

GENESIS 6:1-4 (THE NEPHILIM)

Today's sermon is on four highly debated verses that have led to lots of anger and bitterness between opposing views. Unless you're aware of what different people think, you might wonder what the hubbub is all about because the verses probably seem intriguing but may be a little difficult to follow. Let's read them first and then we'll break them down into major areas of review –

¹ Now it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them, ² that the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they *were* beautiful; and they took wives for themselves of all whom they chose. ³ And the LORD said, “My Spirit shall not strive with man forever, for he *is* indeed flesh; yet his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.” ⁴ There were giants (NEPHILIM) 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.

Today we'll look at the two most prevalent views on these verses and which one is right and why. I don't want to sound condescending, nor do I want to malign another Christian, Chuck Missler, who puts out articles I read from time to time, but he is the one who's chosen his side of this argument and so I'm going to stick to what he's written because it pretty much sums up the view.

Please don't just believe what I believe without thinking the issue through, but like all things in the Bible, there is only one truth about any relevant issue. In the end, opinions don't matter – only what God is telling us does.

Introduction: What is the Bible about? Well, there's no single answer to that question. It tells us the mind of God. It reveals to us the Person and work of Jesus Christ. It's about the state of man. It shows us the way of salvation and the path to destruction. It details all kinds of things, one of them being the redemption of man.

The Bible isn't about angels. Angels are mentioned in the Bible, but they are a secondary subject area. Rather they are participants in the overall drama. The Bible isn't about Babylon. Again, Babylon is mentioned and is an important concept, but it's not about Babylon. In other words, we need to keep our major and minor subject areas from getting out of sync.

One major subject area – the redemption of man – is often and unfortunately inappropriately mixed with another minor subject area which comes from the first four verses of Genesis 6. Because of this, really strange concepts are derived from here. Let's be careful today about how we evaluate these verses and let's keep everything in the context intended by God.

Text Verse: Do not be unequally yoked together with unbelievers. For what fellowship has righteousness with lawlessness? And what communion has light with darkness? ¹⁵ And what accord has Christ with Belial? Or what part has a believer with an unbeliever? 2 Corinthians 6:14, 15

May God speak to us through His word today and may His glorious name ever be praised.

I. The Sons of God, the Daughters of Men, verses 1 & 2

Before we start looking through today's verses, we would be showing **immense wisdom** by going back and reviewing the previous 5 chapters to look for the progression of things. If we don't, we'll immediately violate the third, fourth, and fifth of our top five Bible interpretation rules – context, context, and context.

Chapter 1 gives an overall view of the six days of creation. On the sixth day, man is created, at which time God proclaimed everything "very good" or *tov meod*. Let's note right here that angels are not mentioned at all in this creation account – the focus is on God, the visible creation, and man.

After noting God's rest as being established on the seventh day, Chapter 2 becomes a detailed insert into the sixth day of creation – the creation of

man, the Garden of Eden, the creation of woman and other details. As with Chapter 1, God and man are the focus.

Chapter 3 details the temptation and fall of man, the curse of the serpent, the sentencing of man and woman, and man's exile from Eden – a ghastly business, but one which mainly focuses on man.

Chapter 4 provides insights into the birth of Cain and Abel and the murder of Abel. It then jumps directly into the account of Cain and his lineage reaching to the eighth generation from Adam. During this account, one particular name seems to appear for almost no reason at all. In verse 22, it abruptly and without explanation, says this – “And the sister of Tubal-Cain *was* Naamah.”

At the end of the Cain account, it suddenly shifts again – “And Adam knew his wife again, and she bore a son and named him Seth, ‘For God has appointed another seed for me instead of Abel, whom Cain killed.’²⁶ And as for Seth, to him also a son was born; and he named him Enosh. Then *men* began to call on the name of the LORD.”

All of this details the history of man on earth and it is the focus of what we've read. All of it included types of the coming Christ.

Chapter 5 gives the record of the first 10 people in Jesus' lineage, from Adam, through Seth, to Noah. This is about the history of man on earth and it is being set in direct contrast to the preceding chapter which detailed the line of Adam through Cain.

These records, genealogies, and generations have been carefully recorded for us and then strategically placed in the Bible. We've evaluated them in the past months and we have been shown a direct contrast between the two groups who have been highlighted.

Any attempt to insert something beyond this into Chapter 6 then would be to completely misuse the Bible. The Bible progressively reveals God's workings in and through His creation for the good of man and towards the redemption of man.

