

98-03-22a

Our scripture reading this morning is from Hebrews chapter 5, where the author is speaking of the high priesthood of Jesus Christ. To fully appreciate, or at least come to a significant appreciation of the high priesthood of Christ, I'm not sure we can ever fully appreciate it in this life, but it requires a foundation, it requires a frame of reference so that when these truths are presented, they fit, they make sense, there is a context. Appreciating high priesthood requires understanding what priesthood is, what it's for, and the author breaks off in verse 11 of chapter 5 of Hebrews in talking about that priesthood of Christ, acknowledging the fact that this requires a foundation.

There are some basic truths, some foundational truths that are required to move on and understand these wonderful aspects of the person and work of Jesus Christ. And that bears on our study this morning as we conclude Genesis chapter 4 with the genealogy of Cain. You wouldn't immediately think that those two things are related, but as we examine our scripture reading this morning, watch especially for the role that a foundation in the truth, that a frame of reference provides us in the approach to the will of God and understanding the purposes of God.

The author in Hebrews chapter 5 speaks of Christ. It's difficult to not read all of this, but we'll break into the middle of it in verse 8, talking about Christ. Though he was a son, yet he learned obedience by the things which he suffered, and having been perfected, he became the author of eternal salvation to all who obey him, called by God as high priest according to the order of Melchizedek, of whom we have much to say and hard to explain since you have become dull of hearing.

For though by this time you ought to be teachers, you need someone to teach you again the first principles of the oracles of God, and you have come to need milk and not solid food. For everyone who partakes only of milk is unskilled in the word of righteousness, for he is a babe. But solid food belongs to those who are of full age, that is, those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.

Therefore, leaving the discussion of the elementary principles of Christ, let us go on to perfection or completion or maturity, not laying again the foundation of change of mind away from dead works and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, of laying on of hands, of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment. And this we will do if God permits. For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened and have tasted the heavenly gift and have become partakers of the Holy Spirit and have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the age to come, if they fall away, to renew them again to repentance, since they crucify again for themselves the Son of God and put him to an open shame.

Those verses, by the way, have been the ground for a great deal of thought and

interpretation and argument and debate, whether it refers to a believer who has, as we used to say in the Baptist church, backslidden, or whether it refers to an unbeliever who tasted of the good things of God at the point of gospel hearing and fell away, didn't partake. For the earth which drinks in the rain, by the way, these verses seven and following really help us answer that question. The earth which drinks in the rain that often comes upon it and bears herbs useful for those by whom it is cultivated receives blessing from God.

You have here the often used picture of a cultivated field that is watered and nurtured over and over. This is a regular, ongoing pattern. And what the gardener or the cultivator is looking for is fruit.

And this tells us that we're talking about believers and we're talking about the life of a believer. If it bears herbs useful for those by whom it is cultivated, it receives blessing from God. But if it bears thorns and briars, it is rejected and near to being cursed.

It isn't actually cursed. It's not like the ground back in Genesis chapter three. But it is near to a curse.

It's associated with the curse whose end is to be burned. But beloved, we are confident of better things concerning you. Yes, things that accompany deliverance, though we speak in this manner.

It goes on to talk about God not being unjust to forget their work and labor of love. And the reason he says he's convinced of better things of them is not that he's convinced that they're saved or that they're elect, but he is convinced that they are the field that is going to produce herbs desired or useful to the one who cultivates. And that's why he continues the book.

He doesn't stop Hebrews in the middle of chapter six and say, you all need milk and not solid food, so there's no point in continuing. He says, I'm convinced that you're ready to take on this more advanced understanding, this more advanced teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ. And that's why he continues.

He says, I'm convinced of better things of you. But there's a mixed crowd in the church, as there almost always is. There are some who do need milk instead of solid food.

And he basically is saying here, I'm probably going to lose some of you as we move forward into the high priesthood of Christ because you're not really ready for this. And why is that? Because they need someone to teach again the first principles of the oracles of God. They have come to need milk and not solid food.

And this tells us that at some point in the past, they had made progress in their understanding and then had been deflected, had been distracted, had been led away and lost the ground that they had gained. And he says, you have come to need milk. All

of us start out needing milk, but they now have come to need milk again.

