

Angelology 033
Genesis 6:1-4, Pt 5
March 22, 2020
Dr. Andy Woods

All right, everybody, let me welcome you to Sugar Land Bible Church live streaming. And as you all know, all the churches around the world are in this kind of holding pattern where we are having church, but people are staying at home and relying upon live streaming. So, we're doing that same thing here. We're going to be teaching the doctrine of the angels in our first hour.

Let's open our Bibles to the book of Genesis 6:1-4. We are, in this particular study, at the tail end of a lengthy study on the doctrine of angels. We call this angelology. We have dealt with the good angels. We have dealt with Satan, and we call that Satanology. We have to deal with Satan because he, at one time, was a high-ranking angel in the area of Angelology. And then from there we began to look at the beings that fell with him during his initial revolt, and we call that demonology. So, we've gone through the Bible and looked at, I think, everything it has to say on demons, Satan, and the good angels. And most people would conclude, or wrap up the series there, but we're going one step further. We're looking at Genesis 6:1-4, because what I've tried to explain in prior shows is that Genesis 6:1-4, also speaks on the subject of the angels.

So, let's open our Bibles into Genesis 6:1-4, and reorient ourselves as to what these verses say. Genesis 6:1 says, "Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, that the **sons of God** saw that the daughters of men were beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. Then the Lord said, 'My Spirit shall not strive with man forever, because he also is flesh; nevertheless, his days will be one hundred and twenty years.' The **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, as we have talked about before, there are some problematic phrases in this passage:

- Number one, the two-fold repetition of the expression 'sons of God'— who are the sons of God?
- And number two, who exactly are the product of this interface between the sons of God and human women, the Nephilim?

So, what we have talked about in this series is that there are probably three major views on this. I won't go back through those three views at this point because we've done those in prior shows, but we're focused here on number three, which is what we think is the correct view.

- The sons of God, we believe, are fallen angels during the flood era, just prior to the flood, procreating with human women.

Now, why would they do that? Well, primarily to stop a promise that God made in Genesis 3:15. All the way back in Genesis 3:15, right after the fall of man, there was a messianic prophecy articulated that there's coming One from the seed of the woman, in this case Eve, who will take the serpent's head and ultimately crush it. And we believe that coming One is none other than Jesus Christ. And we know that this Messiah is coming from the seed of the woman; the woman in this case is Eve. And so, we have a clear hint, if you will, in the Scripture, that when the Messiah comes, He's not just going to be fully God, but He's also going to be fully Man. So, what Satan is doing in Genesis 6:1-4, according to this angelic interpretation that we're defending here, is that he is having some of his demons procreate with human women for the specific purpose of creating a race of people that aren't fully man. Now think about this just for a minute: The Messiah must be fully God and fully Man when He comes. He must be from the seed of the woman. And so, Satan says to himself at this particular time in history, 'I'll fix that problem; I'll create a race of people called the Nephilim, the product of angels or demons procreating with human women who are not fully human. That way, the Messiah can never come. I'll create a hybrid race. I will so tamper with the genetics of the human race; I'll create a hybrid race of people that are not fully human.' 9And so that is an answer as to why Satan is doing this in history.

Notice on the chart on the screen, it says **Satanic Attempts to Stop Messiah**. Satan, all the way through the Old Testament, and quite frankly, even into the New Testament, into the life of Christ, made several attempts to prevent the birth of Jesus. Every time he makes that attempt, he changes his strategy just a little bit. And that's how to understand Genesis 6:1-4; it's just another chapter in a long saga. It's another chapter in a long book, if you will, of Satan trying to prevent the birth of the Messiah. So, Satan does this all kinds of times and in all kinds of different ways. And here, he's just altered his strategy some. In Genesis 6, according to the view that I believe in and am sharing with you, he's trying to genetically alter humanity, which is why the beings born from this unholy union are called the Nephilim. Nephilim basically means fallen ones. It comes from the Hebrew verb *nafal*, which means to fall. So, he is trying to lock the human race into a permanent state of fallenness through the genetic manipulation that he is doing here in Genesis 6. So that's the view. The question now becomes, is that really a defensible view? We have looked in several lessons as to why we think this is a defensible view. Here is the line of argumentation that we're using:

Number 1, does the Old Testament teach this view? Remember that I gave you several arguments from Genesis 6 itself that support this view. Probably the strongest argument is this expression, 'sons of God,' which is used two times in Genesis 6, and is used only three other times in Hebrew Bible, and those other times are in the book of Job, where 'sons of God' always means angels. It can mean good angels, and it can mean fallen angels. That was the only book in existence, Job being the oldest book of the Bible, at the time Moses wrote these words. So, when he's using Moses in Genesis 6, Moses, of course, the author of Pentateuch or Torah, or the first five books of the Old Testament, when Moses uses the expression 'sons of God,' he's drawing from that literary heritage that we find in the book of Job.