As we saw, the gospel is recorded in the names of the first 10 people from Adam to Noah. We've also seen the doctrine of Divine Election begin in the Bible where God chooses the second of something over the first of something. This pattern will continue throughout the Bible and will become as clear as crystal even before we leave Genesis.

We've been introduced to the concept of acceptance by God being based on faith and not works. We've also seen God's mode of salvation – it is initiated by Him and it is completed by Him and everything in between is a gift from Him. All of these concepts and many more have been pulled out of just the first five chapters.

**¹ Now it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them,
² that the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they *were* beautiful; and they took wives for themselves of all whom they chose.**

As I said, the only way to properly analyze these two verses is to look to the preceding chapters. If we attempt to insert anything except what has been presented by God, and very detailing at that, then the rest of the Bible will be completely up to our own whims and desires. We have departed the presence of the Lord and have gone into the Land of Nod with Cain – wandering aimlessly in a book without a solid and sound foundation to support us.

As time progressed, and as we've seen in Chapters 4 & 5, men began to multiply on the earth. The only names recorded so far are the only ones relevant to the big picture, but there were many more born. Remember what each account in Genesis 5 said, "...and this person had sons and daughters."

Based on the number of years recorded and the age to which people lived, there could have been hundreds of millions or even billions of people on earth and yet only 27 are mentioned.

In what is also obvious and in repetition of other verses, it says, "...and daughters were born to them." Yes! Men and women, being born, living, marrying, and dying. All the things that continue even to this day.

None of verse 1 has provided any difficulty to scholars of the Bible, but all of a sudden, we enter verse 2 and the over-excited mind and the unclear thinking of sensationalism steps in to divide the sea of reason.

On the right are the waters of drawing out from context to interpret the Bible and on the left is the sea of insertion usually in the deep waters of the extra-ordinary. We've come to the dividing chasm and we have to decide which sea we will dive into.

...that the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were beautiful; and they took wives for themselves of all whom they chose.

We've arrived and we need to decide. Now is the time! How we perceive the rest of the Bible concerning the redemption of man, prophecy, the classes of species God has made, whether the Bible stands alone or not, and a host of other issues revolves around the four words – "the sons of God." Who are the sons of God?

Remember what I already said – "Inserting anything beyond what is given in the first 5 chapters would be to completely misuse the Bible. The Bible is a progressive revelation of God's workings in and through His creation for the good of man and towards the redemption of man."

"The sons of God" must, by default, have been mentioned in the preceding 5 chapters, or explained in detail **right here**, or we are inserting presuppositions and not drawing out conclusions. Who are the "sons of God?"

We'll stop pursuing the correct answer for now and go to a completely different view than the right one and then refute what is presented. I personally don't believe this is necessary based on the concept of full and progressive revelation, but if you knew how many people believe the wrong

thing based on the term “the sons of God,” you would agree that we need to pursue this.

As I said, probably the most noted and vocal proponent of the wrong view is Chuck Missler whose ministry is known as Koinonia House. Here is what he says about the term –

The term translated “the Sons of God” is, in the Hebrew, B'nai HaElohim, “Sons of Elohim,” which is a term consistently used in the Old Testament for angels, and it is never used of believers in the Old Testament. It was so understood by the ancient rabbinical sources, by the Septuagint translators in the 3rd century before Christ, and by the early church fathers. Attempts to apply this term to “godly leadership” is without Scriptural foundation.

His footnote cites – Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7 Then speaking of angels he says “where they are in existence before the creation of the earth.” And... “Jesus also implies the same term in Luke 20:36.”

If you went to this particular article and read this, you might be convinced that Genesis 6 must be talking about angels. I mean, the term (as he says) is used “consistently” in the Old Testament for angels... it must be that then. This is, unfortunately rather dishonest, particularly when one refers to the footnote. There he cites the New Testament Greek, but only when it fits his purpose.

What he fails to note is that the New Testament uses the same term “sons of God” four more times and it is **always** referring faithful believers. Even in Jesus’ own words –

Blessed *are* the peacemakers,
For they shall be called sons of God.

Throw in the term “children of God” and you have 10 more times. Throw in variations of “children of God” and you have even more.

Even the very verse which Missler cites from the New Testament doesn’t at all agree with his own presentation. He cited Luke 20:36. Let’s read it, “But

those who are counted worthy to attain that age, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; ³⁶ nor can they die anymore, for they are equal to the angels and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection.”

