

[Home Page](#) // [About Us](#)

## Nephilim According to Chuck

Part 1 of [Part 2](#)

Angels, Seth and Nephilim, the Giants

Presented by Your servant, Dan Baxley

[servant@yahshuaservants.com](mailto:servant@yahshuaservants.com)

[www.yahshuaservants.com](http://www.yahshuaservants.com)

[www.yahshuaservant.com](http://www.yahshuaservant.com)

The following article is by Chuck Missler (<http://www.khouse.org/>) and has to do with the Nephilim, or the Giants of Genesis 6 and the “sons of god”, asking the question. The answer Chuck comes up with is that the “sons of god” are rebel angels coming to earth from outer space (UFO, aliens) and marry human women – and that the Nephilim – well, we will let Chuck tell you. Along the way I will be adding my comment –  
**Servant’s Comments:**

:

Mischievous Angels or Sethites?

By Chuck Missler

Why did God send the judgment of the Flood in the days of Noah? Far more than simply a historical issue, the unique events leading to the Flood are a prerequisite to understanding the prophetic implications of our Lord's predictions regarding His Second Coming.<sup>1</sup>

The strange events recorded in Genesis 6 were understood by the ancient rabbinical sources, as well as the Septuagint translators, as referring to *fallen angels* procreating weird hybrid offspring with human women-known as the "*Nephilim*." So it was also understood by the early church fathers. These bizarre events are also echoed in the legends and myths of *every* ancient culture upon the earth: the ancient Greeks, the Egyptians, the Hindus, the South Sea Islanders, the American Indians, and virtually all the others.

**Servant's Comment:** First of all, Nephilim sounds like some exotic, out of this world name, but in fact it is Hebrew for "giant", just as the KJV Bible has it translated. It is, "nephilim" not Nephilim. The coolness fads a bit when you put in the right perspective, doesn't it? Secondly, the Church fathers of the first century did not read Genesis 6 like Chuck says. He acknowledges that the Jewish scholars and teachers of long ago introduced the idea that Genesis 6 is talking about angel, rebel angels, that for some reason thought they should be law abiding angels, this one time, and marry the women they would rape. Third, Chuck admits the source of this false teaching is from the Jewish side. So, what is the teaching of our Apostles, from the Christ side?

*(Tit 1:14) Not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth.*

*(1Ti 4:7) But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness.*

Chuck continues:

However, many students of the Bible have been taught that this passage in Genesis 6 actually refers to a failure to keep the "faithful" lines of Seth *separate* from the "worldly" line of Cain. The idea has been advanced that after Cain killed Abel, the line of Seth remained separate and faithful, but the line of Cain turned ungodly and rebellious. The "Sons of God" are deemed to refer to leadership in the line of Seth; the "daughters of men" is deemed restricted to the line of Cain. The resulting marriages ostensibly blurred an inferred separation between them. (Why the resulting offspring are called the "*Nephilim*" remains without any clear explanation.)

**Servant's Comment:** Woe is me, woe is me, how can this be – Adam is called a son of God, in fact there are others, too, that are called "sons of God" and they are not rebel angels – they are not the "nephilim".

*(Luke 3:38) the son of Enosh, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God.*

*(John 1:12) But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His Name;*

*(Rom 8:14) For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.*

*(1Jn 3:1) Behold, what manner of love the Father has bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knows us not, because it knew him not.*

*(Gen 4:26) And to Seth, to him also there was born a son; and he called his name Enos: then began men to call upon the name of YaHWeH (KJV, the LORD)*

From this NT teaching alone we can determine that to be a Son of God you do not have to be an *angel* and you do not have to be from the line of Seth. In fact, it is during the time of Enos, not Seth that men began to call upon the Name of our Creator. Sethites? Nope, have to agree with Chuck on this one, but I think we can assume that if men began to call on the Name of the Creator, as we just read, they would have become known by His Name, just as it is today, those led by the *Spirit of God are the sons of God*. Notice, it says, "men" not Seth, and not Enos, even, but "men" in general. Maybe the first true religion and worship were those calling on the One true God, by His Name then getting off track -- leaders among men begin to marry outside of their Faith -- devout men begin to marry outside of their Church? Sorry to have dispelled the "Sethite" view so early, but the Word says what it says -- it was not during the time of Seth but of Enos -- yes, Sethite, covers all of the descendants of Seth but this assumes Seth and all of his children were being called the sons of God, recognizing the one true God and worship, but we see that this does not occur until after Enos. Some will argue that they did not know His Name because of what is said in Exodus 6:3 "...by my name YaHWeH was I not known..." This is written about the forefathers of the children of Israel, not about what was know pre-flood. Also, letting the Word be true, Genesis 4 clearly states His Name was know during the time of Enos. Exodus 6 says nothing about His Name *never* being known, only that the forefathers of Israel knew Him as "God Almighty" or some such equivalent.