Then from there, we moved into the New Testament, and we asked ourselves, does the New Testament comment on Genesis 6 because your best interpreter of the Old Testament is the New Testament. And there we saw that there are actually three passages that specifically deal with this subject:

- 1 Peter 3:19-20
- 2 Peter 2:4-5
- Jude 6-7

All of those passages talk about how some angels or demons are in a place of incarceration. The Peter passages especially connect it with the days of Noah. And so, we believe this: when Satan fell, he deceived one-third of the angels into falling with him. Some of those fallen angels, later on in history, and we do not know how many, but certainly a subcategory of the one-third of the fallen angels, the two-thirds as you can see from this pie chart, remain good angels, unfallen. But of that one-third, we don't know exactly how many that fell, though likely a lot; some of those fallen angels became involved in the sin of Genesis 6. Those are the angels that God took because they left their natural abode and did something particularly heinous. God took them and put them in this place of incarceration. And that is what these three verses here are speaking of:

- 1 Peter 3:19-20
- 2 Peter 2:4-5
- Jude 6-7

Therefore, if you don't have the doctrine of angels in Genesis 6, you have no real explanation as to why some demons are now imprisoned, and some are free. Clearly, some are free because we wrestle, Ephesians 6, not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers and rulers of this dark world. And yet these verses indicate that some are in jail. It's interesting that particularly the Peter verses connect that jailing with the days of Noah. So, we have authority, not just from Genesis 6, but in these New Testament passages that all support the angel view interpretation.

And before I leave that particular point, slip over to the book of Ephesians for a moment, Ephesians 4:9-10. I'm bringing this up now because several people have asked me about this, and they want to know why I am not including Ephesians 4:9-10 in my list of the three verses dealing with this issue. Notice what it says, "(Now this expression, 'He ascended,' what does it mean except that He also had descended into **the lower parts of the earth**? He who descended is Himself also He who ascended far above all the heavens, so that He might fill all things.)"

Now, backtracking here just for a minute, in the 1 Peter passage, there is a reference to the fact that Jesus Christ, in between His death and His resurrection, descended to where these fallen demons are who rebelled in the days of Noah in Genesis 6, and He preached, or He proclaimed victory over them. So, since that is a reality, a lot of people

want to know why I'm not including Ephesians 4:9-10 as one of my proof texts, because that text indicates that Jesus descended to the lower parts of the earth. So with that being said, let me just offer a brief comment on Ephesians 4:9-10, and why I do not think Ephesians 4:9-10 is speaking of Jesus' descent into some sort of Hades, or maybe hell, or some place of incarceration where the fallen angels are.

Let me give you this quote here from Carl Laney. Carl Laney wrote an excellent book called **Answers to Tough Questions**. It deals with all of the problem passages, major problem passages in the Bible in a very succinct way. If you don't have this in your library, I would encourage you to get this. He has a discussion here on Ephesians 4:9-10, and why Ephesians 4:9-10 is not speaking of Christ's descent into Hades, or into hell, or into this place of incarceration where some of the demons are now. Now, 1 Peter is speaking of that, but Ephesians 4:9-10 is *not* speaking of that according to Carl Laney.

Why is that? And by the way, there's a ton of confusion on Ephesians 4:9-10 because in a statement of Christendom called the Apostle's Creed, you'll see a statement that Christ descended into the lower parts of the earth. I think that some versions of the Creed say, 'into Hades or into hell.' So, the Apostle's Creed took this as a statement of that descent. But I don't think Ephesians 4:9-10 is speaking of that because of what Carl Laney says. So, Carl Laney writes as follows.

"Paul is saying in the context that Christ who went up to heaven (in His ascension) is the same one who had come down from heaven..." [Commenting on Ephesians 4:] "(v.10). That descent from heaven occurred when Christ came to the earth and was born as a human. This text refers to the incarnation of Jesus [and] not a descent into hell. The expression, 'the lower parts of the earth,' [and this is very important to understand], is an appositional genitive. This means that the 'lower parts' refer to 'the earth' [itself. So, when it speaks of Christ's descent into the lower parts of the earth, an appositional genitive is the idea that the lower parts are not something below the earth or something different than the earth, or something within the earth, but it's a description of the earth itself. To reiterate, he says,] "The expression, 'the lower parts of the earth,' is an appositional genitive. This means that the 'lower parts' refers to 'the earth.' For example, 'the city of Portland' refers to the city, which is Portland. The 'city' and 'Portland' are one in the same."

