossils in Lubenow's book than you will in any reference book on the same subject (he lists around 300 human fossils with much of this information). Why would someone who disputes evolution fill up his book with

scientific discoveries which are not found in reference book favoring evolution? It is because theory is more important than truth.

What few students or adults know is that, the disagreements of multi-degreed evolutionists is profound. They agree only on one thing: the concept of evolution, and on just about nothing else. This information is rarely presented to high school or college students studying these things (I was taught evolution in college in a math course and in a child development course, if memory serves; and, of course, in my high school or Junior High science classes). Furthermore, there are various pictures, graphs, brain-size comparisons, etc. which are found in textbooks and museums which have been debunked as absolutely false (by evolutionary scientists), for the most part, and yet continue to find their way into classrooms and museums.

Although there is a great opportunity here to teach debate, critical thinking, scientific evidence, etc., this is almost never seized upon by a science teacher. There is a multitude of information out there, both for and against evolution, for this or that theory of evolution, and what more engaging way to get a class stimulated than to put this up for debate, but, for most science teachers, this would be sacrilegious. The idea of even considering God specifically creating man as recently as 6500 years ago is just, in their minds, ridiculous. Furthermore, I can guarantee you that, if some upstart science teacher opened up this topic to debate in his classes, this would be tamped down so fast by his colleagues that his head would spin. He would be called in to meetings, berated in front of his peers, and incessantly attacked, simply for allowing his students to question and debate evolution.

Can you point to an accepted scientific textbook anywhere that opens up evolution to a fair and reasonable debate? Can you point to a textbook which reveals that differences between evolutionary scientists are not minor but profound? Of course not. However, if you disagree with some philosophical tenet of science, and you will be labeled as being *at war with science*.

Most of what I have just written, could also be said of the science of *global warming*, now called *climate change*; which *science* has also found its way into the classroom. This is a very young science, and there is profound disagreement in this area; and what greater motivating factor than to jazz up students by getting them to debate; but is this found in the public schools? Not to my knowledge. Global warming is, and Al Gore's film is; and the notion that, if you recycle, change the light bulbs in your house, and drive a tiny car when you grow up, that will really help the earth—that is taught.

Let me give you one more example of how philosophy supercedes the facts: I was in grammar school in the 50's and in high school in the 60's, and schools were not seen as so radicalized at that point. However, I came out of my education believing in my heart that most of our founding fathers were deists (that is, they believed that God started up the world and then wandered off to do something else, and left everything in our hands to deal with). I did not know what Christianity was at that time in my life, but I was taught clearly that our founding fathers did not believe in it.

I was also brought up to believe that there ought to be a dramatic wall of separation between public education and anything related to the Bible, and I had the impression that was the intention of the Founding Fathers. Neither of these *facts* are true, and we have copious original documents to show that most of the founding fathers were Protestant Christians who believed in an active God who was clearly involved in the actual founding of our country (the common name for God at that time was Providence, always capitalized). Almost every educational institution, both private and public, was originally founded upon teaching reading and writing **so that one might study the Bible**. 187 of the first 200 colleges in America were Christian, they were Bible teaching institutions.

The idea of separating the Bible from education in our early years as a nation would have been seen as preposterous. We are the nation that we are today, because Bible-believing Christians tried to formulate a government which allowed great freedom and which did not allow one protestant group to persecute another protestant group. Throughout our early history, there has always been a co-mingling of prayers, the Bible and government, stopping short of proclaiming that Baptists, for instance, are the most accurate purveyors of truth.

But, what would happen today if a teacher read or posted a verse from the Bible or even just kept a Bible on his or her desk? In my former classroom, I posted all kinds of quotations about the room, but what would have happened if some of these came from the Bible? I could put up the words of Shakespear, Euclid, Frank Zappa and Cecil Adams, without a word being said, but if I added to these quotations something from the Bible, at some point in time, that would be questioned, and I might even be asked to remove it. Particularly, if that verse was, **Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and you will be saved** (Acts 16:31a). The Supreme Court in 1980 actually ruled that the Ten Commandments could not be displayed on a classroom wall, despite the fact that they are accepted by Christians, Jews and Muslims!

This year (2010), in Florida public schools, they celebrate religious freedom day. So, nonprofit groups wanted to distribute Bibles (with disclaimers on the inside covers of the Bibles). Nope, there would be no distribution of Bibles on religious freedom day; Bibles were banned!

A school in Fort Wayne, Indiana has allowed the teaching of Bible classes as a part of its curriculum since 1944. The ACLU this year filed suit against this school district and got them to stop this evil practice.

In Knoxville, TN, students at a grammar school apparently gathered for a Bible study during recess, and this is now being litigated.

This is how powerful the forces are which work against God and against truth and against the Bible. A significant portion of all lawsuits against schools and school districts over the past several decades are related to the Bible, Christian clubs, Christmas carols, etc. The

NEA (the National Education Association) promotes and recommends a book actually dedicated to Satan,⁷¹ but they would never ever suggest that one read the Bible.

The Supreme Court has not always ruled that the Bible has no place in the classroom. In 1799 *Runkel v. Winemiller*, Justice Samuel Chase concluded: "By our form of government, the Christian religion is the established religion, and all sects and denominations of Christians are placed on the same equal footing."

In 1844 *Vidal v. Girard*, the ruling included these words: "Why may not the Bible, and especially the New Testament be read and taught as a divine revelation in the schools --its general precepts expounded and its glorious principles of morality inculcated? Where can the purest principles of morality be learned so clearly or so perfectly as from the New Testament?"

My point in all of this is, there are powerful forces which want you to believe a certain way, and history and science are both manipulated, edited and falsified in order to get you to think that way. Therefore, most of us believe that ancient man was not very smart, had little or no technology, beyond pottery plates, bowls and beverage containers, and that man evolved mentally, spiritually and technologically. That is the philosophy, and all the information that you will find in the average textbook, will support that view. Two lessons from now, you will see a chart of ancient technology which is going to greatly surprise you.

Coming from the hand of God—and let me stress that this is a personal theory—early man's comprehension and memory was phenomenal, so that everything, or very nearly everything, that early man heard, he retained. We do not know when a written language was developed. My guess is, there was no written language until after the confusion of the languages, and here is why: the mind of Adam (and his early descendants) was so powerful that, they had no reason to write anything down. They heard something once and they remembered it. There would be no reason to record contracts, land agreements, trade and purchase agreements, because this could be discussed, an agreement could be reached, and everyone heard, understood and could remember this agreement. Furthermore, these men stood by their agreements, for the most part (I deal with contracts all of the time, today, and for most people, the contracts that they sign is just some piece of paper which stands between them and what they want).

At this point in our technologically advanced age, we do not fully understand why we remember some things and forget others; why our brain prints and retains some information, and yet, other information seems to be printed and becomes almost immediately inaccessible (lack of short-term memory). Ideally speaking, our own minds seem as though they ought to keep all of our memories somewhere, which is why hypnotism, rightly or wrongly, is used to dredge up old memories. And for all of us, who meet a person and then, 2 seconds later, have forgotten that person's name, know that sometimes information just does not seem to print at all.

⁷¹ See <http://www.nea.org/tools/17231.htm> (Saul Alinsky dedicates his book to the first radical, Satan).

As man degenerated physically, he also degenerated mentally, and a written language became a necessity. Since man needed a written language, he developed one. My guess is, this occurred after the flood and after the confusion of languages.

Lesson 94: Genesis 11

Traditional Archaeological Views

Some assumptions of archeology have remained unchanged since the early 19th century. It was at that time that archeologists separated the earth into several layers representing various time periods and we have held to that model until this day even though it was made prior to carbon dating methods at a time when very little fossil evidence had been uncovered. It was at that time that ancient history was separated into three ages: the Stone Age (10,000–3200 B.C.), the Bronze Age (3200-1200 B.C.) and the Iron Age (1200–330 B.C.). For this reason, a lot of archeological finds are grouped into these preordained time periods. Only organic matter may be dated using C-14 dating methods and there is a dearth of organic matter to be found in Palestinian excavations. Therefore, a lot of dating is done by strata (that is, if it is found in a certain layer, then it is dated according to that layer). This is primarily true of dating layers of earth which is determined to be pre-man.

In terms of a Biblical timeline, there has been some corruption of Biblical texts in regards to the years given. The years given in the Masoretic text are slightly different from those in the Greek text (the very early translation from Hebrew into Greek of the Old Testament; and this translated used very old Hebrew manuscripts which are not available to us today). Also, there is one name left out of Shem's line in the Massoretic text, which is found in the Greek text. It is, in part, for these reasons that it is difficult to correlate Biblical and archeological dates. Somewhere in the Middle Bronze Age (after 2300 B.C.) is when we begin to see greater correlation between archeological dating and Biblical dates. The dates given for the Old Stone Age (also known as the Paleolithic Age) is based as much upon evolution and geological **theories** as it is upon sound archeological evidence. There is no existing archeological evidence which requires us to go back further in man's history than 10,000 B.C.⁷²

It is assumed by archeology, but not taught by the Bible, that earliest man primarily hunted and gathered food from nature. Their earliest implements were made of flint and chipped stone. This is what is known as the Paleolithic period. It is very likely that some groups from Gen. 11 functioned that way, but farming predates the flood and Noah was a farmer immediately after the flood, so there did exist some agrarian societies before and after the flood (recall that Cain was also a farmer).

The second period of the Stone Age, the Mesolithic period, was when, according to archeological assumptions, we first saw food-producing societies and real settlements. There certainly existed advances in the arts of civilization during this time. The Bible would group these two periods of time together.

⁷² *The Bible Almanac*, p. 94

As Charles Clough points out, the original inhabitants of the ark emerged to a cruel world. Even though the antediluvian people were forbidden to enter into the garden of God, they still seemed to have a very moist, and comfortable climate with a great deal of vegetation. However, those in the ark first emerged to a flood-ruined land with some, but very little vegetation. In fact, it was possibly due to the lack of vegetation that they were given permission to eat animals, as they had additional clean beasts on the ark.

The third part of the stone age is called the Neolithic period, which began about 5000 B.C., and it is at this point where the **interpretations** of archeological finds and the Bible begin to fall into some agreement. With all the clay available to the post-diluvian societies, and the lack of large trees, they made mud-brick shelters, which, after a few heavy rains, disintegrated to nothing. Charles Clough points out where archeology assumes that each stage of building these mud huts represents a century, the first few stages more than likely represent a decade or less for each layer of mud huts. Man certainly experimented and his first mud huts were worthless. Afterward, he learned to fire his clay bricks and to affix them with a mortar for a more permanent dwelling.

When Noah and his family came down from the mountains from the east and moved into the Euphrates valley, there would have been far more water on the ground and far more rain, and much more temperate weather as a result. In Gen. 11:1–4, man built a city with a great tower. There is no reason to think that, immediately upon leaving the mountains that they built successful buildings, but, given their age and intellect, within 100–200 years (or less), they were probably building a city which could withstand heavy rains.

In archeological sites in Jericho (Jericho is in Israel; not in the Euphrates valley), we have four Neolithic periods; two which were pre-pottery and two which had pottery. This would correlate with eventually discovering how to fire bricks to make shelters which would withstand rain. With the first group in Jericho, we have found massive defensive walls which have been built. After this wall was destroyed (perhaps by invaders and likely by heavy rains), the second period of time still lacks the ability to make pottery, but they did make realistic portraits of human heads or skulls using clay for molding and shell inset for eyes. The next group in Jericho could make pottery. We do not know if these were new groups which supplanted to original peoples, or whether these ages represented technological advances.

It may occur to you, how can man successfully figure out how to build a city in Shinar (in the Euphrates Valley), and then, hundreds of years later, experiment once again with building? Technology is built upon technology. There is not a person alive in the world today who could build, from raw materials, an airplane, a car or a computer (or even a stainless steel fork). When man dispersed, some families had some knowledge of *this*; and others had some knowledge of *that*. When man began to spread out, he faced different environments with different building materials. Whatever shelters were built to begin with, would have reflected expediency, a loss of some technology and a new set of raw building materials. Expediency may have been the biggest factor. This occurs today. On a plot of ground, a person may first set up a trailer; then he may build a frame home, and then he may build a brick home. It is not that this person has never heard of bricks

before and discovers them right before building his brick home; he started out simply lacking in resources, and did what he could. This could explain mud huts which were later replaced by better mud huts, which were later replaced with brick huts, all occurring not over a century or two, but over a few decades (as Clough suggests). Given the rains, which were probably much heavier in the Middle east at this time, it would not take much time for a few heavy rains to take out the first mud huts in Babel, and later in Jericho.

Prior to the Neolithic Age (the "New Stone Age"), people appeared to live in small migrating groups which had no permanent settlements but they did seem to return to the same areas sometimes for generations. They were concerned with hunting and agriculture and some had hunting camps which were separate from these settlements.

Neolithic peoples domesticated wild animals and were familiar with irrigation and storage insofar as agriculture was concerned. Certainly, most communities would do both, and some would specialize, depending upon the personal preferences of the group. Neolithic villages have been discovered in the mountains of northern Iraq, indicating that these small, roving bands had begun to settle down in one place, but away from Shinar.

