

Adams Faithful Lineage

I invite you to take your Bibles and turn with me this morning to Genesis chapter 5. Genesis chapter 5. It's probably disappointing for a couple of you who are hoping to get out of the genealogies and into the Nephilim. We will get there, but not this Sunday. So, the Lord had other plans for you.

Entitled this morning's message, Adam's Faithful Lineage. Adam's Faithful Lineage. And I think that's really a good way to understand kind of the why of Genesis 5 being here.

If you remember in chapter 4, we saw that the emphasis there is really on Cain's line. Adam's son, Cain, his firstborn, his oldest. We saw that Cain was given particular attention in Genesis chapter 4. He kind of steals the show.

He's the central figure. He gets the most prominence, the most attention. And we saw there this first family come to worship and Cain worshiped in pretense.

So, he showed up to the worship service with the family, but his heart wasn't there. It was false. It was pretend.

There were other motives that were causing him to not want to forsake worship altogether, but at the same time not want to do it as unto the Lord. He didn't love God. And so, then we saw his anger.

We saw that he was angry. We saw his self-pity and his frustration. Eventually, that anger toward God, that discontent spilled out on his brother.

His physical brother resulted in murder. And then after his murder, he covered it up. So, he murdered his brother Abel, and then he covered it up.

And so, Cain received a punishment. He received a punishment from God, and we saw the ominous description of Cain's rebellion in chapter 4 verse 16, where we read, then, Cain went away from the presence of the Lord and settled in the land of Nod east of Eden. Cain went away from the presence of the Lord.

He fled from God's presence. It's one way of just even describing humanity. There are those who run to the Lord and those who run away from the Lord, those who long to be before the face of God and those who want to be away from the face of God.

In the Old Testament, when you read the presence of God, usually that meant, in the original, the face of God. It was to be near his presence. And obviously, God doesn't have a face, but it was an anthropomorphism to demonstrate the idea of God's watchful gaze, his near presence.

And so, the line of Cain, then, is really indicative of what we read there in verse 16. They fled from the presence of God. Cain wanted to be away from Yahweh, and that Cain was

demonstrably wicked.

We saw that, as Enid mentioned, they were a fruitful family. They were full of inventiveness and ingenuity and creativity, and God had blessed them in many ways in his common grace. All kinds of gifting and ability.

And yet, it's true that the line was demonstrably wicked. We know that for two reasons. Number one, when the flood comes, there's not other righteous families.

And so, we know that Cain's offspring here was wicked. I believe also that Lamech here is given in chapter 4 as an example of what the family was like. An example of what the family was like with Lamech, of course, was a man who was violent and vengeful, and he was a polygamist, and he was self-exalting and self-trusting, self-sufficient.

And all of that is held by Moses in chapter 4 in sharp relief to Seth. Okay, so Cain and his line take the primary focus in chapter 4 to demonstrate really humanity's rebellion against God, what Adam's offspring looked like, what life was like on the earth. We're getting a little flavor of that in Cain's line.

And then the contrast comes at the end of chapter 4. We read in verse 25, Adam knew his wife again, and she bore a son and called his name Seth. For she said, God has appointed for me another offspring instead of Abel, for Cain killed him, another offspring. To Seth also, verse 26, a son was born, and he called his name Enosh.

At that time, people began to call upon the name of the Lord. And so, Seth comes and introduces this ray of hope into the darkness. Really, this is the indication here, the origins of confessional Yahwehism, as one author puts it.

This is now the formal establishment of God's people calling upon His name. It's a thrill really to see this, that in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, there are those who begin to call upon the name of the Lord. There is a faithful remnant.

There is a faithful line. One author says that this highlights that the significant contribution of Seth's line was not culture and industry like Lamech, but rather it was theological, it was faith. And so, chapter 4 leaves us with this depiction of the rebellious and the redeemed, of the godless and the godly, the faithless and the faithful.