So, when it says he descended to the lower parts of the earth, an appositional genitive indicates that the lower parts are the same as the earth. Well, why does he call the earth the lower parts? Because it's the opposite from where He came. He came from a place of glory—Majesty on High, and He came *to* our earth to accomplish His mission of His death, burial, resurrection, and ascension. This verse, because lower parts, is another description of the earth, appositional genitive, is not saying He went to somewhere other than the earth, or some sort of inner cavern within the earth, or some sort of trip into Hades, or hell, perhaps in the earth. That's simply not what this passage is saying.

So the Apostle's Creed notwithstanding, I don't think you can use Ephesians 4:9-10 as a proof text to describe this doctrine that I'm speaking of here, that I do believe is taught in 1 Peter: that Jesus, in between His death and His resurrection, descended to where the demons are chained, who were involved in the sin of Genesis 6, and He preached or proclaimed victory over them. Yes, that really did happen. That really is supporting data for the angel view, but I would not throw into the mix Ephesians 4:9-10 to help flesh that out. I think the Apostle's Creed has it wrong here because an appositional genitive does not allow that kind of understanding.

So that's just a little bit of side noting there in this brief review that we're doing. And I bring these things up because a lot of people ask me these kinds of questions. That's why I try to work them in. So, is the angel view a defensible view? Yes, from the Old Testament, Genesis 6. Yes, from three New Testament passages, *not* including Ephesians 4:9-10, for reasons I have already articulated. And yes, the angel view here, number three is defensible through tradition. The earliest Jewish tradition that we have supports the angel view of Genesis 6. Beyond that, the earliest Christian tradition amongst the earliest Church fathers that we have supports the angelic interpretation of Genesis 6. In fact, we've used this quote here **[see Slide on Renald Showers quote]** before that the competing view that Genesis 6 is just talking about the Sethites and the Cainites intermarrying. It has nothing to do with angels. That's the main view that competes with the angel view that we have been teaching here. That particular Sethite Cainite view is a view that didn't even come into existence. Most people don't know this, but it didn't even come into existence until a good four centuries, 400 years after the

church had started. So, the Sethite Cainite view is really not the most traditional view, but the angel view *is* both in the Church Fathers and in Judaism as well.

So, is the angel view a defensible view? Yes, from the Old Testament. Yes, from the New Testament. Yes, from tradition. And when we run into a theological problem like this, we have to say, 'Well, if you're going to advocate a particular view that's questioned, that is debatable, that's controversial, then there must be objections. And we have to ask ourselves if these objections can be answered. And it is true that there are at least five objections to the angel view of Genesis 6 [**see Slide on Objections**]. The first two we've covered, actually, perhaps the first three we've covered, and we're going to try to pick up on number four in just a minute. But let me remind you of the objections that we've dealt with.

Number one, the first objection is Genesis 6 can't have anything to do with angels because Jesus said in Matthew 22:30 that angels don't marry. So, if angels don't marry, how ridiculous is it for you to say Genesis 6 is speaking of cohabitation between angels and humans? But look very carefully at what Jesus says and what He doesn't say. In Matthew 22:30, Jesus says, "For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven." Jesus is not saying here that angels don't procreate. The only statement He is making here is that angels don't marry. Procreation and marriage obviously are two different things. And beyond that, Jesus was making a statement here about angels in heaven. He's not speaking of demons, which is what we are dealing with here in Genesis 6. So that objection, we discover, is really not an objection, because to make that objection work, essentially you have to make that verse, Matthew 22:30, say something more expansive than what it's actually saying.

The second objection, and we've covered this as well, is that the angel view can't be correct because angels, after all, are spirits. And how could a spirit procreate with a human woman in Genesis 6? So, they like to quote Hebrews 1:14, which tells us that angels are ministering spirits. And our response to that is, yes, angels are spirits, generally speaking, but that does not subtract from the fact that they can take on human form. In fact, Hebrews 13:2 tells us very clearly, "Do not neglect to show hospitality to strangers, for by this some have entertained angels without knowing it." How can people entertain angels without knowing it if an angel can't take on human form? So, a spiritual being, yes, they are, but clearly, they have a capacity to take on human form.

