

Angelology 030

(Genesis 6:1-4, Part 2) -

Dr. Andrew Woods

Father, we're grateful for today and for the cooler weather. I just pray that the Holy Spirit would be with us today as we study Your Word here in Sunday School. I pray for the illuminating ministry and His work as well in the main service. Take a look at the book of Revelation the very last chapter now, and I pray that we'll leave here changed and fed, and that you'll make us better Christians because of us being here today and not forsaking Your command which says, "Do not forsake the assembling of yourselves together, as is the habit of some." So, I just pray for a blessing on all these people and especially people watching online. I pray for that blessing on them as well. We lift these things up in Jesus' name, and God's people said, Amen!

We are continuing this study on angelology, the doctrine of angels. So, we've looked at the good angels, the fallen angel, Satan, and then we've looked at demons. Most people would probably stop their study there, but we have a Part 4 because I think that angels are involved in Genesis 6. It's such an interesting thing going on that it deserves its own category. So open your Bibles to Genesis 6:1-4, and let's refamiliarize ourselves with these verses.

We started this last week. So, this is Part 2 on Genesis 6, which are some verses that have puzzled many people, both in Judaism and in Christianity. It says, "Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, ²that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. ³Then the Lord said, 'My Spirit shall not strive with man forever, because he also is flesh; nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.' ⁴The **Nephilim** were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore children to them. Those were the mighty men who were of old, men of renown."

So, the problem words in here are the repetition of the expression 'sons of God' in 6:2,4 and then 'these Nephilim' [in 6:4]; the only other time Nephilim is used in the Old Testament is in Numbers 13:33, where the giants in the land are analogized to Nephilim. The Nephilim apparently were

these strange creatures that came into existence as a result of this unholy union between the sons of God and the daughters of men.

The last time I was with you, I gave you the three major views (see slide on Alternative Views). Obviously, I believe in view number three (fallen angels procreating with human women) because we're dealing with this under angelology.

So, if you want the other views and some of their problems you can listen to last week's message. But I think the correct view, and I have made no attempt to defend this yet; I just want people to understand the view that Genesis 6:1-4 actually is fallen angels procreating with human women. And you say, 'Well, why would they do that? That's the weirdest thing I've ever heard.' Well, it relates to Genesis 3:15, which was a prophecy given to Satan [**see slide on Genesis 3:15**—"And I will put enmity Between you and **the woman**, And between your seed and **her seed; He shall bruise you on the head**, And you shall bruise him on the heel."] At that particular point in time he was put on notice that there was coming One from the seed, that's a key word there, 'seed of the woman,' or Eve, who will take his head and crush it.

So Satan works in history to prevent that prophecy from being fulfilled. And we went through many of these passages last time, but all the way through the Old Testament, you see Satan working to somehow stop or halt the line leading to Christ. His game all the way up to the crucifixion, really, all the way up to the birth of Christ, is to prevent Jesus from coming into the world because if he prevents Jesus from coming into the world, and he is [indeed] trying to prevent that because Jesus is coming through a particular line; so if he prevents and stops that, then he wins and retains his authority over the earth, which was forfeited to him by Adam in Genesis 3.

So Genesis 6:1-4 is just another chapter in that saga. All the way through the Old Testament, Satan is using these different strategies to stop the birth of Jesus. And here, very early on in human history, just prior to the Flood, he was involved with some of his demons impregnating human women to create a hybrid race that is not fully human. If he could create a race whose genetics were contaminated or corrupted to the point that they weren't fully human, then he could create a race of people that could never give birth to the seed of the woman, or Eve, because the Messiah, when He is born, must be one hundred percent God and one hundred

percent man. We call that the hypostatic union. Satan has his theology pretty good so he believes in the hypostatic union, and he thinks in his mind, 'Well, here's what I'll do. I'll prevent anybody from coming into this world that is one hundred percent man, and then I can prevent the birth of the Messiah, and I can retain my authority over the earth.' So all the way through the Old Testament, Satan loves to do what we call preemptive strikes. The satanic mindset is 'I'm going to take You out before You take me out,' and when you talk like this, people ask all the time 'Well, doesn't Satan know he's going to lose?' You need to understand something about Satan. Ezekiel 28:12-17 talks about how his intellect, his mind, his wisdom has become corrupted. The Bible teaches that the fear of the Lord is first the beginning of knowledge or understanding, and then wisdom, which is knowledge applied. You'll see that in the book of Proverbs. If you're not in a right relationship with the Lord, the mind doesn't work the way it's supposed to, because the Bible says [that] a prerequisite for the mind working the way it's supposed to is the fear of the LORD, or respect for God.