And so, then we come to chapter 5, and Moses wants to take Adam's faithful line and begin to line out how we get from Adam to Noah. And so, I don't know about you, but that was pretty painful last week, hearing me read through some of those names, especially Mahalalel, that extra L, I just could not get through my head. I worked on it during the week.

I'm not going to put myself through that this week. I'm not going to put you through that. So, we read the text last week.

You can read it silently. Right now, I'm going to make mention as we go. But this week, we're going to be tracing Adam's faithful line.

We're going to be tracing Adam's faithful line. And the first point that we come to this morning is really the prologue, and that's in verses 1 and 2. So, if you're keeping an outline this morning, we're going to be tracing Adam's faithful line. We're going to look first at the prologue, verses 1 and 2. Moses writes, this is the book of the generations of Adam.

When God created man, He made him in the likeness of God. Male and female, He created them, and He blessed them and named them man when they were created. And this is the introductory superscription.

This is the prolegomena. It's that man is created by God, he's blessed by God, and now here's the blessed line. And these are the generations of Adam.

And as we said, the language is very important here. When you read the book of the generations of Adam, saying this is the written history, this is the written record book. Now, back then, it was a scroll.

So, this is the written scroll of Adam's lineage. He said that phraseology is used one other time in Scripture. Matthew chapter 1 verse 1. This is the book of the genealogy of Jesus.

And so, there's a connection here between the first Adam and the second Adam. It's made clear for us in Scripture. Furthermore, we understand that this is a linear or a vertical genealogy.

And so, we mentioned last week, the point of a linear or vertical genealogy is to get from point A to point Z. In this case, Adam to Noah. Okay? So, that is the type of genealogy that we're looking at. So, this is the written record, the scroll book, the record book of how we get from Adam to Noah.

The fact that it's called the book of the generations indicates that Christotelic purpose. Telic is the end, that there's a Christological end here, Christological focus. Focus.

That is to say that the ultimate culmination here is going to be on Jesus, the Messiah, and this is connecting us there. This is connecting the bloodline. It is the clear purpose of this genealogy.

Not only that, but this genealogy is chronicling how we get through these epic moments in history. So, creation, it's pretty epic. The flood, it's pretty epic.

Essentially, the beginning of all things and then the beginning of all things 2.0 with Noah. And so, this is connecting those. And this functions as a distinct unit.

If you notice, Moses is ending really with a genealogy at the end of chapter 4 where he's saying that Adam knew his wife, they had a son named Seth, to Seth is born Enosh. He could have just continued right into chapter 5 with that same genealogy. And yet, it is significant here that he steps back in verse 1 and he starts over and he says, I'm going to begin again now.

I'm going to start again. This is a formal genealogy with Adam and work my way to Noah. As I said last week, that this chapter is under attack.

And it's not just under attack from skeptics outside of the faith of Christianity, but it's under attack from within even the evangelical community. One commentator laments this. He says, quote, the only reliable chronology which we have, which actually purports to be an adequate chronology dating back to creation, this is the only reliable chronology that exists, is continually being questioned, corrected, amended, and even condemned in favor of fallible documents, which are historically but poorly attested to and marked by many gaps.

So, a literal reading of Genesis 5 is not in vogue. It's not really the best way to win friends and influence people to take a literal interpretation of Genesis chapter 5. And this is very similar to what we found in Genesis 1 and 2. And what I want to pause it for you this morning and remind you of is this. A casual reading of Genesis 5 indicates that it is to be understood as a chronology.

A casual reading of Genesis 5 indicates that it is to be read and understood as a chronology. A careful reading of Genesis 5 yields that it is to be understood as a chronology. So, whether it is a casual reading or a careful reading, you're going to come to the same conclusion.

In fact, I don't believe that the data itself is in question with regard to what it intends to communicate. I believe the issue is a matter of acceptance on our part. Okay? It's a matter of acceptance on our part.

And what I want you to understand when we come to a study like this, as we looked at it last week and we will continue to study it this week, is just even the way that I approach a text like this in my own study. I know the theologically conservative background that I come from. I know generally that I believe young earth.