They've got to go back and start over. There are a lot of principles here, but the primary truth and the link to our passage in Genesis chapter 4 is that it is possible for believers, after salvation, to follow two different paths. And the issue is not so much, is this individual saved or are they lost? In many cases in Scripture, we have no explicit statement of someone's saving faith.

What we do have is a very detailed description of their life and their choices. And this is not an accident. It is striking that most of our discussions, especially when comparing theologies, are related about salvation and turn on, is someone saved or are they lost? When we think about people in our periphery, we primarily think, are they saved or are they lost? If they're saved, our concern level drops significantly.

No matter how bad off they are, we think, well, at least they're saved. At least they're a believer. I know that they have professed faith in Christ at some distant point in the past.

But isn't it interesting that the Bible almost never does that? The Bible doesn't think the way we think in terms of people's status. The Bible looks at lifestyle. The Bible looks at pattern of choice and pattern of thought and doesn't necessarily say, well, here's a terrible pattern of thought, but at least you're saved.

The Bible says, where is your pattern of faith? Where is your pattern of obedience? Almost to the point of deemphasizing whether or not someone is saved. And of course, from our perspective and to us, that's the big thing. We think, well, this life, you may mess up, but if you're saved, it will all turn out right in the end.

That isn't God's perspective and that isn't God's emphasis. And it's very difficult to find any passages that support that view. Over and over again, the entire Old Testament, you don't find a trace of evangelism.

What you find is a call to Israel to obey, a call to Israel to heed, a call to Israel to love the Lord their God with all their heart, all their soul, and all their strength. And we find that this pattern is set for us beginning in the early chapters of Genesis. And if you'll turn with me now back to Genesis chapter 4, we resume after the murder of Abel, after the death of Abel, we resume after the death of Cain.

And we see repeated opportunities that God provides to Cain by coming to him and asking him questions and engaging in conversation with him, repeated opportunities for Cain to acknowledge his transgression. First of all, his transgression in offering a sacrifice apart from faith, offering a sacrifice out of some motivation other than faith, as we saw from Hebrews chapter 11 when it says that by faith, Abel offered a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain. That was the distinction.

But those conversations have taken place. Cain, instead of responding to the

confrontation that God has with him, moves in the other direction. And contact with God drives Cain further into sin rather than sparking humility, acknowledgement, confession, repentance, and a change of direction.

And like the issue of Jesus Christ himself, contact with God, contact with the gospel of God, with the truth about Jesus Christ polarizes human beings. Jesus says, I can either be the rock of salvation or the rock of stumbling. I can either be the rock that men fall on for their salvation or I can be the rock that falls on someone and grinds them to powder.

It's our response, it's our reaction and accountability for that response and reaction that determines our fate in the world. We're going to see that borne out as we trace the genealogy of Cain beginning in verse 16 of Genesis chapter 4. After the curse that Cain brings on himself, that he thinks is greater than he can bear, and God's preserving covenant with Cain in placing a mark on him and vowing retribution on anyone who kills Cain. By the way, we've already discussed the idea that the penalty for murder is death and yet Cain does not physically die.

Why is that? Because the banishment and the curse that is placed on Cain is the equivalent of death. It is just as bad. And under the law of Talion, there is the principle of substitution.

Just like in redemption, there is the principle of substitution. All of the first born in Israel were redeemed with money. The principle of redemption is central to our salvation and it is the substitution of one thing for another.

We trace the law of Talion in the Old Testament and saw that instead of an eye for an eye, money could be paid in lieu of an eye. Money could be paid in lieu of a tooth or an ox or whatever had been mandated by the law as a one for one exchange. It reminds us that there are things as bad as physical death.

The expulsion of Adam and Eve from the garden. In the day that you eat thereof, you shall surely die. Well, what happened in the day that they ate thereof? They were expelled from the garden and from the personal presence of God.

And this is an equivalence. This is as bad as physical death. Apart from the theological concepts of spiritual death and so forth, you have in the physical realm the law of Talion.

An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a life for a life. And when the sentence is death, there are sometimes things as bad as death. Expulsion from the garden is an equivalent.

