

### Chapter III

## LESSONS FROM ADAM TO ABRAHAM

One of the things we have learned thus far is that Adam and Eve and their progeny produced a substantial population on this earth during the one hundred and thirty years between their creation and the birth of Seth. We have also learned that Cain slew Abel in rebellion against the truth, and he was set wandering east of Eden where he took a wife and reared a family. These events give us an insight into the development of Adam's progeny into families, classes and city-states, which would ultimately become the nations of this world.

Now, given the fact of the fall of Adam and Eve, all of their progeny have been born dead in trespasses and in sin. Nevertheless God's grace has been manifested, and some of them, like us, have been saved. This was accomplished then, as now, through the preaching of the Word of God by Adam, or others like him, who believed the promise of the *Seed of the woman*, which would be fulfilled by Jesus Christ and proclaimed as the gospel *in the fullness of the time*.

Consequently the world's populations of that day were not too different from our day --

## Lessons from Adam to Abraham

most were steeped in the lie of the Devil. They used their intellects and their imaginations and they produced various cultures and religious systems. Some of these cultures were more advanced than others, sometimes showing great ingenuity; but all were steeped in the lie of the Devil except for the small remnant who were elected to salvation and trusted in the truth of the saving grace of God through the preaching of the Word of God. It is not surprising then that after a little more than the first fifteen hundred years of human history: *God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually* (Genesis 6:5).

It was at that time, *when men began to multiply on the face of the earth*, that Satan influenced a number of angels, who had rebelled with him against God, to behold *the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years. There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown* (Genesis 6:2-4).

Since the term *sons of God* has been used to denote angels in the book of Job (1:6), and since the Devil's purpose has been to overthrow the purpose of God -- particularly His plan of redemption -- this cohabitation seems to have been an attempt by the Devil and his angels to thwart God's plan of redemption. Nevertheless there have been noted theologians, like Dr. C. I. Scofield and Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, who rejected the idea espoused by Clarence Larkin, that *the sons of God* in this text were fallen angels. (*Systematic Theology, Volume II*, Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, Dallas Seminary Press,

## Lessons from Adam to Abraham

Dallas, Texas, 1947, pg. 114-117; *Scofield Reference Bible*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1909, 1917, 1937, 1945, Dr. C.I. Scofield, pg. 13, Genesis 6:4, Note 1.) They believed these *sons of God* were redeemed men of the sons of Seth, who took wives of the unredeemed daughters of Cain.

This theory does not explain why the saved men of one lineage would only marry unsaved women of another lineage; nor does it explain why such a union would produce giants; nor why it would warrant the judgment of the flood. Even so Scofield and Chafer defended this theory and staunchly rejected the theory of Clarence Larkin (which had been held by many believers for the better part of the Christian era), because they believed angels to be sexless. They based their assumption on our Lord's argument with the Sadducees about the resurrection, in which our Lord said, *For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven* (Matthew 22:30).

This does not prove angels to be sexless. It proves they, as well as those resurrected (who were in life sexual beings), are not given in marriage in heaven. Now given the fact that angels are always spoken of in the Scriptures in the masculine gender, with masculine names, it is understandable why they are not given in marriage. They simply do not have mates. Further we know that angels are spirit beings (which would tend to support Scofield and Chafer's argument), but certain angels have manifested themselves in human bodies without detection that they were angels. Hence the admonition to *entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares* (Hebrews 13:2).

The sexual issue, raised by Scofield and Chafer, appears then to have been a non-issue and is directly refuted by Jude, who wrote of certain angels who left their first estate through

## Lessons from Adam to Abraham

fornication: *And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire* (Jude 1:6-7, emphasis mine).

This brings us to our position, that *the sons of God* who cohabited with *the daughters of men* were angels. We believe their cohabitation was an attempt by the Devil to overthrow God's plan of redemption. This, of course, was and is and always will be an impossibility, but this has never dissuaded the Devil in any of the things he has attempted to do.

