

MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

508(c)(1)(a) Free Church • Sole Tanakh Authority
A Study for Judaism • Christianity • Islam

DOCUMENT 163

CHANOKH (חֲנוֹךְ) — THE FIRST CITY AND THE LINE OF CAIN

A Covenant Deep Dive into Bereishit (Genesis) 4:17

Why Did the Murderer Build the First City? — A Three-Religion Covenant Response

June 2026

Elder Kepha Arcemont, Founder

miqdashbethel.org • miqdashbethel@gmail.com • 402-218-9530
PO Box 762, Pearl River, Louisiana 70452

REACHING JUDAISM, CHRISTIANITY, AND ISLAM

✡ JUDAISM	† CHRISTIANITY	☪ ISLAM
Bereishit (Genesis) 4:17 records Kayin's (Cain's) marriage, the birth of Chanokh (Enoch), and the founding of the first named city — read in Jewish tradition as the moment exile becomes settlement, and the root chanak (to train/dedicate) is later applied to the Temple's own dedication (Chanukah).	The episode is read typologically — the city of man founded by the line of the first murderer stands in deliberate contrast to the “city which has foundations, whose builder and maker is God” (Hebrews 11:10, cited as historical/comparative reference only, never as Tanakh authority).	Qabil (Cain) appears in Qur'anic tradition (Surah Al-Ma'idah 5:27-31) as the archetype of unjust bloodshed; the founding of settled civilization by his line is addressed here as comparative reference only.

DOCTRINAL AUTHORITY — STANDING RULE OF MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

The sole binding authority of Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution is the *Tanakh* — the written covenant of **Yahweh**. No Talmudic tractate, Church council decree, papal encyclical, hadith collection, or extra-biblical tradition carries doctrinal weight equal to or greater than the written Torah. Where any tradition conflicts with the written covenant, the written covenant governs without exception. The Talmud, New Testament, and Qur'an are cited as historical reference and comparative witness — never as superseding authority. Miqdash Bethel uses the Written Tanakh as its sole source for four reasons: it is the only text Judaism, Christianity, and Islam all recognize as originally given by **Yahweh**; it predates and underlies the Talmud, New Testament, and Qur'an, so testing those traditions against it follows the evidentiary direction of **Devarim (Deuteronomy)**

19:15 — the earlier witness governs the later commentary; every later tradition that departs from the *Tanakh* does so by addition or reinterpretation, never by overturning the text itself, so the text remains the fixed standard; and **Yahweh's** own words declare the covenant unchanging (**Malachi 3:6**; **Tehillim (Psalms) 119:89**), making the written covenant — not evolving institutional interpretation — the only stable ground for doctrine. All three great covenant traditions — Judaism, Christianity, and Islam — are addressed simultaneously and equally in every Miqdash Bethel document, because **Yahweh's** covenant belongs to every nation that will receive it. The **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** two-or-three-witness evidentiary standard governs all textual claims in this document.

HOW TO READ THIS DOCUMENT

This document applies the sole authority of the written *Tanakh*. **Yahweh (יְהוָה)** and **Elohim (אֱלֹהִים)** appear in bold throughout. Hebrew book names are given with English in parentheses. Hebrew transliterations appear in ***bold italic*** with English meaning in parentheses at every occurrence. Scripture references are bold. Three audiences are addressed simultaneously: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Rabbinic commentary, New Testament texts, and the Qur'an are cited as historical and comparative reference — not as binding authority. The Written Tanakh governs all conclusions.

TANAKH BOOKS CITED IN THIS DOCUMENT

DIVISION	BOOKS CITED	PURPOSE IN THIS STUDY
Torah	<i>Bereishit (Genesis), Devarim (Deuteronomy), Bemidbar (Numbers)</i>	Primary text — the genealogy of Kayin, the founding of the first city, the Migdal Bavel account, Avraham's pilgrim contrast, the spies' report of Canaan's fortified cities, and the covenant terms for city-building under Yahweh
Nevi'im (Prophets)	<i>Yehoshua (Joshua), Yeshayahu (Isaiah), Yechezkel (Ezekiel), Micah</i>	The fall of a fortified war-city; prophetic witness to the city as a covenant symbol; lexical corroboration of Kayin's curse-words; direct Tanakh testimony against metalwork turned to idol-craft; and the twice-attested oracle of T'zion's war-craft undone
Ketuvim (Writings)	<i>Tehillim (Psalms)</i>	Wisdom witness to the city built without Yahweh and the city Yahweh Himself establishes

I. THE TEXT ITSELF — BEREISHIT (GENESIS) 4:17

I.A. THE VERSE IN FULL

“And Kayin (Cain) *yada* (knew) his wife, and she conceived and bore Chanokh (Enoch); and he was building (*boneh*) a city, and called the name of the city after the name of his son — Chanokh.”
(Bereishit [Genesis] 4:17)

This single verse carries three covenant-significant movements in immediate succession: a marriage and birth notice (consistent with the formulaic pattern of Bereishit's genealogies), the founding of the first city named in Scripture, and an act of naming that binds a man's legacy to a structure of stone and wall rather than to a flock, tent, or field. The Hebrew verb of **Bereishit 4:17** for “he built” is given in the participial/imperfect construction (*boneh* — “was building,” literally an ongoing or inceptive act), which Hebrew grammarians and the BDB lexicon note often signals the beginning of an enterprise rather than its instantaneous completion — Kayin (Cain) did not build a finished city in a moment; he began the urban project that would presumably continue under his descendants.

I.B. CHANOKH (חֲנוֹךְ) — ROOT AND MEANING

The name given to both the son and the city, *Chanokh* (חֲנוֹךְ), derives from the root *chanak* (חָנַךְ) — **Strong's H2596** — meaning, per the BDB (Brown-Driver-Briggs) Hebrew Lexicon, “to train up” or “to dedicate,” with a figurative sense of “to initiate or discipline.” The root occurs elsewhere in the Tanakh in exactly four other places, and in every one of them the object dedicated is a structure, never merely a person in the abstract: **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 20:5** (the dedication of a newly built house, twice in the verse), and **1 Melachim (1 Kings) 8:63** and **2 Divrei HaYamim (2 Chronicles) 7:5** (Shlomo's [Solomon's] dedication of the Temple itself). The only occurrence of the root applied directly to a person rather than a building is the imperative in **Mishlei (Proverbs) 22:6** — *chanokh la-na'ar* (train up the child) — and even there, several Hebrew lexicographers (Abarim Publications, drawing on BDB's commentary on the cognate Arabic root) note the verb's underlying sense is closer to “dedicate” or “inaugurate” a life's direction than to generic instruction. The name Kayin (Cain) gives his son and his city is therefore not a neutral label. It is the same word later used for consecrating **Yahweh's** own Temple — applied, in **Bereishit 4:17**, to a city founded by the line of the first recorded murderer.

I.C. A TEXTUAL CAUTION — DISTINGUISHING THE CITY FROM THE LAND OF NOD

Bereishit (Genesis) 4:16, the verse immediately preceding, records that Kayin went out from **Yahweh's** presence and dwelt in the land of **Nod** (*nod* — “*wandering*”), east of Eden. The city Kayin (Cain) later builds in verse 17 is named **Chanokh**, after his son — not Nod. Nod is the region; Chanokh is the city built within or near it. This distinction matters because of a documented divergence in the historical record: the first-century Jewish historian **Josephus**, in *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book I, Chapter 2, states that Kayin “with his wife, built a city, named Nod” — directly naming the city itself “Nod,” which contradicts the Masoretic Hebrew text of **Bereishit 4:17**. Per this Institution's standing rule that Josephus's accounts must always be corroborated due to his demonstrated pro-Roman, apologetic bias in retelling Israelite history, this divergence is noted explicitly rather than passed over: the written Tanakh names the city Chanokh; Josephus's first-century paraphrase,

written generations after the Temple's destruction for a Greco-Roman audience, names it Nod, and conflates the city's name with the land's name. Where Josephus departs from the Masoretic text, **the Masoretic text governs**, per this Institution's Tanakh-Only Content Rule.