It is important to recognize that man is not a monolithic being. People did not spread out from the Tower of Babel and all do exactly the same thing at the same time. Some probably settled into areas, some possibly roamed about, and others kept moving until they came upon a plot of ground that they liked and could defend. Some carried various aspects of technology with them and others carried other aspects of technology with them.

Recall that these groups of peoples had heard about the antediluvian civilization as well as about the true God and it is quite possible, if not likely, that to the unbelievers, information from the past, given to them orally, became mixed up. After all, most people today who are unsaved and liberal in their religious background see Buddha and Confucius and Jesus Christ as very similar types of people, if not essentially the same. In their eyes, these men represent man's search for God. Christians with any amount of doctrine understand that Buddha and Confucius represent not a search for the truth but a rejection of the truth.

Because of the oral history which they had received, we would expect early, post-deluvian (after the flood) man to be polytheistic, which he is (in some cases). Each had their own gods and goddesses, which would be slightly different because (1) information was passed down orally for several centuries and (2) each group had its own language. We find evidence that there would be a power shifting to the local cult and the officiators of that cult. The result as often what we call a temple-town, when many of the citizens worked for the local temple in one way or another. Some built religious towers (ziggurats). We would expect this because even though the fallen angels who cohabited with man in the antediluvian era have been put into chains of darkness, there still remains perhaps millions of fallen angels who desire to interact with man. They are able to do this through pagan religions. We would further expect to see a power struggle and to see power shift into the hands of these cults, and that is what history seems to bear out.

As these racial groups separated and moved away from Babel, they also began to record their language in writing and to keep economic records. Most (probably all) developed arithmetic and they recorded their myths, legends, ethics, history, laws, songs and literature. So, by Abram's time, many of these villages and temple-towns had put their language into writing. There were certainly struggles between groups for land and buildings and some groups conquered other groups, causing an amalgamation of language, religion and customs. Although it seems that Neolithic man was pretty consistent in their polytheism, or worship of many gods, we also have evidence of ancient monotheism as well. In fact, what we would expect is monotheism predating polytheism, and for polytheism to be based, in part, upon Gen. 6 (the intermingling of man and angelic beings).

You may wonder, how can ancient man, just a few generations after the flood; and not that far removed even from creation, be polytheistic? It is simple: negative volition. **Because, knowing God, they did not glorify Him as God, neither were thankful. But they became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing to be wise, they became fools and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man, and birds, and four-footed animals, and creeping things. Therefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves. For they changed the truth of God into a lie, and they worshiped and served the created thing more than the Creator, who is blessed forever (Rom. 1:21–25).**⁷³

As Rush Limbaugh often says, “When a person is born, that is when history begins for that person.” So, a few hundred years after the flood and the earth is populated by thousands of people who never witnessed the flood; they have not seen the ark; and these concepts are just words to them. They undoubtedly heard about creation and they undoubtedly heard about the angelic infiltration and the resulting half-human/half-angelic race. But, again, these are just words to them. Every man chooses in his own soul what to believe.

Not too long ago, I spoke to a college professor who told me that everything she believed was based upon *peer-reviewed studies*. First of all, there are not peer-reviewed studies on every aspect of life; and secondly, some of these peer-reviewed studies have been shown to be false. This same woman, a brilliant college professor, also believed that prepared food (as in fast foods) were cheaper than buying unprepared foods (which viewpoint lacks any sort of real logic). My point here is, people believe what they choose to believe.

If you are reading this, you probably believe in Jesus Christ. Now, you have never seen Him; you did not have an apparition of some sort; probably, no one took you through long, complex arguments as to His existence. Someone told you the gospel, that Jesus died for your sins, and you believed. **Though you do not now see Him, you believe in Him (1Peter 1:8b).** For all intents and purposes, you made the free will choice to believe in Him.

⁷³ Even though the Romans passage is a different context, the principle is the same.

At the end of the Stone Age and the beginning of the Bronze age, we have since inserted the Chalcolithic period, which is the copper-stone period. This is around 4000 B.C. or so when copper was used extensively.

Interestingly enough, I came across at least 2 different secular sources which, prior to 10,000 B.C. there was an Ice Age which was later followed by higher ocean levels (which would be inline with the Biblical narrative).

Traditional View of the Ages				
10,000 B.C.	8000 B.C.	6000 B.C.	4000 B.C.	2000 B.C.
Stone Age			Bronze Age	
Mesolithic Period			Neolithic Era	

The Iron Age begins circa 700 B.C.

I would assume, based upon the information of the Bible, that various groups of people went through these ages at different times.

During the early part of the 3rd millennium B.C., these various groups became city-states. In fact, for all intents and purposes, these were the first empires. As their groups became larger, they became more efficient at providing the daily necessities and it became more important to provide some sort of defense against those from without. We see in history a simultaneous population explosion, better organized religions, and better defined boundaries. We find these early empires scattered throughout the Near East, in Egypt, Elam and the cities of the Mesopotamian area, Syria and Israel. We have found huge palace complexes and temples and evidence of large-scale commerce, including trade-agreements, cooperation and competition. Much of civilization seemed to be centered about what is known as the fertile crescent; the area in and about the Tigris and Euphrates rivers (which, according to Gen. 11:2, was where civilization began).⁷⁴ With the almost impenetrable Arabian desert in the south (which likely became more and more inhospitable with time), trade between empires often involved routes going through Palestine.

It is during this time which we have also discovered sea-faring nations out on the Mediterranean and the Aegean Sea. It is not inconceivable that there were even a few imitation arks where groups of people built their own ark and launched themselves out into the seas. Satan has always been a great counterfeiter of the truth.

Throughout the 3rd millennium B.C., Egypt had developed into an empire, having gone through dynasties 1-6 prior to Abraham's visit to Egypt. One of the first, great historical records is a plaque of slate, called the Palatte of Narmer which dates back to 3000 B.C., depicting the conquest of Lower Egypt by King Narmer of Upper Egypt (he was unable to

⁷⁴ A proposition which archaeologists would not necessarily agree with.

subjugate it but his successor, Menes was). There is still much confusion surrounding this and some believe that these two are one and the same person. When Mennes united the two sections of Egypt, he proclaimed Horus, the sky god, the national god, and then claimed that he was the incarnation of Horus. Most of the pharaohs of the next several dynasties did likewise.

There is one more lesson on archeology coming up, then we will then return to the exegesis. In this next lesson, you will be exposed to a chart about the technology of ancient man, which you are going to find to be quite surprising.

Lesson 95: Archaeological Assumptions, C-14 Dating and Ancient Technology

We are spending a few lessons on archaeology for several reasons. First, when we come to the end of Gen. 11, we will actually put a date range upon the flood, and therefore, upon the restoration of the earth. We ought to have some idea why archaeology and evolution disagree with these numbers. We also should have some idea about why the Bible teaches somewhat of an inverted evolution and whether or not that can be at all squared with archaeological findings. At the end of this lesson, I will reproduce a chart of what we know about ancient technology, and I think you are going to be quite surprised.

Theologians from centuries ago were not troubled by modern science and modern assumptions, but present-day theologians do not want to appear as though they are *alfalfa-chewing barbarians*⁷⁵ when faced with the assumptions and conclusions of what is called *modern science*. In the past century, modern science has become quite technologically advanced to the point where people view science as some sort of a god and science sees itself that way as well (have you ever heard of the surgeon with a *god-complex*?).

Science has, as a result, become more authoritative, more political and more philosophy driven—particularly in some branches of science. In the realm of evolution, many scientists now equate the evolution theory with the theory of gravity. That is, they are both theories, but who could really doubt them? In the realm of medical advance, there are some scientists who see nothing wrong with abortion—and certainly, nothing wrong with aborting a baby with some clear disease or condition—and, therefore, they see nothing wrong with doing scientific experiments on embryonic stem cells. In this realm, many scientists have taken the position that, *if we can conceive of doing something, then we can do it; after all, we are scientists*. This takes us into the areas of cloning, embryonic stem cell research and abortion. And then, more recently, we have the theory of man-made global warming, which, only 4 decades ago, was the theory of global cooling. Not all doctors and scientists subscribe to these philosophies, approaches or medical procedures. Although doctors have a variety of views on abortion, there are only a few doctors who actually perform them and a few nurses who participate in such a procedure. I knew one such nurse, and it sickened her and plagued her conscience. Even though there is a modern-day push to redistribute wealth as a means of correcting global warming, there are

⁷⁵ I lifted this vocative from Cecil Adams, author of *The Straight Dope* books and columns.

very few scientists actually involved in that movement. In fact, some of the organizations who claim to be involved in global warming research are not even scientists, but people who have cherry-picked scientific research.

So, in many of these areas, science has not just taken on an authoritative position, but a self righteous one as well. Quite obviously, this has bled into politics. I have heard some politicians being fiercely questioned about whether or not they believe in evolution as if this were one of the most important questions to be answered. I recall in the previous election, on many occasions, George W. Bush as being at war with science. For the most part, the Democratic party has aligned itself with embryonic stem cell research, with abortion on demand (often funded in part by taxpayers), and with the idea that, if we charge enough for energy usage, that will save our planet. These are not positions taken by most Democrats; but they are positions taken by their party, and it is done in the name of science.

In the realm of archaeology, there is the problem of theologians latching onto the [Sumerian king list](#). This list gives us a list of kings which reigned before and after the flood. There are parallels between this list and the Biblical account of the flood which are similar. Before the flood, kings ruled for an incredibly long time (18,000 years and longer); and after the flood, their reigns were much shorter. They live in the same area as the Bible speaks of, after the flood. We also appear to be dealing with a Semitic people, which is also in agreement with the Bible. Finally, this list seems to begin to reasonably parallel the Bible around 2300 B.C., where the length of reigns is reasonable and archaeology is comfortable assigning some real dates to these rulers lives. Unfortunately, some theologians have been so anxious to grasp at some extra-Biblical corroboration for the Genesis flood that they have assumed that this list is it, and it isn't.

The main cause of concern for some believers is archaeology and paleontology. Archaeology is the study of ancient man through his relics, monuments, pottery and artifacts. Paleontology is the study of past geological ages based upon the study of fossils. These sciences make several assumptions:

The Assumptions of Archaeology and Paleontology

- The age of man on this earth is very ancient;
- Man evolved from a primate-type being which was not human;
- Man either is, was or has always been in a state of evolution; that is, a progression from more primitive to less primitive to civilized to modern.

The data which these scientist collect are dropped conveniently into these slots of general agreement.

Not all archaeologists and paleontologists make these assumptions. These assumptions are essentially moot with regards to archaeology covering the time of around 2300 B.C. and forward.

It is interesting that, the Bible, the Sumerian King List and archaeology all come together around 2300 B.C.

The dating of man is accomplished by radioactive dating methods and by the strata in which fossils have been found. There are two types of commonly used radioactive dating, carbon-14 and potassium argon dating. C-14 dating is done as follows. All living and previously living things have a certain amount of carbon in them. We constantly ingest and egest carbon and carbon carries within it a minute amount of radioactive carbon, known as C-14. When that which is living dies, it no longer ingests carbon; however, it has a certain amount of carbon within it which has a tiny amount of C-14 within it. The C-14 begins to disintegrate, thus changing the ratio of C-14 to carbon within this once living organism. The half-life of C-14 is approximately 5700 years so that once a living organism dies, the C-14 within it is reduced by weight by half every 5700 years. To get an idea as to the kind of ratio that we are dealing with, there is approximately one atom of radiocarbon for every trillion molecules of carbon dioxide in the air.⁷⁶ It is important to realize that we are dealing with a very minute amount of carbon and an even smaller amount of C-14 (less than one trillionth of the carbon examined) and that this method of dating assumes that the ratio of C-14 to carbon in the atmosphere has always been constant throughout all human history. Since the antediluvian world was probably surrounded by an atmosphere with more water vapor in it than the present world, this may have had an affect upon this ratio. What happened in the flood was cataclysmic, and what set the flood off is unknown. Is it possible that a higher concentration of radioactive carbon was introduced into the earth's atmosphere during these cataclysmic events? I have previously suggested that the earth was struck by meteors or asteroids, which both set off the 40 days of rain and tilted the earth. Although I came up with these thoughts independently, others have hypothesized similar events which set off the great flood of Noah. Such a series of events could have changed the C-14 concentration in the earth's atmosphere, throwing off all calculations which extend beyond 5000 (or so) years ago.

Furthermore, due to the very small amount of carbon that we examine, there is significant time limitation to using this method. Although some have touted C-14 dating as being accurate for 50,000 years, it may not be accurate for even 10,000 years, even assuming atmospheric constancy. Also, the interpretation of the results can be distorted. As Charlie Clough points out, when a piece of wood found in a tomb is tested using carbon dating methods, the age given is not the age of the tomb nor is it the age of the tree when it was put into the tomb but, rather, it is the age of the tree when it was cut down originally. Furthermore, there have been instances where C-14 dating produced clearly inaccurate results.