There were two possible results to this cohabitation if God had not intervened. First, hybrids are produced by a mixed parentage. For example, it takes a horse and an ass to produce a mule, but mules are sterile. If this were true of the offsprings of angels and women it would not have been long before the human family would have ceased to exist because of its inability to reproduce. This would have destroyed the human family before the *Seed of the woman* could have come. Second, assuming the offsprings could have reproduced, this would have destroyed the federal headship of Adam -- preventing Christ from also acting as a Federal Head because angels were individually created, with no common head. Nevertheless federal headship was preserved because *Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord* (Genesis 6:8). He and his family were then preserved, as a redeemable race, in the ark during the judgment of the flood; and the rest of the human family (those corrupted by the cohabitation) perished in the flood; and the angels involved were *reserved in chains...unto judgment*, which eliminated a future repetition of this scheme.

## Lessons from Adam to Abraham

Thus God defeated this insidious plan by the intervention of the flood.

Of the two theories, the theory that *the sons of God* were angels answers questions left unanswered by the other theory. For example, applying the second theory, it is reasonable that a union of angels with women could produce giants; it is reasonable that the judgment of the flood was to preserve God's redemptive purpose; and it is reasonable that the demons originated with this cohabitation, being the spirits of the hybrids who perished in the waters of the flood. This, incidentally, is the only feasible explanation for the origin of the demons in the Scriptures, because it is inconsistent with God's nature to have created evil spirits. Thus the demons, like the human family, came from a creation of God that had been created perfect, but had fallen.

Even so let us suppose the theory embraced by Dr. Scofield and Dr. Chafer was correct. Then, according to the theory, the judgment of the flood came upon the earth because of the unholy union of the sons of Seth with the daughters of Cain. According to the theory God preserved Noah and his family to preserve the godly lineage of Seth, from which, ultimately, the Christ would come. This raises the question, what is a godly lineage? Since the Scriptures declare, *There is none righteous, no, not one* (Romans 3:10); since they declare, *For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God* (Romans 3:23); since they declare, *The heart [of man] is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?* (Jeremiah 17:9); and since they declare, *For there is not a just man upon the earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not* (Ecclesiastes 7:20), the whole concept of preserving a godly lineage is on the shifting sands of human reason and not on the solid rock of the Word of God.

The proposition of preserving a godly lineage simply will not stand in the face of these and

## Lessons from Adam to Abraham

other Scriptures. The proposition of preserving a godly lineage seems to forget the fact that the Scriptures promised the virgin birth of Christ (Isaiah 7:14). This was God's answer to the transmission of sin from one generation to another, from father to son. Thus the virgin birth of Christ provided that Jesus could be born into this world without a sin nature, a condition which was impossible by natural generation through the lineage of Seth or any other members of the human family. Thus the *godly lineage* theory collapses like a house of cards and produces more questions than answers.

As we progress in our journey through the Bible it may not always be evident, but each personality we meet will have some connection with the theme of the redemption of man. Some of the characters we meet will provide a very positive connection with this theme; others will be enemies of the truth of redemption; and still others will have a connection with redemption that may not be immediately evident. Thus the Biblical treatment of the theme of redemption will be like a great stage performance with some personalities playing leading roles, and others will provide the supporting cast and historical circumstances for the portrayal of this great drama. This should have been evident in each of the characters we have met thus far, and it is evident in Abraham the next major personality in the progressive revelation of the redemption of man.

Abraham was born two years after the death of Noah, which was 2,008 years after the creation of Adam. He is revealed in Scripture to be the father of the faithful (Romans 4:16). As such, the Scriptures portray him both as a believer and as a type of the believer. There was a point in his relationship with the Lord when Abraham was called *the friend of God* (James 2:23). Since our Lord told his disciple, *Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you* (John

## Lessons from Adam to Abraham

15:14), the believer who walks according to the truth of the Word of God is also the friend of God. Thus it should be carefully noted, Abraham was the friend of God because he believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness. He did not own this title because of personal merit. His relationship with God, like all believers, was a relationship based upon the unmerited favor of God. Therefore the only righteousness he possessed, which was acceptable with God, was the imputed righteousness of Christ.

Thus for a proper understanding of Abraham and of ourselves, we must observe that he was the *friend of God* by grace through faith and: *Not by works of righteousness which [he had] done, but according to his mercy he saved [him], by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on [him] abundantly through Jesus Christ [his] Saviour; that being justified by his grace, [he] should be made [an heir] according to the hope of eternal life (Titus 3:5-7).* (Note: I have taken the liberty to change the plural pronouns in this text to singular pronouns, to apply this text directly to Abraham, even though, contextually, it applies to all believers.)