World History
Student Questions

9-18-68
Wed. A.M.

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 up-bringing.

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. Afterall, 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" (IIPeter 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 women, 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 tithe 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 thnk 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 Tubal-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 "Sieg Heil!" in a sense means--not only for him but attributed to him.

So the worship of men, thn, becomes a historical fact easily documented. Now it is a question of finding out whether the men who have come to be worshipped indeed could 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 descendents of someone who was looked upon as God! And then when you see the whole 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 how

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 pursuade 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 thinks 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 [illegible] 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.

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 pursuaded—uh, I know Mr. Schulz and I have talked it over. There is a possibility that has been, I think, ta

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 pursuaded 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. Afterall, 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" it 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 or the world." I'm just wondering if up to the Flood you have the descendents 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 descendents 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 Watusi 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 type 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 (Gen. 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 G[illegible] intervention but led to its own penalty so that Cain would himself—he was driven out [illegible] 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

44

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 some 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 site 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.

GENEALOGY OF THE TWO MAJOR LINES OF PEOPLE IN THE PRE-FLOOD WORLD

Line of Cain (Genesis 4:17-22)	Line of Seth and Enos (Genesis 4:25 to 5:32)
	ADAM (Lived 132 years and begat Seth)
CAIN started a WAY of life that was the epitome of rebellion against God. He was the original ancestor of the NON-white disobedient line of people in the pre-Flood society. Ancient tradition indicates he died a violent death.	ABEL had no children and lived only a few brief years when earth's human population was still very small. Yet, because of his righteous example, he qualified as the first preacher of righteousness and will be in the first resurrection (Heb. 11:4, 39-40; I John 3:12).
	SETH, 105 years. He was a righteous man with obedient, happy children. He was the son of Adam and Eve who replaced the murdered Abel. It was from this line of people that Christ was ultimately to come (Luke 3:38). He was the second in this line of eight preachers of righteousness in pre-Flood times.
ENOCH was the first son born to Cain. Cain built a city and named it after his son (Gen. 4:17) Notice that some of these names repeat themselves in the two lines of people.	ENOS, 90 years. He was the third of eight preachers of righteousness in his line. During his life the population of the world had grown large enough to necessitate the spreading of the truth by preaching and writing (Gen. 4:26).
Irad Note: These three descendents of Cain are simply listed in Gen. 4:18. Apparently they had no great impact on society.	CAINAN, 70 years.
Mehujael	MAHALALEEL, 65 years.
Methusael	JARED, 162 years.

(Chart concluded with the crucial generations down to the Flood).

ENOCH, 65 years. As Gen. 5:21-24 states, he was a man famous for his obedience to God--but his life was cut short by some 600 years!

LAMECH lived somewhere in the period 3400 to 2500. He was a contemporary of both Cain and Noah! He was the leading man of violence in the centuries prior to the Flood. The magnitude of his evil deeds had tremendous negative impact on pre-Flood society.

METHUSELAH, 187 years. His was the longest life recorded in human history! Methuselah died in the Flood. His father, Enoch, had prophesied the end of that wicked society and Methuselah, his son was a living testimony of this!

LAMECH, 182 years. He was the father of Noah. Do not confuse him with the other Lamech, the descendent of Cain.

JABAL, JUBAL, TUBALCAIN and NAAMAH were the four outstandingly important children of the 77 that Lamech traditionally had. They shaped their society in many wrong directions! As a direct result, the FLOOD came in their generation. And one of them carried the WAY OF CAIN THROUGH THE FLOOD! This generation was contemporary with the lives of Methuselah, Lamech, and Noah.

NOAH, 600 years to the close of the Flood. He was the only man left in the world who was both racially pure and spiritually righteous when the Flood came! He was the eighth preacher of righteousness in the pre-Flood world (II Peter 2:5).

- -

EXPLANATION OF THE CHART: This simple chart provides the KEY to understanding the TIME ELEMENT of the pre-Flood world. The most significant feature of this summary outline is that it shows that the impact of LAMECH AND HIS FAMILY was concentrated in the last few centuries before the Flood when the population of the earth was exploding.

Notice that it is not possible to determine who each of the 8 preachers of righteousness is. Certainly Abel, Seth, Enos and Noah should be included, as well as Enoch. And it seems clear that Methuselah should be excluded. But who is the other man to be dropped out--Jared or Lamech, Noah's father? How is Jude 14 to be understood in this connection? Is Genesis 5:29 a definite indication that Noah's father was a righteous servant of God? These are among the questions that remain about this fascinating period of history, unfortunately regarded as mythical by modern historians!

(This chart revised 9-1-70)

The "Prehistoric" period essentially means pre-Flood. Prehistory is supposedly the time when there were humans—but they were too "primitive" (too low on the evolutionary scale) to know how to write! So prehistory actually means pre-written history or the pre-literate period.