And you can see Paul talking about this in Romans 1. When the Gentiles reject the things of God, they reject the clear revelation of God as revealed in creation. Paul says that their minds become darkened. So when dealing with Satan, you're not dealing with a logical being. You're dealing with a being that's power-driven, determined but not rational, because it is irrational to think you can beat God. Look at some of the things Hitler did towards the end of World War II, and there are documentaries on this—he was invading countries, and his advisors told him, 'You don't have a prayer, you don't have a shot logically at winning.' But he would do it anyway because his mind wasn't working correctly.

Thus, I think that's the right way to understand Satan. In Genesis 6, he is simply trying to corrupt the genetics of the human race so that the Messiah will never be born. That's basically what the view is, and what I want to do in today's and subsequent sessions is to offer a defense of that view.

[See slide on Lesson Overview] Overall, we're looking at the Old Testament, the New Testament, the church and Jewish tradition on this. Then we'll look at the objections to the view, many of which you're probably already thinking of as I'm speaking. Today, even if time permits, we'll just have a chance to look at the Old Testament. That is, we're focusing our attention on Genesis 6 and what that passage is actually saying. In other words, is the angel view that I'm

trying to articulate defensible just from Genesis 6? I'm of the opinion that it is for three reasons **[see slide on Sons of God?]**:

Reason number 1 is that when you read through those verses [Genesis 6:1-2] earlier, notice a shift from the word 'men' to the term 'sons of God'. That immediately opens the door to the reality that, 'Oh my goodness, perhaps these entities, called the sons of God who are involved in this unholy union are not men because there's a different category for them.' They're fallen angels.

[See slide on Genesis 6:1-4] So again, take a look at Genesis 6:1-4. ... "when men began to multiply on the...earth." And then in 6:2, it says, "...the sons of God..." Then it talks later in the same verse about the 'daughters of men.' Then 6:3 says, 'My spirit shall not strive with man...' but then 6:4 uses a different expression, 'sons of God.' Then at the end of 6:4, it says 'men' three times.

So if all that's happening here is human marriages, then why the sudden shift in vocabulary? That certainly is not something that seals the deal, but you look at that and say, 'Well, those seem to be different entities entirely.'

The main reason people hold to the angel view has to do with reason number 2 **[see slide on Sons of God?]**: the Old Testament uses the identical expression, "sons of God." The Hebrew word or phrase for "sons of God," translated "sons of God" here is 'bene,' which means 'son' or 'sons;' 'bene Elohim,' which means, God. When you actually start studying and tracking that identical Hebrew expression through the rest of Hebrew Bible, Old Testament, you'll discover that exact expression only occurs five times. It occurs twice here in our passage, Genesis 6:2,4. The only other time it occurs, three other usages, is in the book of Job 1:6; 2:1; and 38:7. So the question then becomes, 'Well, what does it mean everywhere else? I mean, if the phrase is only used five times, three other times outside of Genesis 6, then what does it mean in the other three usages?' And if you can figure out what it means in the other three usages, you can figure out what it means here in Genesis 6.

[See slide on Job 1:6]. So having said that, look for example, at the Job 1:6. It says, "Now there was a day when the sons of God [does that sound familiar—that's our same word, bene Elohim]

came to present themselves before the Lord, and **Satan** also came among them.” Now here, very clearly, ‘sons of God’ is a reference to angels, and we think that because they're presenting themselves unto God in the book of Job, that's the heavenly scene in Job 1 and 2. Then it's very clear that Satan was right there with them, and we know from our study of Satanology in Ezekiel 28:14,16, **[see slide on Ezekiel 28:14,16]** that Satan is an angel. In fact, recall that in those verses, he is called ‘the anointed **cherub**.’ So there's no doubt that Satan originally was a high ranking unfallen angel prior to his sin.

Here he is now in the book of Job in his fallen state, going into the presence of the Lord as a fallen angel along with his buddies or friends, I guess we could say, the ‘sons of God’. They begin the attack on Job's character and they accuse him, and you know the story of this book of Job. But that's how the book of Job starts. So there's no doubt in Job 1:6, that ‘sons of God’, bene Elohim is angels.

What about the other reference? Notice, if you will, that Job 2:1 says the same thing: “Again there was a day when the **sons of God**, [that's our word phrase, bene Elohim] came to present themselves before the Lord, and **Satan** also came among them to present himself before the Lord.” So here again is Satan, a fallen angel, going into the presence of the Lord with his associates who would also be angels. And some people object to the interpretation that I'm giving here about fallen angels procreating with human women, because they'll try to make the argument that, ‘Well, these fallen angels couldn't be fallen angels because they're called sons of God. That doesn't sound very fallen to me.’ But notice here that Satan is with these entities called sons of God.