Expulsion from the association with the rest of his relatives, the land where Adam and later Seth and his offspring would live. Cain is banished to the land of wandering, the land of Nod. And this, even today in Jewish circles, to be banished and cut off from your family is the equivalent of death.

Someone who converts to Christianity, his family will say he's dead. It's an equivalent. To them, he is dead.

So we have this concept with Cain. Verse 16, Cain went out from the presence of the Lord and dwelt in the land of Nod, i.e. wandering, on the east of Eden. Last week we studied two concepts from this verse.

First of all, going out from the presence of the Lord, what the significance of the presence of the Lord is. And secondly, what the east represents in Scripture. And I hope you have recollection of those thoughts.

Verse 17, And Cain knew his wife, and she conceived and bore Enoch. And he built a city, and called the name of the city after the name of his son, Enoch. To Enoch was born Erad, and Erad begot Methuselah, and Methuselah begot Methuselah, and Methuselah begot Lamech.

Then Lamech took for himself two wives. The name of one was Ada, and the name of the second was Zillah. And Ada bore Jabal.

He was the father of those who dwell in tents and have livestock. His brother's name was Jubal. He was the father of all those who play the harp and flute.

And as for Zillah, she also bore Tubal-Cain, an instructor of every craftsman in bronze and iron. And the sister of Tubal-Cain was Amah. Then Lamech said to his wives, Ada and Zillah, hear my voice.

Wives of Lamech, listen to my speech. For I have killed a man for wounding me, even a young man for hurting me. If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, then Lamech seventy-sevenfold.

And Adam knew his wife again, and she bore a son, and named him Seth. For God has appointed another seed for me instead of Abel, whom Cain killed. And as for Seth, to him also a son was born, and he named him Enosh.

Then men began to call on the name of the Lord. One of the first things we need to address is in verse 17, when it says, Cain knew his wife, and she conceived and bore Enoch. This euphemism we first encountered in verse 1 of chapter 4, now Adam knew his wife Eve, she conceived and bore Cain.

The terminology is identical here. This euphemism has been brought over in New Testament study, and it may seem like we're roaming far afield here, but we're really not. If you think about Romans 8.29, when it says, talking about God, whom he foreknew, then he predestined to be conformed to the image of his son.

There is quite a significant branch of theology. Many, many believers have been trained

up in this understanding of the word of God, believe that God's foreknowledge is an expression of this idea, or this euphemism, of intimacy and love. Obviously when it says, Adam knew his wife, Cain knew his wife, and they were offspring, this is a use of the term know that goes beyond just familiarity, or an understanding of a concept.

Because it implies great intimacy, because it implies closeness, this idea has been imported into the concept of God's foreknowledge. If you go to many Reformed works, it will talk about God actually loving ahead of time, loving early on, and that this is a fundamental part of election. We're not going to dwell on this, but I do want to clear it up because we are encountering this euphemism three times in the space of the chapter, 4.1, 4.16, and 4.25, and we do need to understand what this does and does not mean.

Basically, the verb here, Yadah, in Hebrew, Y-A-D-A-H, is much like the English term know, its meaning is determined by context, and the context pretty much forces you to a particular conclusion about this term. It does not have as its locus of meaning inherent in the word, it does not have the idea of intimacy or love, unless it's implicit in the context, we don't find that. We do find it in the context, for example, in Genesis 24.16, which talks about the finding of Rebekah for Isaac, and when she comes to the well and she's going to water the sheep, it says that she was a virgin of her people and had not known a man.

Well, because you have the context, known a man, that tells us what the word know means. But you have other passages, such as Genesis 29.5, and you might turn there, where the very same verb is used, Yadah, and here you have a conversation, Jacob is talking to some men who have gathered around a well, they're herdsmen, Jacob says to them in verse 4 of Genesis 29, My brethren, where are you from? And they say, We are from Haran. Then he said to them, Do you know Laban, the son of Nahor? And they said, We know him.

Very same verb, very same construction, but obviously he's not asking them a gross question here. He's asking them if they know an individual. And there are several such passages in the Old Testament where the verb Yadah is used of people, of knowing one person or knowing another, and it has no implication of physical relationship, intimacy, or love.