His inclusion of this verse has two errors. First, it never says we will be angels. It says we will be “equal to the angels.” But the text explains what that means – they won’t marry, nor can they die anymore. Being like the angels simply means that we won’t marry and we will be aeveternal – having a beginning, but no end.

Secondly, being a son of God from a human perspective means that we are “sons of the resurrection.” This means that any human – ever – who is saved is, by default, a son of God – just as Paul and John speak of in their letters. Missler has made a category mistake by equating sons of God with angels in this passage from Luke.

Going back to Genesis 6, I said earlier that we should analyze this based on what has already been presented, unless something new is fully explained **when presented**.

The term “sons of God” is given only three other times in the Old Testament– as Missler noted, all in the book of Job. When you read this, you can easily infer that is speaking of angels.

Missler says that “sons of God” is “a term **consistently** used in the Old Testament for angels,” but it is really mentioned in only one other context – Job. This is sly because he is elevating one context – that of Job – above another, that of Genesis. And Job comes after Genesis – it is not progressive revelation if one cites Job first.

One word can have a zillion meanings and its meaning and translation must always be based on the context. There is no way we could get “angels” out of the context of Genesis 1 through 5.

And finally, let’s go to Deuteronomy 32:8 which Missler speaks of when he cites the Greek translation, the Septuagint – “When the Most High divided

their inheritance to the nations, When He separated the sons of Adam, He set the boundaries of the peoples According to the number of the children of Israel.”

When I teach a Bible class, I bring up the same points time and again. One of them is to either skip over commentaries completely or to take them with a complete grain of salt. We don't establish doctrine on what other people say. Another thing I tell them is to always read the footnotes. Footnotes aren't commentaries, but they provide important insights into a variety of things.

In the case of Deuteronomy 32:8, other versions say “angels of God” instead of “children of Israel” and some others say “sons of God.” In all, there are differences across the board from ancient Hebrew and Greek versions and even to the oldest Latin versions.

That's a big mess...what does that mean? Well, one thing is for certain, the term “sons of Israel” was believed by someone to mean the same thing as “sons of God.” And it's most likely that others took the term “sons of God” to mean “angels of God.” Which is it?

When you're looking at a poem like the one in Deuteronomy 32, you can't take just a single verse and come to a conclusion, but when you look at the whole thing, it's apparent that it is speaking about men, not angels. And in fact, in verse 3, when speaking to Israel, it says “*Is He not your Father, who bought you? Has He not made you and established you?*”

As you can see, even in Deuteronomy, the concept of the Father/son relationship is based on God's people whom He has sovereignly chosen and redeemed. These are the sons of God, just as they are throughout the **entire** New Testament, without exception, as well.

Missler has done a lot of typing to convince people of his position, but none of what he says makes sense based on the overall premise of the Bible. In one of his papers he says this – “It should also be pointed out that most conservative Bible scholars accept the “angel” view. Among those supporting the “angel” view are...”

He then cites a bunch of names who agree with him. Does anyone know what's wrong with that? This is known as the Fallacy of *Ad Populum*. In other words, just because someone notable or a large group of people believe something, it doesn't make it right. It just means that there are a lot of people, including some of famous people, who are wrong. We don't base truth on polls.

In fact, Missler makes so many fallacies, that if you know how to detect them, you can pare down his article to a few incoherent sentences. We could go on for hours with the breakdown in his argument, but we'd be here all night.

There are only two options for who the sons of God are based the **preceding** chapters – either the line of Cain or the line of Seth, not angels. And the Bible has already shown us which, the line of Seth.

The main focus of Chapter 4 is the line of Cain, but then at the very end, it moves to the line of Seth. And immediately it says, "Then *men* began to call on the name of the LORD." It should be painfully clear, that calling on the name of the Lord is being equated with the line of Seth in contrast to that of Cain.

So let's finish the verse before we move on – "...the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they *were* beautiful; and they took wives for themselves of all whom they chose."

The sons of God, meaning the line of Seth, "saw the daughters of men..." We are one species with two genders. Genesis has already taught that. The problem isn't that angels are intermarrying with humans. The problem is that "the sons of God" are marrying women based on their beauty, regardless of who they marry.