So ‘sons of God,’ I don't take as an automatic reference to the good angels because Satan is with this crowd. ‘Sons of God,’ I think, refers to angels in general, and the context tells you whether you're dealing with good angels or fallen angels. But there we are at the beginning of Job—we've got two references to bene Elohim, sons of God, and it clearly refers to angels.

[See slide on Job 38:7] Flip over to Job 38:7 This is the part of Job where God finally speaks and gives Job a pop quiz to show him how little he knows. There's nothing that makes you more humble than a pop quiz, right? Especially from God, and especially when God starts to ask you questions about things you weren't there to see, like creation. So in the process of this pop quiz,

God is asking Job all of these questions about creation. He asks Job in Job 38:7 'Where were you when I created the heavens and the earth, etc'; "When the morning stars sang together And all the sons of God shouted for joy?" Now, morning stars is a clear reference to angels because stars don't sing, do they? So it can't be talking just about stars in the heavens; it's using stars as an analogy for angels because they appear to have vocal cords, and they appear to make noise, make a joyful noise unto the Lord. As you know, the angels are pretty good at that. "When the morning stars sang together"... Now, one of the things to understand about the Hebrew language is that it functions in what we call Hebrew poetry. One of the ways the Hebrews express themselves is through poetry. And when I say poetry, we get confused on that because our poetry rhymes sounds. I would have an example, but I can't think of one. But you know what I'm saying? The sounds rhyme. You know you're a poet and you don't know it. How's that? The sounds rhyme. That's not how the Hebrews did poetry. They didn't rhyme sounds like we do; they rhymed ideas. And that's a Hebrew structure called parallelism where you have to take the two lines together because the two lines are rhyming an idea. So there are all kinds of different forms of Hebrew parallelism. There's something called antithetical Hebrew parallelism, where the second line is saying something completely different than the first line.

Then there's synonymous Hebrew parallelism, where the second line is saying what's in the first line, but in different words. And this is what we have an example of here. Everybody takes this Job 38:7 passage as synonymous Hebrew parallelism. If this is synonymous Hebrew parallelism, and the morning stars singing are angels, then obviously the expression '...the sons of God shouting for joy,' must be angels too, because what's happening in the second line is repeating what's in the first line, but in different words.

So there's no doubt that in Job 38:7, bene Elohim means angels. So the sons of God, bene Elohim is only used five times in the whole Hebrew Bible, and two times right here in Genesis 6. The only other three occurrences are in the book of Job. So if that's what it means in the book of Job without equivocation, then that's probably what it means in Genesis 6.

Now, one of the things to understand about this is that people who deny the angel position will talk about how the book of Job was written late. I do not believe the book of Job was written late. I think the book of Job occurred early, and not only did it occur early, but it was written early. The book of Job was not written by Solomon as some think, long after the Genesis story took place.

The book of Job was written in the patriarchal time period. If you have the **Bible Knowledge Commentary**, look at Dr. Roy Zook's treatment of the book of Job, he was very interested in the book of Job because he went through a tragedy related to his daughter going into a coma because of a motorcycle accident, and she wouldn't wake up from the coma. He actually wrote a little book about it called, **Barb Wake Up**, which you can find online. In the midst of the anguish he was going through with his daughter, he became very interested in the book of Job and wrote a commentary on it. When reading his commentary, it's wonderful because you're not dealing with a guy who's just writing about things from an academic perspective but with someone who is really suffering. In his treatment on the book of Job you can find in his own commentary and also in the **Bible Knowledge Commentary**. His position is that [the book of] Job was written by Job. Isn't that heavy? The book of Job was written by Job shortly after the experiences that Job himself went through, and as he came out of those experiences, he wanted to write it down immediately. If Dr. Roy Zook is right on that, this means that the book of Job is the oldest book of the Old Testament, because the book of Job happened, and Dr. Zook does a great job of defending this when you look at the setting—it fits the setting of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, so the book of Job could have been written as early as 2000 BC.

Moses did not write the Pentateuch and the treatment that we're reading here about the sons of God until six centuries later. So when Moses is talking about the sons of God in Genesis 6, the only point of reference is the book of Job because the book of Job was the only book that God had allowed to be inspired and recorded at that point. So obviously Moses is not referring to the book of Romans or things like that. He's referring to the only book that existed at the time when he wrote Genesis 6. In the book of Job, 'sons of God,' used three times, always means angels.