C-14 Accuracy

In the Proceedings of the Symposium on Radiocarbon Variations and Absolute Chronology held at Uppsala in 1969, T. Säve-Söderbergh and I. U. Olsson introduce

⁷⁶ *World Book Encyclopedia*, Vol. 16 ©1982

their report with these words:

"C-14 dating was being discussed at a symposium on the prehistory of the Nile Valley. A famous American colleague, Professor Brew, briefly summarized a common attitude among archaeologists towards it, as follows: If a C-14 date supports our theories, we put it in the main text. If it does not entirely contradict them, we put it in a footnote. And if it is completely out of date we just drop it. Few archaeologists who have concerned themselves with absolute chronology are innocent of having sometimes applied this method. . ."

Although I came upon at least one critic who followed the *evolution* of this statement, he did not seem to dispute the original statement which is quoted above. His problem with the statement is, there were more and more details being left out (i.e., this was a reference to a very specific arena of study—Egyptian archaeology). With what I know about *human evolution evidence*, this same principle seems to be true in this field of study as well.

The critic: <http://www.ntanet.net/quote.html>

We have several documented instances where living animals or recently dead animals were determined to be thousands of years old. Some living penguins were determined to be 8000 years old; shells of living mollusks have been dated as 23,000 years old, a freshly killed seal was dated as having died 1300 years ago.

My point is, people with agendas, including creationists, will cling to data which they like and dismiss that which they do not. Many of us begin with assumptions in this area (for instance, I believe in man's age being recent, but hesitate to assign any sort of a date to the earth itself).

Potassium-argon dating depends upon the decay of potassium 40 into argon 40. This decay rate is much slower than that of C-14, and is used to date items which might be a million or more years old. Certain rock formations are dated this way. The assumption here is that when some rock formations of Africa show to be 1.5 million years old, then the tools and the bones of primitive man found in that vicinity are also 1.5 million years old. I hope that it is obvious that this does not indicate the true age of the artifacts or the bones found with the rock but, at best, dates only the rock itself.

I have mentioned these methods of dating for several reasons:

- To indicate that the methods of dating are not infallible
- To show you that they are the product of a certain number of assumptions which may or may not be erroneous

Archeologists have, on a number of occasions, come to faulty conclusions. In the Bible, the Elamites are Semitic (descended from Shem). However, 19th century archeology determined that they were Hamitic. This caused a number of people to turn away from the Scriptures as being the Word of God, and liberal protestant theology in the mid-19th century was the result of this (in part). If you cannot trust the basic history of the Bible, then what in the Bible can be trusted? Later, in the 20th century, it was discovered that, in this area

named after Elam, where decidedly Hamitic ancestors were discovered, there were lower layers of people, who were of a distinctly different racial stock. It was determined that the original settlers of Elam were Semitic.⁷⁷ Interestingly enough, liberal protestant theology continued unabated, as it is based more on negative volition toward the Word of God than on specific scientific facts.

The JEPD theory, which believes that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, was based upon faulty assumptions that man had not developed writing by the time of Moses. Even though this assumption has since been proven false, the JEPD theory not only persists, but it is one of the dominant theories taught in seminaries throughout the world. In other words, you can go to a seminary, designed to build up pastors and evangelists for the ministry, which teaches that which is fundamentally false based upon theories and assumptions which have been proven false. This may help to explain why it is hard to find a decent church in your city. So many ministers have been trained to doubt some of the most fundamental facts of Scripture (e.g., the Mosaic authorship of Exodus through Deuteronomy), that Christianity becomes a watered-down morality.

Stratigraphy is the study of various strata of sites where man has lived. Due to man's predisposition toward evolution, it is thought that the stone age came first (which can be separated into different eras), then the Chalcolithic (copper/stone) period, the bronze age, etc. A period of man's history is assigned to these strata which are postulated to be in one of these categories and everything found in that strata are then dated by the strata in which they are found. When man is dated based upon the strata within which he is found, then we are at the mercy of the precepts upon which stratigraphy is founded. That is, a particular human fossil may be determined to be a million years old because the strata in which he is found is assumed to be a million years old. You see, carbon dating destroys portions of the items which are found in archaeological digs, so using this method conserves the organic matter which is found (which is very little in the Palestinian area).

The problem here is that anyone can go out today and find people who are living in one of these *ages*. There are people who are living in the stone age; people who function as hunters and gatherers who join in tribes. It has been a fact throughout all human history that these various kinds of people have lived almost side-by-side since the dawn of man. It is true that many societies go through a period of growth and prosperity in which their culture becomes richer and more diversified during which we see a technological boom. In fact, in many countries today we see a tremendous boom in technology. However, it takes but a superficial examination of human history to see that the world has moved through ages of advance and decline, advance and decline. Man in Rome in the first four centuries A.D. was light years ahead of man in the dark ages, which occurred centuries later.

The second problem with strata identification is, these nice neat strata variations as we would find in any textbook so not agree with what is out there in the real world. A geology textbook has these layers of earth neatly piled upon one another, but, in the real world,

⁷⁷ From: <http://phrasearch.com/Trans/DBM/setup/Genesis/Gen057.htm>

they are random 95% of the time (I have forgotten from where I got that figure). There are all kinds of theories as to why older layers end up on top of more recent strata, but, as I pointed out before, you cannot back up one theory with another theory. That is not logical.

Despite my spending 3 lessons on this material, many people will continue to believe that ancient man with his pottery was undeveloped and barbaric, and modern man is tremendously evolved since then. However, we know a lot about ancient man, and you rarely find this information in any book on archaeology, because it flies in the face archaeological assumptions.

Now, I do not wish to disparage the work of archaeologists or paleontologists. The Bible has been continually vindicated in several areas of archaeology and historical accuracy due to their discoveries. They have also been force-fed certain assumptions throughout their entire school life; and when you are told something long enough at an early enough age by people that you trust and admire, it is only natural to accept those premises. As either Lenin or Hitler said, "A lie told often enough becomes truth."

Will Durant, one of the greatest ancient historians of the 20th century, wrote: *The discoveries here summarized have restored considerable credit to those chapters of Genesis that record the early traditions of the Jews. In its outline, and barring supernatural incidents, the story of the Jews as unfolded in the Old Testament has stood the test of criticism and archeology; every year adds corroboration from documents, monuments, or excavations...we must accept the Biblical account provisionally until it is disproved.*⁷⁸ If Will Durant, a man who knows far more about ancient history than you or I, and a man who doubts Old Testament miracles, can accept that which is not miraculous in the Old Testament as accurate history; how much more ought we, as believers in Jesus Christ, be able to accept the Word of God as it stands written?⁷⁹

Charles Clough, in his book *Dawn of the Kingdom, section III*, gives a list of the technological advances made by early post-diluvian man (he took these from Arthur Custance, *Doorway Papers*). I've reproduced Custance's list below:

Scientific Achievements of Ancient Hamitic Peoples

Mechanical Principles and Applications: Gears, pulleys, lathes, fire pistons, gimbal suspension, suspension bridges, domes and arches, lock gates and lifts, steam engine principle, clockwork mechanism, etc.

Materials: Copper, bronze, iron, cast iron, steel, cement, dyes and inks, rubber, lenses of several types, glass (including possibly a malleable glass), china and porcelain, glues, preservatives, shellacs, varnishes, enamels, gold and silver work (including sheet, wire, and plating of metals), etc.

⁷⁸ *The Story of Civilization; 1. Our Oriental Heritage*, by Will Durant; MJF Books, ©1963; p. 300 (footnote).

⁷⁹ This is the second time I have inserted this quote; it seemed apropos here.

Scientific Achievements of Ancient Hamitic Peoples

Building Techniques, Tools and Materials: Nails, saws, hammers, brace and bit, sandpaper, Carborundum, plans and maps, surveying instruments, central heating systems, window materials, including glass, protective coatings, street drainage systems, sewage drainage on a wide scale, running water in piped systems, piped gas for heating, drills (including diamond drills), buildings of all types (including genuine skyscrapers and earthquake-proof construction), etc.

Fabrics and Weaving: Cotton, silk, wool, linen, felt, lace, needles, gauze, mechanical looms, mending, tapestry, batik, thimbles, parchment, tailored clothing, feather and fur garments, knitted and crocheted materials, all types of thread, ropes up to 12 inches in diameter, paper of all kinds (including coated stocks), etc.

Foods: Aloes, Chickie gum, Tomato, Pears, Cascara, Sweet potato, Kidney beans, Pineapple, Prickly pear, Cereals, Chili pepper, Squash, Cocoa, Cashew and peanut, Corn, Coffee, Manioc, Beans, Tea, Artichoke, Strawberries, Tobacco, Potato, Arrowroot.

Foodgathering Methods: Fish poisons and animal intoxicants, Elephants for labor and land clearance, Traps and nets of all kinds, The use of tamed animals to catch "game": cats for hunting, birds of prey such as eagles, falcons, etc., dogs and cormorants for fishing.

Writing, Painting, etc: Inks, chalks, pencils, crayons, block printing, literary forms, movable type, textbooks, encyclopedias, envelopes and postal stamps, libraries and catalogues, etc.

Medical & Surgical Practices & Instruments: Anaesthetics, Cocaine, Adhesive tapes, Bandages, Poultices, Troches, Decoctions Infusions, Pills, Suppositories Snuffs, Splints Plasters Tourniquet, Enemas, Gargles Lotions Soaps Ointments, Inhalators, Vaccine for smallpox, Cascara and other emetics, Tranquillizing drugs, Caesarian operations, Trephination, Insecticides, Fumigators, Quinine, Surgical stitching, Truth serums, Curare, Animal-stupefying drugs, Surgical instruments: knives, forceps, tweezers, etc., Identification of, and treatment of, hundreds of common diseases and injuries, , including brain and eye operations and surgery in general.

Animals Domesticated: Pigs, Dogs, Llama and Alpaca, Horses, Cats, Sheep, Fowl, Camels, Cows, In agriculture, use of: multiculture and fertilizers mechanical seeders, and such.

Travel Conveyances, etc.: Compass, Canals and locks, Road rollers, Skis, Snowshoes, Toboggans, Sternpost rudder, Wheelbarrows, Cement paving, Surfaced roads, All types of water craft, Stirrups, harness for domestic animals, Wheels: solid, spoked, rimmed and tired, Wheeled vehicles, travois, Boats with water-tight compartments, Bridges (suspension, cantilever, arch, etc.), Use of birds for navigation.

"Aircraft": Balloons, Gliders and helicopters, Kites and Parachutes, Jet Propulsion, Weather-signaling and forecasting.

Scientific Achievements of Ancient Hamitic Peoples

Cosmetics, etc.: Mirrors, Nail polishes, Toothbrushes, Wigs, Scissors, Shaving equipment, Combs, Powders and ointments, Jewelry of all kinds.

Mathematics: Geometry, A kind of logarithms, Trigonometry, Concept of zero, Algebra, Use of place system.

Trade and Commerce: Paper money and coinage, Systems of inspection, Banking houses, Accounting systems, Trade regulations and price-fixing, Wage regulation and compensation, Loans with interest systems, Weights and measures, Postal systems, Formal contracts.

Household Furnishing: Hammocks, Gas cookers, Fans, Folding beds, Oil stoves, Space heaters, A form of "telephone", Rocking stools, Whistling pots and kettles, Go-carts for children, and other toys, Lamps, Clocks, Rotary querns, Running water.

Games: Revolving stages for theaters, Rubber ball games, Board games (chess, checkers, etc.), Wrestling, Lacrosse.

Warfare: Bows and crossbows, Bolas, All types of piercing and striking weapons, Repeating bow, a form of machine gun, Rifled weapons, Guided missiles, Body armour, Aerial bombardment, Flame throwers, Poison gases and toxic agents, Gun powder, Heavy artillery (catapults of several kinds).

Musical Instruments: Tuning forks of various kinds, Wind instruments (organ, pipes, horns, flutes, etc.), String instruments (various modifications of the harp), Percussion instruments (tubes, bars, stones, bells, and diaphragms).

Miscellaneous: Umbrellas, Safety pins, Straws for drinking, Spectacles, Calendars, Telescopes (?), Snow goggles, Cigar holders, finger printing for identification.

Does this sound like the ancient man you have been taught about in school?

Custance explains: *For many readers this list will be entirely unsatisfactory. However, a word of further explanation about it may help to clarify things. Many of the items, in fact the majority of them, could be called Hamitic "firsts". Some of them bear no relationship historically to their western counterparts as far as we can ascertain from a study of the transmission of culture traits. Still, they had the idea before we did. The ingenuity of many of these devices and techniques is truly extraordinary, particularly in view of the paucity of natural resources. It is no exaggeration to state that primitive people have done marvels with their natural resources as they found them. The difficulty for us is that we are deceived by their very simplicity. Whether highly civilized or of primitive culture, the Hamitic people have shown an amazing ability to exploit the immediate resources of their environment to the limit.*

Scientific Achievements of Ancient Hamitic Peoples

It is only recently that we in our culture have become aware of our indebtedness to non-Indo-European people for practically all the basic elements, simple and complex, of our own technological civilization. The only purpose of this list here is to draw attention to the fact that in each of these elements of culture Hamitic peoples got there first and independently, and in most cases were our instructors. As we have already said this aspect of the subject is elaborated with documentation in Part IV of this volume.

