

Pre-Flood Traditions

Question: In relation to Genesis 4: If the tradition is right that Cain and Abel were twins, it seems rather unusual that Cain grew up in one way being disobedient whereas Abel was righteous. What caused this?

Answer: Morality has nothing to do with birth. Most of this has to do with upbringing.

Let's face it—the Bible states something peculiar in Genesis 4:2. Everywhere else the statement is consistently repeated that "Adam knew his wife" or somebody "knew his wife and she bore so-and-so"—this is stated over and over again. This is the only place in the Scripture where it says, "And she added to bare" or "she added in baring his brother Abel." And Adam Clarke brings out the implication that the meaning of this Hebrew phrase could be understood as meaning a twin—could be an unlike twin, not a like twin! You must understand that: There are different kinds of twins. This was an unlike twin though of the same sex—hence they came from different egg cells. That's certainly what is indicated.

An important comment on tradition: And then one can look at ancient tradition—and we state that that's what it is. After all, the word "tradition" in the Bible is not necessarily used in a consistently negative manner. It's wrong if it's the wrong kind of tradition. But we have certain customs in the Church about how to conduct the Passover service and other things—the format by which we proceed. We have a tradition about the order of events in the Sabbath service. There are certain traditions such as this which we follow and there is no reason to change them. This is why Paul used the term in a proper sense in II Thess. 2:15 and 3:6.

The meaning in relation to this class is that we place a different weight on different things. In other words, I have stated clearly that even the Jews recognize that that part of scripture which has the most weight is the Law—then the Prophets. This is the same as saying that you don't interpret the Law by the Writings as much as you interpret the Writings by the Law. But this is what the world has done with the New Testament! They interpret Jesus by way of Paul instead of Paul by way of Jesus! The Gospel supersedes in time order, and in point of approach, Paul's letters "in which are some things hard to be understood" (II Peter 3:16). Now "all scripture is given by inspiration of God"—we recognize this. However, it is not all of equal impact for all periods of time. Prophecy means more in one generation than it does in another. Law meant more, in that sense, to the Jews living in Palestine than it does to us since some laws are not even applicable; we don't even live in a society where it could be possible—because some laws are not for the individual, some laws are for the community. The law of the jubilee is for the community and not the individual.

In the same way, I don't put the same weight on everything that I read. I put less weight on some things and more weight on others. We create a world-view in the history class. Remember, history is an art. Never forget that! Therefore, in reading the Bible (and especially in regard to the subject at hand—the pre-Flood society), we create a picture, a generalized picture—much like you look back on your life and create a distorted picture of what you have experienced, because no picture is absolutely clear. And don't tell me the Gospels give you an absolutely clear picture of everything Jesus did, because there are many things you must fill in in your own mind (John 21:25). It is impossible to put everything down on paper. We do this in our own lives. We begin to have rosey pictures of some things that weren't quite as rosey at the time! But those are incidental details like an artist who paints a picture if he reproduces a scene: It's just as distorted in some little details as a photograph distorts things by maximizing the insignificant. You have to realize this! So history is an art—and I

think in this sense a valid art. Because there are some things which are increasingly important as time goes by—the longer time passes, the more important they become! In the same way, other things become less important. And one must weigh events on the basis of value. (And this is why true science has its limitations—it cannot determine the difference in value if it is strictly, you know, a matter of only recording information or data. This is the so-called scientific approach.) But as time goes by we discover that different happenings have different weight, and have exercised a far greater influence in the world than the people at the time it occurred might have imagined.

Now the story of Cain and Abel: It is unimportant whether they were twins; it is clear that they were brothers. It is even more important that there was some differentiation in the upbringing of the two—that one was brought up right and, for some reason, the other was not. And, clearly, the whole picture is that we are dealing even with a racial difference to start with in this particular family of two sons. Now, when we realize what was involved, there is no reason why they may not have been twins—no reason why they may not. The one was pampered more than the other because the one was the firstborn and was looked upon as God by the mother who thought that she had borne the promised seed. She was deceived! The cause was strictly upbringing. (But I wanted to get in this thought here about the relative weight that should be applied to different things.)