[See slide on Authorship of the Book of Job] Dr. Tom Constable, in his online notes, says this concerning the book of Job: "The book [that is of Job] does not identify its writer... From the patriarchal period, Job himself is the favored candidate, though some scholars have nominated Elihu".... [Now, if Elihu wrote, it doesn't change my thesis at all because Elihu lived and wrote during the days of Job as well. Elihu, you remember, is one of the "counselors," and I put counselors in quotation marks because these guys were lousy counselors. In fact, Job even tells them 'You guys are lousy counselors.' If you ever want to learn about how *not* to counsel people, read the book of Job. Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar are terrible counselors, as is Elihu, because they're all acting on knowledge that they think they have, which they don't. They're blaming Job's

circumstances on Job. When you're counseling or dealing with somebody who is suffering, oftentimes the best thing to do is not to jump in and offer your wisdom of the day. It's really to sit there and listen to them. I've found that just letting them vent and emote or whatever it is they want to do, and then carefully offer things as the Lord leads, is far more effective. That's far better than just charging in like these guys did and putting themselves in the role of God acting like they understood everything that was happening when they didn't have the foggiest idea].

Dr Constable goes on to say, "...There are many examples of ancient extra-biblical writings in which the author spoke of himself in the third person," ... [now, that's one of the big reasons people don't think Job wrote the book of Job because Job refers to himself as if he wrote it in the third person. He doesn't say 'I' or 'me'. Since in the 21st century when we write about our own lives, we use 'I', or 'me', that's obviously what Job did, right? No, that's a fallacy called anachronism, which means outside of time, where you're reading a common literary convention in the 21st century back into 2000 B.C. There are many examples of writings during this time period where writers spoke of themselves in the third person in their own books.

To repeat what Dr. Constable says, "...There are many examples of extra-biblical writings in which the author spoke of himself in the third person, so we need not eliminate Job on that ground. The book reads as though an eyewitness of the events wrote it" ... [I mean, Job goes into this book in incredible detail, and you get the idea that he was actually there to experience these things as an eyewitness, and that he writes about it immediately after the fact] "... I tend to prefer a contemporary of Job," ... [maybe Elihu] ... or Job himself, because of the antiquity of this view, and the fact that no one has proved it unsatisfactory."

So what did the early Jews think about the book of Job? What did the earliest Christians think about the book of Job? According to Dr. Constable, they believe Job wrote the book of Job very close to the events that transpired. So if all of that is true, that means for six centuries, there's only one book on the biblical record, and that's the book of Job.

So when Moses, six centuries later, around the time of the Exodus, starts to pen the Pentateuch, the first book in Pentateuch being what we call the book of Genesis, and he's using the expression 'sons of God,' bene Elohim, he's using the expression identically to what it meant in

the only book in existence at the time, the book of Job. And in the book of Job, bene Elohim always refers to angels.

So you can see the logic of why the angel view believes what it believes. It's the concept that Moses is borrowing nomenclature from the only book that existed, the book of Job.

Now as the book of Proverbs says, one man sounds good until another man arises to cross-examine him, and since this is a very debatable issue that I'm speaking of here, I always like to give the other side. What the non-angel interpretation says is go to the book of Deuteronomy, same author, same time period where 'sons of God' does not mean angels.

Gleason Archer and everybody else that denies the angel view goes to Deuteronomy 14:1 to say that Genesis 6 has nothing to do with angels. Deuteronomy 14:1, it says, "You are the **sons of the Lord your God**;" ... [Now obviously that's not angels because he says] "..., you shall not cut yourselves nor shave your forehead for the sake of the dead." Here it is talking about marks and haircuts and things that humans experience. So what they'll say is, 'Look, 'sons of God' doesn't mean angels in Deuteronomy 14:1, so sons of God has nothing to do with angels in Genesis 6.' That's the argument.

But looking very carefully at this expression, it's not exactly the same expression, is it? It doesn't say 'sons of God.' It's not bene Elohim, which I'm taking as a technical phrase that *always* means the same thing everywhere it's employed. In Deuteronomy 14:1, it doesn't say 'sons of God;' it adds a phrase or two "the sons of the Lord your God." Therefore, I don't know if Deuteronomy 14:1 is really sufficient evidence to undermine the angel view.

The other view people will refer to is Romans 8:14, which says, "For all who are being led by the Spirit of God, these are the **sons of God**." They say, 'Look, 'sons of God' doesn't mean angels here. It's talking about Christians being led by the spirit. So therefore sons of God doesn't mean angels in Genesis 6.' But let me ask you a question. What language was the Old Testament written in primarily? Hebrew. What language is this written in? It's Greek. So you're going to use a Greek word, [and] what it means in a totally different language to undermine what it means in Hebrew? You can't do that. It's a different language. But when you get into discussions with

people about that, those are the two verses they'll quote. I don't really think either of them is adequate, but they'll quote those to undermine the angel view.