It's what I was taught. It's what I believe about the Bible. And yet there's a sense in which in approaching a text, we say this, well, what if when I come to Genesis 5, it leads me to a different conclusion? Would I be willing to amend my view if the text takes me there? And I hope that that is your approach in Bible study, to let the text speak, and if need be, to amend your view.

So, I believe last week, quite definitively, we demonstrated that this passage was intended to be understood as a chronology. And one of the common arguments that's posited against understanding Genesis 5 as a chronology is that when you and I come to this passage, we're reading it with post-enlightenment, western lenses, and we fail to understand the Hebrew mind. I'd like to tell you that I think it is possible to come to Genesis 5 and read it with those kinds of lenses.

That's not actually the conclusion that you reach. In fact, if you were to look at the overwhelming history of the church through the ages, most theologians have understood Genesis 5 to be teaching an actual chronology. You begin to talk about the modern lenses that

misunderstand Genesis 5. It's those that have begun to weight the evidence of things like apparent archaeology and geology more heavily, and now try to reread Genesis 5 to make it reconcile with the apparent discoveries of geology, archaeology, and history.

Here's what I want you to understand. We're not opposed to history, or geology, or archaeology. But when it comes to a matter of authority, we must be clear that if we cannot reconcile the two, which one are we going to go with? And so right now, if there's an apparent contradiction, which I don't believe there would ever be an ultimate contradiction, we're to land with the authority of Scripture.

And in fact, if you were to look at what has remained constant through the ages, the Scripture here remains unchanged, whereas geology and archaeology has continued to have new discoveries and even amend previous findings. So the point here is clearly sequential. It is chronological.

If you're curious, when this idea was entered, that this is not a chronological computation, it really came in the late 1800s by a man named W. H. Green, and he wrote a treatise called Primeval Chronology, and that was where he began to posit that we need to abandon a literal view of Genesis 5. So it's a relatively recent view. And that being said, in this genealogy, as we come to it, there is a question as to how much time is really passing. Can we go back and actually account for the exact year that the earth was created? And that has happened in church history.

There are various theologians over the years that have attempted to reconstruct that. I think there is a little bit of a challenge. I want to demonstrate that for you this morning.

So the prologue in Genesis 5.1, I'm positing here, is indicating that this is to be understood as a lineage, as a record, as a scroll. That was in the Hebrew mind. It was in every mind since then that that group of words means something, that we're to understand that the Hebrews were not Neanderthals.

They understood ages and years. When they put them together, it yielded the same conclusions you and I reach. But then we come to understand the pattern, the pattern of this genealogy.

And it starts off right there in verse 3. When Adam had lived 130 years, he fathered a son in his own likeness after his image and named him Seth. The days of Adam after he fathered Seth were 800 years, and he had other sons and daughters. Thus, all the days that Adam lived were 930 years, and he died.

And so here is the pattern, and this pattern continues throughout the genealogy. When Dad had lived X years, he fathered a son. Dad lived after he fathered this son another Y years, and then had other sons and daughters.

Thus, all the days of Dad were Z years, and he died. It is a mathematical formula. It's a pattern through this genealogy.

I want you just to stop and consider all the things that are not a part of it. We don't know where these men of old lived. We don't know what their vocations were, what they did for work.

We don't know the identity of their wives. We can infer that they existed because they were having children. We don't know how many children and grandchildren they may have had.

The only clue that we have in the pattern is that each of them had at least five children, because we read the one son that's included in the genealogy, and then we read other sons, plural, and other daughters, plural, which at a minimum would have been two each, two more sons and two more daughters. So at least we know each one of these had a minimum of five children, and other than that, we know nothing about them. Okay, we know nothing about them.

Why? Because the emphasis is on the chronology. Now, why do we not then work our way backwards and come up with the exact date, exact year that God created the earth? You find even among Bible scholars that take the Scriptures to be the authoritative inerrancy of God, those who have a high view of the inerrancy of Scripture, they're cautious in putting a time stamp on the exact age of the earth. Why is that? Well, there's two reasons.