Question: The Bible shows us that God was still working with the human family after the expulsion from Eden. Thus it seems somewhat incongruous that Adam and Eve could make such far-reaching mistakes when God was present to give them advice.

Answer: Well, I think that is clear. You never find that God ever again worked with Adam and Eve! There is no mention of this in the Bible. Adam was cut off from the tree of life, and God kicked him out from His presence! The two who brought the offerings were the sons. And I do not think there is a bit of evidence to show that God ever tried to persuade Adam to go back to the Garden. The Scripture says it was otherwise—that He set angels there that nothing like that could take place. But God did appear to the human family and apparently reappeared to the sons to work with them!

The mother never was undeceived in some of these points. And the idea of dualism and the doctrine of an immortal soul in a material body has ever since continued all the way down to our world. She instilled this kind of thinking into Cain's mind! She liked Cain.

There are some mothers who like some children more than others. I think every mother has this characteristic. Some carry it to the tragic extreme of letting this little boy, as Eve did, just dominate! Probably Cain was allowed to have his way all the time. There was nothing Abel could do that seemed to be right! You know how this is in some families? I know of one woman in the Church who thinks that if there is any mistake her daughter is always making it—but her boys can not! Somehow they are different. Maybe she can see it in herself that she used to make mistakes because she is a woman, and so the girl is being brought up a lot better than the boys just because of that. It was probably Cain that didn't get the beatings and he's always the one who was accusing Abel. And so Abel got the beatings or the spankings. Knowing human nature, I think we can bear down on that and make the picture clear. Because this is how it has to start—right in the home and the family unit.

Of course, there is also the fact that God does call some individuals and He doesn't others. But you don't have to be naughty and nasty and evil just because God hasn't called you, you know. You can just be spiritually ignorant but nevertheless be a responsible character. God did not call Theodore Roosevelt or Winston Churchill, and yet they were men of some remarkable ability and character and good judgment.

Question: Would you comment on the "process of time" expression in Genesis 4:3?

Answer: No. I mean, there are all kinds of possible explanations each one as clear as the original!

Question: Would you comment on the offerings Cain and Abel brought in Genesis 4?

Answer: There are certain kinds of offerings that were allowed. Josephus tells us that it was not the question of the fact that it was a vegetable offering, "the fruit of the ground," as distinct from the animals. Because God accepted both kinds, both are acceptable kinds of offerings. So it was not a question of the nature of it—Josephus is right. The question is that Abel got the food by rearing the animals properly. Cain was forcing the soil. It's the same principle that God does not accept tithing money from the price of harlotry. In other words, God is not going to bless you and doesn't want your money if you run a house of prostitution, tithing or not. You can't justify sin by tithing. Cain was trying to force the soil. This is what he was doing. Josephus makes it clear. And I think Josephus has the absolutely right answer because nothing else makes sense—or God wouldn't accept vegetable and fruit offerings otherwise. And that's why punishment came on him—he was trying to GET. That's what his name meant. So that is clearly the answer. This is the answer that the priests would have given, the teachers in the Old Testament Church.

Question: I don't know whether this topic would require guidelines or more facts, but could you give us more about mythology. We had some interesting comments on Tabal-cain as Vulcan and Naamah as Athena.

Answer: I take that up in Classical Literature. It does not belong in this class. There I give the guidelines—and/or the facts! The reason is that we can't cover everything here; we don't have that kind of time.

The rule normally is not to go into that until we have a framework in history. However, I'll just summarize it this way in terms of religion in history: You are dealing with the personification of the attributes of God and/or nature! This is worthless other than to analyze the philosophy behind religion. In other cases your dealing with the deification of heroes.