We may sum up what has been said thus far by setting forth the following propositions. First, the Table of Nations in Genesis 10 is a historic document indicating how the present population of the world has been derived from Shem, Ham, and Japheth. Secondly, this threefold division is more than merely a genetic variation of certain "racial" types: there is evidence that it is intended to indicate that the three branches of the race were divinely apportioned a characteristic capacity which has been reflected in the unique contribution each branch has rendered in the service of mankind as a whole. And thirdly, the contribution of Shem has been a spiritual one, of Ham a technological one, and of Japheth an intellectual one: in the process of history, these contributions were made effective in this order.

Certainly, ancient man lacked *i-phone* and *WordPerfect*, but this partial list should indicate that these men were not the grunting, semi-civilized, "let's go throw a rock at the head of an animal and see what happens" types, as they are all too-often portrayed. One of the main reasons that the authorship of Moses is questioned by higher critics is that they do not like the idea of such civilized literary content coming from bronze age man. However, it is clear now that writing and language occurred as much as a millennium before Moses.

I reproduced this list to indicate that man has, even in ancient history, been extremely intelligent, very inventive, and that identifying the age of man by stratification, under the assumption that man has progressed over a long period of time from very primitive to highly civilized (I guess we are the ones who view ourselves as being highly civilized), is fraught with inaccurate presuppositions.

This list was taken from:

http://www.custance.org/Library/Volume1/Part_I/Chapter3.html

Arthur Custance's background and credentials are listed here:

<http://custance.org/insight.html>

Having spend such a short time in archeology, we will return to the exegesis of Gen. 11 in the next lesson.

Gen 11:10 These are the generations [toledoth] of Shem. Shem was a hundred years old and fathered Arpachshad two years after the flood.

Recall that Noah had 3 surviving sons who went with him onto the ark: Shem, Ham and Japheth; and that we followed out these generations of Noah in Gen. 10 and saw how the children of each man could be followed out to which area he settled in.

However, now we come back and look at the generations (tôwl^edôth or תולדות) of Shem. We did not look at the toledoth of Ham or Japheth, per se. That is, we did not find this word used in conjunction with them. However, we find this word used with Shem, which, in the Hebrew, should jump out at you. God the Holy Spirit is saying, “This is the line to watch.” This is not always the case when we follow a line, but the repetition of Shem’s line, at this point, stands out, along with the use of the word *toledoth*.

There are two kinds of genealogies generally found in the Bible: there is the *cluster* genealogy which concentrates on the sons, grandsons, and sometimes great grandsons of one man; and then there is the *straight-line* or the *linear* genealogy which is much like a relay race, where the baton is handed off from one generation to the next, and 5–10 generations are listed. Shem had several sons—Elam, and Asshur, and Arpachshad, and Lud, and Aram—but we only look at one of those sons: Arpachshad. He takes the baton from Shem and hands it off to Salah. Salah hands off the baton to Eber, and so it goes. So this is not a repeat of Gen. 10:22–31. Gen. 10 presented 3 cluster genealogies; and this portion of Gen. 11 presents a particular straight-line genealogy. The purpose of a straight-line genealogy is to eventually take us from Adam to Jesus (the last Adam—1Cor. 15:45). Somehow, every author of Scripture who listed a genealogy seemed to know that there was one particular straight-line genealogy to follow, even though most of them contributed only 7–10 pieces of the entire puzzle.

It is my personal opinion that this genealogy in this form was composed around 2100 B.C. Liberal theologians claim, without any real proof, that someone wrote this down a 1000 or so years later. There are a large number of details in the Bible, some cultural and some historical, which archaeologists continually discover to tell us that the Bible got it right. I gave you a quotation from Will Durant, one of the greatest of the ancient historians, who does not believe in anything supernatural, but says that, historically, you cannot fault the Bible. Now, if an historian says that the history of the Bible, insofar as he knows (and he knows a lot more than you and I) is accurate, then does it make more sense for these words to be composed near to the time these events took place, or for someone to write this a millennium later?

When I say *composed*, I am saying that I do not know if this was committed to writing, but it was committed to memory, at the very least. I personally believe that man’s memory had a greater capacity at this time, and that writing and a written language probably existed before Abraham (who will be the focus of the next several chapters).

No matter who you believe when it comes to the date these things were composed, somehow, 2 millenniums before the birth of Jesus Christ, someone knew which line to watch. Furthermore, this would have been counter-intuitive. At this time, there is a great civilization in Egypt, but we have no straight-line genealogy for any of the sons of Ham. Japheth is settling in lands all over western Asian and Europe, spreading out further than

the other 2 sons of Noah, but no one in his line is followed out. But Abraham's genealogy is followed out. In my opinion, this genealogy was recorded long, long before there was an Israel. God the Holy Spirit knew this was the line to watch and that this line would lead to the genetic and legal lines of Jesus Christ (which lines are distinguished *after* King David).

This is a genealogy, which I won't cover in any detail, except for the fact that, this gives us a precise timeline going from the flood to Abraham (which timeline will be made clear in a chart to follow). You will recall that the timeline before the flood was also very precise in this same way. When we put this information together, we can actually determine how long it has been since the flood and how long man lived prior to the flood.

What follows below is the English translation from the Masoretic text (the Hebrew text) interspersed with Greek text (abbreviated LXX) where there are differences.

Gen 11:11–26 And Shem lived 500 years after he fathered Arpachshad and he had other sons and daughters. When Arpachshad had lived 35 years, he fathered Shelah. And Arpachshad lived 403 years after he fathered Shelah [the Greek text has, instead: *And Arphaxad lived 135 years, and fathered Cainan. And Arphaxad lived 400 years after he had fathered Cainan, and he later fathered more sons and daughters, and died. And Cainan lived 130 years and fathered Salah (Shelah); and Canaan lived 330 years after he had sired Salah, and fathered more sons and daughters, and died.*]. He also fathered sons and daughters. Shelah lived 30 years [the Greek text, the LXX, reads 130 years] and fathered Eber. And after he fathered Eber, Shelah lived 403 years [LXX—330 years]. He also fathered more sons and daughters. Eber lived 34 years [LXX—134 years] and fathered Peleg. After he fathered Peleg, Eber lived 430 more years [LXX—270 years] and he fathered more sons and daughters as well. Peleg lived 30 years [LXX—130 years] and fathered Reu. After he fathered Reu, Peleg lived 209 more years and he fathered more sons and daughters. Reu lived 32 years [LXX—132 years] and fathered Serug. After he fathered Serug, Reu lived 207 years and he fathered more sons and daughters. Serug lived 30 years [LXX—130 years] and fathered Nahor. After he fathered Nahor, Serug lived 200 more years and he fathered more sons and daughters. Nahor lived 29 years [LXX—179 years] and fathered Terah. After he fathered Terah, Nahor lived 119 years [LXX—125 years] and he fathered additional sons and daughters as well. Terah lived 70 years and fathered Abram, Nahor and Haran.

Obviously, there are some serious disparities between the Masoretic and Greek texts with regards to the ages. The Greek text actually adds an additional 875 years (if my math can be depended upon). The only differences which are pertinent here are the years in which one man fathered another, not how long they lived after.

Let's look at this line working backwards from Abraham to the flood (the ages given is the age of the father when he sires this particular son—the person cited above him in the chart):

When did the flood occur?

The Line of Shem	Masoretic (Hebrew) Text		Septuagint (Greek Text)	
Abraham	Most seem to agree that Abram was born in or around 2160 B.C.			
Terah (Gen. 11:26)	Lived 70 years and then he fathered Abraham. Terah would therefore be born 2230 B.C.		70 years	2230 B.C.
Nahor (Gen. 11:24)	29	2259 B.C.	179	2409 B.C.
Serug (Gen. 11:22)	30	2289 B.C.	130	2539 B.C.
Rue (Gen. 11:20)	32	2321 B.C.	132	2671 B.C.
Peleg (Gen. 11:18)	30	2351 B.C.	130	2801 B.C.
Eber (Gen. 11:16)	34	2385 B.C.	134	2935 B.C.
Shela (Shala) (Gen. 11:14)	30	2415 B.C.	130	3065 B.C.
Cainan (Gen. 11:13 in LXX only; he is also named in the book of Luke)			130	3195 B.C.
Arphaxad (Gen. 11:12)	35	2450 B.C.	130	3325 B.C.
Flood (Gen. 11:10)	2	2452 B.C.	2	3327 B.C.


Shem was born about 100 years before the flood; so, according to Gen. 11:10, that would have been about 2550 B.C. in the Hebrew and 3425 B.C. in the Greek. According to the Hebrew, man is approximately 6000 years old; according to the Greek, man is approximately 7000 years old.

This assumes that there are no missing names in the text and that the numbers given are accurate.

I do not pretend to know which line is accurate or whether Cainan properly belongs in this line or not. Robby Dean argues against Cainan [here](#), which argument I have not summarized, as I don't see it as important. Man being 6000–7000 years old is good enough for me at this point. As I have pointed out many times in the past, this is in complete agreement with normal human population growth estimates. It is the evolutionist who must layer theory upon theory upon theory in order to justify his faith that modern man is 1 million years old.

The Bible and modern archeology synch up fairly well from around 2300 B.C. and forward. Most modern archeology is based upon 19th century precepts, which have not changed dramatically for over 100 years, even though they were developed before carbon dating. They are also based upon evolutionary theory, where modern man is thought to have been around for about 1 million years, whereas, the Bible has man on this earth for around 6000–7000 years.

I have seen several charts, and this one, **The Biblical Chronology of Genesis 11**, is one of the clearest and easiest to follow:



This came from <http://www.creationism.org/lifespan.jpg> Bear in mind that Cainan, who is named in the LXX and in the book of Luke, would add 130 years to everything after Arphaxad. There still could have been an overlap of Shem's life and Abraham's. Also, bear in mind that, there is 875 years difference between the line shown above and that found in the Septuagint (the Greek text). This would have changed the overlap of these generations quite radically. In any case, Shem, Arphaxad, Salah and Eber would have still outlived their sons, grandsons and, in some cases, great grandsons.

Lesson 97: Genesis 11 **Ancient Biblical Texts**

When examining the straight genealogical line of Shem, we saw how the Hebrew text had fewer years between Shem and Abram than did the Greek text. In fact, I have spoken of the Greek and the Hebrew texts on several occasions, but without giving many details. So, here are some details:

The original text of the Old Testament was written in Hebrew. However, the Hebrews first used the old Phœnician alphabet until Nehemiah's time (444 B.C.), at which time, they then used the Aramaic script. This is because the final ancient incarnation of an independent Israel—the nation of Judah—was conquered by the Babylonians in 586 B.C. and the people were actually carried off to Babylon. Then Babylon was conquered by Cyrus the Great, a Persian, and then, in 516 B.C., the Jews were allowed to return to their land.

The Jews returned to the land, but with several books (Daniel and Esther) which were written in Aramæan and their other holy books were now written with an Aramæan alphabet. Since Cyrus the Great had only conquered and controlled Babylon for a short time before allowing the Jews to return, we must reasonably suppose that both the Babylonians and the Persians used the Aramæan language.

The Old Testament, at this time, was also translated into the Aramaic, which translation is called the Targums. The Hebrew of this era and the Aramaic of this era are quite similar languages, employing the same alphabet and many of the same words and language structure. I do not know the ancient languages well enough to distinguish between them, but we have 2 very similar languages at this point, both using the same alphabet, but with both Hebrew manuscripts and an Aramæan translation.

The Hebrews, around 200 B.C., then began to use the square letters of the Aramaic script, but the language was still Hebrew. Here is a chart of the Phœnician alphabet side-by-side the Hebrew alphabet: <http://hebrewoldtestament.com/hebrewalpha.htm> Bear in mind that this is actually an Aramæan alphabet adopted for the Hebrew language. So, for hundreds of years, we have the original manuscripts, all adopted to an Aramæan alphabet, but also from that era, there are the Targums, which are free translations (paraphrases) from the Hebrew into the Aramæan language.

This history and background is based upon the Old Testament Scriptures themselves, upon the opinions of ancient historians, and upon actual manuscripts found called the Dead Sea Scrolls (it is my understanding that partial manuscripts containing all 3 alphabets were found). Prior to 1947, the oldest Hebrew manuscripts which we had, had been copied in the 10th and 11th centuries A.D. (this is known as the Masoretic text).

The Greek translation, called the Septuagint, and abbreviated LXX, would have been made from manuscripts far older than we have access to today. However, that does not mean that they worked from original manuscripts; nor were these manuscripts necessarily more accurate. Furthermore, the Greek text represents a very uneven translation. However, when it comes to numbers, if I was going to lean in any direction, it would be toward the Greek text (however, in most other respects, I lean toward the Hebrew text).

So there are no misunderstandings, when speaking of the Greek and Hebrew texts in the study of the book of Genesis, we are dealing with the Old Testament specifically. The background and various texts pertaining to the New Testament is a completely different topic.