One we mentioned last week, which is to say there's some type of rounding taking place here. So we don't know whether Adam was 929 years and 180 days or something like that, and they just rounded up to 930, or it was a few months past 930 years. So there's close approximations here, but there's not specific details designed to give us that type of yield.

Furthermore, there is actually a question relating to the years themselves. So, if you were to total up all of these years, you come up with 1,656, and that follows a certain traditional text of Scripture. What do I mean by that? Well, I'm going to get technical for just a moment here, but I want to equip you so that as questions come up, you've got a framework for understanding where they're coming from and how to respond.

So, what you have before you is the very Word of God. Okay? You have the Word of God. So when you quote it, we say you're quoting Scripture, you're quoting the Word of God.

Interestingly enough, we can't go back in time and find the original Bible, the original manuscript. Like, we don't have that actual original scroll that Moses wrote on. It doesn't exist anymore.

If it did, it would probably be being worshipped. We don't have Moses' scroll. Rather, what we have are many, many hundreds and thousands of copies that were made off of those original documents.

And in the course of reconstructing the Scriptures, what we do is we compare various documents from various places and locations. We put them together. We allow them to correct one another so that we can essentially reconstruct what the text actually originally said.

Now, there are some verses in Scripture where we're not 100% certain what was originally

written. Okay? There are places in the Scripture where we're not 100% certain was this copy what was originally written or was this copy what was originally written. Now, whenever that happens, thankfully, there's never a core doctrine at stake.

There's never an issue that would impact your salvation or really even theology proper. It would be things commonly like when Paul wrote, did he say, Jesus, or did he originally say, Lord Jesus, or did he say, Lord Jesus Christ? So, we don't know always for certain, but generally the kinds of things that we have questions about are insignificant from the ultimate theological sense. Well, interestingly enough, in Genesis chapter 5, you have three manuscript families that are used to construct this part of the Old Testament.

Three different locations that they come from, the Septuagint, which was the Greek translation of the Old Testament, the Masoretic Text, which was the Hebrew that was preserved through the Hebrew tradition, generally the most reliable, generally what most of your Old Testament is informed by, and then you have the Samaritan Pentateuch. Okay? So, three text families. The Masoretic Text is the one that's being used here.

Okay? So, that date, that chronology that you have, that total comes from that family of documents. The Masoretic Text, the one that is most commonly the most reliable of all of the Old Testament manuscripts. Interestingly enough, the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament has some different numbers in it, and then the Samaritan Pentateuch has some different numbers in it.

So, when you begin to look at those, it would seem that the types of differences were made intentionally. So, it wasn't just, oops, I forgot a detail, but rather someone inserted a discrepancy to try to maybe smooth things out. And really, it seems like they tried to take the extreme differences in the ages and kind of level all of them out.

Okay? So, one text, for example, would have that Adam, when he lived not 130 years, but 230 years, fathered a son in his likeness after his image. It's possible that that's actually what was in the original document. We're not 100% certain on a few of those ages.

So, what is the span between all of these discrepancies? Between the highest list, if you were to take all of the longest ages, and then the list that has the shortest, you're looking at the discrepancy of about a thousand years. It's actually less than a thousand years between the two. So, what I could say then is this, and I think that this is actually marvelous and beautiful.

Some of you are saying right now, we define beautiful a little differently, bud. Here's what I think is so beautiful. God preserved for us in Genesis 5 a chronological genealogy so that we don't have to guess essentially how old the earth is.

We have a pretty close idea. And that he didn't reconstruct it, he didn't preserve it for us in such a way as just be able to go back and have an exact date. So, I can tell you exactly when the earth was created.

God did not write it down for us in that way or preserve the scriptures in such a way for us as to be able to calculate an exact date. And that he clearly conveyed here in this genealogy an understanding for us to take away that this is representing an earth that maybe this took place, creation, 5,000, 6,000, 7,000 years prior to the flood. That's what we're talking about, or before Christ, excuse me, before Christ.