II. WHY DID THE MURDERER BUILD THE FIRST CITY?

II.A. CIVILIZATION AS COMPENSATION, NOT RESTORATION

Bereishit (Genesis) 4:12 records **Yahweh's** sentence on Kayin (Cain) in full, and the Hebrew of the sentence repays close attention. Kayin (Cain) is told that when he works the ground it will no longer yield to him its strength, and that he is to be *na ve-nad* (נָע וְנָד) — rendered “*fugitive and wanderer*,” “*vagrant and vagabond*,” or “*restless wanderer*” across English translations — in the earth. The two words are not redundant. *Na* (Strong's **H5128**, from the root *nua*) carries the sense of quivering, tottering, or trembling — the same root used of a drunkard reeling (**Yeshayahu [Isaiah] 29:9**) and of the earth itself shaking under judgment (**Yeshayahu 24:20**); it describes involuntary, anxious movement rather than purposeful travel. *Nad* (Strong's **H5110**, from the root *nud*) carries the sense of drifting, fleeing, or being shaken loose from a fixed place — and it is the very root that gives the land Kayin (Cain) settles in its name: **Nod** (**Bereishit 4:16**), so the curse-word and the place-name share the same root, binding the sentence to the geography in the Hebrew itself. Hebrew grammarians classify the paired construction *na ve-nad* as a hendiadys — two near-synonyms joined to intensify a single idea rather than to describe two separate states — and several commentators note the words are “little differing from each other” in meaning, so the combined force is closer to “ceaselessly, terrified, homeless” than to two distinct punishments. Kayin's (Cain's) sentence, in the Hebrew, is not simply relocation; it is the imposition of permanent inner unsteadiness — a man who can never stand still, in a body that will not stop shaking, in a land literally named for the shaking itself. **Bereishit 4:14** records Kayin's own complaint — that he will be hidden from **Yahweh's** face and exposed to anyone who finds him. The city of **Bereishit 4:17** answers this sentence point for point, but answers it with human engineering rather than covenant repentance: a city provides fixed walls against the very *na ve-nad* **Yahweh** decreed, defensible boundaries against the very threat Kayin (Cain) himself named, and a settled name — his son's name, inscribed permanently on stone and gate — against the facelessness of ceaseless motion. Kayin (Cain) does not return to **Yahweh** to have the curse lifted. He builds a structure that makes the curse survivable on his own terms. **This is the first recorded instance in Tanakh of a pattern repeated throughout Scripture: humanity engineering around a Yahweh-imposed consequence rather than addressing the covenant breach that caused it.**

HIDDEN FROM YAHWEH'S FACE

Bereishit (Genesis) 4:14 records Kayin's own words in direct address to **Yahweh**:

"Behold, You have driven me out this day from the face of the ground, and from Your face I shall be bidden; and I shall be a fugitive and a wanderer on the earth, and it will be that whoever finds me will kill me."

This is a verse that rewards close attention on three levels — **textual, lexical, and covenantal**.

First, the text's own structure. Kayin (Cain) does not dispute the sentence Yahweh has pronounced. He does not say it is unjust. He does not confess guilt or ask for forgiveness. What he does is enumerate the consequences — exile from the ground, hiddenness from **Yahweh's** face, wandering, and vulnerability to death — and present them as an unbearable compound burden. The complaint is not I have sinned but the consequences are too great for me to bear (the word translated "punishment" or "iniquity" in many English renderings is the Hebrew *avon* [עֲוֹן] — Strong's H5771 — which carries both meanings simultaneously: the guilt of the transgression and the punishment it earns, deliberately fused in a single word by the text). Kayin (Cain) experiences both realities at once and finds the weight of them intolerable — but his response is still not repentance. Instead it is a complaint!

Second, the lexical weight of "hidden from Your face." The Hebrew phrase is *miPanekha esater* (מִפְנֵיךָ אֶסְתֵּר) — *"from Your face I shall be hidden."* The verb *satar* (סָתַר) — Strong's H5641 — means to hide, to conceal, to be screened from sight. It appears throughout the Tanakh in two distinct covenantal registers: **Yahweh** hiding His face from Israel as an act of covenantal withdrawal and judgment (*Devarim* [Deuteronomy] 31:17-18, *Yeshayahu* [Isaiah] 59:2, *Tehillim* [Psalms] 27:9*), and the individual petitioner crying out against that hiddenness, begging **Yahweh** not to hide His face (*Tehillim* 13:2, *Tehillim* 27:9, *Tehillim* 102:3*). Kayin (Cain) is therefore not simply describing a geographic removal from **Yahweh's** presence. He is, with full Hebrew precision, naming the covenantal condition of divine abandonment — the state in which **Yahweh's** face is turned away — and registering it as a form of death-in-life even before physical death enters the picture.

Third, the exposure Kayin names and what he builds to answer it. The second half of the complaint — *"whoever finds me will kill me"* — is the human consequence that flows directly from the covenantal one. Hidden from **Yahweh's** face, Kayin (Cain) has no divine covering. The Hebrew word for the threat is *hareg* (הָרַג) — to be slain, killed outright — the same root used for what Kayin (Cain) himself did to Hevel (Abel) in verse 8. The irony is exact and surely deliberate: the threat Kayin fears from unknown others is precisely the act he committed. He who made his brother *na ve-nad* (נָע וְנָדָד) — *"fugitive and wanderer"* — in the most absolute sense (death) now fears becoming *na ve-nad* himself and being cut down as he cut down Hevel. **Yahweh's** response in verse 15 — the mark that warns others away — is a restraining mercy extended to an unrepentant man, not an absolution. And when Kayin (Cain) builds his city in verse 17, he is building a structural answer to both fears simultaneously: walls against the wandering **Yahweh** decreed, and defensible enclosure against the killers he dreads. The city does not resolve the *avon* (iniquity/punishment). It contains its consequences on human terms.

II.B. THE WIDER LINE OF KAYIN — SKILL WITHOUT CREDIT

The remainder of **Bereishit (Genesis) 4:18-22** traces Kayin's line through Lamech to three sons: *Yaval* (Jabal), father of those who dwell in tents and keep livestock; *Yuval* (Jubal), father of all who play the lyre (*kinnor*) and pipe (*ugav*); and *Tuval-Kayin* (Tubal-Cain), forger of every implement of bronze and iron. **Bereishit (Genesis) 4:23-24** then records Lamech's boast to his wives — a violent escalation of Kayin's own crime, openly celebrated rather than concealed. The text does not state that these activities are themselves sinful, nor that Yaval, Yuval, and Tuval-Kayin acted in conscious defiance of **Yahweh** — the Tanakh makes no such direct claim, and none should be read into it. What the text does is something more precise: it records the full range of civilization-building skill — herding, music, and metalwork — without attaching a single word of

acknowledgment toward **Yahweh** to any of it. Yuval is named father of all who play the lyre and pipe; the verse stops there. No source of the gift is named. No dedication of the art is recorded. The same capacity — to build, to herd, to make music, to forge — can be exercised in two directions: credited to **Yahweh** as its source, or exercised as though it belongs to the maker alone. **Bereishit (Genesis) 4:18-22** records the latter. This is not a claim that music or skilled craft is corrupt; it is a claim about *direction and credit* — and it is the identical pattern still visible in the present age, in which the world continues to build, compose, and advance with extraordinary skill while routinely withholding from **Yahweh** the honor for the gift itself.