Let's go back to Genesis 4 and that most peculiar verse – "And the sister of Tubal-Cain *was* Naamah." If you can reach back into your memory, I told you that Naamah means "loveliness." The meaning of her name explains the seemingly purposeless addition of her into the account. Out of the

countless people who lived on earth, only 27 were mentioned in 1656 years before the flood.

The “sons of God” saw the daughters of men, that they were beautiful and they intermarried.

In Chapter 4 we saw in the line of Cain, Naamah’s father was named Lamech and in Chapter 5 from the line of Seth, Methuselah’s son was named Lamech. Both Naamah and Methuselah are the 8th generation from Adam and, although the Bible doesn’t say this, the implication is that Methuselah could have named his son Lamech after the name of his father in-law.

Throughout the Bible, the subject of inappropriate intermarrying is brought time and time again. Abraham sends for a wife for Isaac from his kin. Esau displeases his parents by marrying Canaanite women. Later the Israelites are forbidden from intermarrying with the Canaanites and several other surrounding nations.

Solomon intermarried with women from many nations and it says “that his wives turned his heart after other gods; and his heart was not loyal to the LORD his God.” The great prayer of humiliation given by Nehemiah is **based** on intermarrying with pagans. And as if we needed any more proof that this is what the Bible is trying to teach us, all we need to do is go to Malachi and read the reason given as explicitly as it can be –

Because the LORD has been witness Between you and the wife of your youth, With whom you have dealt treacherously; Yet she is your companion And your wife by covenant. ¹⁵ But did He not make *them* one, Having a remnant of the Spirit? And why one? He seeks **godly offspring**. Therefore take heed to your spirit, And let none deal treacherously with the wife of his youth.

This is the lesson of the Bible for faithful believers. Like bookends on the Old Testament, from Genesis to Malachi, God expects his people to remain within the godly line he has ordained. And this applies to the New Testament too. Twice Paul tells us so –

A wife is bound by law as long as her husband lives; but if her husband dies, she is at liberty to be married to whom she wishes, **only in the Lord.** 1 Corinthians 7:39

And we read this from Paul's hand as well –

Do not be unequally yoked together with unbelievers. For what fellowship has righteousness with lawlessness? And what communion has light with darkness? ¹⁵ And what accord has Christ with Belial? Or what part has a believer with an unbeliever?

In fact, this was our text verse and it perfectly resembles what was going on in Genesis 6. Paul even uses the same thought process here. The sons of Christ and the sons of Belial, or the devil – which is the line of Cain as is born out even to the last books of the Bible.

II. A Shorter Existence, verse 3

³ And the LORD said, “My Spirit shall not strive with man forever, for he *is* indeed flesh; yet his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.”

In verse 3, we see a sad commentary (like we need anymore...) on the existence of man. Before the flood, men really did live to great ages. If you don't believe this, then you have no reason to believe the promises about the future from Isaiah's own pen –

²⁰“ No more shall an infant from there *live but a few* days, Nor an old man who has not fulfilled his days; For the child shall die one hundred years old, But the sinner *being* one hundred years old shall be accursed. ²¹ They shall build houses and inhabit *them*; They shall plant vineyards and eat their fruit. ²² They shall not build and another inhabit; They shall not plant and another eat; For as the days of a tree, *so shall be* the days of My people, And My elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. -Isa 65:20-22

Because man shunned God's will, He promised to cut their years approximately 8-fold, to only 120 years. Eventually, this was cut by about another 3rd, so that the psalms record our years are 70 and if we're strong

enough, even to 80. Nothing has changed since Moses wrote that Psalm 3500 years ago.

The reason our years were cut is because even in 70 or 80 years we can accomplish immense wickedness. Imagine people in their hundreds, closing in on their thousands.

III. The Nephilim, verse 4

⁴ There were giants 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.

The term translated “giants” is actually *Nephilim* and is often simply transliterated that way, such as in the NIV. Nephilim is almost exclusively used by people who believe in angels sleeping with men because it sounds so much cooler.

The term *Nephilim* isn't some extra special word, it's just a word. It means “fallen ones” and they were giants. This is explained in the only other occurrence used in the Bible, which is Numbers 13:33 – “The land through which we have gone as spies *is* a land that devours its inhabitants, and all the people whom we saw in it *are* men of *great* stature. ³³ There we saw the giants (the descendants of Anak came from the giants); and we were like grasshoppers in our own sight, and so we were in their sight.”