The pre-Flood world has been archaeologically discovered and is described in terms of Paleolithic, Mesolithic, and Neolithic (some, not all) cultures. Definitions:

PALEOLITHIC: Old Stone (chipped stone tools) Characterized by food gathering. The Paleolithic Cultures reflect the way of life of Cain which may be described as nomadism. He was driven out as a fugitive and vagabond (Gen. 4:12) and his descendents copied this way of life.

MESOLITHIC: Middle Stone (intermediate or transitional stage) Anati defines this as follows: "Toward the end of the Paleolthic, and in the transitional period called Mesolithic, or Middle Stone Age, some drastic changes took place. By then...a new technique of tool-making abruptly appeared, and with it came other new expressions expressions of spiritual and social life. New kinds of art, new ways of burying and of worshipping the dead, new criteria for choosing habitation sites, show that great changes were taking place in the mentality and the way of life of the people. The new tools had a much richer variety of forms: many earlier tools had several possible uses, but most of the new ones had precise and special purposes. This specialization, revealed by remains of implements found in caves and camp sites, is a considerable revolution in itself. It probably indicates also some drastic changes in the economic organization of the human group." (Palestine Before the Hebrews, page 40.)

NEOLITHIC: New Stone (polished or ground stone tools) Characterized by food producing as contrasted with food gathering. The Neolithic has these main features: settled agriculture, domesticated animals (sheep, oxen, dog, pig), pottery (but recall that Cain's city "Enoch," pre-Flood Jericho, is described as "Pre-pottery Neolithic"). Also associated with the Neolithic are trade and metals (copper, bronze, brass, iron). The discovery of metals in Neolithic sites in Asia Minor is forcing archaeologists to completely revamp their concept of the Neolithic. They are finding Neolithic culture to be much more advanced and sophisticated than previously imagined!

It should be noted that man actually started out "Neolithic." That is, Abel and Cain were food producers, not gatherers. Note the description of their way of life in Genesis 4. But Cain was driven out and reduced to Paleolithic; he had to wander and gather food. Not until later did Cain and his descendents work themselves back up to an advanced Neolithic level of culture as described in the last half of Genesis 4.

Important: The Old, Middle and New Stone cultures should be labelled just that—cultures, not ages! They have nothing to do with world-wide chronological order. Only in local areas does the cultural sequence revealed in the archaeological strata show time-order. Actually all three basic types of culture were in existence at the same time in different parts of the world before the Flood. As an illustration, we still have still have stone cultures today—parallel with the jet age! In some parts of the world you can walk off the edge of the run-way right into the "Stone Age!"

This brings us to what we have dubbed "Dr. Hoeh's great generalization": At least in Palestine, the Paleolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic all transpired within the lifetime of Adam and/or Cain—that is, within the first 900 years of human experience! (This contrasts sharply with the one million or more years assigned by evolutionary scholars!,

- - - - - - - -

The main cultures of the pre-Flood world as related to the Bible account:

1. Family of Seth. Apparently few remains. This means that they had a nomadic culture which left few remains, or that God saw to it that the Flood buried their cultural remains too deeply to be detected (possibly in the Mesopotamian valley).

2. Nephilim. Neanderthal Man and the Mousterian Culture of the Middle Paleolithic. Named from Le Moustier, its type-site in southern France. European cave-dwellers associated most strongly with this culture.

3. Nomadic tent-culture of Jabal-Jubal. Upper Paleolithic. See Genesis 4:20. Had tents like American Indian wigwams. Gravettian culture extending from southern Russia into Europe. Earliest portable dwellings. Associated with the Aurignacian and Perigordian cultures in Europe and related to the Ahmarian in Palestine (see page 119 in Anati's Palestine).

4. Cain. Pre-Flood Jericho, "Pre-pottery Neolithic A". Economy based on trade.

5. Lamech. His culture possibly reflected by "Pre-pottery Neolithic B" culture of pre-Flood Jericho.

6. Tubalcain. Catal Huyuk in south-central Asia Minor. Key is very early evidence of smelting metals—copper, iron!

7. Naamah. Mersin in southeastern Asia Minor near Tarsus. Key is evidence of looms and weaving. Very little turmoil evidenced at this site. Dr. Hoeh said she must have been of pure Negroid stock or she and Ham biologically could not have had Negro children after the Flood.

The principle that emerges: Thus the Bible mentions in Genesis 4 the people who were wealthy, famous and influential in the pre-Flood world--people around whom entire cultures and cultural traditions revolved! It seems that God guides archaeologists to uncover key cultural areas which serve to substantiate the Bible. (However, we must remember that the great majority of sites have still not been excavated.)

List of major pre-Flood archaeological sites:

Name	Size	Archaeologist	Comments
1. Jericho	10 acres	Kathleen Kenyon	Small rooms
2. Mersin	12 acres	John Garstang	Mound is 80 feet high
3. Catal Huyuk	32 acres	James Mellaart	Largest known Neolithic site in the Near East!

Note: Pasadena Ambassador campus is 45 acres by comparison.