

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE MESSIANIC LINE

(Gen. 4:25-5:32)

1. *The Birth of Seth*

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

2. *The Two Genealogies*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BEGINNINGS OF THE MESSIANIC LINE 4:25, 26

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

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

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

BEGINNINGS OF THE MESSIANIC LINE 4:25, 26

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

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

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

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

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

"6 And Seth lived a hundred and five years, and begat Enosh: 7 and Seth lived after he begat Enosh eight hundred and seven years, and begat sons and daughters: 8 and all the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years, and he died.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. *The Translation of Enoch*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. *Methuselah, Lamech, and Noah*

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

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

8. *The Longevity of the Antediluvian Patriarchs*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* * * * *

FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

The Messianic Ministry

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

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

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

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

* * * * *

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART NINETEEN

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

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE MESSIANIC LINE

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

GENESIS

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