So, that is what it yields for us. We know then that the earth is certainly less than 10,000 years old without being given a specific age of the earth. If you remember when we came to the text last week, we said that there were some unique attributes of this genealogy that lead us to that conclusion.

A good way of describing it is that is a Latin term that means this is of its own kind. There's not another chronology in scripture that looks exactly like the one found here and then in Genesis 11. Why does it not fit those other categories? Well, it's because of the uniqueness of how the numbers relate to one another and form that intricate interlocking pattern such that we can construct all of the together.

Nevertheless, as one commentator writes, the overwhelming consensus of evangelical scholarship holds that Genesis 5 provides only a loose genealogy of the line of Seth and not a complete chronology. The effect of this is to say that the number of years cited in Genesis 5 must cover a considerably longer period of time. I would say, in fact, that this is incorrect, that the scripture is designed to convey this for us.

I'm going to go back over and just review a few of these facts so that you're aware. There is the recognition that when you read in verse 4 that Adam fathered Seth, that's a clear indication not merely of a distant son as in a grandson or great-grandson, but rather a parent-child connection. Furthermore, we read of Adam and Eve naming Seth in the end of chapter 4. We read of Lamech naming his sons at the end of chapter 5. This would indicate, again, a parent-child relationship.

So, when you come to Genesis 5, you can be convinced that this is written for you to understand as a chronological genealogy. What I was amazed of as I was studying this, before we move on to the next point, I just want to highlight this for you yet again, was reading over and over and over evangelicals who would see Genesis 5 as non-literal. And to read the reasons, here was one that I think summed up what was the common expression.

If the earth is old and Christians insist it is young, we risk becoming a tragic obstacle to faith for those both outside and inside the church. This was written after a prominent faithful reformed denomination at their annual conference. It was an appeal made that we're going to lose our children.

We're going to lose our children if we say that the Bible teaches young earth. And we're going to lose opportunities with the world if we say that the Bible teaches a young earth. It's going to be a stumbling block.

It's going to be an obstacle to people. Let's say that that was quite indicative of what was really going on, that it was never a concern that that was what the Bible taught, but rather that what the Bible teaches is not going to be convenient or palatable for the agenda that we're trying to accomplish. And those are very different things.

And so when you come to the text of Scripture, you're to recognize that the question is not how well received is this going to be by our children or our neighbors, but rather what does God intend for us to understand. Over and over and over, what I found was not textual arguments to take Genesis 5 as something other than a literal chronology, but rather appeals to not lose really influence and respect by adopting a position that would be lowly regarded in the eyes of men. So why do I believe that the earth is less than 10,000 years old? I believe the Scripture is without error.

I believe Genesis 5 teaches us a chronology. We're going to see it again in Genesis 11. It was intended by God to convey for us not just from where we came, but from whence we came.

So if you have questions about that, email me. I'd love to talk with you about it. I'd love to send you information.

You got questions about some things I've referenced. I'd be happy to engage with you on that. But as we head back to our genealogy here, what we find here is there's more going on than merely a chronology.

And so I do believe the chronology is an emphasis, and yet there's more going on here as well. As we read the text, there's a certain refrain, and perhaps you caught it last week. I want to bring it out for you again this week.

What's going on in the pattern here? Listen as I read Genesis 5, 5. Thus all the days that Adam lived were 930 years, and he died. Genesis 5, 8. Thus all the days of Seth were 912 years, and he died. Verse 11.

Thus all the days of Anosh were 905 years, and he died. Verse 14. Thus all the days of Kenan were 910 years, and he died.

Verse 17. Everyone's favorite. Thus all the days of Mahalalel were 895 years, and he died.

Verse 20. Thus all the days of Jared were 962 years, and he died. Verse 27.