This is also why the name **Chanokh** — *chanak*, “to dedicate” — is so pointed a silence in this genealogy. The same root later names the dedication of **Yahweh’s** own Temple (**1 Melachim [1 Kings] 8:63**); here, in the line that bears the name first, nothing is ever recorded as *chanak’d* — dedicated — to **Yahweh** at all. The city is dedicated to a son’s name. The lyre and pipe are dedicated to no one the text identifies. The pattern across the whole chapter is therefore not “technology is forbidden,” but a contrast in what the gift is for: skill aimed at securing a name for oneself, versus skill offered back to **Yahweh** as its acknowledged source — the same contrast a musician makes today in choosing whether the music he writes and plays is credited to his own hand or offered, by name, to the One he understands to have inspired it.

II.C. THE DELIBERATE CONTRAST — BEREISHIT 4:25-26 AND 5:1-24

Immediately following the Kayin (Cain) genealogy, **Bereishit (Genesis) 4:25-26** records the birth of Shet (Seth) to Adam and Chavah (Eve), and states plainly: **“then men began to call upon the name of Yahweh.”** The text’s structure is deliberate and the contrast is total. The line of Kayin (Cain) is marked by city-building, weapon-forging, and boastful violence; the line of Shet (Seth), beginning in the very next verse, is marked by calling on **Yahweh’s** name. **Bereishit (Genesis) chapter 5** then traces the line of Shet (Seth) forward to a second man also named Chanokh (Enoch) — not Kayin’s son, but Shet’s seventh-generation descendant (**Bereishit 5:18-24**) — of whom the text says he “walked with **Elohim**,” and “**Elohim** took him,” without recording his death. Two men carry the same dedicated name, Chanokh, in the same opening chapters of Bereishit: one builds a city for himself and disappears from the text after being named once; the other builds nothing recorded, walks with **Elohim**, and is taken by Him directly. The name *chanak* (to dedicate/train) is given to both — and the Tanakh’s own structure invites the reader to ask what each Chanokh was, in fact, dedicated to.

II.D. THE PATTERN CONFIRMED — ARCHITECTURE, METALLURGY, AND HUSBANDRY TURNED FROM THEIR SOURCE

The historical record outside the Tanakh corroborates, as a second and third witness per the **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** standard, that each of the three crafts named in Kayin’s (Cain’s) line — building, metalworking, and the keeping of herds — has been turned throughout history toward the honoring of false gods rather than **Yahweh**, exactly the direction-and-credit pattern identified in Section II.B for music.

Architecture. Every major Greek and Roman temple was constructed for the explicit purpose of housing a named deity’s cult statue, and was itself dedicated to that deity by name — the Parthenon to Athena, the Temple of Olympian Zeus to Zeus, the Temple of Mars Ultor to Mars, and so on, each one a “dwelling” (Greek *naos*) built to house and honor a god other than **Yahweh**. The architectural skill itself — column, pediment, proportion, engineering — is identical in kind to any building skill exercised anywhere; what determined the

structure's purpose was who it was built to honor, and across the classical world's surviving architectural record, that was almost never **Yahweh**.

Metallurgy. The historical record of ancient Near Eastern metalworking shows the craft bound up with the casting of cult statuary from the earliest periods — gold and silver were treated as symbols of divinity, smiths were credited with priest-like status as mediators between the material and spiritual realms, and the Greek tradition gave metallurgy its own patron god, Hephaestus, among the Olympians. The Written Tanakh itself testifies directly to this turning, in its own primary text rather than as outside corroboration: **Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 44:9-20** gives a sustained, direct indictment of exactly this craft — the metalworker who “*shapes an idol with hammers, forges it with the might of his arm,*” growing hungry and weary in the labor, only to bow down to the very thing his own hands made. Yeshayahu 44:9 states plainly that all who fashion idols are nothing, and what they treasure is worthless. This is not an inference from silence, as in Bereishit 4; it is the Tanakh's own explicit verdict on metalwork turned from **Yahweh** toward a god of human manufacture — the same craft named in **Bereishit 4:22** for Tuval-Kayin, later named in **Yeshayahu 44** for the purpose it would be turned to in Israel's own surrounding world.

Tuval-Kayin, the Smith, and the Weapon: Four Tanakh Witnesses

The question the text raises but does not answer in a single verse is this: did the line of Kayin (Cain) produce metalwork for peaceful industry alone, or did **Tuval-Kayin's** (תּוֹבֵל קַיִן) craft extend to the instruments of killing? The Written Tanakh answers this question across four independent witnesses, none of which require extra-biblical inference.

Witness One — The Word the Text Uses: *keli* (כֶּלִי). **Bereishit (Genesis) 4:22** states that **Tuval-Kayin** forged ***kol keli nechoshet u'varzel*** (כָּל־כֶּלִי נְחֹשֶׁת וּבְרָזֶל) — “*every instrument/implement of bronze and iron.*” The governing word is ***keli*** (כֶּלִי) — Strong's H3627 — a broad Hebrew term meaning *implement, vessel, instrument, or weapon*, with no restriction to peaceful tools. BDB lists ***keli*** under four semantic categories, one of which is explicitly *weapons of war*. The word appears throughout the Tanakh in unambiguous military contexts: ***keli milchamah*** (כֶּלִי מִלְחָמָה — *instruments of war*) in Yehoshua (Joshua) 1:14, Shoftim (Judges) 18:11, 1 Shemu'el (1 Samuel) 8:12, and Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 32:27. The text of **Bereishit 4:22** does not qualify ***keli*** as peaceful implements only. It says ***kol*** (כָּל — *every, all*) — every instrument of bronze and iron, with no category excluded. Tanakh's own vocabulary, applied consistently across the whole corpus, does not permit a reading that restricts **Tuval-Kayin's** craft to plowshares alone.

Witness Two — The Immediate Literary Context: Lamech's Boast. The Tanakh places **Bereishit (Genesis) 4:23-24** — Lamech's killing boast — in the very next breath after **Tuval-Kayin's** introduction in verse 22, with no intervening material. Lamech declares to his wives: “*I have slain (haragti — הָרַגְתִּי) a man for wounding me, a young man for striking me. If Kayin is avenged sevenfold, then Lamech seventy-sevenfold.*” The root ***harag*** (הָרַג — Strong's H2026) means to kill, to slay — the same root used in **Bereishit 4:8** for Kayin's (Cain's) murder of Hevel (Abel). The Tanakh does not state that Lamech used **Tuval-Kayin's** metalwork to carry out this killing. What it does is place the forger of every bronze and iron implement in verse 22 and the boast of lethal violence in verses 23-24 back-to-back, within the same literary unit, with no separation. Tanakh's own editorial structure is not accidental. The sequence — smith, then slaying — is the text's own witness to the connection between the craft and its application.