So why am I convinced that Genesis 6 is talking about angels when it mentions sons of God?

- Number one: the sons of God seem to be distinguished from men.
- Number two, every other Old Testament use of bene Elohim means angels, all three usages occurring in the book of Job, being the *only* book available at the time when Moses wrote. So I'm pretty convinced that 'sons of God' is a technical word meaning angels in Genesis 6.
- The third argument from the Old Testament is the Septuagint [**see slide Sons of God?**]. Have you ever heard of the Septuagint? Notice in brackets there or in parentheses, it's LXX, which means seventy. The Septuagint is a Greek translation, and actually, there wasn't one. There were different variations of it, but a Greek translation from Hebrew into Greek, probably 150 to 200 years before Jesus walked the face of this earth. And you say, 'Well, why does such a thing exist?' It exists because of Alexander the Great. Alexander the Great in the Intertestamental period made Greek the lingua franca, the common language, of the ancient world. That's a practice that he followed called Hellenization, and that's why Alexander the Great and his lineage started to declare war on the Jewish people, because they wouldn't cooperate with Hellenization since they had their own culture and their own religion.

So Alexander the Great was trying to bring in what we would call the New World Order, and things haven't changed that much, have they? The world today wants a new world order, and these Jews keep standing in the way of everything. So what became available because everybody was involved with Greek, and this was actually God setting the stage for Jesus. Because in Greek you have the fullest, richest dialect, one of them anyway, known to man. In English, we have one word for love. The Greeks had four. Is it family love? Is it romantic love? Is it brotherly love, or is it selfless love? The Greeks had four different phrases for love, allowing you to explain which love we're talking about. In English, we only have one boring word 'love,' so obviously Greek is a much richer dialect. I believe God used Alexander the Great. God can use his enemies for His own

purposes. God used Alexander the Great to spread the Greek language, so the richest language was available to record the New Testament because Jesus was going to show up, and He deserves the richest language, doesn't He?

So, because people were beginning to move into Greek, they needed a Greek translation of Hebrew Bible, and it's called the LXX, meaning seventy because according to tradition, and this comes from the letter of Aristeas, I think it is, seventy scholars did that translation work in seventy days. And so you have, 150 to 200 years before Jesus ever showed up, a Greek translation of the Old Testament before there ever was a Jesus in His incarnation; before there ever was a New Testament. What's interesting is that you get into a lot of the different variations of the Septuagint, and ask yourself a simple question: 'Well, when the Septuagint translators got to this expression, 'sons of God,' how did they understand it?' It's very interesting to note that they translated it in many cases as angels. So when they saw *bene Elohim*, they thought it was speaking of angels. Now you say, 'Well, the Septuagint, who cares about that? That's not inspired,' and that's true, it's not inspired. But sometimes we can use the Septuagint to resolve linguistic ambiguities.

For example, we have Isaiah 7:14, which we take as a prophecy concerning the virgin birth of Christ. People will come back on this and say, 'Well, it doesn't say **virgin**.' It says **alma**, which means a young woman of marriageable age; it doesn't necessarily mean a **virgin**. We've gone into that discussion here when I've preached on Christmas. But it's interesting that the Septuagint translators took that word, **alma** in Isaiah 7:14, and translated it as **parthenos** when they went from Hebrew to Greek. And you say, 'Well, who cares?' Well, it is a big deal because **parthenos** in Greek *always* means **virgin**. So the Septuagint translators apparently thought that Isaiah 7:14 was speaking of the **virgin** birth of Christ. I'm making that same argument here with **bene Elohim**. The Septuagint translators themselves thought that phrase referred to angels.

So notice that we're just looking at Genesis 6, and looking at just Genesis 6, you can see arguments emerging that indicate this is not just speaking of cohabitation, polygamy or unbelievers marrying believers. You start to see there's something more going on here because you've got a switch from men to 'sons of God.' There is the book of Job, the only other book that uses the phrase 'sons of God,' the only book available at the time if Job did write Job, and it

always means 'sons of God' there, and then you've actually got some leadings from the Septuagint.

So there actually becomes a logical, rational basis for believing that these 'sons of God' cohabitating with human women are fallen angels trying to disrupt the line leading to Jesus Christ.

And you say, 'Well, I'm sure glad we're finished with Genesis 6; now we can move on to the New Testament.' No, not quite.