Ancient Manuscripts of the Bible

The Texts

Text/Commentary

The Masoretic Text (the Hebrew text)

Originally, the Old Testament Hebrew text was not divided into chapters or verses. Furthermore, they used a consonantal alphabet for their written language (there were no vowels in the original Hebrew manuscripts). However, prior to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947, our most ancient Hebrew Old Testament manuscripts came from the 10th and 11th centuries A.D.

The Masoretes (circa 500–1000 A.D.) were dedicated to preserving the text of the Old Testament, to which they added vowel points, so that the words could be pronounced (the vowel points are dots and bars, all written above or below the consonants, so that the original text remains unchanged). The Old Testament portion of our English Bibles are based upon the Masoretic text, because we simply did not have any older Hebrew manuscripts.

The manuscripts from the Masoretes extent today only go back to the 10th and 11th centuries A.D. This is because, as a manuscript became worn and old, the Masoretes would recopy it. Once they had produced an accurate copy (and they had very exacting rules to determine this), they would destroy the older manuscript.

With the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947, we now have all 3 types of ancient Hebrew manuscripts dating back before 100 B.C. and earlier, which manuscripts confirm the accuracy of the Masoretic text of a millennium later. However, none of these are complete manuscripts of the Old Testament.

The Targums (the Aramaic text)

After the Jews had been conquered in 586 B.C. and then returned to their land in 516 B.C., many returning to the land apparently spoke both Hebrew and Aramaean, 2 very similar languages which used the same alphabet. Some only spoke Aramaean. Some Jews remained in Babylon, as they were born there, raised there, and had no connection to the Land of Promise. So, somewhere around this time period, Aramaean translations (actually, paraphrases) of portions of the Old Testament were made, presumably for those Jews who remained in Babylon (and, very likely, for the Persians as well). It appears that, in some ancient synagogues, the Hebrew and Aramaic texts are read alternately. It is possible that there is even an Old Testament passage which alludes to such a practice (Neh. 8:1–8; particularly, v. 8). Because most Jews now spoke Aramaean, these targums made it possible for them to hear, read and understand the Old Testament Scriptures.

Ancient Manuscripts of the Bible

The Texts

Text/Commentary

There were ancient copies of the targums discovered with the Dead Sea Scrolls. Because these are paraphrases, many scholars do not hold the targums in high regard, and it is unclear as to how many targums are extant and from what time period.

The Septuagint (the Greek Text and abbreviated LXX)

Just as the Jews forsook Hebrew for Aramaic, they began speaking Greek soon after Alexander the Great conquered much of the world (during the 300's B.C.).

Somewhere between 300–100 B.C., 70 men (most accounts say 72 men) were commissioned to translate the Old Testament into Greek. We do not know how long it took or whether there were exactly 70 men, or how many of them lasted until the end of the project, or who did what. However, sometime during that time period, approximately 70 men took Hebrew manuscripts, much older than we possess today (the Dead Sea Scrolls aside) and translated the Hebrew Old Testament into the Greek language.

This was the first known great translation of an entire book in history that we actually have copies of.

One source claimed that, of the 350 times the Old Testament is quoted in the New, in only 50 of those instances does the text differ greatly from the LXX.⁸⁰ Another claimed that, of the approximately 263 times the Old Testament is quoted, 85 are taken almost verbatim from the LXX, and there are another 100 or so which bear some resemblance to the Greek text.⁸¹

Insofar as I can determine, there are portions of the Septuagint in the Dead Sea Scrolls; and that, prior to their discovery, our oldest Alexandrian Septuagint manuscripts dated back to the 4th and 5th centuries A.D. There are at least 2 different versions of the Septuagint (or portions of it), although they are certainly not very different in text. .

There have been several ancient Greek translations of the Old Testament; some of which are extant; others of which we know through other historical documents. The Hexapla was 6 versions of the Bible, side-by-side, in 6 columns, 4 of them being different Greek versions of that era. This was put together in the 3rd century A.D. by Origen, but I don't believe we have even a partial manuscript of this.

⁸⁰ From <http://www.bible-history.com/faussets/S/Septuagint/> accessed September 21, 2010.

⁸¹ From http://www.christianmissionconnection.org/The_Septuagint_A_Critical_Analysis.pdf accessed September 21, 2010.

Ancient Manuscripts of the Bible

The Texts	Text/Commentary
The Aramaic (Syriac) Text	<p>As mentioned, probably the earliest translation of the Old Testament was made into Aramaic around the time of Nehemiah. We do not have any manuscripts from this period of time.</p> <p>The Hebrews borrowed one form of the Aramaic alphabet around 444 B.C. and then another form of the Aramaic alphabet around 200 B.C. and used this alphabet to copy and recopy the Old Testament Scriptures⁸². The Jews, for 70 years, had been removed from Judæa and were under the control of Persia (modern-day Iran). So, they would have brought their language, to some degree, with them when they returned to the Land of Promise. For all intents and purposes, a new generation of Jews, raised from youth in Persia, returned to Judæa.</p> <p>The Peshitta is the common Aramaic text today (also called Syriac) and it is actually a dialect of the Aramaic.</p>
<p>The oldest Aramaic (Syriac) Old Testament manuscript dates back to A.D. 464 (which is quite old). How close this is to the earliest Aramaic translation of the Old Testament is unclear.</p> <p>In my studies of the Old Testament, the Syriac text seems to be the furthest from the Greek and Hebrew.</p> <p>When it comes to the New Testament, there is a whole debate about whether it was originally written in the Greek or in the Aramaic.</p>	

⁸² Norman Geisler and William Nix; *A General Introduction to the Bible*; Chicago; Moody Press, ©1968, p. 244.

Ancient Manuscripts of the Bible

The Texts

Text/Commentary

The Latin Text
(called the Latin
Vulgate)

Because Rome conquered most of the world, people first spoke Greek (because Rome had a Greek culture and spoke Greek) and later, Latin. By the 2nd century A.D., some areas conquered by Rome spoke Latin primarily, so there were translations made of the Old and New Testaments into Latin (although, none of those are extant today). What followed over the next 2 centuries was a number of different Latin translations.

Saint Jerome was commissioned by Pope Damasus I near the end of the 4th century A.D. to do the official Latin translation. *Vulgate* means *vulgar, common*, and the idea was, to make a translation of the Bible into the language of the (common) people. Jerome was not the only person to have a hand in all of this.

Although there are problems which developed with the Catholic church over the many centuries (the chief ones as a result of intermingling politics, power and the church; and goofy precepts which began by tradition), the Latin Vulgate was an excellent Old and New Testament translation. I tend to find more agreement between the Hebrew and the Latin than with the Greek or Syriac (when there are differences).

*The oldest extant manuscript of the Vulgate is the Codex Amiatinus (Biblioteca Laurenziana, Florence), written at Wearmouth or Jarrow between c.690 and 700.*⁸³

The Greek, Syriac and Latin translations were made from Greek and Hebrew manuscripts—manuscripts which are, for the most part, older than what we have today.

It needs to be noted that, when a translation is done, there is a smoothing out of the language and the sentence structure. That is, there may be some difficult phrasing or sentence structure, or even a sentence which does not make sense, and a translation general will smooth it out so that it makes sense. The same is true of your English translation. Almost every sentence should make sense in your English Bible. In the Hebrew, this is not always the case, part of the problem being the transmission of the manuscripts over the years.

These ancient translations run into the same problems that we do: if there is a difference in text, which text should be taken? If a sentence does not make sense, how can we make it make sense? If a phrase is idiomatic, do we give it a literal translation or do we translate it in a way to give the idiom a modern understanding?

⁸³ From <http://www.answers.com/topic/vulgate> accessed September 21, 2010.

Ancient Manuscripts of the Bible

The Texts

Text/Commentary

We consider the autographs of the Hebrew text to be the inspired text. The autograph is a perfect copy of what was originally written, and there are no autographs extant today. The MT (Masoretic text) is considered to be the closest thing that we have to the autographs, with some deference given to the Dead Sea Scrolls and to ancient translations (Greek, Latin and Syriac).

The most dramatic differences between texts are the number of years named; and the spelling of some proper nouns. When it comes to the Law or to narrative, there are very few significant differences between the MT and the Dead Sea Scrolls (that is, if you read an English Bible based upon the MT or upon the Latin or upon the Greek, you are not going to come away with a completely different understanding of the Old Testament).

Most modern translations are made from the original Greek (New Testament) and Hebrew (Old Testament; with some portions written in Aramaic). However, deference is given to the ancient translations named above, as well as to other translations and alternate readings. In my study of the Old Testament, where I ponderously look at each Hebrew word, I do come across a fair amount of deviation. However, very little of this deviation is doctrinally substantive. In the book of Samuel, for instance, the biggest problem that I have come across is in 1Sam. 14:18, where King Saul appears to ask for the Ark of God to be brought to him, he probably called for the Ephod of God instead. I have never come across a different reading which made me question or want to revise any major or minor doctrine. That is, I never looked at a verse and said, "If you read it this way, it gives this spin to the doctrine of redemption, but if you read it that way, it puts a different spin on that doctrine." So, despite the textual problems, none are so great as to actually change a doctrine from the Word of God.

It is worth noting that, the accuracy of the New Testament of the Bible is greater than the accuracy of Shakespeare's plays which we have today. The New Testament, written in the 1st century A.D., before the invention of the printing press, is far more accurate than the text of the 37 plays written by Shakespeare, which were written in the 17th century, after the invention of the printing press. In every single one of Shakespeare's plays, there are gaps where text ought to be; so scholars have simply tried to fill in the blanks with text which fits the context. On the other hand, there is no indication that any text is missing from the New Testament, written 1600 years previous to Shakespeare.⁸⁴

The background for the Old Testament and New Testament manuscripts is entirely different.

For more information about the Peshitta, see <http://www.peshitta.org/>

⁸⁴ Josh McDowell, *A Ready Defense*; Here's Life Publishers; ©1990; p. 24.

If this area of study is interesting to you, let me recommend Geisler and Nix's *A General Introduction to the Bible* or any of Josh McDowell's books on apologetics (e.g., *A Ready Defense*, *Evidence that Demands a Verdict Vol. I*).

Lesson 98: Genesis 11:10–26

The Line of Shem

Previously, we studied the ancient texts of the Bible; now let's return to the text itself:

Gen 11:10–26 These are the generations of Shem. Shem was a hundred years old and fathered Arpachshad two years after the flood. And Shem lived 500 years after he fathered Arpachshad (he also had other sons and daughters). When Arpachshad had lived 35 years, he fathered Shelah. And Arpachshad lived 403 years after he fathered Shelah [the Greek text has, instead: *And Arphaxad lived 135 years, and fathered Cainan. And Arphaxad lived 400 years after he had fathered Cainan, and he later fathered more sons and daughters, and died. And Cainan lived 130 years and fathered Salah (Shelah); and Canaan lived 330 years after he had sired Salah, and fathered more sons and daughters, and died.*]. He also fathered sons and daughters. Shelah lived 30 years [the Greek text, the LXX, reads 130 years] and fathered Eber. And after he fathered Eber, Shelah lived 403 years [LXX—330 years]. He also fathered more sons and daughters. Eber lived 34 years [LXX—134 years] and fathered Peleg. After he fathered Peleg, Eber lived 430 more years [LXX—270 years] (he also fathered more sons and daughters). Peleg lived 30 years [LXX—130 years] and fathered Reu. After he fathered Reu, Peleg lived 209 more years and he fathered more sons and daughters. Reu lived 32 years [LXX—132 years] and fathered Serug. After he fathered Serug, Reu lived 207 years (he also fathered more sons and daughters). Serug lived 30 years [LXX—130 years] and fathered Nahor. After he fathered Nahor, Serug lived 200 more years (he also fathered more sons and daughters). Nahor lived 29 years [LXX—179 years] and fathered Terah. After he fathered Terah, Nahor lived 119 years [LXX—125 years] and he fathered additional sons and daughters as well. Terah lived 70 years and fathered Abram, Nahor and Haran.

Shem would have had direct knowledge of the flood and those who had descended from him would have had second-hand knowledge of the flood. Abraham could have gotten information about the flood and the pre-deluvian age directly from Shem, who lived during that time; or less directly from, say, Eber. Shem lived approximately 100 years before the flood, so he actually lived during the antediluvian era (the same is true of his brothers). Furthermore, it is likely that Shem knew Methuselah and Lamech (his grandfather and great grandfather), and both of them were alive during Adam's life. So, even though there are 11 generations from Adam to Seth and 10 generations from Seth to Abram, Abram has only 3 or 4 people between Adam and him.

We cannot underestimate the existence of faith and positive volition toward the Word of God. Adam saw the restored earth from 6th day. Noah and Shem saw the angelic corruption of the human race. Shem saw the flood. Peleg was alive during the partitioning of the human race due to division of the languages. But, bear in mind, by the time that we

get down to Abram, even if there are only 3 or 4 people between him and Adam, these are still just words, and man individually chooses how he is to understand them. That is, some historical accounts are passed down for a dozen or two generations, and some understand these accounts to be the words of God and some do not. It is a choice that we make. Now, many lessons ago, I gave you some of the [amazing things](#) found in just the first 2 chapters of Genesis, which distinguish this book of being just a collection of stories, myths and traditions; and later, I gave another list of the [amazing things](#) in the first 6 chapters of Genesis. Nevertheless, it is possible to go through that list and decide, “I am not convinced;” and then reject the Bible as the Word of God. For me, the more I study the Bible, the more I am convinced that the Bible is the Word of God. That is faith, but not blind faith. There is considerable evidence for what I believe. However, another man would simply dismiss the evidence and choose to place his faith in another opinion.