Witness Three — The Prophet Names the Smith and the Weapon Together. Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 54:16 provides the most direct Tanakh statement on the metalsmith-weapon relationship, and it comes from **Yahweh's** own direct speech: "*Behold, I have created the smith (**charash** — חָרָשׁ, Strong's H2796) who blows the coals in the fire and brings forth a weapon (**keli** — the identical word as **Bereishit 4:22**) for his work — and I have created the destroyer to ruin.*" **Yahweh** Himself, speaking through **Yeshayahu (Isaiah)**, names the smith and the weapon as a connected pair within His own creative order, while simultaneously asserting sovereignty over both. This is not an inference drawn from silence. Tanakh's own prophetic text explicitly identifies the metalsmith as the source point of the **keli** that becomes the instrument of destruction — the same **keli** **Bereishit 4:22** uses for **Tuval-Kayin's** entire output.

Witness Four — The Name Tuval in a War-and-Conquest Context. Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 27:13, in the extended oracle against Tzor (Tyre), lists **Tuval** (תּוּבַל) among the trading nations that dealt in **nefesh adam u'keli nechoshet** (נַפְשׁ אָדָם וְכֵלִי נְחֹשֶׁת) — "*human souls and implements of bronze.*" The same **keli nechoshet** (bronze implements) of **Bereishit 4:22** appears here, and the name **Tuval** embedded in **Tuval-Kayin** reappears in a context of commercial warfare, slave trafficking, and the instruments of conquest. The Tanakh connects these two texts through shared vocabulary and shared naming — the line from **Tuval-Kayin** the smith of **Bereishit 4** to the **Tuval** of **Yechezkel 27** who trades in bronze implements and human slaves runs through the Tanakh's own textual threads, not through extra-biblical reconstruction.

The Four Witnesses Together. **Keli** in Bereishit 4:22 is not tool-only language — the Tanakh's own usage across Yehoshua (Joshua), Shoftim (Judges), Shemu'el (Samuel), and Yechezkel (Ezekiel) establishes this. Lamech's killing boast in Bereishit 4:23-24 places lethal violence in the same literary breath as the smith's introduction. Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 54:16 names the metalsmith as the direct source of the weapon in Yahweh's own prophetic speech. And Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 27:13 ties the **Tuval** name to bronze implements in an explicit war-and-conquest context. These four witnesses, all drawn from the Written Tanakh, establish within the **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** standard that the line of Kayin did not produce metalwork in a vacuum sealed from violence. The craft and the killing were bound together from the beginning — not as an inference imposed on the text from outside, but as the Tanakh's own testimony, read on its own terms.

Animal Husbandry. Across the ancient Near East, Egypt, Greece, and Rome, the herds that husbandry produced were the literal currency of pagan sacrifice — sheep, goats, and cattle offered daily to deities in Mesopotamian and Canaanite temple ritual, a practice attested as far back as the fourth millennium BCE in Egypt and continuing in some form across the ancient world until the spread of Christianity. The same skill Yaval (Abel) is credited with — the keeping of herds — supplied, throughout the ancient world, the offerings laid on pagan altars rather than (or alongside) those consecrated to **Yahweh** at His own altar. A distinct and more contemporary expression of the same underlying pattern — animal life and animal product placed in service of human purposes without reference to **Yahweh** as Creator and Sustainer of that life — is the modern practice of animal experimentation in research and science, which this study notes as a present-day continuation of the same direction-and-credit question, without treating either ancient sacrifice or modern research as identical practices; the parallel is in the underlying pattern of use, not in the specific act.

In each of the three crafts — building, metalworking, and herding — the capacity itself is morally neutral and is never condemned as such in Bereishit 4. What the historical record corroborates, craft by craft, is the same

structural choice already visible in the silence of the text: the gift can be turned toward **Yahweh**, named and credited to Him, or it can be turned toward something — or someone — else.

A Note on Animal Husbandry and the Line of Kayin

Yaval (יָבָל) in **Bereishit (Genesis) 4:20** is named as the father of those who dwell in tents and keep *mikneh* (מִקְנֶה — *livestock, herds*) — Strong's H4735. It would be an error, however, to read this as the Tanakh's introduction of animal husbandry as a corrupt institution. The Tanakh's first herdsman is not **Yaval** but **Hevel** (הֵבֶל — *Abel*) — recorded two verses earlier in Bereishit 4:2 as a keeper of flocks — and Bereishit 4:4 records that **Yahweh** looked with favor on **Hevel** and his offering from the firstborn of his flock. The institution itself carries **Yahweh's** own acceptance from its first appearance in Scripture. **Yaval** does not introduce something corrupt; he institutionalizes and spreads what **Hevel** already practiced in righteousness. The clean animal distinction embedded in Bereishit 7:2 — **Yahweh** Himself designating *behemah tehorah* (בְּהֵמָה טְהוֹרָה — *clean animals*) before the flood — and **Noach's** (Noah's) accepted offering of clean animals in Bereishit 8:20 confirm that the herd, properly kept and properly offered, is a **Yahweh**-recognized provision, not an indictment. What the Tanakh indicts is not the institution of the herd but what any institution — the city, the forge, the flock — becomes when it is severed from covenant relationship with **Yahweh** and dedicated to something other than Him.

The principle Bereishit (Genesis) 4 establishes is not that the city, the forge, or the flock are corrupt by nature. **Yahweh** later commands cities — including the cities of refuge (Bemidbar [Numbers] 35) — and chooses Yerushalayim (Jerusalem) as His own dwelling (Tehillim [Psalms] 132:13). **Yahweh** fills *Betzalel* (בְּצַלְאֵל — *Bezalel*) with skill in metalwork to build the *Mishkan* (מִשְׁכָּן — *Tabernacle*) (Shemot [Exodus] 31:3-5). Hevel keeps flocks and **Yahweh** accepts his offering (Bereishit [Genesis] 4:4). The indictment is never the institution — it is the dedication. This is the *chanak* (חֲנֻכָּה — *to dedicate/train*) principle established in Section I-B of this document: the same root that names Kayin's (Cain's) city also names the Temple's own dedication. What separates a city **Yahweh** judges from a city **Yahweh** inhabits is not architecture. What separates a forge **Yahweh** equips from a forge that produces Lamech's boast is not the metal. What separates Hevel's flock from Yaval's is not the animal. It is covenant — and the absence of it.

II.E. THE PATTERN IN THE PRESENT AGE — THE MODERN CITY AS ENGINEERED SECURITY

The structural logic identified in II.A — a city built as an engineered answer to insecurity, rather than as a return to **Yahweh** — has a contemporary expression worth naming directly, with care taken to distinguish what is documented from what is disputed.

What is documented: modern municipal surveillance infrastructure has expanded rapidly and has generated real, sourced controversy independent of any one ideological framing. Automated license plate reader networks — most prominently those operated by the company **Flock Safety**, under contract with several thousand law enforcement agencies across the United States — capture and store the movements of ordinary residents at scale, and by 2026 a documented wave of cities (Evanston, Cambridge, Santa Cruz, Flagstaff, Eugene, Berkeley, Staunton, and at least two dozen others) had either cancelled their contracts or removed the cameras after discovering that locally collected data had been accessed by federal agencies, including immigration enforcement, beyond what city officials had understood or authorized. The American Civil Liberties Union

published formal guidance in 2018 warning city officials of exactly this risk before it materialized. A police chief in Staunton, Virginia, publicly affirmed that residents questioning the technology were engaged in legitimate civic action, not obstruction. None of this requires reading any hidden agenda into the technology; it is simply the documented record of what has happened when a city's infrastructure is built first and its governance and data boundaries are worked out afterward — engineering outrunning accountability.