Four more arguments from Genesis 6. **[See slide on Additional Arguments from Genesis 6]:**

First of all, the expression Nephilim. Remember we saw there in Genesis 6:4, the Nephilim. We take that as the product of the 'sons of God' and the daughters of men. "...The Nephilim were on the earth... [the Nephilim obviously must be some weird looking creatures because later in Numbers 13:33, they're analogized to giants. So let me ask a question: when the Septuagint translators got to the word Nephilim, what Greek word did they use? They used the word **gigantes**. Now we're dealing with Greek here. **Gigantes** in Greek culture was a reference to the Titans. Do you remember your Greek mythology? Who exactly were the Titans? They were half-man, half-god creatures. Because the gods, if I remember some of my Greek mythology, were procreating with human women. So through those unions, there was this type of being created a demigod, man-god entity. So when the Septuagint translators got to this word Nephilim, they used a word from Greek mythology consistent with the angel view that I'm trying to articulate. The Nephilim fallen ones are the hybrid race. And that's who the **gigantes** are in Greek mythology tracking how the Septuagint translators translated Nephilim from Hebrew into Greek—I find that very interesting also.

[See slide on Genesis 6:8-9] In Genesis 6:9, you read, "But Noah found favor in the eyes of the Lord. These are the records of the generations of Noah. Noah was a **righteous** man, **blameless** in his time. Noah walked with God." Now most people read that and think, 'Well, Noah is just a great guy. I mean, he is swell. He loved the LORD, and he was obedient to the Lord,' which he was. And so people say, 'Well, all that means is Noah obeyed God, and Noah was a righteous man.' I am convinced that Noah certainly had his high points, but he was not a perfectly moral person. Why would I say that? Because nobody is.

Genesis 8:21 says, "...for the intent of man's heart is evil from his youth";... **[See slide on Genesis 8:21]**

Romans 3:23 says, "...for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God." Romans 3:23 doesn't say, 'for all except Noah have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God.' **[See slide on Romans 3:23]**

[See slide on Genesis 6:8-9] And actually, when you get into Genesis 6:8, it says, "But Noah found favor..." Some translations say grace. "Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord,"... And that comes right before it's saying that he was righteous and blameless. Now why would Noah find grace in the eyes of the Lord? Because he was a sinner like the rest of us that needed the grace of God. And in the post-Flood world you start seeing that Noah got a little tipsy at one point. It says in Genesis 9:20,21: "Then Noah began farming and planted a vineyard. He drank of the wine and became drunk and uncovered himself inside his tent." Now, I don't know how you interpret that; I don't think he's walking with the Lord right here.

And by the way, why is that even in there? I mean, why would Moses, when he's writing Genesis, make a reference to Noah's drunkenness? Well, everybody, ever since Genesis 3:15 believed that their own son was the Messiah. That's what Eve believed. We saw that last time related to the birth of Cain. Well, *he* wasn't the Messiah. Cain was the first murderer. So therefore, we must be waiting for somebody besides Cain. Lamech, Noah's father, as we saw last time, in

[See slide on Genesis 5:29]

Genesis 5:21 thought that Noah, baby Noah was the Messiah, and Noah certainly did wonderful exploits for the Lord. He walked by faith. He was obedient to God. But Genesis 9:20,21 says he was no Messiah either. So therefore we must be expecting someone else, and that's why the deficiencies of all of these Old Testament characters born into this line are revealed, as it keeps telling us we must be waiting for somebody else—until Jesus shows up and says, "Which of you can accuse Me of sin?" And we say, 'Well, He's the guy we've been waiting for.'

So that's why Noah's imperfections are recorded for us. That's why Noah himself had to find grace in the eyes of the Lord, just like anybody else. So if Noah wasn't perfect, what does this mean here when it says "Noah was a righteous man, blameless in his time."?

The second word, translated **blameless** in Hebrew, is used in Exodus 12:5 concerning the Passover lamb, “Your lamb shall be an **unblemished** male.” That’s the same word as **blameless** in Genesis 6:9, also used in Exodus 12:5. So look at that and ask, ‘Well, does that mean the Passover lamb is sinless and moral?’ No, it’s not making a statement, obviously, about the morality of an animal. It’s making a statement about the *genetic purity* of that animal. The Passover lamb had to be **unblemished** because it’s a portrait of Jesus who was **unblemished** so there couldn’t be any spot or blemish genetically in that Passover lamb. And when that same Hebrew word is used to describe Noah in Genesis 6:9, it’s not a statement about the morality of Noah, because that wouldn’t fit 6:8, which says, “Noah found favor [grace] in the eyes of the Lord.” It’s a statement about Noah’s *genetic purity*.

In other words, just as God got around the satanic attack as Cain murdered Abel in Genesis 4 through the birth of Seth, and the messianic line continued, what this is saying is that as Satan is disrupting the genetics of the human race so that the Messiah can never be born, God is preserving Somebody. And I think by extension, He’s preserving His family.