And I've shown you this passage here in Genesis 18:22 [see Slide on Genesis 18:22;19:1], which speaks of the men turning towards Sodom. And then in Genesis 19:1, we learn that the men that turned toward Sodom were actually two angels—angels that actually showed up at the house or the tent, if you will, of Abraham. Abraham and Sarah actually gave them a meal [see side on Genesis 18:5-8]. So, angels in their physical capacity obviously have an ability to eat. They have an ability to digest food. I would assume that they have the ability to eliminate waste, etc. And so, this idea that Genesis 6, an angelic interpretation of that passage, doesn't work because angels are spirits, ignores that objection, it ignores all of the biblical data. When you study everything the Bible has to say on the doctrine of angels, you clearly learn that they are spirits, but they have a capacity to take on human flesh.

The third objection, and this is where we were a couple of weeks ago, and I'm taking a little while to review this, probably because this morning some of you may be new viewers. And beyond that, we actually didn't meet as a church body last week. Thus, what we've covered is a couple of weeks old, so I hope you'll pardon me as I'm trying to lay the foundation once again. But the third objection is that there are Nephilim in the post-flood world.

And by the way, to get more treatment on each of these issues, just go back into our archives and watch them. Here, I am just summarizing what we said. People note that the flood killed every living thing. It says that over and over again in Genesis 7:19-23; there were only eight preserved on the ark. And so, we believe that the Nephilim or this genetic experiment gone awry that Satan was orchestrating in the pre-flood world, all [the Nephilim] perished in the flood. If the Nephilim didn't perish in the flood, then God's purpose for sending the flood was ineffective because He sent the flood specifically not only to judge the world of its sin, but according to the angel view, to destroy this hybrid race that Satan was creating.

The problem with the angel view of Genesis 6 as we've described it, is Numbers 13:33, [see slide on Numbers 13:32-33] in the days of Joshua—first in the days of Moses, and also in the days of Joshua, it says, “...There also we saw the Nephilim (the sons of Anak are part of the Nephilim;)...” and people say, ‘Aha! I thought you told us that all of the Nephilim perished in the flood. And if all the Nephilim perished in the flood, then did

Satan do this a second time? Did he repeat the experiment that he did in Genesis 6 a second time in the days of Moses and in the days of Joshua?’

So, Numbers 13:33 was given at a time when the nation of Israel had passed out of the Red Sea, as they had been in Egyptian bondage for 400 years. They went, according to our map here, down south to Mount Sinai, the tip of the Sinai Peninsula, to receive the Mosaic Law. And then there was basically an eleven-day journey from Sinai into the Promised Land. And when you read about it in Deuteronomy 1:2-5, right in there, it gives you that number of an eleven-day journey. They just had to trust God for eleven days and they would have been in Canaan. So, they made their way up north. They got to the southern border of Israel in a place called Kadesh Barnea. They saw giants in the land. They fell into fear and God closed down that whole generation, with the exception of Joshua and Caleb, who entered with the next generation as what we would call seasoned senior citizens, a better name for them as seasoned citizens in their eighties. And in the process of seeing the giants in the land, that's where they say in Numbers 13:33, [It's] “There also we saw the **Nephilim**...” And so, many, many people use Numbers 13:33 to argue that there was a second post-flood angelic eruption. In other words, Satan reduplicated, allegedly, what he had tried to produce in Genesis 6.

So you'll notice from the writings of Finis Jennings Dake, [**see Slide on Finis Jennings Dake quote**] which is a study Bible that a lot of people are drawing from, and they may not know that's where they're getting their information from, but Dake, as far as I know, was one of the first to articulate this second angelic eruption perspective. He writes, **“There were two eruptions of the fallen angels among men. They produced races of giants on the Earth each time. The first eruption was before the flood, and the second one was after the flood.”** A lot of this thinking comes from the reference to the Nephilim, not in Genesis 6, but in Numbers 13:33. Now I want you to look very carefully at the context of Numbers 13:33, [**see Slide on Numbers 13:32-33**] because this is what the second eruption view isn't telling you. The context of Numbers 13:33 is in Numbers 13:32, an evil report, “a **bad report**,” in other words, coming from the spies. The spies looked into the land of Canaan from Kadesh Barnea, and they went into fear. And out of fear, they began to articulate the size of their opponents, and in the process, they start using all of these figures of speech to describe their opponents in the land. They say, for example, in Numbers 13:32, the **“land that devours its inhabitants.”** Now, that's obviously a figure of speech. That's what you call a personification. You'll