What is disputed, and should be named as such rather than asserted: a separate and more sweeping claim — that “smart city” and “15-minute city” urban-planning concepts are themselves a deliberate, coordinated system for confining and controlling populations — circulates widely but is treated by fact-checking organizations and peer-reviewed urban planning literature as a documented case of misinformation, traced substantially to a single anonymous social media post rather than to verified policy documents. This study does not adopt that broader claim, because the **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** standard this Institution holds itself to require more than a single contested source, and the academic and journalistic record on this specific claim does not corroborate it as written.

What can be said with confidence, and what is the actual point of contact with **Bereishit (Genesis) 4:17**, is narrower than either extreme: the same human impulse that built a walled city against the curse of *na ve-nad continues to build walls — now digital, now data-based* — against modern fears of disorder, crime, and instability, frequently without the deliberation, transparency, or accountability that such power over other people's freedom of movement would require even on purely civic grounds. Whether any specific policy crosses from legitimate public safety into illegitimate control of free people is a prudential and political question this study does not resolve; what **Bereishit (Genesis) 4:17** does establish is the pattern itself — that engineered security, ancient or modern, answers fear with structure rather than with **Yahweh**, and that the structure built to make a people safe can, without anyone naming it as such, become the structure that makes a people watched.

III. FIVE COVENANT WITNESSES TO THE CITY THEME

Per the **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** standard, no doctrine may stand on a single text. The following witnesses corroborate the principle that “the city” functions throughout Tanakh as a recurring symbol of human consolidation either against or under **Yahweh's** covenant.

WITNESS ONE — MIGDAL BAVEL, THE TOWER AND CITY OF BABEL (BEREISHIT 11:1-9)

“And they said, Come, let us build ourselves a city, and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make ourselves a name (*shem*), lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.” (Bereishit [Genesis] 11:4)

The second great city-building project in Tanakh repeats Kayin's (Cain's) own stated motive with almost no variation: a name (*shem*) secured against scattering and exposure, built by human hands rather than received from **Yahweh**. This Institution's **Doc 132** and **Doc 133** treat this episode at length; it is cited here only as direct corroboration that city-building-as-self-securing is an established Tanakh pattern, not an isolated reading of **Bereishit (Genesis) 4:17** alone.

Two further details of the *Migdal Bavel* account, both drawn from the Torah text itself rather than from outside commentary, sharpen the parallel to Kayin's (Cain's) city.

First, the builders' stated fear — **“lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth”** (**Bereishit 11:4**) — stands in direct opposition to **Yahweh's** own command to Noach (Noah) and his descendants only two chapters earlier: **“Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth”** (**Bereishit 9:1**). The builders of Babel did not merely seek a name; they organized their entire project around resisting a specific, already-given covenant instruction — staying concentrated in one place when **Yahweh** had directed the opposite. This is a more precise and more textually grounded form of the same self-securing impulse seen in Kayin (Cain): not simply building apart from **Yahweh**, but building in active resistance to a command He had already spoken.

Second, the tower's stated purpose — a top **“that may reach unto heaven”** (**Bereishit (Genesis) 11:4**) — is not merely a description of great height. In the ancient Near Eastern world Babel itself occupied, the sky was widely understood as the dwelling place of the gods, and a structure built to reach it carried the sense of intruding upon, or asserting equality with, the divine realm rather than simply building tall for practical reasons. Read this way, the tower of **Bereishit (Genesis) 11** extends Kayin's (Cain's) pattern one step further: where Kayin (Cain) built a city to secure himself *against* exposure to **Yahweh**, the builders of Babel built a tower to ascend *toward* the place they understood divinity to dwell — on their own terms, by their own engineering, without being summoned. **Yahweh's** response — confusing their language and scattering them across the earth (**Bereishit (Genesis) 11:7-9**) — directly imposes the very dispersal they had organized the entire project to prevent, closing the episode with the same point Kayin's (Cain's) own city implicitly raised: **no human structure secures its builders against Yahweh's purposes for them.**

WITNESS ONE-B — AVRAHAM, THE PILGRIM WHO BUILT NO CITY (BEREISHIT 12:1-9; 13:1-4; 23:1-20)

Standing against both Kayin (Cain) and the builders of Babel is *Avraham* (Abraham), called by **Yahweh** in **Bereishit (Genesis) 12:1-9** to leave his country and go to a land **Yahweh** would show him — and who, upon arrival in that very land of promise, builds no city, no wall, and no tower. The text instead records him pitching tents (**Bereishit (Genesis) 12:8; 13:1-4**) and building altars to **Yahweh** at the places he stopped — the structure he raises is for worship, not for self-securing. Where Kayin (Cain) answered **Yahweh's** sentence of *na ve-nad* with permanent walls of his own making, Avraham receives an actual covenant promise of land (**Bereishit (Genesis) 12:7**) and chooses to remain a sojourner within it rather than fortify himself against the very uncertainty the promise was meant to resolve. The pattern holds to the end of his life: the only structure Tanakh records Avraham acquiring by his own transaction is not a city but a burial cave, the cave of Machpelah, purchased in **Bereishit (Genesis) 23:1-20** for the burial of Sarah — a holding in the land of promise large enough for the dead, not a city built for the living to secure themselves. The contrast with Kayin (Cain) and with Babel is structural, not incidental: the man who receives **Yahweh's** covenant promise directly is the one figure in this stretch of Tanakh who does not respond to uncertainty by building himself a city at all.

WITNESS TWO — SEDOM (SODOM), THE CITY YAHWEH DESTROYS (BEREISHIT 19:24-25)

Bereishit (Genesis) 19:24-25 records that **Yahweh** “rained upon Sodom and upon Amorah (Gomorra) **brimstone and fire... and he overthrew those cities.**” The cities of the plain stand as the clearest negative witness in Torah: a city, however established and populous, possesses no inherent protection against **Yahweh's** judgment merely by virtue of being built. The wall that answers Kayin's (Cain;s) fear of exposure in **Bereishit 4:17** is, in Sodom's case, no wall at all before **Yahweh's** direct action.

WITNESS THREE — YERUSHALAYIM (JERUSALEM), THE CITY YAHWEH CHOOSES (TEHILLIM 132:13-14)

“For Yahweh has chosen Tzion (Zion); he has desired it for his habitation. This is my resting place forever; here will I dwell, for I have desired it.” (Tehillim [Psalms] 132:13-14)

Against the cities of human self-security (Chanokh, Bavel, Sedom) stands the one city Tanakh records **Yahweh** Himself choosing and inhabiting. The contrast is not that cities are inherently illegitimate — **Yahweh** Himself establishes one — but that legitimacy belongs to the city **Yahweh** founded and indwells, not to the city man builds to outrun his own exposure before Him.

Tzion's role as the city Yahweh founds reaches its fullest statement in a prophetic oracle attested twice in Tanakh, in nearly identical wording, by two separate prophets — a built-in fulfillment of the **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** standard within the prophetic witness itself: **Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 2:2-4** and **Micah 4:1-3**. Both record that in the last days, the mountain of **Yahweh's** house — Tzion — will be established above all other mountains, and that the nations will stream *toward* it of their own will, saying, “**Come, let us go up to the mountain of Yahweh... that he may teach us his ways.**” This is the precise inversion of **Bereishit (Genesis) 11**: at Babel, men built a tower to climb *toward* the height where divinity was thought to dwell, on their own initiative, by their own engineering, and were scattered for it; at Tzion, **Yahweh** Himself exalts the mountain, and the nations come up to it not by conquest or self-assertion but by invitation and instruction. The oracle then completes the city-and-war pattern traced throughout this study: **Yahweh**

“shall judge between the nations,” and “they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more” (Yeshayahu 2:4).