So Noah was *perfect genetically*, I would assume, along with his wife and their three sons, Ham, Shem and Japheth, and their respective wives, eight total in the ark. That’s why it’s making a statement that he was **righteous** and **blameless**. He was one of the few on the face of the earth whose gene pool had not been contaminated by what Satan was trying to corrupt in Genesis 6.

So my reading of **righteous** and **blameless** is very different than most Bible readings. You read that and think he’s innocent? Well, I don’t think that’s what it’s saying. I think it’s saying he was *genetically pure*. That’s why the Bible works so hard to trace the lineage [**see slide on God’s Messianic Purpose**] from Adam through Seth through Noah and his family protected in the ark, and then post-Flood, through Shem, and ultimately to Terah, to Abraham, to Isaac, to Jacob, to Judah, and ultimately to Jesus Christ.

In other words, the attack that Satan was waging in Genesis 6 was so profound that God had to preserve Somebody, because if He didn’t preserve somebody in their family, there would be nobody left on planet earth to fulfill the promise of Genesis 3:15—that the Messiah must be fully God and fully man. So that’s how I read a lot of the things in Genesis 6:12 where it says, “God

looked on the earth, and behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted their way on the earth.” Why does it say, “all flesh had corrupted their way”? You can interpret that morally, and maybe morals have something to do with it, but I think a lot of it has to do with genetics. The genetics of the human race were being tampered with of such a severe nature that if this was allowed to go on, the Messiah would never be born, which is what Satan was doing here prior to the Flood.

I think that helps us to understand the total evil that was going on in Genesis 6. Look at the degree of evil. [See slide Genesis 6:1-4] God says, “... ‘My Spirit shall not strive with man forever, because he also is flesh; nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.’...” ‘You guys got 120 years, and it's over.’ Why?

[See slide Genesis 6:5-7] Because there was wickedness on the earth. “...every intent of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually” [to such an extent that] “... ‘The Lord was sorry ...’ and He was grieved...” that He made mankind to begin with, and He decided to “...blot out man...”

[See slide on Genesis 6:11-13] Go to Genesis 6:11-13, where it talks about how the earth was corrupt and filled with violence. “...all flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth. “...the earth was filled with violence...” People lost any sense of morality or right and wrong. Something was happening to the human race that pushed it to this level of depravity.

Watch your doctrine of depravity very carefully, because I find that Calvinism particularly misrepresents this doctrine. [See slide on Total Depravity] They make it sound as if people in their depravity are as evil as they can possibly be and that they indulge every single sin. Now, I believe in depravity, if you'll let me define it the way I want to define it. Depravity means total; every aspect of our being, has been corrupted by sin. There isn't any part of my being, including my mind, that hasn't been corrupted by sin. But it does not mean that I'm as bad as I can possibly be, because even an unbeliever will give money to the Cancer Research Society. Even an unbeliever, when they see a child in the crosswalk, will apply the brakes. What I'm seeing in Genesis 6 is a level of depravity beyond what's normal; I don't think they could have gotten to this level without serious interface and influence from the demonic realm.

Something really abnormal is happening in Genesis 6 that we don't find today. Here are a few verses:

- Genesis 3:22 tells us that man still knows good and evil.
- Matthew 7:11—man knows “...**how to give good gifts to your children...**” Even the mob knows how to do that. Our doctrine of depravity doesn't mean people are as *bad* as they could possibly be.
- Acts 10:1-2, there's an example of a guy named Cornelius who was praying and offering alms unto the Lord, and he was not saved. We know he was not saved yet, because he wasn't saved until Peter got there with the gospel. Acts 11:14 makes that very clear.
- We know that within every single human being there's something called conscience. Sometimes we do things that violate our consciences, and our consciences accuse us per Romans 2:14-15. But sometimes we do good things and our consciences defend us. Paul clearly tells us that also in Romans 2:14-15.

Now, I'm not saying human beings are inherently good either. All of us need the grace of God, but we are not *all* as wicked as we can possibly be, though some might be. They develop what Paul calls a seared conscience. When I look at Genesis 6 and see the description of it, I'm seeing a human race pushed to a level of depravity that's unnatural. What pushed them to that point? The influence of the demonic realm did through the experiment that Satan was running in Genesis 6.