And don't think that this rarely happens because all you have to do is go one generation back and remember a man named Joseph Goebbels who introduced Adolf Hitler as "My Fuehrer and My God!" It is almost inconceivable that a modern Western nation can think in these terms! Yet Hitler was looked upon as God—that is, the spokesman of God; but he was called God even by Goebbels. He was looked upon as the spokesman of God. There was something like this even in the days of the Kaiser though it didn't go to the same extreme—it was stated commonly as more of a joke: "God knows everything—but the Kaiser knows best!" This is something like the story about President LBJ and Lady Bird—she says to him, you know, "Everything is alright. Why don't we try this walkin' on the water again!" This approach—the idea that the Great Society can only be brought by a Messiah. Americans wouldn't go for serious worship of a leader; and not even in Germany under the Kaiser was it any more than a joke. But under Hitler it was taken seriously; he was looked upon as the Savior. Hence salvation was attributed to him. That's what "Siag Heil!" in a sense means—not only for him but attributed to him.

So the worship of men, then, becomes a historical fact easily documented. Now it is a question of finding out whether the men who have come to be worshipped indeed can be pinpointed Biblically and historically. This, I think, explains what the Bible says that "the sons of god saw the daughters of men that they were fair." The "sons of god were descendants of someone who was looked upon as God! And then when you see the who story we'll discover that, in fact, Cain was the first individual who was made a god! If you want to read it, just read the beginning portion of Ovid's Metamorphoses where you will see the story of the Garden of Eden, and how the world was going right, and h

This man led the world astray. And he was the first man who was made a god. You can't mistake the fact that this is the story of the family of Cain and the religion of Cain that has come down in pagan tradition. And Metamorphoses has this idea that human beings were transformed into some divine being.

In fact, that's what the old religion was. It was an effort to make religion to fool the people so they would worship the men who were once in power and position in government. It was an attempt to give religious aura. Every Caesar when he died was made a god! And one offered incense before Caesar because he was now divine. And the Pantheon was the place of worship of the divinities in which the Caesars were gods. The common people went to hades! They deserved it for following these gods!

Question: This concerns to the two lines of Cain and Seth. Why is it the one went in an evil direction, the other was righteous, but then they tend to dovetail together and both end up evil.

Answer: We may simply state that the line of Seth universally did not go right. One would in fact have to draw the conclusion that the family of Seth went its own way.

Cain did evil—the whole way of Cain—like the Gentiles today. But the Children of Israel "did that which was right in their own eyes." Now Cain knew he was doing wrong. Don't think that the Communists believe fully, or that anybody has believed fully, that everything they are doing is right. I think they finally persuaded themselves, but they know partly that it's wrong. And they try to hide it.

The philosophy of Seth is very clearly the philosophy of the Children of Israel: They do what seems right to them. They really sincerely think it's right. The implication is that all the other sons of Seth went wrong, and all the other sons of Adam. And only one son of Seth did not. These are the only individuals that God ever chose or used (Gen 5). So the whole world went astray. And finally you end up with Enoch having no son who really obeyed. And this is the implication of Josephus, that Methuselah is the one who finally said, "Well look, if this is what happened to Dad, this isn't paying off either. And here is where you have the final break-up of it, and the man who died in the Flood. I think this is the correct picture. But his son Lamech came to himself, and I suspect the relative shortness of the life of Lamech, the father of Noah (777 years—Gen. 5:31), is to some extent attributable to the sins of Methuselah. And then Noah obeyed; and from that time on you have no sons that did obey. — *Shen dit*

So it isn't a question of whole nations—no, it's just a matter of only a few individuals at most. And only two or three of those are even pictured as doing their part specifically. The others, you know, are not mentioned as being of any great significance—though I think the tradition of Noah being an eighth preacher of righteousness is a significant tradition.

Question: Did God destroy the Garden of Eden after Adam and Eve left?

Answer: I don't think He had to. It went to weeds. It soon became unrecognizable. It just went wild like any other unattended place would.

As far as taking of the tree of life, that was preserved. The tree—we don't know what's happened to it. I would say that there is no indication of any tree around there surviving. It was only a symbol, you know. The tree became unimportant and no longer had to be protected. The fruit of it was no longer available.

Question: Could you comment on Genesis 5:24—"Enoch...was not; for God took him"—in relation to the implied statement that perhaps Lamech killed Enoch?