Thus all the days of Methuselah were 969 years, and he died. Verse 31. Thus all the days of Lamech were 777 years, and he died.

This is to be a memento mori. That is a reminder of death. You know, professors many years ago would have a skull on their desk.

Why? It was a memento, a reminder of death. In Genesis 5 here, Moses is making it very apparent that there is a reminder of death. It sure didn't take long.

Death was promised at the beginning of creation as a possible consequence. If you remember, it was not a part of the original creation. Rather, in Genesis 2, verse 17, after God commands Adam to eat of every tree, he says, but of the tree of knowledge, and verse 17, of good and of evil, you shall not eat of it.

For in the day that you eat of it, you will surely die. And so death came into creation. You remember what Satan said to Eve? Genesis 3, 4. You will not surely die.

See, Satan was a liar and a murderer from the beginning. Satan was a liar and a murderer from the beginning. He knew that death was promised.

He knew that death would be the consequence. He knew that it would come as a result of sin, and yet he was trying to convince Eve, Eve, you can sin, you can rebel against the very Word of God, and do it consequence-free. And yet what came from Adam's sin? Remember how Paul describes it in Romans chapter 5, verse 12? Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all sinned.

Romans 5, 14 says, death reigned from Adam to Moses, for death reigned from Adam to Moses. And so these offspring of Adam are living incredibly, remarkably long lives, hundreds and hundreds of years. I mean, some of them are right on the brink of an entire millennium, which is unfathomable.

It's unfathomable. And when you meet someone who's lived on this earth 80 years, 90 years, 100 years, and you begin to talk to them about what things were like in their childhood, whatever of it they can still remember, it's amazing what takes place in a century. I mean, it is astounding.

And these patriarchs lived not just one lifetime, but multiple lifetimes. I mean, our average life expectancy right now is mid-70s. Methuselah's like 13 lifetimes or something like that.

It's just, it's staggering. And yet, every single one of these patriarchs died. Every single one of them died.

There's something about the human heart that does not like to contemplate death. There's something good for us about contemplating death. It was Solomon who would say in Ecclesiastes, it's better to enter into a house of mourning than a house of parting because it's the end of every man.

And he takes it to heart. And to be reminded of the consequences of sin, to be reminded that our life is passing. Charles Spurgeon, in preaching on the matter of death, said, there may be some of you who stand today like a man upon the shore when the tide is swelling towards his feet.

There came one wave and it took away the grandmother. Another came and a mother was swept away. Another came and the wife was taken.

And now it dashes at your feet. How long shall it be ere it breaks over you and you too be carried away by the yawning wave into the bosom of the deep death. Children, husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, prepare to meet your God.

There was a sense of urgency there in his proclamation. Just reading this week of Puritan minister Richard Greenham, who was ministering in England and he was ministering at a time that the plague would come and it would just wipe people out. It was in the 1500s and there were many people who had died of the plague that he was in association with.

And so he would often, it was said, preach to his congregation about the brevity of life. Preach often about the reality that death was coming. Causes people to be sober-minded, not because he was dark and morbid, but because he wanted to prepare them for that day and he wanted them to have the comfort and assurance of finding new life in Christ.

See, all of this death comes through the first Adam and it points toward our need to find ourselves in the second Adam. Horatius Bonar, one of Scotland's great ministers and a father of the Scottish Free Church, wrote about this connection. He said, the first Adam dies and we die in him, but the second Adam dies and we live in him.

The first Adam's grave proclaims only death. The second Adam's grave announces life. I am the resurrection and the life.

We look into the grave of the one and we see only darkness, corruption, and death. We look into the grave of the other and we find there only light and incorruption and life. I love this last part.

We look into the grave of the one and find he is still there, his dust still mingling with the fellow dust about it. Then we look into the grave of the other and find he is not there. He is risen.

Risen as our forerunner into the heavenly paradise, the home of the risen and redeemed. You understand what he's saying there? Adam's body decayed somewhere. It mixed in with all the other dust of the earth.