Our faith, no matter how we apportion it, is powerful. Politically, over the past several years, I have observed friends and family members speaking disparagingly of others, and even cutting off relationships altogether, all over political issues. There are people with such an amazing faith in the goodness, power and competence of government, despite all empirical evidence to the contrary, that they are willing to place a massive amount of faith and dependence upon our government and in leaders who seem to share this same faith (for instance, many want to see the government take over the healthcare industry, because they have faith that the government will do a fair and competent job; many of these people believe that government will do this even more cheaply than the private sector, because the profit motive will be removed from the equation).

I’ve seen actual beat downs on video, based upon differences in political theory, which is based upon faith (e.g., the union thugs who beat down an African-American because they thought he was a part of the TEA party movement). The political opinions of these union thugs and the African American were all based upon faith. These opinions were so strong that, those in the union believed in what they were doing.

A general observation which I have made is, the more a person has faith in God and in the Bible, the less faith they have in man and government; and such people seem to prefer as decentralized a form of government as is possible with as many checks and balances as can be legally applied. For those whose faith in God is scattered, hard to define, nonexistent or simply not the foundation of their lives, they seem to have a great deal more faith in charismatic politicians and large government, which is continually *moving the country forward*, whatever that means. Their faith in a man who says he will move the country forward is astonishing to me. Gallup has done many polls on this and related topics, and the political party which favors less government has more people who identify themselves as religious or strongly religious and who attend church more often than those of the party which has greater faith in government, and, therefore, wants more of it.⁸⁵ It is not a difficult concept—if you have little or no faith in God, then you have to place your trust in something else, and, for many people, that is government and charismatic and/or

⁸⁵ <http://www.gallup.com/poll/142826/Republicans-Remain-Disproportionately-White-Religious.aspx> for example.

likeable individuals (2 politicians come to mind—Rod Blagojevich and Charlie Rangle, who are both associated with corruption, and yet are very charming and likeable individuals).

In a less contentious realm, we all have great faith in our cars and driving ability and the rules of the road; and we step into our cars day after day, despite the risk involved. I personally get on planes regularly, and trust that they will take me safely from point A to point B, despite the fact that, I still cannot wrap my mind around thousands of tons of steel flying 2000 miles as if it were nothing at all. And I don't care how many pictures I see of arrows showing the movement of air around the wings of a plane which provide lift, it is still an amazing and even suspect thing to me. Yet, because of my great faith, I fly several times a year, and give it very little thought.

Most of life is like this. My faith in planes is reaffirmed with each and every flight, despite the dubious notion of this hulk of steel flying through the air. And my faith in the Bible is reaffirmed, as I learn more and more about it. There may be considerable evidence involved, but, in the end, where we place our faith is always a choice.

Having faith in Jesus Christ is also a choice. Only a handful of people saw Him die on the cross, and they are all dead today. Only one man of that group wrote about it (the Apostle John). Furthermore, no one actually saw our Lord bear our sins, because Palestine was enshrouded in a thick darkness when God the Father poured out our sins on God the Son (Matt. 27:45).

Is there evidence that our Lord died for our sins? Certainly, the Bible is filled with types of Jesus Christ, even from the very beginning. The Old Testament is filled with prophecies about Jesus Christ. There are so many of these, that it is mind-boggling; yet, all a person who does not want to believe, has to say is, "So what?" and that ends that.

One of the most humorous things to me is someone saying, "Well, if God wants me to believe in Him, then all He has to do is tell me directly." This is spoken by a person who, if you said, "How would you know it is God?" would answer, "I would just know. It would be obvious." Somehow, a person without a belief in God will argue that they would know God if God just spoke to them. That in itself indicates a great deal of faith.

Jesus Christ is God in the Flesh; He is God made manifest (John 1:1–3, 14). Yet people met Him face to face and they rejected Him as the Messiah. He did amazing things—miracles, in fact—and yet the religious leaders of His day criticized Him for it. He deftly handled the Word of God, and was able to out-argue any scribe or Pharisee, and still, they demanded that He be crucified.

Choosing to place your trust in Jesus Christ for salvation is a choice; no one can argue you into it and no one can force you to do it. You choose to believe or you choose not to believe. We all have faith and we all choose to place our faith in a variety of people, philosophies and institutions. The person who tells you that he only bases his life upon what he sees or has logically proven to him, is either lying, or he is a person who is totally

lacking in introspection (I had a college professor once tell me that she only believed in peer-reviewed studies and this is what she based her life and her philosophies upon).

So, anyway, Abram, who comes along either 300 or 1200 years after the flood, is told about the origins of the earth, the fall of man, the intermingling of the fallen angels and mankind, and the flood; and the Seed of the Woman; and Abram believes in Jesus Christ and God credits him with righteousness based upon this choice that he makes (Gen. 15:6). He hears these words about Jehovah Elohim and he believes them. So, even though Abram is only removed from Adam by fewer than a half-dozen men, what happened prior to Abram's life is a matter of faith on his part.

For these ancient fathers to live for several generations—outliving sons, grandsons and great grandsons—could be a powerful cultural influence. Noah's sons lived for hundreds of years and for several generations; and this helps to explain the origins of ancestor worship.

History is revised and distorted all of the time. When I went to school, I was taught that most of our founding fathers (for the United States) were deists. That is, they believed that God wound up the earth like a clock and then wandered off to do something else, leaving us to fend for ourselves. I believed this for decades; teachers taught me this and I read it in my history books, and so I believed it. In the past 5 years, I have been exposed to the writings and speeches of our founding fathers, and it turns out that most of them appear to be born again believers, often using the word *Providence* (always capitalized) to refer to God or to God's will. You will note, I have been exposed to evidence from both sides: books and teachers which claim one thing; and other books and papers which claim to be the original words of our founding fathers. I never met a founding father, never saw a speech that he gave, and I never saw any founding father write down words on a piece of parchment. I have taken it on faith that, these documents that I have seen are accurate transmissions of the words they wrote 250 (or so) years ago. My understanding of history has to necessarily be based upon faith.

So it is with Abram and whatever words he recorded (I personally believe that he wrote the first 24 chapters of Genesis, and that the first 11 were probably transmitted to Abram orally). Someone told him, this is what has transpired since the beginning of time, and Abram believed these words and wrote them down.

Over the past few weeks, as I have worked on a group of about 10 lessons, I have been pondering two questions: what does the line of Shem mean, if anything; and what happened during this time period? Somewhere between 300–1200 years go by, and we know that (1) man settled in the Euphrates Valley and built the tower of Babel and that (2) God confused the languages and scattered mankind. There are a few other things which I believe may be implied by the text (specifically, by the genealogy).

Given that Peleg's name is given as being significant in Scripture, let me postulate that, the names of some of these men may have reflected the eras in which they lived (or, the era to which they were born into).

The Meaning of the Names in Abram's Line

Name	BDB Meaning	Smith's Meaning	Discussion
Shem	<i>name</i>	<i>name</i>	<p>Shem may be better defined by his sons and where they ended up: Syria (Aram), Chaldea (Arphaxad), parts of Assyria (Asshur), of Persia (Elam), and of the Arabian peninsula (Joktan). Semitic languages find their origin with Shem.</p> <p>Perhaps the name Shem became synonymous with the concept of reputation and fame (everyone would have known Shem, for hundreds of years). Maybe this concept became an integral part in the building of the Babel tower: <i>And they said, "Come, let us build us a city and a tower, and its top in the heavens. And let us make a name [= shem] for ourselves, lest we be scattered upon the face of the whole earth."</i> (Gen. 11:4).</p>
Arpachshad	<i>I shall fail as the breast: he cursed the breast-bottle</i>	<i>stronghold of the Chaldees</i>	<p>Also spelled <i>Arphaxad</i>. His name is less defined than the others. Most place him in the Chaldees. Perhaps his name refers to the actual building of this city (however, by my estimation, this would have been too early in time).</p>
Cainan	<i>decree, statute</i>		<p>This is the missing man from the Hebrew text. During his time, man began to set up a governmental system with laws, <i>decrees and statutes</i>, since approximately 300 people would be alive during his generation.</p>

The Meaning of the Names in Abram's Line

Name	BDB Meaning	Smith's Meaning	Discussion
Shelah	<i>sprout</i>	<i>a petition</i>	It was determined that, if there are laws, there must be a system of judicial prudence, where men could go and <i>petition</i> on their own behalf.
Eber	<i>the region beyond</i>	<i>the region beyond</i>	Eber's name suggest that his family had begun to think about the land further out. This suggests that this generation left the mountains and moved into the Euphrates valley. Or, perhaps they began to look outward from the Euphrates valley. Most of his life and that of Arpachshad would have overlapped.
Peleg	<i>division</i>	<i>division</i>	Peleg was alive around the time that the languages were confounded. For him to receive this name at birth, means that he would have been brought up in a family which, for the first time, spoke a different language than the rest of civilization. In his generation, mankind separated into several families. There may have been as many as 300,000 people alive during Peleg's life.
Rue	<i>friend</i>	<i>friend</i>	People had to choose what they would do, when languages were confused. They banded together by language and by clans, calling one another friends (implying a cultural similarity based upon familial similarities).
Serug	<i>branch</i>	<i>branch</i>	Now that these families began to spread apart, Serug was viewed as a branch of the family.

The Meaning of the Names in Abram's Line

Name	BDB Meaning	Smith's Meaning	Discussion
Nahor	<i>snorting</i>	<i>snorting</i>	His name also means <i>hoarse, dry, hot</i> ; and may describe the climatic conditions for several decades of the Euphrates valley.
Terah	<i>delay</i>	<i>station</i>	Terah was said to be an idolater in the Bible, and is the reason that Abram had to separate himself from Terah. Because of his idolatry, blessing from God was <i>delayed</i> until Abram.
Abram	<i>exalted father</i>	<i>a high father</i>	Abram is known as the father of the Jewish race.

Quite obviously, this is only a theory, but one which I believe to be solid. For the Hebrew line, the meaning of a man's name reflected the thinking of his father, which reasonably mirrors the world in which he finds himself. Therefore, the names of some of these men tell us something about the world in which they grew up.

Lesson 99: Genesis 11:27–28

Population Growth; Abram's Line

At this juncture we are nearly ready complete Gen. 11 and move into the life of Abram (Abraham) with lesson #101.

We now have no reason to doubt that Abram had the ability to read and write. At one time, so-called scholars of a century ago doubted that Moses wrote the Pentateuch (the first 5 books of the Bible) because they claimed that writing did not exist during his time. A bizarre theory of authorship was borne out of this, called the JEPD theory or documentary hypothesis. They claimed that, 1000 years after Moses died, one author wrote a lot of stuff using the word *Elohim* in it (E); another wrote a lot of stuff using the word *Jehovah* in it (J); another put together the Deuteronomistic code (D); and then some priest took all of this and compiled it, putting the finishing touches on the Old Testament (P). Now, the Elohimist and the Jehovahist did not write separate books—no—that would be too easy. They wrote various lines and chapters, and all of this was later woven together. And, of course, the Elohimist used the word *Jehovah* and the Jehovahist used the word *Elohim*. The idea was preponderance of usage. If you have never heard of this theory before, no doubt it sounds pretty bizarre and convoluted to you. This all came about because most *scientists, historians* and *archaeologists* agreed (i.e., there was a consensus) that Moses could not read and write because no one could read and write way back then. So, theologians, knowing that scientists, historians and archaeologists are always honest and forthright (tongue-in-cheek), adopted theories to account for the idea that Moses could not read or

write. I mention this because this goofy theory is now taught in most seminaries, even though it was based on false theories of history. Now, we have all kinds of writings from the era of Moses, and from before his time, and virtually all historians and archaeologists agree that Moses could read and write. I mention this because (1) you may come across this theory in the future and think it sounds pretty cool (it can be presented persuasively) and because (2) this is the theory which predominates most Protestant seminaries today.

This is an illustration of one way that Satan works. He takes a consensus and builds lies around it, and manages to somehow foist this upon the theological world. The Bible is not clear as to how Satan is able to influence our thinking, but the Bible is clear that he is able to. 1Tim. 4:1–2: **Now the Spirit expressly says that, in later times, some will depart from the faith [the sound teachings of Bible doctrine] by devoting themselves to deceitful spirits and doctrines of demons, through the insincerity of liars whose consciences are seared.** 2Cor. 11:13–15: **For such men are false apostles, deceitful workmen, disguising themselves as apostles of Christ. And no wonder, for even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light. So it is no surprise if his servants, also, disguise themselves as servants of righteousness. Their end will correspond to their deeds.**

Since then, we have found that writing and various mediums for writing, existed long before Moses. In fact, according to Will Durant, written history is at least 6000 years old and can be traced back to the Near East⁸⁶ (which area includes the Fertile Crescent, the area where Terah and his family lived).