Answer: Well, to be plain: I have not personally been persuaded—ah, I know Mr. Schulz and I have talked it over. There is a possibility that has been, I think, taken

for granted by the Christian world that this Enoch of the family of Seth was slain. I still would hold to the Jewish tradition that Gen. 4:23 pertains to the story of Cain instead, and whether it includes Enoch is a question. I am not fully persuaded that it does. Let's say there is no other evidence but what somebody has drawn it from the Scripture. There is no outside tradition.

Now, you see, there are several ideas. It is possible—very possible—that it is like the two witnesses, that indeed he was slain and that they might have wanted to make a mockery of him; and God took him and he wasn't found (Heb. 11:5). I don't say this is not possible. My mind is open, I'm not prejudiced on the point. I can say that. I feel that it is not fully clear that this is the situation we are dealing with. But if it is the only explanation is that God took him and he "was not found" when they wanted to find him, see—just like God took Moses and not even the Devil has been allowed to reveal where Moses' body is (Deut. 34:6; Jude 9). Maybe the Devil himself doesn't even know in one sense of the word, but I see no reason why the Devil couldn't know. After all, spirit can certainly perceive what's under the ground, you know—no question about that.

I have no reason to think this is not an explanation—God took him and he wasn't found. I think that is a possible explanation. I think it's the likely explanation when you see the whole picture. But I would want to bear it in mind as something that merits reconsideration. Mr. Armstrong is very careful about not dwelling on things that are of secondary prominence even within the story.

All we can say is that it is an exegetical tradition; that is, it is drawn from the Scripture, not from other material. Something has much more weight when it is drawn from other material than merely a possibility from the Scripture when it is not directly stated.

Question: I was wondering about when man began to eat meat. Was that after the Flood or before?

Answer: Certainly human beings were eating flesh—Mr. Armstrong has made this very clear—already eating flesh before the Flood or there would be no real reason why the distinction between clean and unclean was made at the time (Gen. 7:2). I see no reason why not. Man was not trying to be a vegetarian during that period from anything we know.

And I would draw the conclusion that animals, in the same way, were carnivorous as a result of the curse that came on the whole world when Adam sinned, though man had no fear of beasts until after the Flood. And this was a different situation. In other words there are animals that have the fear of man that are not carnivorous. Merely having the fear of man is not related to the character of the animal. Deer, rabbits, others that are not carnivorous have the fear of man. That is, it's a distinct penalty or characteristic visited on animals for certain reasons—so that basically we don't have the problems, I take it, that man had before the Flood. There must have been some problem because the whole of society emphasizes the terrible impact of the slaughter of animals in quantity; and how much of this would have been in self-defense is a question.

Question: Concerning the nephilim in Genesis 6:4, upon checking the word "mighty" turns out to be the same word gibbor used in connection with Nimrod; and also it talks about "of old, men of renown"—the Hebrew for "of old" means "from the beginning of time the world." I'm just wondering if up to the Flood you have the descendants of Cain who fell away—which is from the root neph, "to fall away," possibly from God's way—Nimrod then, coming from Ham's descendants more or less took up and maintained this falling away. Can you comment about this?

Answer: Every student asks, "Can I comment?" Yes, that's true enough—I can. If you want the comment!

In the first place, nephilim does not in itself convey the idea necessarily of gigantism. That's one point. Now remember, there were "nephilim in the earth in those days; and also after that...." I would take the meaning of nephilim as being much more characteristic of Neanderthaloid creatures than any other kind of human beings I have seen—because the Bible distinguishes only one kind of creature without necessarily gigantism in the human family and that's the nephilim, undoubtedly based on the concept of "to fall, a feller, a bully," because "he fell" or "he fells others" are all derivations depending on how you construct the Hebrew verb.

Now, we are told that "There were nephilim...in those days and also after that"—and also that when the sons of god married the daughters of men they had children, you see—"mighty men..of old, men of renown." The implication from this would seem to be that gigantism was a characteristic that actually was in the family of Cain if our picture is right, and I think it will turn out to be—that gigantism clearly had to have come down all the way through the family if it is going to crop up later after the Flood. If it's a hereditary thing that has disappeared and never existed in either the family of Seth or Cain, then how do you account for it unless it's oriental? It had to come down in one of the families; and if Ham's wife is indeed Naamah, then this is where it occurred. And that's why gigantism as a whole is characteristic, in modern history, of blacks exclusively—that is, at least this side of the Flood. And if Nimrod is the father of giants, then it was in the family of Ham and cropped up especially in the family of Cush through Nimrod. It may occur elsewhere, but in this case it has to do with strength whereas, for instance, the Hatusi are not individuals of great strength. They're very fragile-structured people even though extremely tall (where the men average close to seven feet in height).