Guess what? It's still here somewhere. And you realize on the face of the planet every day, give or take, there's about 150,000 people that depart from this life. 150,000 goodbyes.

150,000 bodies that need to be buried in the ground that are going to go back to dust. I mean, it's sheer staggering to think about. And yet you come out of the world and into the church and the message is not avoid death at all costs or death is the worst thing that could happen to you or death is the end or you need to be afraid of death.

You come into the church and hear the gospel of Jesus Christ and you're united to him and the message changes to what? I like how one author summarized Paul's words in Philippians 1 when he said, for me to live is Christ and to die is gain. It's I'm better off dead than alive. And you're saying that is the message of the Christian gospel.

You don't have to fear death. That you're to read Genesis 5 and you're to recognize that the bell is tolling here. Why did the bell toll? The bell would toll at a funeral to announce to the living that someone has departed.

Death is at the doorstep. Death is coming. That's why the bell would toll.

And so Genesis 5 is like the bell tolling. It's reminding us of death. And yet death for the believer is not something that we fear for in the second Adam.

I love how the church takes that message and just flips it on its head. You know, I hope that in evangelism, that's a starting point for you often. When you talk to someone, you just ask them point blank.

I mean, usually they're unnerved. Hey, are you ready to die? I want to talk to you about something. It's probably my most common lead-in verse in sharing the gospel with someone.

It is appointed to man once to die. And then comes judgment. Are you ready to die? I love the story of Dwight Moody on his deathbed.

James Boyce records it. Said Moody had been declining for some time and his family had taken turns being with him. On the morning of his death, his son, who was standing by the bedside, heard him exclaim, earth is receding, heaven is opening, God is calling.

And like a good son, his son said, you're dreaming father. Moody answered, no, well, this is no dream. I have been within the gates.

I've seen the children's faces. And for a while, it seemed Moody were reviving, but he began to slip away again. And he said, is this death? This is not bad.

There is no valley. This is bliss. This is glorious.

By this time, his daughter was present and she began to pray for his recovery. And he said, no, no, Emma, don't pray for that. God is calling.

This is my coronation day. I have been looking forward to it. Shortly after this, Moody was received into heaven.

At the funeral, the family and friends joined in a joyful service. They spoke, they sang hymns, they heard the words proclaimed, where, oh death, is your victory? Where, oh death, is your sting? The sting of death is sin and the power of sin is the law, but thanks be to God, he gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Sin and death is unavoidable.

It is the unavoidable reality of being in the first Adam. And yet the second Adam came so you don't have to fear death. That is a primary takeaway from Genesis chapter 5. Next week, Lord willing, we're going to look at Enoch.

Enoch is like the one exception along with Elijah, who lived under the first Adam and somehow dodged and avoided death altogether. He was simply taken up. So we're going to look at Enoch.

We're going to look at Noah. Those of you that were hoping to get to the Nephilim this Sunday, you're going to have to wait a couple more weeks, but we will get there. And I hope that this is something that you're able to take with you.

Even just the tremendous encouragement that the more and more we talk as believers about not fearing death and encouraging one another to not fear death, the more we actually don't. This is good for us to talk and think in these ways. Let's pray.

I thank you so much, Lord, that it is not death to die. Paul makes that very clear in 1 Thessalonians, that we do grieve when we lose loved ones, and yet we grieve simply because we miss out on their fellowship. We miss out on the enjoyment of knowing them.

There's a missing ache in our hearts when they're gone, and yet we don't grieve for them because we know that for those who are in Christ, no one who's died would ever want to come back here because they've now departed and they're with the Lord. I thank you so much, Jesus, for coming and rising again, for allowing us to partake in your resurrection. I pray, Lord, that if there's any right now who are fearing death, that are not confident they're in Christ, are not confident of the promise of resurrection life, or that that would all change for them today, and that they would find the comfort of knowing that death is not something that we're to fear if we're in you.

Thank you, Lord, so much for your grace to us. We love you. We praise you.

Amen.