Durant writes: *In this rough theater of teeming peoples and conflicting cultures were developed the agriculture and commerce, the horse and wagon, the coinage and letters of credit, the crafts and industries, the law and government, the mathematics and medicine, the enemas and drainage systems, the geometry and astronomy, the calendar and clock and zodiac, the alphabet and writing, the paper and ink, the books and libraries and schools, the literature and music, the sculpture and architecture, the glazed pottery and fine furniture, the monotheism and monogamy, the cosmetics and jewelry, the checkers and dice, the te-pins and income-tax, the wet-nurses and beer, from which our own European and American culture derive by a continuous succession through the mediation of Crete and Greece and Rome. The "Aryans" did not establish civilization—they took it from Babylonia and Egypt; Greece did not begin civilization—it inherited far more civilization than it began; it was the spoiled heir of three millenniums of arts and sciences brought to its cities from the Near East by the fortunes of trade and war. In studying and honoring the Near East, we shall be acknowledging a debt long due to the real founders of European and American civilization.*⁸⁷

⁸⁶ *The Story of Civilization; 1. Our Oriental Heritage*, by Will Durant; MJF Books, ©1963; p. 116.

⁸⁷ *The Story of Civilization; 1. Our Oriental Heritage*, by Will Durant; MJF Books, ©1963; p. 116.

Durant goes on to say that we have discovered advanced cultures as old as 4500 B.C.⁸⁸

As we saw in the previous lesson, the period of time between the flood to the birth of Abram was about 300 years, according to the Hebrew text, and nearly 1200 years, according to the Greek text. The Greek numbers roughly line up with Durant (however, Durant and others teach that human history stretches further back). In any case, *culture and recorded history* roughly approximates the Biblical timeline.

Mathematically, the numbers of the Bible match up with what we know about human population growth far more reasonably than the numbers of evolution. In evolution, each phase of man (homo habilis, homo erectus, homo sapiens) runs for about 1 million years, and that homo sapiens have been on this earth for about 1 million years. This does not match up at all with normal population growth figures.

If you have been a part of any public school system, you have heard over and over again that the age of man (homo sapiens) is 1 million years. So, many of us have been brought up to believe that man has been on this planet for a million years (our particular grouping of man). However, if we are to look at population growth studies—taking into account wars, sickness, fertility rates, etc.—today's population on the earth lines up mathematically with the flood of Noah occurring 4500–5500 years ago. There are no credible population growth models of any sort which line up with man being a million years old. The evolutionary theory requires a whole host of additional theories in order to explain today's population. This is not a minor problem; evolution is off by a factor of about 180, which is a huge discrepancy.

To understand what it means to be off by a factor of 180, let's consider baking a cake, and the package says to add 1 cup of water. If you are off by a factor of 180, that means, you add 180 cups (22½ gallons) of water. Will you end up with anything which is even close to being a cake?

Let's use a golfing illustration: you are facing a difficult putt of 5 yards and you are off by a factor of 180. That means, you gently strike the ball, and, instead of going 5 yards, it goes 900 yards instead. That is how far off evolution is from matching up with normal human population growth curves. Their explanation is to offer up more theories⁸⁹ to explain why their original theories are correct (which is not a good argument for any theory; that is, a theory to back up a theory logically proves nothing).

As a teacher, I taught that populations grew exponentially and could be approximated with an exponential equation (along with virtually every Algebra II and Pre-Calculus book at that

⁸⁸ *The Story of Civilization; 1. Our Oriental Heritage*, by Will Durant; MJF Books, ©1963; p. 117. Even though the Biblical timeline puts advanced civilization after the flood 1000–2000 years later, we are still very roughly in the same ballpark when it comes to a clearly advanced society.

⁸⁹ Such as, man did not grow in population for 990,000 years; or mankind was destroyed almost entirely by worldwide disasters several time.

time).⁹⁰ We could use this curve to look forward (which is why a scientist will estimate that there will be such-and-such population in such-and-such a year); but we can also take these same equations to peer backwards into time, to determine when man began. One assignment I gave to my students was to determine how long man has lived on this earth. Their answers were anywhere from 1000 years to 25,000 years (this all depends upon what population figures the student works with). The highest value, 25,000 years, is $1/40^{\text{th}}$ 1 million years, which is the approximate age of homo sapiens (according to *science*), and the students who came up with this figure carefully chose data points in order to maximize the age of man (that was their intent). This would suggest that the population of humans built up to present-day levels, and then suddenly dropped back to a handful of people *40–180 times* in order to conform with normal, human population growth. In other words, mankind endured approximately 100 ice ages (or similar worldwide events) over the past million years in order for our population to be what it is today (which theory would also require for man's population on this earth to be similar to the population of today—about 6 or 7 billion—100 times in the past).

I cover this in greater detail at <http://kukis.org/evolution/Worldpopulationgrowth.htm> or, in a pdf format, at <http://kukis.org/evolution/Worldpopulationgrowth.pdf> where I show you the actual mathematics involved.

I have discussed this problem at length with quite a number of people, and what evolutionists do is, they explain and *support* their theory with other theories. They theorize various reasons why early mankind's birthrate and population growth is not consistent with the number of years man has been on earth (that is, by their estimation).

The same approach is done with the layers of the earth. Whereas we would expect the layers of earth with the oldest fossils to be at the bottom, and for each layer of earth above that to be populated with more recent fossils, this is not the case. In fact, approximately 95% of the earth is out of synch with these drawings which you find in most geological textbooks, with each layer of earth laying neatly on top of an older layer of earth. How does evolution and geology account for this? More theories.

I attended two college logic courses, and one of the fallacies of logic should have been known as the Fallacy of Too Many Theories, or the Fallacy of Theoreticus Maximus; that is, the idea that you cannot justify one theory by offering up another theory, which is supported by another theory. There comes a point at which you are just making stuff up. The people I would disagree with would offer up a variety of weird theories in order to explain away the fact that normal human population growth is in agreement with the Bible, but not at all with evolution (which fact would make many of them bilious).

If you understand the human population growth model, and you want to see the strength of a person's faith, discuss this with someone who believes in evolution. The end result can degenerate into name calling, anger, and hissy fits. Such a person has been taught

⁹⁰ Some Algebra II books today may not have this equation in them because Algebra II has been dumbed down over the past 10–15 years.

all of his life that evolution is true; that it is the only reasonable scientific explanation, that only rubes and religious fanatics believe otherwise (and those who have been indoctrinated since birth), and they will defend that theory with great vigor, no matter what their own personal understanding of the issue happens to be. If they find themselves running out of arguments, they will call you stupid or brainwashed (or worse); and they will never yield an inch. This is the power of faith.

In previous lessons, we covered the line of Seth (Noah's son) to Terah (Abram's father). That is where we will pick it up again.

Gen 11:27–28 Now these are the generations of Terah: Terah fathered Abram, Nahor and Haran. And Haran fathered Lot. And Haran died before his father Terah in the land of his birth, in Ur of the Chaldeans.

These are the generations of appears to begin each section of Genesis. This would have been a good place to begin Genesis chapter 12. The NIV translates this as, *This is the account of Terah*; the Concordant Literal Version reads: *And these are the genealogical annals of Terah:...* The ERV reads: *This is the story of Terah's family*. This will not be about Terah, but more about his sons; and then we will focus on one son, Abram.

For many of these genealogies, you should get the impression as if one particular person is pointing to another particular person who is pointing to someone else in particular. This is not some random listing of names. Terah will point to Abram; Abram will point to Isaac, and Isaac will point to Jacob. And so it goes, until this line is followed out to Jesus Christ (in many different passages, but finally summed up in Luke 3). Somehow, 6 or 10 different authors, separated in time by 1000–3000 years, out of the millions of people who have lived on this earth, were able to, choose the 75 men who formed a line from Adam to Jesus. There are 77 if we go from God (Luke 3:38) to Jesus (Luke 3:23). Although Luke lists all those in the royal line, he would have gotten these names from several Old Testament sources (we covered this back in [the Genealogy of Jesus Christ](#) back in lesson #47).

Gen 11:27–28 Now these are the generations of Terah: Terah fathered Abram, Nahor and Haran. And Haran fathered Lot. And Haran died before his father Terah in the land of his birth, in Ur of the Chaldeans.

That Haran died before his father was actually commonplace. As we have noticed with each successive generation, their lifespan decreases, and fathers and even grandfathers are outliving their progeny.

Ur of the Chaldeans is located where one branch of the Tigris meets the Euphrates River, not too far from the Persian Gulf. The entire valley around the Euphrates and Tigris Rivers is called the Fertile Crescent. This general area would be later called Babylonia and later Mesopotamia (Acts 7:2), and it is known as Iraq today. When one compares its former designation, *the fertile crescent*, to what this area is today, the transformation has been quite remarkable.

*Azzam Awash writes in Natural History: Five thousand years ago the entire region [of the fertile crescent] was lush, fertile--an ideal birthplace for human civilization. Archeological studies published this year show that between 3000 B.C. and 2000 B.C. a concatenation of cities stretched eastward from Mesopotamia all the way to modern-day India and Pakistan. Yet the most extensive evidence of urban evolution comes from the old riverbanks of the Tigris and Euphrates. Solid wheels were used, and perhaps invented, there. Organized cultivation of wheat and barley began on those marshy shores. The cities' inhabitants developed a written language. And a distinct separation between state and temple was recorded.*⁹¹

We do not know with any certainty exactly where Ur of the Chaldeans was. Up until 1850, it was assumed that this was Urfa, which was near Haran (Charan) in Southern Turkey (which, in my opinion, is way, way off). Others place it at Ura' near Haran (Charan—also, way off). What seems to be the most accepted interpretation is Ur is Uri, in modern Tell el-Muqaayyar. Excavations in this area have produced a layer of water-laid clay, indicating a great flood; cemeteries dating back to 2500 B.C.; and the ruins of a ziggurat (which is a temple tower built to heathen gods). I will assume that this is much closer to the Persian Gulf. Later, Ur was ruled by neo-Babylonian (Chaldean) kings. Abram moved from Ur to Haran with his family (Gen. 11:28, 31).

Archeology has uncovered a great deal of information concerning the society in which Abram's family possibly lived prior to this move (this may have been the society which developed after Abram and company left). They have found the remains of five temples which appeared to have surrounded the Ziggurat of king Ur-Nammu in a semi-circle. The largest was 300' x 180' with thick, fortress like walls, and it was dedicated to the moon-god. To give you the concept of the strength of the materials, there were water fountains there which are still standing; the water troughs were coated with bitumen. There were temple kitchens with still-functioning ovens.

What has also been discovered at this site are spacious, comfortable homes. Whereas, excavations which found homes dating to 600 B.C. were fairly simple, one-story, three or four room houses, built around a courtyard, these in Ur, dating back to the earth 4th millennium B.C. were two-storied villas with 13+ rooms, the bottom floor built of sturdy fired brick and the top with mud brick, the walls coated with plaster and whitewashed. The front door led to a small entry hallway into an inner court, which had paving (not unlike, in concept, to our tiled entryways of the present), and then there was a reception room, kitchen, living rooms private rooms and a domestic chapel. A lavatory was hidden under the stone staircase, which led to private and guest rooms.

We have already examined the lines of Japheth and Ham; and Japheth's sons spread out the furthest, going both west, northwest and north. Ham went west and southwest from the Euphrates valley. The line of Shem stayed, for the most part, in the Euphrates valley.

⁹¹ From http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1134/is_9_116/ai_n21092828/ accessed October 5, 2010.

Gen 11:27–28 Now these are the generations of Terah: Terah fathered Abram, Nahor and Haran. And Haran fathered Lot. And Haran died before his father Terah in the land of his birth, in Ur of the Chaldeans.

Abram's brothers are Nahor and Haran, which makes Lot Abram's nephew.

Lesson 100: Genesis 11:27–32

Abram's Line

Gen 11:27–28 Now these are the generations of Terah: Terah fathered Abram, Nahor and Haran. And Haran fathered Lot. And Haran died before his father Terah in the land of his birth, in Ur of the Chaldeans.

At this point, the book of Genesis changes. Previous to this, we have studied 2000–3000 years of human history in Gen. 1–11 (along with one verse which may go back millions of years into pre-human history). Although we followed 2 specific straight-line (or linear) genealogies which took us from Adam to Noah and then from Noah to Abram, we have not really looked at anyone's life in any sort of detail. Individuals have been mentioned along with an incident or two from that person's life, but much of this has been a rather long period of human history condensed down to 10 chapters (maybe more, if we include the Book of Job). However, now, we will focus on the life of Abraham (then on the lives of Isaac, Jacob and Joseph). In fact, the lives of these 4 men comprise the content of the rest of the book of Genesis.

Since the book of Genesis is ready to pivot from a study of human history to the study of several individuals, let's examine this transition in points.