We need not search for any other explanation than “giants” as so many people try to do. The description is given right here. There are other accounts of giants in the Bible as well and descend from other groups. Each is titled by the group it descended from – Anakim, Emim, Zamzummim, Rephaim, and even the Phlishtim, or Philistines, who Goliath belonged to.

So who were these giants and where did they come from. I hate to tell the sensationalists, but this isn't a hard nut to crack. Even in modern times, we've had exceptionally large people around us. Many are genetic defects, but many are the result of purposeful breeding. The verse back in 6:2 gives us the answer –

...that the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they *were* beautiful; and they took wives for themselves of all whom they chose.

Things are absolutely no different now than they were then. How many times do two good looking people get married and those around them say, “they will have beautiful children” or “their son will be a basketball player.” I’ve heard it a million times. Why? People know what the results of two good sets of genes will be.

We can do the same with plants, trees, and animals. Through advances in DNA, we have identified 14 original known breeds of dogs in past history. Go back a little earlier and there is one set of dogs, created by God. Now, there are over 400 breeds and we pop out new ones every year. We breed them into the massive Mastiffs that can reach almost 300 pounds and we breed them into tea cup Chihuahuas that weigh only ounces.

When people lived to 900 and more years of age, they could – within only a couple generations – produce immensely large humans. Even now, when we live to only 70 or so, world records in athletics are broken all the time because people are being engineered for physical greatness.

The Nephilim are large because they were bred large, at the expense of faith. Even to this day, families choose the road of success and exceptional gene development over godly husbands and wives. This then, is the explanation of these giants.

It is the only avenue which rightly handles the Bible based on the first five chapters of progressively revealed thought from God and it simply takes proper handling of what has been presented.

When it says, “these were the mighty men of old, men of renown” it is a statement that could be said of any of our finest military personnel, our greatest basketball players, or any other person the world idolizes for their high breeding and superior abilities. The commentary then matches the commentary of today – a godless world which looks to the flesh rather than to God.

Here is Missler's misguided thoughts on this matter – "The most fatal flaw in the specious "Sethite" view is the emergence of the Nephilim as a result of the unions. (Bending the translation to "giants" does not resolve the difficulties.) *of course it does, Chuck, because Nephilim are explained as "giants" helloooo* It is the offspring of these peculiar unions in Genesis 6:4 which seems to be cited as a primary cause for the Flood. *This is absolutely false. The Bible says exactly why the flood came, "the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every intent of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually."* Procreation by parents of differing religious views do not produce unnatural offspring. *No, but selective breeding does.* Believers marrying unbelievers may produce "monsters," but hardly superhuman, or unnatural, children! *Nothing – not a word in the Bible says they were either superhuman, or unnatural.* It was this unnatural procreation and the resulting abnormal creatures that were designated as a principal reason for the judgment of the Flood. *Another complete falsity and one which fails to take into account Nephilim after the flood.*

In other words, if the Nephilim appeared after the flood and destroying them was the purpose of the flood, then the purpose wasn't met by God at all.

Seeing as how we're looking over this issue, I'd like to cite a few other references from the Bible which Missler uses. We can't go over them all, but each one of them has two possibilities. The first option would be to take the Bible as the account of fallen man and God's plan of redemption for him.

The second is to get into the mystical, irrational, and sensational in an attempt to seem authoritative on matters which require higher thought and deeper understanding than others can somehow attain.

Daniel 2:43 speaks about the intermingling of certain groups and is used as a source text for inter-class breeding – either with angels or aliens. However, you will never see the NIV translation used here because it completely destroys their case –

As you saw iron mixed with ceramic clay, **they will mingle with the seed of men**; but they will not adhere to one another, just as iron does not mix with clay. Daniel 2:43 (NKJV)

And just as you saw the iron mixed with baked clay, **so the people will be a mixture** and will not remain united, any more than iron mixes with clay. (NIV)

The book of Jude has these verses, which must be misapplied in order to come to meet their conclusions, “But I want to remind you, though you once knew this, that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe. ⁶ And the angels who did not keep their proper domain, but left their own abode, He has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness for the judgment of the great day; ⁷ as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities around them in a similar manner to these, having given themselves over to sexual immorality and gone after strange flesh, are set forth as an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.”

Missler will take verse 6 which is speaking about angels leaving their proper domain, and ties it with verse 7 which speaks of the sexual sins of Sodom and Gomorrah. But, these are two examples in a litany of examples and comingling them would be no different than comingling the angels with verse 5 which concerns the disobedient Israelites in the desert. It is bad handling of the Bible – plain and simple.