Jacob is not asking these men if they love Laban. There's a similar use over in 2 Kings 9.11. I've just selected a few of these because this is one of the most common verbs in the Old Testament, has a variety of uses. By the way, one of the most common uses, which is quite striking and bears a study all its own, is the phrase, Then you shall know that I am the Lord.

And in the last half of the Old Testament, that is an incredibly oft-repeated phrase, and it tells us something about the purposes of God in the discipline of Israel. The prophets generally are talking about the discipline of Israel, and what is the purpose of the

discipline? What is the purpose of the captivities and the chastenings and the abuse and hardship that Israel endures in the time of the prophets? God is trying to bring them back to a knowledge of himself, and this is key. It's key to our understanding of Genesis 4. If you look at 2 Kings 9.11, there is a prophecy that is given about the dogs eating Jezebel on the plot of ground at Israel.

This is given by Elisha. He opens the door and flees in 10. Then Jehu came out to the servants of his master, and one said to him, Is all well? Why did this madman come to you? This is Elisha, Elisha the madman.

And he said to them, You know the man and his babble. Jehu has no respect for Elisha. He says, You know this man, you know his babble.

Obviously, there is no implication here of love, intimacy, close relationship of any kind, but it's the verb Yadah, used of a person. So, you get the idea. It is an illegitimate transference of meaning to read intimacy and love into the term know.

When you get to Romans 8.29, and it says whom he foreknew, this is not only illegitimate transference, this is a term in grammar for importing meaning to a word where it doesn't belong. Not only is it a case of that, but you have a different word. When you put a prefix on a word, it means an entirely different thing.

You find dozens of examples of this in English. Think about the word fix. We fix a tire, we fix a broken object, but if you put a prefix on there, prefix, prefix has nothing to do with repairing anything, does it? It completely changes the meaning of the word.

You have infix, you have suffix, each of those by putting a prefix on it changes the meaning of the word. Well, in the New Testament, ginosko is the Greek word for know, and proginosko is the word for foreknow. When you put on a prefix, you have to start from scratch.

Obviously, you're going to look at the root meaning of the word, but the inherent meaning of that word with its prefix is liable to be different. Just as a final thought on this, turn with me to Acts 26, verse 5. Paul is speaking here in his own defense. He is recounting his history, his manner of life as a Pharisee and as a Jew prior to his Damascus Road experience.

You can pick up in Acts 26, verse 2, he's talking to King Agrippa. He says, I think myself happy, King Agrippa, because today I shall answer for myself before you concerning all the things of which I am accused by the Jews, especially because you are expert in all customs and questions which have to do with the Jews. Therefore, I beg you to hear me patiently.

My manner of life from my youth, which was spent from the beginning among my own nation at Jerusalem, all the Jews know. They knew me from the first, if they were willing

to testify, that according to the strictest sect of our religion, I lived as a Pharisee. So, what is Paul doing? He says, there are Jews here who, if they were willing to testify, could tell you that I grew up in Jerusalem, I lived by the strictest rules of the Pharisee sect, and nobody could find any fault with me.

But if you look there at the beginning of verse 5, it says, they knew me from the first. That verb is *progenosko*. Now, those Jews have no special relationship, no love, no intimacy with Paul.

In fact, they hate him so much, they're not even willing to speak up and say, well, that's really right, he was a Pharisee, and he was accepted among us, and he sat at the feet of Gamaliel, and was one of the premier protégés of that great Pharisee. They don't want to speak up at all, but he says, they *progenosko* me. They knew me before.

They knew me beforehand, and there's no intimation. And that, by the way, is the only other use of *progenosko* in the New Testament to which we can appeal to get an idea about God's foreknowledge. So, we want to be careful to not be impressed by grammatical arguments that are not sound.

And people who appeal to the Old Testament and say, look at how many times *no* means to have relations and be intimate, and this was God's intimacy in eternity past, is not a sound argument. Even logically, if you think about this, relationship is a two-way street. It's not a one-way street.

We have a name for someone who thinks they have a relationship with someone else when that other person doesn't know anything about it, and it takes place ahead of time before there's even any contact. We call it fantasizing. It's not a legitimate concept to apply to God.