[See slide on Henry Clarence Thiessen]. Just so you don't think I'm misstating the doctrine of depravity, Henry Clarence Thiessen tells us “The Scriptures speak of human nature as totally depraved. However, the doctrine of total depravity is easily misunderstood and misinterpreted. From the negative standpoint, it is important to know both what it does not mean and what it does mean. This does not mean that every sinner is devoid of all qualities pleasing to men; that he commits or is prone to every form of sin; or that he is bitterly opposed to God as it as is possible for him to be. Jesus recognized the existence of pleasing qualities in some individuals (Mark 10:21). He said that the scribes and the Pharisees...did some things God demanded (Matt. 23:23); Paul asserted that some Gentiles ‘do instinctively the things of the law’ (Rom. 2:14); God told Abraham that the iniquity of the Amorites would grow worse (Gen.15:16); and Paul says that [in the last days] ‘evil men and imposters will proceed from bad to worse’(2 Tim. 3:13).”

So we may be bad, but we're not necessarily worse. Some of y'all might be, and I might be, but that's really not what the doctrine of total depravity is teaching. And when you look at Genesis 6, you look at humanity run amok. There is nothing redemptive at all. There is no thought that they're thinking that's pure. So something obviously unprecedented is happening in Genesis 6. There's a lot more going on here than just cohabitation. The influence of the satanic and demonic realm is pushing them to this level.

And beyond that, why bring the flood? When the flood hit, it says “...**Every living thing that moved on the earth perished**—....” Every living thing would include the Nephilim, wouldn't it? Because there are a lot of Nephilim chasers today trying to find the Nephilim. But if you have, and I've heard people argue that Noah tucked a few away in the ark, that discounts why God sent the Flood. God sent the Flood to destroy this genetic experiment. So I don't think there are Nephilim today even in the Numbers passage, which I'll go into.

[See slide on HC Leupold]. The flood was unprecedented. HC Leupold points out that there's “...**A double 'all'** in Genesis 7:19. He's not just saying y'all. He's saying 'all y'all', which in Texas means everything, right? So the whole Earth was underwater. I realize there are a lot of people today that don't believe that; they believe in a local flood, which to me is laughable because why build an ark that is 450 ft long, 75 ft wide, and 45 ft deep if it's just a bathtub overflow in Mesopotamia? The Flood is analogized to the second coming of Christ, which every eye will see, right? So it's global. And by the way, if the Flood was just local, why would you put animals and birds on the ark? You could just have them run off to safe ground. So every ancient writer believed that the Flood was global. Even John Calvin got this one right. He said, “And the flood was forty days, etc. Moses conspicuously insists on this fact, in order to show that the **whole world** was immersed in the waters.” So Calvin got the **whole world** correctly interpreted. I wish he would do that in John 3:16. That's another story. So the world that we're in right now is thrice removed from original creation. Do we understand that? This is the problem with having the kids sing, *'This is my Father's World.'*

Are you sure about that? Because there have been three catastrophes that have already happened: [See slide on Uniformitarianism is not Biblicism]

A. Fall

B. Flood

C. Dispersion of languages at Babel.

So the world that we're in now, I've underlined it, is thrice removed from its original creation, meaning that the Flood was just as significant to this earth as was the Fall, as was the Dispersion at the Tower of Babel.

So here's the question: why would God send something that unprecedented in terms of judgment? Was it just because unbelievers were marrying believers, as the first view suggests? No, that happens even today. God doesn't send a flood when that happens, or we'd all be in a lot of trouble.

Is it just because people were becoming polygamists? No, that also happens today. Just go to the state of Utah. You'll see remnants of it. So God doesn't send a flood when polygamy happens.

But God does send a global judgment when the interface with Satan is so severe that the genetics of the human race are being tampered with to the point where a Messiah can't even come. Now that's severe. That's unprecedented, and that will send a flood. So I think the necessity of the Flood itself also argues for the angel interpretation.

What are some more proofs for the angel interpretation? **[See slide on Additional Arguments from Genesis 6]**

- The Septuagint translators interpretation of Nephilim as Titans;
- The statement about Noah's perfection;
- I don't think that the level of depravity in people prior to the Flood is explicable absent demonic involvement of an abnormal nature. Something obviously really weird was

happening then from our perspective or else God would not have sent a global judgment to destroy this experiment in its entirety.

So put all these things together, and I'm confident that the angel view is the correct one.

When I'm with you next Sunday, we'll look at *three* New Testament passages because the New Testament is the best commentary on the Old Testament. The New Testament is going to make reference to this event *three* times, and without exception, the New Testament is going to describe it as *angelic* and connect it with the days of Noah.

So I don't think any single argument seals the deal, but cumulatively, I think the angel view is the most plausible view.

I'm two minutes over, so we don't have time for questions, but let me close with some prayer.

Father, we're grateful for Your truth, Your Word, even these things in it that are sort of hard for us to understand, but make us good students of Your Word so we can handle well the full counsel of God's Word. We'll be careful to give You all the praise and the glory. We ask these things in Jesus' name, and God's people said, Amen!