Transitional Point in the Book of Genesis

1. At this point, in the book of Genesis, we are transitioning from a history of mankind to the lives of 4 specific individuals.
2. God has a plan for mankind as well as for angelic beings. Gen. 1–10 gives us an early history of the earth and of mankind.
3. So far, we have studied the 5 divine institutions: the human soul, work, marriage, family and nation. Each of the divine institutions has a dramatic effect upon our lives; and each involves a system of authority and our own free will.
 - 1) We have seen the importance of individual choices, perhaps best illustrated by Adam, Eve, Cain, some of those in Cain's line, Enoch, and those of Noah and his family.
 - 2) We have seen the importance of work, particularly in the building of the ark in obedience to God (as well as the untold story of the collecting of the animals and the care for these animals before and during the flood). Furthermore, you will recall in the line of Cain, men were often identified with their vocation (as is the case today; when you meet someone for the first time, you almost immediately you ask, "And what do you do?").
 - 3) We have seen the corporate witness of a marriage—first with Adam and

Transitional Point in the Book of Genesis

- Eve (where the position of authority was reversed) and later where the proper chain of command appears to have been retained, with Noah and his wife.
- 4) There is the corporate witness of Noah's family, which involved the authority of Noah, work, and positive volition on the part of Noah and all who are in his family (the whole ark thing would not have worked without the entire family functioning as a unit, even though the Biblical focus is upon Noah).
 - 5) Finally, we have seen that God requires man to be separated into nations (the corporate witness of a nation will be a part of God's promises to Abram and then later, when these promises begin to be fulfilled by the nation Israel in subsequent books of the Bible).
4. However, what the key is, the volition of the individual soul. This is what the book of Genesis will continue to focus on man's volition.
 5. As we get into the life of Abraham we will see that God appears to shift from working through mankind as a whole to working through one man, and then through his descendants. God excludes everyone else in the human race because the human race is, for the most part, in rebellion against God. They are exhibiting negative volition, are involved in idolatry and have rejected God, so that God now selects one man, Abram, and through him, He is now going to deal with the rest of the human race. In this respect, Abram is also a type of Christ.
 6. This demonstrates God's determination to bless mankind despite human rebellion. No matter how negative man gets, no matter how rebellious the human race becomes, God reveals His determination to bless man. This is grace. Therefore, grace will continue to be a major theme, just as it is throughout all of Scripture. There will be a great emphasis upon grace in the life of Abram. Blessing becomes the dominant theme, whereas, in the first eleven chapters, there was this continual rebellion so that cursing (or divine discipline on the human race) has been the dominant theme (although, clearly, individuals were delivered throughout the first 10 chapters of Genesis).
 7. What we see in each of the men in the second part of Genesis—Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph—is the constant struggle of the believer to operate on divine viewpoint instead of on human viewpoint, arrogance and autonomy. This is the struggle that we as individuals constantly face. We will see this again and again in Abram's life. Despite what God has promised him, despite the blessing of God, despite God's personal appearance to Abram on numerous occasions, Abram still tries to live his life and solve his problems apart from God. This continues to be a problem and will continue to plague nation Israel later on. But we see in these men the constant struggle that the believer has, between his desire to live independently of God and his need to have a relationship with God.
 8. In Abraham we see a progression in spiritual growth before he receives the promised blessing. Everything moves toward that promised blessing in the seed of Abraham. That is the focal point of the promise. The blessing to all men ultimately comes through the seed, which Paul will interpret as the Lord Jesus

Transitional Point in the Book of Genesis

Christ, but, in context, the promised seed focuses on Isaac. Isaac is that funnel through which that blessing that God promises will come. Before Abraham receives the promise he has to be mature enough to have the capacity to handle the promise. That is true for us. We have to be mature enough to handle the blessings that God gives us or He won't always distribute them. Abraham has to go through many tests and training procedures before God finally, when Abram is age 100, brings about His promise in the birth of Isaac.

9. There are crucial doctrines that are taught through the life of Abraham. First of all, we have doctrines related to salvation.

- 1) Regeneration: This comes through the fact that Sarah is barren. It is impossible for her to give birth and Abraham is sexually dead, and yet God regenerates them. He gives life where there is death. Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel, the three wives of the patriarchs are all barren. God is teaching a principle: that He is the one who brings life where there is death, just as He brings spiritual life where there is spiritual death.
- 2) Justification: Paul develops this in Rom. 4 and also in Galatians. Abram is the Old testament picture of justification by faith alone in Jehovah Elohim alone.
- 3) Also we see substitutionary atonement in Genesis 22, when Abram is to take Isaac and sacrifice him, the promised seed, to God. God at the last minute stays his hand and provides a substitute through the ram that is caught in the bushes by the altar.
- 4) In Abram we have perhaps the greatest example in Scripture of the life of faith. We walk by faith and not by sight, and Abram is a picture of the faith-rest life (we will have the doctrine of faith-rest in the very near future).
- 5) Abram is also a picture of the personal sense of eternal destiny, and this is seen in Hebrews 11:8-19: **By faith Abraham obeyed when he was called to go out into a place which he was afterward going to receive for an inheritance. And he went out, not knowing where he went. By faith he lived in the land of promise as a stranger, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs of the same promise with him. For he looked for a city which has foundations, whose builder and maker is God. By faith also Sarah herself received strength to conceive seed and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged Him who had promised to be faithful. Because of this came into being from one, and that of one having [sexually] died, even as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as innumerable as the sand which is by the seashore. These all died by way of faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off. And they were persuaded of them and embraced them and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they who say such things declare plainly that they seek a fatherland. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from which they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they stretch forth to a better fatherland, that is, a heavenly one. Therefore God is not ashamed to be**

Transitional Point in the Book of Genesis

called their God, for He has prepared a city for them. By faith Abraham, being tested, offered up Isaac. And he who had received the promises offered up his only-begotten son, of whom it was said that in Isaac your Seed shall be called, concluding that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead, from where he even received him, in a figure.

All of these points will be examined in greater detail as we delve into the life of Abram.

The final 5 points come from [Robert Dean's Genesis Study lesson #065](#) (these points were edited).

Gen 11:29 And Abram and Nahor took wives for themselves. The name of Abram's wife was Sarai. And the name of Nahor's wife, Milcah, the daughter of Haran, the father of Milcah, and the father of Iscah.


Interestingly enough, this is the first time that we learn anything about the wives. We knew Eve, but we were told virtually nothing about the wives of Noah, Shem, Ham or Japheth (not their names or their origins).

Milcah, Nahor's wife, is also his niece. We will find out in Gen. 20:12 that Sarai is either Abram's half-sister (same father but different mothers) or his niece (the granddaughter of Terah).

Gen 11:30 But Sarai was barren. She had no child.

Sarai's barrenness was a problem in the ancient world. At that time, it was a sign of prosperity to have a lot of children. God had commanded man to fill the earth and, as we have seen in our study of genealogies, most families did just that, often having 10–20 children. These children provided a

The Genealogies of Genesis



From: <http://www.esvstudybible.org/sb/images/1200/diagram-01-01.png>

better life for themselves and for their parents; and they took care of their parents in their old age.

Sarai's barrenness is also mentioned in Gen. 16:1–2 and will be an important theme from that point on. That Abram's wife Sarai is barren will become the most important issue in hers and Abram's marriage. After several years of marriage, they produced no child, which is why this remark to be made. Whether the human author or God the Holy Spirit is foreshadowing at this point is unknown.

Name	Abram	Sarai	Nahor	Milcah
Meaning	<i>exalted father; father of high and windy places</i>	<i>my princess; possibly, contentious, bitchy</i>	<i>snoring</i>	<i>queen</i>

R. B. Thieme Jr. says that *Sarai* means *contentious, bitchy*. Rotherham is the only other person I could find who suggested the same thing. It is possible that Sarai (SRY in the Hebrew) is short for *sheriyûth* (תּוֹרִיקָה) [pronounced *sher-ee-RUTH*], which means *firmness, hardness, stubbornness*. Strong's #8307 BDB #1057.

Gen 11:31 And Terah took Abram his son, and Lot, the son of Haran, his son's son, and Sarai his daughter-in-law, his son Abram's wife. And he went forth with them from Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan. And they came to Charan [Haran] and lived there.

Interestingly enough, Sarai has now been mentioned 3 times in the previous 3 verses, but her familial relationship to Abram is not discussed here. I do not have an explanation for that.

Terah and his family traveled northwest up the Euphrates River, apparently. This would have been a major trade route during that time. Haran (the city; also spelled *Charan*) was about 90% of the way to the land of Canaan, and, at that time, it may have even been seen as the eastern edge of the land of Canaan. We are never given a reason for this journey. Perhaps the death of Haran back in Ur of the Chaldees made Terah want to move elsewhere.

A Map of Abraham's Journey



From http://www.genesisfiles.com/Images/Ur_HarranMap.jpg

In the map above, in the far right bottom corner is the Persian Gulf. The 2 rivers leading to that gulf are the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. The land around these rivers, at the time, was known as the fertile crescent (much of which is Iraq today). It is called a crescent because it also takes in the area of Palestine along the Mediterranean Sea (imagine a crescent moon superimposed, face-down, upon this map).⁹²

The yellow line in the map above is a reasonable guess as to the route that Terah and company took (along the Euphrates River) to Charan. Southwest of Charan is the Land of Canaan, bordered on the west (the left-hand side of the map) by the Mediterranean Sea.

Gen 11:31 And Terah took Abram his son, and Lot, the son of Haran, his son's son, and Sarai his daughter-in-law, his son Abram's wife. And he went forth with them from Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan. And they came to Charan [Haran] and lived there.

When it comes to several city's names, we do not know the origin of the name, but we can certainly guess. Haran, Terah's son, died back in Ur of the Chaldees, but, apparently, the rest of the family (under Terah) moved to Charan (Haran). In the Hebrew, these 2 proper

⁹² The crescent moon and a star are used to symbolize Islam. Some attribute this to early idolatry among the Arabs (the worship of celestial bodies), this fertile crescent of old may have played a part in the selection of this symbol.

nouns are very similar, and it is not out of the question for one to be derived from the other (and a poor manuscript could result in one being easily mistaken for the other). Furthermore, *Charan* and *Haran* mean the same thing: *mountaineer*.

Did Terah and company simply stop at a city with a name similar to Terah's son? Did Terah name this city, which eventually became its name (and possibly recorded here as a gloss). We are not given any clues, apart from the name itself.


Charan was an important city on the trade route between the Mediterranean and the Mesopotamian area and it is unclear in this context as to how well established it was by this time. It was a flourishing city during the 3rd millennium B.C., which would place it in this time-frame, either immediately before or after. Living in two large cities would indicate that in order to do any trading and carry on any kind of commerce, Terah and family would have to learn the languages of those in that area. Being major cities, there were probably two or more languages spoken in each area and some variations of each.

Gen 11:32 And the days of Terah were two hundred and five years. And Terah died in Charan.

The life span of man dropped off dramatically after the flood. Noah lived 950 years, but his son Shem lived only 600 years. His son Arpachshad lived only 468 years. And the decrease of life span continues down to Terah, who lives only 205 years.

In fact, this life span decrease roughly models an exponential decay curve, which is quite surprising, if you think the writers of Genesis simply pulled numbers out of a hat. However, this is perfectly in line with normal decay curves of any kind. Interestingly enough, growth curves are closely associated with the growth or expansion of life; and the decay curve (a related equation) is associated with the death and decay of life (and other things). These exponential curves are universal, and integral to all life and death. That the ages of Noah's descendants conform to such a curve is what we would expect in a true recording of history; it is not what we would find in a fictionalized account.

Without sin, Adam's body was designed by God to live forever. After sinning, Adam's body lived nearly 1000 years. Those who descended from Adam also had long life spans as well. However, with the flood, the gene pool was dramatically narrowed to one family, and that one family entered into a world with a great deal more bacteria (millions of people, animals and plants would have been destroyed by the flood), and who knows what



From <http://custance.org/old/seed/fig3s.jpg>

else changed which affected our lifespan. The end result was a decrease of the life span of man from nearly 1000 years to 70 or so.

From the very beginning, the Bible is concerned with a particular family line, beginning with Adam, and now, having worked its way down to Abraham. The book of Luke will actually follow this line of Adam all the way to Jesus (which is the genetic line of our Lord, which goes through Mary). However, many authors, over a period of several thousand years, knew, through the guidance of God the Holy Spirit, which line to follow.

With Abraham's salvation, we will begin the Age of Israel (also known as the Jewish Age). The Age of Israel may be broken down into 3 parts: the time of the Patriarchs (from Abraham to Joseph); the nation Israel (from Joseph' death to our Lord's ascension into heaven); and the Tribulation, which will begin at the termination of the Church Age and will continue for a shortened 7 years.

[Introductory Lessons](#)
[HTML](#)

[Genesis Lessons 1-100](#)
[HTML](#)

[Genesis Lessons 101-200](#)
[HTML](#)

[Introductory Lessons](#)
[PDF](#)

[Genesis Lessons 1-100](#)
[PDF](#)

[Genesis Lessons 101-200](#)
[PDF](#)

[Kukis Homepage](#)

[Exegesis](#)

[Doctrines](#)