So, this is a subject we need to cover as we look at this phrase, Cain knew his wife, Adam knew his wife. It is not a place to come when we look at the foreknowledge of God and draw inferences about that very special attribute of God's character. Cain knew his wife.

She conceived and bore Enoch, and he built a city and called the name of the city after the name of his son, Enoch. Now, we've already seen that there are some textual problems throughout the Old Testament. We've noted a few here in Genesis, and this is a verse that has another textual problem.

I will not go into all the gory details, but let me give you a little bit here. Enoch is literally C-H-A-N-O-C-H. There's a hard C-H at the beginning of that name, so it's Chanak.

And the person who built a city in verse 17 is Chanak. Chanak is the builder of the city. The verb here for build is unusual.

It is a participle, which literally means he was the city builder, or he was building a city. It has the idea of ongoing action. In English, this is a gerund, an I-N-G word, building.

But participles are often used to rename a noun and indicate that this is a characteristic of someone, or this was a longstanding occupation. Remember, this is the first city, apparently, that was ever built. And so Enoch was the city builder.

That was his claim to fame. He built a city. First one anybody had ever seen.

And this participle is, most words in Hebrew are composed of three consonants. These three consonants are B-N-H. Bana is to build.

When you make an O-E construction out of the vowels, that makes it a participle. So, boneh is the participle, and this is the word used of Enoch. He is the city builder.

And he called the name of the city after the name of his son. But then you have in the English, Enoch, repeated again at the end of the verse. And it's this way in the Masoretic text as well.

But it is an extremely awkward construction in Hebrew, and those awkwardnesses tell us that something has happened to the text. And this is either a gloss, meaning that someone has inserted the word Enoch where it did not belong, or the verb has migrated from up above, where it should say, she conceived and bore Enoch, and Enoch built a city and called the city after the name of his son. But the name of the first city is not Enoch, and it wasn't built by Cain.

There are several things in the text that tell us this. First of all, what is the curse on Cain? He's going to be a fugitive and a vagabond. He's going to go live in the land of wandering.

It doesn't make any sense that he went out to Nod and built a city. How long does it take to build a city? You've got to stay in one spot for years and years and years. So right away, the combination of that fact and the awkwardness in the text is a signal to us to look carefully at our understanding of it.

And it yields fairly quickly to analysis. So Enoch built a city and called the name of the city after the name of his son. What is the name of Enoch's son? Well, we find out in the next verse.

To Enoch was born Erad. And we have actually some extra-biblical confirmation of our hypothesis here about the text, because in ancient Mesopotamian tradition, and where is Mesopotamia? That's the land of Abraham, that's the land of Ur, this region where civilization began. In ancient Mesopotamian tradition, the name of the oldest city in the world was Eridu, which is essentially the same as Erad.

So even in Mesopotamian tradition, when they said the oldest city in the world, it's Erad, it's Eridu. There's also a very fascinating wordplay, and it's hard to get anybody excited about a wordplay if you see it in the Hebrew and you try to explain it, it doesn't make a whole lot of sense. But you remember I said the word builder is Boneh? Well, the word his son is Bono.

And Bono and Boneh sort of go together in the same way that the word for city, which is Ir, and Erad go together. And it's a very common occurrence to see in Hebrew little wordplays like this. We saw it back in the account of the fall, where it said that the Eve knew that they were naked, and the word naked and the word cunning are a play on the same set of consonants.

We have the same thing here. We have Boneh and Bono, and we have Ir and Erad working together here. So all of these things are clues that provide us the answer to this rather confusing situation.

To Enoch was born Erad. Erad begot Mehujael. You start getting into the begots here, and we think, well, you know, let's read quickly.

When you go through one of these read the Bible in five years things, and you get to the begots, you just think, you know, ka-chunk, ka-chunk, ka-chunk, ka-chunk. Where are we going to pick up the story again? But these names are quite interesting, and there's no detail in the word of God that is there by accident. It all is there for a reason.

And the begots are one of the most fascinating and also one of the most challenging places to study. If you look here at these names, after Erad, he begot Mehujael. The Js are Ys in Hebrew, so this is actually Mehu-ya-el.