Now when the Bible has "of old" meaning "from the beginning," this would imply in fact again what we have concluded: That the origin of the different kinds of races—the origin is to be found in the act of Creation itself. In other words, that all the types that were to arise were patterned then and did not occur later. That's a point I had never thought of, the idea that when Eve was made these characteristics were all built in there capable of expressing themselves hereditarily. I think this is the answer.

But you see, in reality, the body cells of the male are manufactured and are, in this sense, hereditary. And all the female egg cells are hereditary. The only ones that never would have been hereditary were from Eve herself because this is an act of Creation! That God could have designed in all the races there, and that's why we have all the shadings in between—that's what God allowed after the Flood. God preserved after the Flood through intermarriage (which was not the proper way) what He did before the Flood when you had the various children—the only way it could be possible. ?

Question: The curse on Cain was apparently more severe than the curse on Adam (Ge 4:11-12; 3:17). Was the curse on Cain a double curse?

Answer: I don't think it was necessarily double. I think we deal with two things here: Obviously, a curse again came on the earth in the instance of Cain's sin, but it was dual. That is, unlike Adam who might have reaped what he sowed, Cain's way went one step further where it was always greed and getting!

Adam was like a carnal Israelite—you can sort of read the average American man in the way Adam handled his wife. It is so typically that—you'd never characterize Adam as a typical Arab. You could not understand the situation correctly if you did! The average Arab does not act this way toward his wife—never has, probably never will! Adam was a typical man that we would associate with the thinking of Western European man: He let his wife go her own way! This kind of thing is not done in all cultures.

Now, Cain's way—and this is important to recognize—Cain's way not only led to God's intervention but led to its own penalty so that Cain would himself—he was driven out by God; but, obviously, anybody who was beginning to live his way just like he did, and the children that he would bring up, would also develop the same habits and practices to the

same point where everybody was trying to get. He might try to sow; it might even yield; but somebody else would reap it because they'd drive him off, steal it after he got it, just like he was trying to do to others. In other words, his way produced the situation where he would be a vagabond and a wanderer, you see, and would not even be able to get all that he himself could have produced despite whatever curse might have come on the earth further as a result of changes in mountain building that would effect the whole weather pattern, the whole structure of the surface of the earth altered to precipitate such a thing as this.

The average Arab today, as an illustration, who is a nomad, sows, wanders off, and comes back later to reap. He doesn't stay around where he sowed. And it is understood by others that this is what belongs to the people who sowed. But if Cain's way is strictly a way of getting, then you have no guarantee when you come back that somebody else may not have reaped it the day before and got off with it. Or let you reap it, put in the work, and then steals it from you.

But this is exactly what Cain was begetting. He was begetting the same system we have in America, in one sense of the word, where everybody puts in less, wants to get more, and discovers that everybody else has done the same thing!

Question: That relates to my question. We have heard that the way of Cain came through the Flood via the sister of Tubalcain, Naamah. What about the statement that she married Ham?

Answer: This is based on the the Jewish tradition—I would caution all of you to recognize the difference in weight which we place on various statements. You may find this in JFB's Critical Commentary on relation to Genesis 4. Is that your entire question?

Question added: Was Ham leading her or was she leading him—what was the situation?

Dr. Hoeh: As far as we know, no one of the three sons of Noah was really obeying God in any sense of the word other than going along with father! This certainly seems to be the case. There is no real tradition to show otherwise.

And most men let their women decide what their religion should be. You find that the woman's feeling is that the religion is normally more important than the man does. This is when you have a false religion. I don't think this is necessarily true when one is actually converted and recognizes that religion has to do with everything that is! In this case the picture changes. But religion so often is associated with unreality, the unreal: the ceremony, the emotional condition that is associated with some spiritual concept. This is the reason why most churches cater to women far more than to men. The only religion that is truly a man's religion in the world, in which no woman has any major part, is Islam. And when you discover what the basis of that religion is, you'll understand why women wouldn't go for it anyway!