The entire premise of what Jude is saying is that disobedience by mingling believers with non-believers is what brings God’s wrath.

I could go on all day with Missler’s misguided missives, but let me give one more quote from him and then end –

If one takes an integrated view of the Scripture, then everything in it should “tie together.” *As if his view ties anything together. It is convoluted and unreasonable, especially when we consider the natural progression of the first five chapters, which is all that is thus far given by God.* It is the author’s view that the “Angel View,” however disturbing, *I would say

“however goofy”* is the clear, direct presentation of the Biblical text, corroborated by multiple New Testament references *it is completely, 100%, unsubstantiated from the NT references and only taking things completely out of context and leaving out what is relevant can this view hold any water at all* and was so understood by both early Jewish and Christian scholarship; *never mind discussing the fact that **other** early Jewish and Christian scholars have said your view is wrong* the “Sethite View” is a contrivance of convenience from a network of unjustified assumptions antagonistic to the remainder of the Biblical record.

*In fact, there is nothing contrived about following the natural progression of the revelation given up to chapter 6 and then seeing that it is completely supported by the rest of the Bible. We don’t introduce presuppositions into the Bible and then look for ways to justify them. Instead, we allow the Bible to progressively reveal itself and then we look to the rest of the Bible to support what has naturally and obviously been revealed.

Ok, so I’ve been flapping my gums for the past 35 or 40 minutes about something that most people could give diddly about. The question is then, “How do these verses point to Jesus?”

Well, let’s remember that Jesus is the God/Man. He was born of a virgin and the Holy Spirit. God is the Creator and He designated that things reproduce after their own kind. We don’t have dats, because dogs don’t breed with cats. We don’t have Melephants, because mice don’t breed with elephants. We don’t have Zales because zebras don’t breed with whales. This is how God created things – to produce after their own kinds.

There is one exception to this – the virgin birth of Jesus Christ. He is the God/Man.

There is nothing mentioned concerning the reproduction of angels, and in fact the Bible supports the notion that they don’t reproduce. The account today is given to us to show that God expects us to keep ourselves pure and free from defiling ourselves by marrying outside of the community of believers.

When men began to reproduce for the sake of breeding larger, stronger, or more beautiful people, it led to wickedness, idolatry of the flesh, and a rejection of God. God wants us to remain dependent on Him, not on man. He wants our devotion and obedience and not the worship of sports heroes.

The incarnation of Jesus was to show us the immense love God has for us and that we can trust in His Son. While our sports stars die and return to the dust, Jesus remains on His throne, having been resurrected after His cross to an everlasting and indestructible life.

This is the message of Jesus Christ and the love of God which is found in Him. Let us be faithful to our spouses, marry within the community of believers, and trust that Jesus alone has something better for us at the end of our trail.

The Nephilim

Man has multiplied on the earth
And daughters were born to them too
We look to their size and strength to evaluate their worth
And to the ladies curvy shapes,,, whoo hoo

We give our sons, raised in the godly home
To women who will give us baseball heroes
Never do their eyes to the Bible roam
Instead in Bible quizzes, we have to hand out zeroes

The boys choose any girl they like
It doesn't matter if she worships beelzebub
As long as she can run, jump, and ride a bike
He is happy to buy her dinner, maybe an Italian sub

But the Lord isn't pleased with this type of mingling
And He won't always strive with the rebellious man
Chasing after what gives physical tingling
Is as worthless as an empty tin can

Our days are limited to less than before
Because with many years comes the multiplication of sin
But even now in years ten and threescore
We can still really do ourselves in

We produce giants for the courts and the field
And we look for super-models, our children to yield

They will be mighty men and super women you see
In another generation, we'll have super bowl heroes
Never mind their soul that lasts for eternity
Never mind their Bible scores, which are all zeros

I would suggest, before you decide
To give your children an unholy bride

That you would consider what displeases God
And keep away from banishment to Nod

Instead, be faithful as His Son was to You
He gave His life – Yes, He is faithful and True
Cling to the cross and your average wife
Or your bushy bearded husband, for all of your life

Handsome or beautiful, or not, they reflect God's Son
And are worth more than a million super bowl heroes
Eternity waits for you to have fun
So keep yourself from the Bible test zeroes

Hallelujah and Amen.

Next week we'll look over Genesis 6:5-13 – To Build an Ark