Obviously, because these are very early names, very old words, it's difficult to ascertain with certainty what the meaning is, and there have been conjectures, pro and con, but generally Semiticists or Old Testament scholars have settled on the meaning blotted out by God for this name. It is also sometimes thought to mean grief, depending on how you trace the etymology. As I mentioned before, etymology is the ascertaining of the meaning of a word by looking at its history.

Well, in the earliest periods of history, there is no history, so these are the archetypes. These words were sort of made up, and they're the first use to which everybody else appealed for their etymology. So you can't always go to etymology to figure out what these mean.

We have to actually look at their derivatives, and there are Arabic cognates and things that we can look at to figure out what early people assigned as a meaning to these words. But Mehu-ya-el generally is thought to mean blotted out by God, or a great word for grief. And his son is Methu-sha-el.

And Methu, or Mutu, is an ancient word that means man, and Sha-el is a Hebrew pointing. This may very well be Sha-ol, and the meaning of the name would then be man of the underworld, or man of Sheol. You start to see a pattern of rebellion in the meaning of these words.

When you have a son, and you look down in the swaddling clothes there at this newborn heir of everything that you own, and you name him blotted out by God, or you name him man of Sheol, you're shaking your fist in God's face. And this tells us something about the attitude of these descendants of Cain, that they are truly chips off the old block. And they're not concerned about God or the things of God, and they see that as their posterity, that's their legacy, that's their heritage, is rebellion against God.

And they figure this is a valid alternative lifestyle, and who are you to tell me any different. This is sort of an in-your-face sort of a legacy when it comes to relationship with God. You get down to the son of Methu-sha-el, or Mutu-sha-ol, he names his son Lamech.

Lamech means oppressor, or overthrower. So you have three generations in a row here, and it reminds us of the three generation curse that we find later on in Exodus 34, when God declares his glory before Moses, hides him in the cleft of the rock, and passes by. He says, the Lord, the Lord, gracious and merciful, compassion for thousands, and so forth.

Nevertheless, he does not forgive iniquity or overlook transgression, but he visits the sins of the fathers on the sons and the sons' sons, even to the third generation of those who hate him. Well, you have here a pretty good indication that these are generations of those who hate him, just from these names. So you have blotted out by God, man of the underworld, and overthrower and oppressor, as the lineage of Cain.

By the time you get down to Lamech, Lamech takes for himself two wives. Everything about Lamech is doubled. Lamech is the man of two things.

He takes two wives. The name of one is Ada, and the name of the second was Zillah. Their names are both words that go to sensual pleasures.

Ada means pleasure or ornament, something pleasing to the eye. Zillah means shade or shadow, a refreshment in the cool. We studied Friday night about the olive tree, and everyone resting in the shade of his vine and his olive tree.

Shade is a sensual pleasure. It's a good feeling. It's also Sil, Sade is a letter in Hebrew, and T-S-I-L is the root of her name.

Well, Tzil-Tzil in Hebrew means it's the sound that a bell makes. It's a tinkling sound. When it comes over into Greek and you talk about the sounding brass or the tinkling cymbal, well, if you were rendering that in Hebrew, you would say Tzil-Tzil of the cymbal.

So, again, you have perhaps a combination of visual stimulation and auditory stimulation or sensual stimulation. All of these names of the wives have to do with the idea that this is a man who's out for pleasure. Ada and Zillah.

Ada bore Jabal. Now you have three sons. You have Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal, or all three of their names come from the same word, which is Yabal, which means to produce, to bring forth something, to bring something into existence.

And these three sons of Lamech all are the originators of something. You find that Jabal, or Yabal, again, all these J's are wives, Jabal is the father of those who dwell in tents and have livestock. His brother's name is Jubal.

He's the father of all those who play the harp and the flute. He is the originator of music. And then you have Tubal, or Tubal-Cain, who is the metal worker.

What is the significance of this outcome, these three sons that issue from the line of Cain? We're going to pause and take our break, and when we come back we're going to see. And when we do, we'll bring this around and find out if this has any significance at all for us as we go forth and live our lives. But let's pause and take a break.