Question: When we go through Genesis 4 and other of these early chapters and the statement is made that this is according to Jewish tradition, what do you go by when you say "Jewish tradition?" Do you go by what Josephus wrote or something else?

Answer: I would say Josephus if it's from Josephus! If it is not Josephus, then I would merely call it "Jewish tradition." I use the expression "Jewish tradition" as a general term to include the statements that the various rabbis have made, that the priests or Saducees might have made. Some of these are clearly based on contemporary records. Others are strictly exegesis, that is, a deduction from the Scripture. Some are merely based on a deduction from the Scripture. I put minimal weight on ordinary Jewish tradition. I put minimal weight on it because we have to test it carefully. Nevertheless, there are some remarkable things because I begin to turn it up also in Gentile tradition. The same thing that clearly indicates some parallel.

Now, I will stop with this question which I want to ask and answer briefly because it has not been brought up here today in this class: What about the lifetime and the pattern, if our Jewish tradition is a basis—is it possible for Naamah to be the wife of Ham, still be the sister of Tubalcain, have Tubalcain at least a young man or a youth when Cain is still alive? In tradition Tubalcain is pictured as a youth when Cain is still alive. And is the tradition valid which implies that the death of Cain was just before the death of Adam or around that time?

Now we analyzed all of these put together at the end of the class last evening for about ten minutes. It is possible to have these overlaps when you use the extremes of chronological possibility. I mention this so that there is no question.

Now if the tradition is true that Cain died before Adam, it was probably shortly before. Cain is clearly the Saturn of Roman tradition in Ovid's Metamorphoses; he is pictured like Kronos as an old man—old "Father Time," you know, with a white beard. He's an old man. Now if Cain lives close to 930 years and dies before Adam, then it is possible to have a mother who has, by Lamech, the youth Tubalcain—who is pictured as a youth at the time of the death of Cain, who could have been the first born son—and still have the youngest daughter, Naamah, be the wife of Ham.

In this case, we are setting the maximum limits where a woman probably could have children even till into the 600th year of life; and on the basis of the fact that today one could still have children now upwards of age 50 while living till beyond 70, in that time they could have had them upwards of 640 to 650 years when people were living well over 900.

On this basis, if Naamah is indeed the youngest daughter of Zillah—I'm just setting extremes; it doesn't say that she is, there might have been one other child—she still would not have needed to be more than around a hundred and twenty years of age when Ham was around 100. And by that time (age) the difference of 20 years is insignificant in terms of living a long time. My wife is somewhat older than I am—by several years, in fact. I remind her of it on occasion! I tell her I think I am emotionally equally mature! Nevertheless, at the time I married her she was proportionately a lot older than she is now because years have gone by since. And the difference there between her age and mine as a percentage was far more than in this pre-Flood circumstance. Now, I am presuming that Ham married a woman who was somewhat his age, even though she might have been older. And it is not unknown to have wives older than husbands. Mrs. Herbert Armstrong was older than Mr. Armstrong—not by much, but definitely older. And Mrs. Sherwin McMichael is significantly older than her husband. I think, frankly, that in God's ministry this has often been the case, far more than ordinarily even in the Church. I'll just cite this as an illustration. So it is possible—and it would be equally as possible the older the woman would become. But I don't think Ham had a "mother complex." Anyway this is the situation in terms of possible longevity. This factor of longevity is very important to bear in mind when analyzing the pre-Flood society.



### Cain's City and Society

Josephus records seven key points about Cain:

(1) Cain was "a covetous man . . . wholly intent upon getting." This statement reveals the evil leader's true character — completely selfish!

(2) Cain was the first man to plough and force the ground.

(3) Cain did not repent, but only grew worse in his wickedness. He "only aimed to procure everything that was for his own bodily pleasure, though it obliged him to be injurious to his neighbors." He increased his wealth by violence and robbery.