notice also in Numbers 13:33, they say “we became like...” ‘like’ is a simile; “we became **like grasshoppers** in our own sight.” Obviously, we don't think the land is actually devouring its inhabitants. There were not grasshoppers in the land. These are personifications, or a simile, as a fearful report is being brought back to God's people concerning their opponents in the land. And it's in that context that these fearful spies use that word “Nephilim.” So, I don't think these spies are actually saying there's Nephilim in the land in the technical sense, in the literal sense that we find in Genesis 6, but they're simply in their state of fear, analogizing their opponents to the worst thing that they knew of in Jewish history that Moses had written about, which was this Genesis 6 issue.

So, I think the Genesis 6 Nephilim are very literal, but I think the Nephilim in Numbers 13 are *not* literal. And quite frankly, the Bible does this a lot. It will lay down something in a literal sense, like a shepherd, for example, and then it will use, later on, that shepherd as a metaphor for something— like the ministry of Christ, the role of a pastor or an elder. So, in the second use, it's not saying a literal shepherd, it's using a figure of speech, or a metaphor, or a simile. And I think that's what's happening with these Nephilim. I do not think what they're seeing in the land is literal Nephilim. I think they're psyched out. They're fearful, they're afraid. And so, they analogize their opponents in the host of tons of other figures of speech to the worst thing they could think about in Jewish history.

So literal Nephilim in Genesis 6, but they're being used in a metaphorical sense in Numbers 13:33. And that's what the two-eruption view isn't telling you. The two-eruption view is building its theology on this verse, not fully explaining the context of this verse, that this isn't actually an evil report from the spies that were in emotional turmoil. And one of the things to understand about the Bible, and hear me very carefully on this, because it's easy to be misunderstood—The doctrine of inspiration does not guarantee that everything in the Bible is true, because the Bible records statements of people that said false things. In Genesis 3, for example, Satan lied. He told the woman, ‘You will not die.’ Well, obviously that's not a true statement. So the doctrine of inspiration doesn't guarantee that what the serpent said was accurate. What the doctrine of inspiration guarantees is that the statement actually took place just like it says. So, Numbers 13:32-33 is an example just like that. You don't go to a passage like this to build a doctrine, because when you look at it contextually, it's coming from these twelve, I

believe there were twelve roughly, intimidated spies who were analogizing what they saw in the land to the worst thing they could think of in human history.

And I like to quote scholars just to show you that the view I'm espousing, because most of you may have never heard this, is consistent with what many scholars teach. For example, my professor, Dr. Ronald Allen, who wrote the Numbers commentary in the **Expositor's Bible Commentary**, says this of Numbers 13:32-33. He calls them "**the faithless spies who were speaking evil...**" ... And then he says, "**...the use of the term Nephilim seems to be deliberately provocative of fear, a term not unlike the concept of bogeymen and hobgoblins.**" "**...By describing themselves as mere grasshoppers in the sight of the fabulous Nephilim, they frightened the sandals off...**" [I mean, assuming there were sandals back in this day, I assume there were] "**...the people and led a nation to grievous sin of unbelief against their caring God.**"

Now, it is interesting that the nation of Israel in the time of Joshua, enters the land, and they are in that land for 800 years, until they are finally evicted from that land, from the Babylonian captivity about 800 years later. And there's a whole chunk of your Bible dedicated to that 800-year time period. The Chronicles books talk about it; the Samuel books talk about it somewhat. And beyond that, you've got Judges. You've got the Kings books. And in all of that history which covers 800 years, you know what you never see a single time? You never see the word Nephilim again. It's mentioned in Numbers 13, but once they actually get into the land, the word disappears. And that's further evidence that these spies were using the word Nephilim as more or less of a figure of speech.