Chuck continues:

Since Jesus prophesied, "As the days of Noah were, so shall the coming of the Son of Man be,"<sup>2</sup> it becomes essential to understand what these days included.

Origin of the Sethite View

It was in the 5th century a.d. that the "angel" interpretation of Genesis 6 was increasingly viewed as an embarrassment when attacked by critics. (Furthermore, the

worship of angels had begun within the church. Also, celibacy had also become an institution of the church. The "angel" view of Genesis 6 was feared as impacting these views.)

Celsus and Julian the Apostate used the traditional "angel" belief to attack Christianity. Julius Africanus resorted to the Sethite interpretation as a more comfortable ground. Cyril of Alexandria also repudiated the orthodox "angel" position with the "line of Seth" interpretation. Augustine also embraced the Sethite theory and thus it prevailed into the Middle Ages. It is still widely taught today among many churches who find the literal "angel" view a bit disturbing. There are many outstanding Bible teachers who still defend this view.

### Problems with the Sethite View

Beyond obscuring a full understanding of the events in the early chapters of Genesis, this view also clouds any opportunity to apprehend the *prophetic* implications of the Scriptural allusions to the "Days of Noah."<sup>3</sup> Some of the many problems with the "Sethite View" include the following:

#### 1. The Text Itself

Substantial liberties must be taken with the literal text to propose the "Sethite" view. (In data analysis, it is often said that "if you torture the data severely enough it will confess to anything.")

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*,<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup>

**Servant's Comment:** I have to take issue with this. First off, according to the Hebrew Dictionary, H1121, used in Job 1:6 and 2:1 and 38:7, does not constitute what Chuck Missler says, "...which is a term consistently used in the Old Testament for angels". The Hebrew, H1121, *ben*, or *bane* is used for "son" but can also be rendered "servant", thus Job could read, "Servants of God" just as easily as "sons". Also, this term that Chuck says is found "consistently" in the OT shows up three times in the Book of Job, and in once in Genesis 6, to me this does not constitute what Chuck is suggesting – the term for "angle" is "malak (Strong's H4397) and is found some 104 times in the OT – using

Chuck's reasoning, this is the term that should have been use if "angels" were meant, "angels of God". But wait, there is more – "ben" or "bane" is used and is a Hebrew term for "son", as he says, but look at this; it is used in over 1,460 verses in reference to "sons of men", with some 1,967 times, total, referring to flesh and blood "sons" of men, not angels or of God, but of men. So, where is the real *consistency* found – not of angels but of men.

One more thing to consider: The words of our Lord –

**(Mat 5:9) Blessed *are* the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God. KJV**

**(Mat 5:9) Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called sons of God. NIV, ESV, ASV, HRB**

Dare we call the fallen angels -- the rebel angels, "peace makers"?

Read Heb 1:5 and reread the verses presented in the earlier comments and then considers the following:

**(John 10:34) YaHshua answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, You are gods?**

**(Psa 82:6) I have said, "You *are* gods"; and all of you *are* children of the most High.**

Next, considering the term, Elohim, is a plural reference, meaning more than one. This would then be read as "sons of the gods", in English, or "servants of the gods". What this demonstrates is that the translators, in this case, Hebrews, would have to know there is more than one God, which they do not, they hold to a single, ONE God. This is pointed out by Hebrew Scholars and Biblical experts in the Jewish community opposed to the Jewish mystic's interpretation this is to be read as "angels" telling us that this plural term, Elohim, is also used to refer to "Judges", men appointed as Judges over the people. This understanding from the other side of Jewish opinion would then read, "sons of the Judges", or "sons of judges". The example of "Judges" ruling a later "Kings" is found in the Book of Judges, those ruling before the Kings were appointed.

Therefore they are in the dark if we accept all of the various opinions when it comes to this translation and to say, for sure, without doubt that this "sons of god" does not mean "servants of the Gods" or does not mean "sons of judges" is careless – no – wishful thinking. But why? We will see the answer later.