(4) Cain "became a great leader of men into wicked courses." He was a dominant personality with an overwhelming impact on society.

(5) Cain was "the author of measures and weights." He was not only the inventor of wrong farming methods but he was the originator of trading — with the motive of getting. His aim was to give the least to get the most. His weights and measures must have been dishonest. This is supported by Josephus' statement that Cain "changed the world into cunning craftiness." Cain was the original pre-Flood wheeler-dealer!

(6) "He first of all set boundaries about lands . . . ." Cain was the first to build fences around his land. He said, "Don't trespass! This is mine!" He didn't want to let anybody else's cattle grazing on his land. This was the feeling and attitude he cultivated and promoted in himself and others.

(7) "He built a city, and fortified it with walls, and he compelled his family to come together to it . . . ." The Bible speaks of this same city: Cain "built a city, and called the name of the city, after the name of his son, Enoch" (Genesis 4:17).

In recent years, archaeologists made a startling discovery. In their excavations at the site of ancient Jericho (adjacent to present-day Jericho in Palestine) they were dumb-founded to uncover an immense town in an early "Pre-pottery Neolithic" state some 4000 years, as they measure time, before any city of this type should have existed! This vast town flourished at a time when only villages of tents and huts should have been in use — but there it was! It was of comparatively large proportion, of great duration — and it had a huge, massive wall around it! When the archaeological findings are correctly interpreted, it is evident this city must have existed before the Flood!

In short, when the statements of the Bible and Josephus are correlated with the findings of archaeology, there is only one logical conclusion for this unparalleled phenomenon: Pre-Flood Jericho was the walled city of Enoch which Cain built!

Here are some details concerning this city. It occupied an area of not less than ten acres — large dimensions for that very early time, and especially since it was completely surrounded by a great wall. Thousands of people lived in and

around this heavily fortified town -- and it is these fortifications that form the most astonishing feature of this whole remarkable discovery.

The defences of earliest Jericho are described as "astounding for any period!" They consisted of a ditch, wall, and tower. The ~~ditch or moat~~ was some 23 feet wide and 6 or 7 seven feet deep. Inside this protective ditch the wall itself was built, a remarkable structure over five feet thick and some 17 or more feet high! And adjoining the wall was a great circular stone tower -- which was still standing when the site was excavated -- reaching a height of over 26 feet.

James Hellart makes this significant observation: "The prodigious labour involved in the erection of these defences implies an ample labour force, a central authority to plan, organize and direct the work and an economical surplus to pay for it." (Earliest Civilizations of the Near East, London, 1965, p. 36.) Such was the power and authority Cain had mastered.

To recapitulate: Early in his life, after having been driven out by God, Cain wandered over many areas of the world. He did not stay in any one place very long. And the children he had over the course of these many decades also were nomads who migrated and engaged in hunting and fishing. ~~The implication in Josephus' account is that Cain did not build this famous walled city until well into his life span~~ (he lived over 900 years!). Some centuries elapsed before he began this project. We should also note the location of this city: It was in "Seth's land" or Palestine. Cain had dared to come back into forbidden territory! When He drove Cain out, God had in effect told him and his future children: "This area of the world is for Seth and his family. The rest of the world is for you to wander in." But the infamous Cain was not interested in obeying any of God's orders.

Archaeologists have concluded that pre-Flood Jericho could not have supported its immense population by agriculture alone. They conclude that this famous city must have existed on the basis of trade and commerce! How could a city like this carry on trade? Remember what Josephus said -- that Cain was the inventor of weights and measures, implying that he was engaged in trading. But also recall that he procured "spoils by robbery." In other words, he must have forced surrounding peoples to pay tribute, and he must have engaged in looting and pillage! This was the source of his commercial resources!

In addition, with the Dead Sea then already in existence and located near by, Cain must have controlled the salt trade of the world. This was a lucrative business because all people need salt for meats and vegetables.

Cain, then, built this great walled town and made it the world center of trade and commerce. From it he pillaged the rest of society. He sent marauding bands out to steal and loot! Then they would escape their pursuers by hiding inside the city's impenetrable walls! This was Cain's headquarters, the focal point of that society's "civilization."