The same metallurgical craft named in **Bereishit (Genesis) 4:22** for **Tuval-Kayin** — the forging of bronze and iron — and indicted in **Yeshayahu 44** for its turn toward idol-craft, is here turned a third way: not toward violence, and not toward false gods, but back toward cultivation, under **Yahweh's** own judgment between nations rather than nations' judgment by the sword. Where Kayin built walls against exposure, Lamech forged weapons for vengeance, and Babel built a tower toward heaven only to be scattered, the city Tanakh ends on is the one mountain where the craft of war is itself unmade.

WITNESS FOUR — THE PROPHETIC INDICTMENT OF CITY-PRIDE (YESHAYAHU 14:13-15; YECHEZKEL 28:2-8)

Both **Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 14:13-15** (concerning the king of Babel/Babylon) and **Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 28:2-8** (concerning the prince of Tzor/Tyre) record prophetic oracles against rulers whose cities had become, in their own estimation, unassailable —

"I will ascend... I will be like the Most High" (Yeshayahu 14:14)

"I sit in the seat of Elohim, in the midst of the seas" (Yechezkel 28:2, paraphrased structure)

Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 14:13-15 addresses the king of Babel (Babylon) in a prophetic taunt, and the language it uses is not political but cosmological. The king does not merely say **"I will conquer more nations"** or **"I will build a greater city"** — he says **"I will ascend"** (*e'eleh* — Hebrew root *alah*, the same verb used for going up to offer sacrifice, going up to **Yahweh's** mountain, ascending to the place of **Yahweh's** presence). Five successive **"I will"** declarations follow in verses 13-14, each one a step higher: above the clouds, above the stars, to the sides of the north, above the heights — until the final claim, **"I will be like the Most High" (Elyon** — the exalted one, **Yahweh** Himself in His highest designation). The structure is deliberate. The king of Babel's city-pride has escalated past military dominance, past wealth, past architectural achievement, into a claim to occupy **Yahweh's** own position. The city of man, in Yeshayahu's analysis, does not merely compete with **Yahweh** for territory; at its extreme it claims to replace Him. **Yahweh's** answer comes in verse 15 in a single downward stroke: **"Yet thou shalt be brought down to She'ol (the pit), to the sides of the pit"** — five **"I will ascend"** declarations answered by one descent, from the imagined highest point to the actual lowest. The city that reached toward the Most High ends in the pit.

Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 28:2-8 addresses the *nasi* (prince/ruler) of **Tzor** (Tyre) in a separate oracle, and the claim he makes is slightly different in form but identical in direction. Where the king of Babel said **"I will be like the Most High,"** the prince of Tyre has already arrived at his own conclusion — he declares **"I am El"** (a god), and specifically

"I sit in the seat of Elohim, in the midst of the seas" (Yechezkel 28:2)

Tyre was a wealthy island city-state, its prosperity built on maritime trade — the phrase **"in the midst of the seas"** is literal geography become theological claim: the prince's city is so impregnable, so wealthy, so physically removed from the reach of ordinary enemies that he has concluded his security is divine rather than merely strategic. His city has done for him what Kayin's (Cain's) city was meant to do — made the curse of exposure survivable — and he has mistaken that engineered security for divinity itself. **Yahweh's** response through **Yechezkel** names the error precisely:

"thou art a man, and not El" (Yechezkel 28:2)

The declaration of divine status collapses on a single fact. The oracle then traces what **Yahweh** will do: strangers will draw swords against the prince's wisdom, they will defile his brightness, they will bring him down to the pit (**Yechezkel 28:7-8**), and he will die the death of the slain **"in the midst of the seas"** — the very geography of his claimed security becomes the geography of his end.

Taken together, these two oracles give Witness Four its force. The king of Babel's city made him aspire to **Yahweh's** position. The prince of Tyre's city made him believe he had already arrived there. Both are wrong by the same measure — **"thou art a man, and not El"** — and both meet the same end. The city of man at its zenith is not merely insufficient security against **Yahweh**; it becomes the occasion for the deepest possible confusion about who **Yahweh** is, and who man is in relation to Him.

The Pattern in the Present Age — Institutions Built Where Yahweh Was Not Asked

The city-pride oracles of **Yeshayahu 14** and **Yechezkel 28** do not describe an ancient anomaly. They describe a repeating pattern, and the Written Tanakh itself traces that pattern into the covenant community long before the modern age.

1 Melachim (1 Kings) 12:26-33 records the clearest structural example. After the kingdom divides, Yeravam (Jeroboam) fears that the people will return to the house of David if they continue going up to Yerushalayim to worship **Yahweh**. His solution is institutional: he casts two golden calves, erects them at Beit El and Dan, and tells the people —

"It is too much for you to go up to Yerushalayim: behold your gods, O Israel" (1 Melachim 12:28)

He then builds *beit bamot (houses of high places)*, appoints priests from outside the Levitical line **Yahweh** designated, and establishes a rival feast calendar to replace **Yahweh's** own appointed times. The complete package is present: a building, an institution, an unauthorized priestly class, and a revised calendar — all constructed specifically to redirect where the people go to find **Yahweh**, and who stands between them and Him when they arrive. The Tanakh's verdict on this is consistent and fixed: it becomes the *chet Yeravam (the sin of Jeroboam)*, the measuring rod against which every subsequent northern king is judged. Every king who followed Yeravam's pattern is recorded as having *"walked in the way of Yeravam"* — the institution outlasted its founder and became the standard of covenant failure.

Yahweh names the mechanism behind this pattern directly in:

Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 29:13: *"this people draw near with their mouth, and with their lips do honor me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men" — mitzvat anashim melumadah*

In Hebrew, literally "a commandment of men that has been learned by rote." The people are still going to the building. They are still performing the liturgy. They are still saying the right words. But what they are doing has been shaped by what men decided rather than what **Yahweh** said. The form of assembly survives; the covenant content has been displaced. **Yahweh** does not call this misguided or incomplete — He calls it a removal of the heart from Him.

Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 7:1-14 — the Temple Sermon — completes the three-witness testimony. The people of **Yirmeyahu's** day were repeating *"the temple of Yahweh, the temple of Yahweh, the temple of Yahweh"* (verse 4, three times in the Hebrew), treating the physical structure itself as a guarantee of safety regardless of covenant obedience.

Yahweh's response is unsparing: the building means nothing if the covenant is broken.

He points to Shiloh — where the Mishkan (Tabernacle) had stood — and says He did to that structure exactly what He will do to Yerushalayim. This is the critical point: **Yahweh** indicts the misuse of a structure He Himself authorized. The institution built by men on their own initiative, in **Yahweh's** name but without His instruction, stands at even greater distance from the Written Covenant than the Temple **Yahweh** commanded — and even that Temple was not exempt from His judgment when the covenant was forsaken inside it.

The contemporary expression of this pattern is direct, not analogical. The religious institutions of the present age — churches, denominations, assemblies organized around human theological tradition rather than the Written Covenant — operate on the same logic as *Yeravam's* rival sanctuaries: the institution tells the people this is where **Yahweh** is found, this is the authorized mediator between you and Him, and these are the traditions required to access Him. **The specific additions and subtractions vary by tradition** — replacing **Yahweh's** own name with titles He never gave Himself, inserting doctrinal formulations not found in the Written Torah, adding feast days **Yahweh** never commanded, removing the Shabbat He did command, elevating councils and creeds above the Written Covenant as the governing authority — but in each case the mechanism is the one **Yeshayahu 29:13** names: *mitzvat anashim melumadah*, the precept of men, learned by rote and presented as **Yahweh's** own instruction.