Chuck Continues:

The "Sons of Seth and daughters of Cain" interpretation strains and obscures the intended grammatical antithesis between the *Sons of God* and the *daughters of Adam*. Attempting to impute any other view to the text flies in the face of the earlier centuries of understanding of the Hebrew text among both rabbinical and early church scholarship. The lexicographical antithesis clearly intends to establish a contrast between the "angels" and the women of the Earth.

**Servant's Comment:** When reading this do not forget the instructions from the New Testament teachings, which Chuck chooses to ignore –

*(Tit 1:14) Not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth.*

*(1Ti 4:7) But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise yourself rather unto godliness.*

The Rabbinical mythic writings may be filled with truth but they are also known for their fantasy and some of the most outrageous accusations against their Messiah, our Savior, YaHshua. They should not be considered a final word in anything for as mentioned before, there is a greater number in the Rabbinical discussions among themselves that reject this fable.

As pointed out before, the Jewish community claim One and only One God but continue to use a term for Him that implies more than one -- Elohim. If the Jewish Rabbis Chuck finds so knowledgeable in the language then why is it they do not understand this, and why doesn't the teachers of this fable also quote from the Jewish scholars that refuse this fable? Because it does not fit in with their religious view and also we find our Savior, YaHshua, "consistently" referring to the OT as "...your law" -- John 8:17, 10:34, 18:31 & Acts 18:15 – this demonstrates that our Savior questioned what the religious leaders of that day were teaching as truth.

Chuck continues:

If the text was intended to contrast the "sons of Seth and the daughters of Cain," why didn't it say so? Seth was not God, and Cain was not Adam. (Why not the "sons of Cain" and the "daughters of Seth?" There is no basis for restricting the text to either subset of Adam's descendants. Further, there exists no mention of *daughters of Elohim*.)

Servant's Comment: Funny, this same reasoning could be used on those supposing the term "sons of god" means "angels" – why not "sons of the Judges" or "sons of the Kings" – remember, all civil authority exists by appointment of our Creator and when men turned from this understanding and became a law unto themselves began to marry outside of their given authority and became their own authority by using their position to claim wives from among mankind by using their power as rulers to take whomever they wanted.

If "angels" were meant then why didn't the writer of Genesis just say that? Why doesn't Genesis 6 just say "angels took wives" or "angels of god", if that is what is really meant? This is called witnessing against yourself. These judges broke with a God given law concerning marriage, and this may have been the beginning or record of rulers building harems for their own pleasure.

Chuck continues:

And how does the "Sethite" interpretation contribute to the ostensible cause for the Flood, which is the primary thrust of the text? The entire view is contrived on a series of assumptions without Scriptural support.

The Biblical term "Sons of Elohim" (that is, of the Creator Himself), is confined to the direct creation by the divine hand and not to those born to those of their own order.<sup>6</sup> In Luke's genealogy of Jesus, only Adam is called a "son of God."<sup>7</sup> The entire Biblical drama deals with the tragedy that humankind is a fallen race, with Adam's initial immortality forfeited. Christ uniquely gives them that receive Him the power to become the sons of God.<sup>8</sup> Being born again of the Spirit of God, as an entirely new creation,<sup>9</sup> at their resurrection they alone will be clothed with a building of God<sup>10</sup> and in every respect equal to the angels.<sup>11</sup> The very term *oiketerion*, alluding to the heavenly body with which the believer longs to be clothed, is the precise term used for the heavenly bodies from which the fallen angels had disrobed.<sup>12</sup>

Servant's Comment: Mumbo Jumbo, ever heard that term? Well, that is what this is, just so much smoke and mirrors. What does the Word say?

*(1Co 15:38-40) But God gives it a body as he has determined, and to each kind of seed he gives its own body. All flesh is not the same: Men have one kind of flesh, animals have another, birds another and fish another. There are also heavenly bodies and there are earthly bodies; but the splendor of the heavenly bodies is one kind, and the splendor of the earthly bodies is another.*