Now take a look for a minute at Genesis 6:4 because a lot of people try to get mileage out of Genesis 6:4. Notice what Dake does to support his two-angelic eruptions interpretation. He quotes **Genesis 6:4: "There were giants in the earth in those days [before the flood] and also after that [after the flood]..."** Now notice what he does here. He puts 'before the flood' in brackets. Why does he have to put that in brackets? Because you don't find that phrase in Genesis 6:4. He's read that into the passage. "... There were giants in the earth in those days. Bracket before the flood and also after that. Notice the second bracket he inserts after the flood. But the passage doesn't say that. Look specifically at verse 4. It says, ... "The **Nephilim were on the earth in those**

days, and also afterward,” ...it never defines what ‘those days’ are, and it never tells you what ‘afterward’ is. Now people assume it's after the flood. And if Nephilim were on the earth after the flood, then that would lend support to a second angelic eruption interpretation. But there's an entirely different way of looking at this. When you back up to verse 3 of Genesis 6, God says, ‘My Spirit will not strive with man forever, because he also is flesh; nevertheless, his days shall be **one hundred and twenty years**.’ There are one hundred and twenty years in existence, at least, that we know of before the flood. One hundred and twenty years is a long, long time. The United States of America has only been in existence, give or take, two hundred and forty years. And so, think of a time period that's roughly half the duration of the political life of our entire country. And so, when it says “...The **Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward**...” it never defines when “those days” are. It could be within that one-hundred-and-twenty-year window, for all we know, prior to the flood. In other words, there's no, what we call in Latin, ‘terminus a quo’ given, which is a fancy word for saying beginning point. It never tells you when “those days” started and it never tells you what “after” means. Now people assume it's after the flood. But what I'm trying to explain is that is an unwarranted assumption. It could be describing the beginning of some point, and after some point within the one hundred and twenty-year window.

So, what you're seeing is that this second angelic eruption view is built on a lot of evidence that, to my mind, seems somewhat flimsy.

And that gets us to our fourth objection. And I was actually going to start the study here with number four, because everything we've done thus far is review, believe it or not, but I think it's review we needed to do. The fourth objection is people say, ‘Well, what about **the Nephilim in David's day?**’ Notice again the words of Dake as he's trying to find support for his second angelic eruption view. He says, “The second eruption of fallen angels was evidently smaller in number and more limited in the area; they were, for the most part, confined to the land of Canaan, and their offspring were known as the nations of Canaan. They were known as the Raphaim; ... [the] Anakim; Horim; Zanzumim; and other names. They are enumerated in Gen. 15:18-21”... [and many other passages].

He goes on and says, “...These were to be utterly destroyed by the sword of Israel just as the flood had destroyed the ones that had lived in the Dispensation of Conscience...”

[Another way of saying pre-flood] ... Israel failed in this purpose so the giants were left to test and prove the chosen people...The giants made trouble for Israel until the time of David when the last of the races of the giants were killed.” So, what Dake is doing is finding every example of a strange creature in the land of Canaan during that 800-year window before the Babylonian captivity whether it's any reference to giants—Raphaim, Horim, etc., and he's assuming that those are also references to the Nephilim. Now notice what I said: He's assuming that because the word Nephilim, although it's used in Genesis 6, although it's used in Numbers 13, is not used in any of the passages or people groups that Dake cites.

And so, a lot of people grab some verses which talk about strange creatures in the land, and they assume that those are the Nephilim as a result of the second angelic eruption. They like to use this passage here in 2 Samuel 21:20. It says, “There was a war at Gath again, where there was a man of **great** stature who had six fingers on each hand and six toes on each foot, twenty-four in number; And he also had been born to the giant.” Now people look at that and say, ‘there's the Nephilim. I told you there was a second eruption. There it is right there in your Bible.’ The problem is, do you see the word Nephilim here? They're assuming that's Nephilim, but the text does not actually say that. They like to use Deuteronomy 3:11 which says, “For only Og king of Bashan was left of the remnant of the Raphaim. Behold, his bedstead was an iron bedstead; it is in Rabbah of the sons of Ammon. Its length was nine cubits, and its width four cubits by an ordinary cubit.” Now that would be a bed that this entity or this person or creature slept in that was what, twelve or thirteen feet long? So people say, ‘There it is. That's the example of Nephilim.’ But does it say Nephilim? It doesn't say that, does it? They like to use 1 Chronicles 11:22, which says, “Benaiah the son of Jehoiada, the son of a valiant man of Kabzeel, mighty in deeds, struck down the two sons of Ariel of Moab. He also went down and...” [Look at this guy. He] “... killed a lion inside a pit... [I like this little detail here. And it happened] on a snowy day. I don't know why we have to know it happened on a snowy day. But you have this guy killing this lion in a pit on a snowy day and people say, ‘Obviously this guy had superhuman strength. There is another example of the Nephilim. There was a second angelic eruption.’ But notice again that this particular passage does not say Nephilim. Dake and others are assuming it means Nephilim, but assuming something is not the exact same thing as proof. So, if there was no second angelic eruption, which is my position, there was one in Genesis 6, but not after the flood, then how do I explain all of these strange creatures? Six fingers and six