The connection to the city-pride oracles is not merely thematic. The prince of Tyre did not declare himself divine in a vacuum — he declared it from inside a city whose engineered security had made him feel untouchable. The religious leader who adds to or subtracts from **Yahweh's** Written Covenant does not typically announce himself as a rival to **Yahweh** either — he operates from inside an institution that has made him feel authorized, that carries centuries of tradition behind it, that commands the affirmation of a congregation trained to receive his interpretation as **Yahweh's** word. **The structure produces confidence. The confidence produces the claim. The claim displaces Yahweh.** That is the same sequence from **Bereishit (Genesis) 4:17** to Tyre to the present day: a city built by human hands, named after the one who built it, and presented as the place where what you need is found — when **Yahweh** was never consulted in its construction.

Both oracles end in the ruler's downfall to *She'ol* (the grave/pit). The prophets corroborate, across two separate empires and centuries after **Bereishit (Genesis) 4:17**, the same principle the Kayin (Cain) narrative establishes at the dawn of human history: a city built to secure the builder against exposure before **Yahweh** secures nothing of the kind.

WITNESS FIVE — YERICHO (JERICHO), THE WALLED CITY AS WAR MACHINE (BEMIDBAR 13:28; YEHOSHUA 6)

The clearest case in Tanakh of a city functioning as the literal infrastructure of war is *Yericho* (Jericho). Forty years before the conquest, the spies sent into Canaan reported back in fear specifically because of fortified cities:

“the cities are walled, and very great” (Bemidbar [Numbers] 13:28)

By the time Yisra'el (Israel) crosses the Yarden (Jordan), **Yehoshua (Joshua) 2:15** and **Yehoshua 6** describe Yericho as a stronghold whose wall was substantial enough to have a house built directly into it — Rachav's (Rahab's) house, from which the spies escape by the wall itself (**Yehoshua 2:15**). Yericho was the first fortified city standing between Yisra'el and the conquest of the land of promise; its walls were not incidental architecture but the very thing standing between the covenant people and the inheritance **Yahweh** had sworn them. Here the pattern traced throughout this study — the city as engineered security against a threat — receives its most direct reversal. **Yahweh** does not instruct Yehoshua to besiege Yericho with siege engines, battering rams, or any of the military technology its walls were built to withstand. The city falls by seven days of marching, the sounding of trumpets, and a shout (**Yehoshua 6:1-20**), with the wall itself collapsing rather

than being breached by force. The very technology of fortified warfare, built specifically to resist conquest, is set aside entirely; what defeats it is **Yahweh's** word, not Yisra'el's weapons. This is the same principle already established at Sodom (Witness Two) carried one step further: not merely that a city's walls cannot protect it from **Yahweh's** judgment, but that the specific military function those walls were built to serve is rendered irrelevant by Him without Yisra'el needing to engage it on its own terms at all.

A historical caution belongs here, in keeping with this study's standard of distinguishing settled Tanakh content from disputed secondary scholarship. The archaeological dating of Yericho's fortifications and which excavated wall, if any, corresponds to the conquest generation remains a genuinely contested question among archaeologists; excavations by Garstang, Kenyon, Wood, and more recently Nigro's team have not produced full agreement on the stratigraphy, and mainstream archaeological treatments and conservative biblical-chronology researchers reach different conclusions on the matter. This study does not resolve that dispute and does not need to: the text's own claim — that **Yahweh** brought down a fortified war-city without Yisra'el's weapons — stands on the authority of **Yehoshua 6** itself, independent of how the archaeological correlation is ultimately settled.

IV. THREE-RELIGION AUDIT — HOW EACH TRADITION CARRIES THE FIRST-CITY PRINCIPLE

ELEMENT	JUDAISM	CHRISTIANITY	ISLAM
Primary Practice	The root chanak (dedicate) reappears in Chanukah, the Festival of Dedication, commemorating the rededication of the Second Temple under the Maccabees (167-160 BCE, attested in 1 Maccabees, read as historical reference, not Tanakh text).	Hebrews 11:10 and Hebrews 13:14 (cited as historical/comparative reference only) speak of Avraham seeking “a city which has foundations, whose builder and maker is God,” and of believers seeking “a city to come” — read as a deliberate inversion of Cain's self-built city.	Surah Al-Ma'idah 5:27-31 recounts Qabil's murder of his brother and Allah's subsequent teaching through a raven's burial of another raven, addressed here as comparative reference only.
Covenant Strength	Rabbinic tradition (e.g., Bereishit Rabbah 23) treats the naming pattern of Bereishit 4:17 as evidence that Cain sought permanence and legacy through his offspring's name rather than through repentance — a reading consistent with the text's own structure.	The contrast preserves the Tanakh's own structural logic (the city man builds versus the city Yahweh builds) without claiming the New Testament source material as doctrinal authority over the Torah text itself.	The Qur'anic tradition preserves the core moral structure of the Tanakh's account — unjust bloodshed followed by exile and remorse — without inventing a city-founding narrative parallel to Bereishit 4:17.

Covenant Departure	Where later tradition treats city-building itself as the sin, rather than as a substitute for covenant repentance, it overstates the text — Yahweh later commands and blesses city-building under covenant terms (e.g., the cities of refuge, Bemidbar [Numbers] 35; Yerushalayim itself).	Where this typology is read as superseding or replacing the literal historical claims of Bereishit 4:17, it departs from this Institution's Tanakh-Only Content Rule; the typological reading is offered as comparative reference, never as a reinterpretation that displaces the plain text.	Where any later tradition constructs an expanded narrative of Qabil's city-building not found in the Written Tanakh, it is held to the same evidentiary standard as Josephus's "Nod" — comparative reference only.
Covenant Witness	The same root that names Cain's city of self-security names the Temple's own dedication — a continuous reminder that what a thing is "dedicated to" determines its standing before Yahweh, not the act of building itself.	The recurring image of two cities — one of human making, one of divine making — is a continuous witness, attested independently within the Tanakh itself (Sodom versus Tzion), that the contrast did not originate in later tradition but in the Torah's own opening chapters. The New Testament book of Revelation (cited as historical/comparative reference only, never as Tanakh authority) carries the same two-city contrast to a final resolution, depicting the fall of a corrupted "Babylon" and a New Jerusalem descending from heaven — an ending consistent with, though not binding upon, the Tanakh's own pattern of judgment on self-built cities and vindication of the city Yahweh founds.	The shared recognition, across Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, that the first murderer's line produced civilization rather than restoration stands as common ground for addressing all three traditions on the nature of unrepented sin and its civilizational consequences.

V. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL CORROBORATION — THE AGE OF THE FIRST CITIES

This section is offered as historical and archaeological background, not as a dating claim for the **Bereishit 4:17** narrative itself, which this Institution does not attempt to fix to a secular chronological framework. The independent archaeological record nonetheless corroborates that the Fertile Crescent — the broad geographic region in which Tanakh locates the line of Adam, Cain, and their descendants — is also the region in which the secular historical and archaeological record places the world's earliest known walled settlements and proto-urban sites. **Jericho**, in the Jordan Valley, contains some of the earliest known fortified settlement evidence in the Levant. **Çatalhöyük** in southern Anatolia is documented by UNESCO as showing continuous Neolithic and Chalcolithic occupation across more than two thousand years, with clustered housing and the social organization associated with settled, non-nomadic life. Excavations at **Sha'ar Hagolan** and **Tel Tsaf** in the Jordan Valley region — within the same broad geography Tanakh's early narratives describe — show early manifestations of town planning, large-scale grain storage, and communal organization, predating the great Mesopotamian cities of the Uruk period by roughly two millennia. None of this archaeological material identifies a specific site as “the city of Chanokh”; the Tanakh gives no coordinates for Cain's city, and this study makes no claim to have located it. What the independent historical record does corroborate, as a second and third witness per the **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** standard, is the underlying claim embedded in the Tanakh's own narrative sequence: that organized, walled, named urban settlement is among the very earliest recorded human innovations, beginning in precisely the region of the world the Torah identifies as the cradle of the human family.