toes. Guy sleeping in a bed that looks like it's about twelve to thirteen and one-half feet long, and another guy that kills a lion on a snowy day. I would simply say this: Those are what we would call abnormalities of nature. I could take you to the Guinness Book of World Records, and I could show you people of abnormal size and of abnormal height. And there are people born today, tragically, with too few fingers or too many fingers. That doesn't make them Nephilim. That's just a genetic normality that you can explain independent of the Nephilim phenomenon. And of course, if you watch any NBA games, I've had the chance in my life, and I'm not exactly a short person—I stand about 6 foot 6 1/2. I've stood next to Shaquille O'Neal in San Antonio. We were in a hotel once where they were involved in one of the great series of the NBA of the battle between the Los Angeles Lakers and the San Antonio Spurs, if I remember right, in one of the playoffs, and there was Shaquille O'Neal. So, I went and stood right next to him. Gabe, our youth pastor, has stood next to, and he's got a picture of it, Akeem Olajuwon. And my goodness, Gabe doesn't look that tall next to Hakeem Olajuwon. And I certainly didn't feel very tall next to Shaquille O'Neal. When I was younger and a Lakers fan, still am to some extent a Lakers fan, but I was really a Lakers fan back in the day. I went to games, and I stood next to one of my heroes growing up, Kareem Abdul-Jabbar. I felt like a shrimp next to him. So just because there are giants and people that are what I would call freakishly tall, abnormally tall, and I don't know if these guys mind that they're tall. All the millions and millions of dollars that they make in the NBA. I think of Yao Ming, who played here for a number of years in Houston. I think of Ralph Sampson, who also played here in Houston. I mean, I'm not going to jump to the conclusion that they're all Nephilim just because they're genetically different than the rest of us. So that's my explanation for some of these strange creatures in the land. You can explain them without jumping to the conclusion that there was a second angelic eruption.

Now, one of the things that Dake uses to support his point is that God commanded that these entities in the land—women, and children, be completely and totally eradicated. So, people say, 'Well, my goodness, if they were eradicated prior to the flood because they were Nephilim, maybe there was a second angelic eruption after the flood. And that's why God similarly commanded all of them to be completely and totally exterminated and eradicated.' So, notice what Dake says here, and again he's weaving together proofs for his second angelic eruption view. And what people do when they put these views together is they talk so fast, stringing their points together that you really don't have time to sit there and back up and examine each point carefully. And so, when

they string it all together at once, it looks like they're saying something accurate. But we as Christians are called to be Bereans. We're called to sort of slow down and examine each point, point by point. And what I'm saying is none of the points that Dake uses, absolutely none of them are convincing or proof of anything. Maybe to sort of a fast-talking salesman who has the gift of gab and knows how to sling a bunch of ideas together simultaneously, can it sound good. But think of your calling as a Christian. You're supposed to be a Berean, Acts 17:11. You're supposed to examine carefully everything that's taught. That's what the Bereans did with Paul. That's why they were considered more noble-minded than the Thessalonians. And that's what you should do with Dake. And that's what you should do with this live stream this morning. Look at the Scripture yourself and see if these things are accurate. But one of the proofs that Dake uses is this: "...These were to be utterly destroyed by the sword of Israel just as the flood destroyed the ones that had lived in the Dispensation of Conscience." So, he is using the total eradication of the Canaanites prior to the flood, Genesis 6. And he's trying to compare that to the command that God gave to the Israelites to completely exterminate the giants and so forth in the land. And he's trying to say, 'Well, therefore, if this is true and if this is true, the conclusion is the giants in the land post-flood must be Nephilim as well.' And I'm here to tell you that that really is no proof at all. It is true that God said to Joshua, who entered the land of Canaan, as Joshua was acting on the command of God, "They utterly destroyed everything in the city, both man and woman, young and old, and ox and sheep and donkey, with the edge of the sword." So, the argument is God said to Joshua to eradicate everything. God said that same thing concerning or the flood, rather that same thing concerning the Nephilim, Genesis 6. So therefore, post-flood those in the land must have been contaminated by some sort of Nephilim virus. That's the argument that is being used. And my point is that is no proof of anything, because typically in the Bible and the nation of Israel frequently disobeys God here. God, typically in the Bible says that concerning the enemies of Israel, 'You've got to completely wipe these people out. You've got to wipe out the women. You've got to wipe out the children. You've got to wipe out the animals.' Now, that's not because they're Nephilim. That command in and of itself does not give me the right to see Nephilim in all of these passages when the word Nephilim isn't even used. But God specifically commanded the Jews to do that because He knew that if these people groups were not completely obliterated, and by the way, an additional study which we don't have time to get into, they had centuries to repent. So don't think that God gave this command in a nanosecond. There were one hundred and twenty years, we've