VI. NINE COVENANT DECLARATIONS ON CHANOKH AND THE FIRST CITY

#	COVENANT DECLARATION	BASIS
I	The first city recorded in Tanakh is built by the line of the first murderer, in direct response to Yahweh's sentence of na ve-nad (wandering and exposure) — civilization's origin in Scripture is bound to unrepented sin, not to covenant blessing.	<i>Bereishit (Genesis) 4:12-17</i>
II	The name Chanokh (to dedicate/train) given to both Cain's son and his city is the identical root later applied to the dedication of Yahweh's own Temple — what a thing or person is dedicated to, not the act of dedication itself, determines its covenant standing.	<i>Bereishit (Genesis) 4:17; Devarim (Deuteronomy) 20:5; 1 Melachim (1 Kings) 8:63</i>
III	Two men named Chanokh open the book of Bereishit — one who builds a city for himself and vanishes from the text, and one who walks with Elohim and is taken by Him directly — and the Tanakh's deliberate placement of both names invites the reader to weigh what each life was truly dedicated to.	<i>Bereishit (Genesis) 4:17; 5:18-24</i>

IV	City-building as a substitute for covenant repentance is a repeated, not isolated, pattern in Tanakh, corroborated independently at Bavel (Babel) and named explicitly by the same self-securing motive — “let us make ourselves a name.”	<i>Bereishit (Genesis) 11:4</i>
V	A city's scale, permanence, or population provides no inherent protection against Yahweh's judgment, as the cities of the plain demonstrate by their total destruction.	<i>Bereishit (Genesis) 19:24-25</i>
VI	The one city Tanakh records Yahweh Himself choosing and indwelling stands as the corrective to every city of human self-securing — legitimacy belongs to what Yahweh founds, not to what man builds against exposure to Him.	<i>Tehillim (Psalms) 132:13-14</i>
VII	Where extra-biblical historical sources — Josephus's Antiquities, or any later tradition — diverge from the Masoretic text on a textual point such as the name of Cain's city, the Written Tanakh governs, and the divergence is to be noted explicitly rather than harmonized away.	<i>Bereishit (Genesis) 4:16-17, against Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, Book I, Chapter 2</i>
VIII	The one man in this stretch of Tanakh who receives Yahweh's covenant promise of land directly — Avraham — is also the one figure who does not respond to uncertainty by building himself a city; he builds altars and lives in tents, and acquires by his own hand only a burial cave, not a fortified settlement.	<i>Bereishit (Genesis) 12:1-9; 13:1-4; 23:1-20</i>
IX	The walled city as the literal infrastructure of war — first implied in Kayin's line through Tuval-Kayin's metalwork and Lamech's boast, and made explicit at Yericho — is undone entirely in the prophetic vision of Tzion, where the nations stream toward Yahweh's mountain by invitation rather than conquest, and the same craft of bronze and iron is beaten from weapons into tools of cultivation.	<i>Bereishit (Genesis) 4:22-24; Yehoshua (Joshua) 6; Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 2:2-4; Micah 4:1-3</i>

SCRIPTURE INDEX

REFERENCE	SUBJECT	SECTION
Bereishit (Genesis) 4:1-2	Birth of Kayin and Hevel	<i>Background</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 4:8	Kayin's murder of Hevel	<i>Background</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 4:12	The sentence of na ve-nad — fugitive and wanderer	<i>II.A</i>

Bereishit (Genesis) 4:14	Kayin's complaint of exposure	<i>II.A</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 4:16	The land of Nod	<i>I.C / II.A</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 4:17	Primary text — founding of the city Chanokh	<i>I.A / I.B / I.C</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 4:18-22	The line of Kayin — Yaval, Yuval, Tuval-Kayin	<i>II.B / II.D</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 4:23-24	Lamech's boast	<i>II.B</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 4:25-26	Birth of Shet; men begin to call on Yahweh's name	<i>II.C</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 5:18-24	The second Chanokh, of the line of Shet, who walked with Elohim	<i>II.C</i>
Bemidbar (Numbers) 13:28	Spies' report of Canaan's fortified, walled cities	<i>III / W5</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 9:1	Yahweh's mandate to fill the earth — directly opposed by Bavel's builders	<i>III / W1</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 11:1-9	Migdal Bavel	<i>III / W1</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 11:7-9	Yahweh imposes the dispersal Bavel's builders sought to prevent	<i>III / W1</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 12:1-9	Avraham's call and his altars, not cities, in the land of promise	<i>III / W1-B</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 13:1-4	Avraham's tents — sojourning rather than fortifying	<i>III / W1-B</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 19:24-25	Destruction of Sedom and Amarah	<i>III / W2</i>
Bereishit (Genesis) 23:1-20	Avraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah — a holding for the dead, not a city for the living	<i>III / W1-B</i>
Yehoshua (Joshua) 2:15	Rachav's house built into Yericho's wall	<i>III / W5</i>
Yehoshua (Joshua) 6:1-20	The fall of Yericho — a fortified war-city defeated without Yisra'el's weapons	<i>III / W5</i>

Bemidbar (Numbers) 35	Cities of refuge, city-building under covenant terms	<i>IV</i>
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15	Two-or-three-witness standard	<i>Doctrinal Authority</i>
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 20:5	Chanak applied to a newly built house	<i>I.B</i>
1 Melachim (1 Kings) 8:63	Chanak applied to the Temple's dedication	<i>I.B</i>
2 Divrei HaYamim (2 Chronicles) 7:5	Chanak applied to the Temple's dedication	<i>I.B</i>
Mishlei (Proverbs) 22:6	Chanak applied to training/dedicating a child	<i>I.B</i>
Tehillim (Psalms) 132:13-14	Yahweh's chosen city, Tzion	<i>III / W3</i>
Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 2:2-4	Tzion exalted; nations stream to it; swords beaten into plowshares	<i>III / W3</i>
Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 14:13-15	Prophetic indictment of the king of Babel's pride	<i>III / W4</i>
Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 24:20	The earth shaken — root nua, same as na in Kayin's sentence	<i>II.A</i>
Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 29:9	Drunkards reeling — root nua, same as na in Kayin's sentence	<i>II.A</i>
Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 44:9-20	Direct Tanakh indictment of metalworking/woodworking turned to idol-craft	<i>II.D</i>
Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 28:2-8	Prophetic indictment of the prince of Tzor's pride	<i>III / W4</i>
Malachi 3:6	Yahweh's covenant is unchanging	<i>Doctrinal Authority</i>
Micah 4:1-3	Tzion oracle paralleled — second prophetic witness to swords beaten into plowshares	<i>III / W3</i>

**“And he was building a city, and called the name of the city after the name of his son —
Chanokh.”**

BEREISHIT (GENESIS) 4:17 — THE WRITTEN COVENANT OF YAHWEH

MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

Document 163 • Chanokh — The First City and the Line of Cain • June 2026

miqdashbethel.org • miqdashbethel@gmail.com • 402-218-9530 • PO Box 762, Pearl River, Louisiana 70452

508(c)(1)(a) Free Church • Sole Tanakh Authority • Reaching Judaism, Christianity, and Islam