learned, before the flood waters hit, and there were centuries, and there were warnings through the prostitute Rahab and others, I can demonstrate to you that there was a knowledge of Yahweh. I mean, they knew what was coming. They had an opportunity to repent. And it is true that God said to eradicate all of them, women, children, and animals. And the reason God said that is not because they were Nephilim. He said that because if you allow them to live in any sense, the apple doesn't fall far from the tree. The little kids that are pagans and idolaters are going to grow up to be pagans and idolaters. And if you allow this people group to live, the nation of Israel, God's special nation, God's redeemed nation, is going to follow their pattern of living and is going to become idolatrous, just like these people groups were idolaters. And my goodness, because Israel didn't do exactly what God said, isn't it interesting in biblical history how the nation of Israel goes into captivity, and the northern tribes are scattered because they started to imitate the detestable practices of those within the land?

Now, before you sit in judgment on the Israelis, what sin is in your life and in my life where God says, 'Deal with this,' and we put it off and we think we can contain it without eradicating it under His power. And what we discover in the course of time is that the sin ultimately controls us, rather than the other way around. That's why God gave these commands, not because they were Nephilim.

And so you see these types of commands later in biblical history. This is what God said to Saul. This is why Saul lost his empire. In 1 Samuel 15:2-3, it says, "Thus says the Lord of hosts, 'I will punish Amalek for what he did to Israel, how he set himself against him on the way while he was coming up from Egypt. Now go and strike Amalek and utterly destroy all that he has, and do not spare him; but put to death both man and woman, child and infant, ox and sheep, camel and donkey.'" That doesn't give me a right to read Nephilim into this. It is 'Get rid of these idolaters or you're going to imitate their practices.' And of course, Saul didn't do that. He did it partially. Partial obedience. And that's how he lost his kingdom.

And go all the way into the time of Daniel, into the time of Babylon, into the sixth century. Did you watch what God did to those that persecuted Daniel and threw him into the lions' den? It says in Daniel 6:24, "The king then gave orders, and they brought those men who had maliciously accused Daniel, and they cast them,..." [Look at this]... "their children, their wives into the lions' den; and they" [that's those cast into the den] ...

“had not reached the bottom of the den before the lions overpowered them and crushed all their bones.” Now, there's another example in the Bible where there's an eradication of even the children and the wives. Now, that took place in Babylon, 350 miles to the east of the nation of Israel in modern-day Iraq, a land called Shinar. You will see that geographical location given in Daniel 1:2. So if everywhere there's a total eradication of a people group, I'm allowed to read Nephilim into that passage, then I guess I have to believe that Nephilim weren't just in the land of Israel. Somehow these Nephilim made it all the way to Babylon.

So, my point is that none of these arguments that Dake and others raise is that convincing.

So, the next time we're together, I want to deal with this fifth and final objection. And that objection is this: If the angel view of Genesis 6 is true, then could that sin be replicated today? Because that's what many, many conferences are teaching, and they're packing out auditoriums, trying to convince people that the Nephilim are going to come back; the angelic incursion is going to come back because after all, the Bible says, “As it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be...”

So, we will deal with that objection next time. But our main point today is the objections to the angel view of Genesis 6 don't carry a lot of weight, including this objection that there was somehow Nephilim in David's day and beyond thanks to a second eruption. There was no second eruption. The eruption that we're speaking of was a one-time event in Biblical history. It was unique. Satan was doing something specific during that time. Following that time period, following the flood, his strategy changed. Same goal, but the strategy is different. And there's nothing in the life of David or these strange creatures that indicate that the Nephilim somehow were the product of a second eruption.

I'm going to close us in a word of prayer, and I hope you'll join us at 11:30 a.m. Central Standard Time as we are, Lord willing, going to try to complete the Book of Revelation.

Let's pray. Father, we're grateful for your truth and things in Your Word that we that don't get taught on much. But we need to get an accurate understanding so that we're not drawn into sensationalism. So, help us to be good stewards of these areas of Your

Word as well. 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!