Each after its own KIND, they cannot commingle – dogs beget dogs. Cutting through the fluff and puff the Word is plain and clear to those with eyes to see and ears to hear. Angels can no more produce offspring through women than apes can. Least of all, marry and spawn giants (nephilim). The angels are Heavenly bodies and we are Earthly bodies and the angels do not have the power to procreate like this. If they have this ability then our Savior coming as He did would mean nothing, because rebel angels have been doing this intermingling of the spirit and flesh all along – not big deal. Our Lord's birth would not have been the miracle it is claimed to be. This is why this doctrine is dangerous and for that alone should be rejected. But, what do we see happening? Why is this fable becoming such a popular teaching among so many when it points away from and lessens the act of our Savior's coming in the flesh? How does this false teaching benefit anyone? Some say it fills in all of the gaps, really? That the fall of man is really because of fallen angels? Read all of Genesis 6 and 7 and you will see the context is all about men, the fall of mankind, not angels, and the real reason our Creator regretted having made MAN. Only Noah survived and those close to him, not giants survived, no Nephilim hid in caves until the flood subsided as they are teaching.

*(Gen 7:21) Every living thing that moved on the earth perished--birds, livestock, wild animals, all the creatures that swarm over the earth, and all mankind.*

*(Gen 7:22) Everything on dry land that had the breath of life in its nostrils died.*

*(Gen 7:23) Every living thing on the face of the earth was wiped out; men and animals and the creatures that move along the ground and the birds of the air were wiped from the earth. Only Noah was left, and those with him in the ark.*

What about the giants in the days of King David? We have giant people of today that live on the earth, they are few but do exist in comparison to the average height and weight of normal men. Why would it be any different in the days of King David. In fact, if those of the family of Goliath had been creatures that managed to escape the flood and were offspring of the rebel angels how is it they were all killed off by David and his men of valor? According to the Book of Enoch it was the supposed Nephilim that were consuming men.

Here is a quote from the Book of Enoch:

***"And they became pregnant, and they bare great giants, whose height was three hundred ells: Who consumed all the acquisitions of men. And when men could no longer sustain them, the giants turned against them and devoured mankind. And they began to sin against birds, and beasts, and reptiles, and fish, and to devour***



**one another's flesh, and drink the blood."**

Three hundred "ells" is translated as "cubits which would make these giants somewhere around 400+ feet tall. Some say this is an exaggeration, and what is really meant is, thirty cubits, not three hundred. So, at this more conservative measure we have 43+ feet. This account from the Book of Enoch makes even the family of Goliath small fry. If we stay with the account given to us in the Scripture rather than fairy tale books of old we can stand on solid truth, not imagined things of men.

Also prove the offspring would not be "giants" or 'nephilim", after all, our Savior was of normal human size, wasn't He? He was, even by the false teachers standards a real "Son of God".

Chuck says, "...and in every respect equal to the angels...", this is simply not true. Ask yourself; is YaHshua equal to the angels -- or -- more? Then consider this --

*(1Jn 3:2) Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it does not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is.*

Our future is greater than many think or imagine. Not only are we too called "sons of God" but we are told we are going to just like YaHshua.

Chuck continues:

The attempt to apply the term "Sons of Elohim" in a broader sense has no textual basis and obscures the precision of its denotative usage. This proves to be an assumption which is antagonistic to the uniform Biblical usage of the term.

## 2. The Daughters of Cain

The "Daughters of Adam" also does not denote a restriction to the descendants of Cain, but rather the whole human race is clearly intended. These daughters were the daughters born to the men with which this very sentence opens:

And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. Genesis 6:1,2

It is clear from the text that these daughters were not limited a particular family or subset, but were, indeed, from (all) the Benoth Adam, "the daughters of Adam." There is

no apparent exclusion of the daughters of Seth. Or were they so without charms in contrast with the daughters of Cain? All of Adam's female descendants seem to have been involved. (And what about the "sons of Adam?" Where do they, using this contrived dichotomy, fit in?)

Servant's Comment: It is not *clear*, not when you consider the there were other humans on this planet besides the sons of Adam. Reading Genesis 1 we read about a God speaking in a plural form Elohim, (El would be the singular, to mean only One) but in all of the first chapter of the Bible, the God of the Bible identifies Himself as more than one. When we consider YaHshua's preexistence and His revelation concerning a Heavenly Father, we can see how this fits the New Testament teaching that YaHshua was with God the Father and that YaHshua Himself was the creating force used by our Heavenly Father to create everything. John 1:1-3, 14 teaches this. So, God the Father and God the Son were present at creation. YaHshua was known as YaHWeH, the Father had not clearly been revealed to mankind until He came in the Flesh and declared Him. John 6:38 and Mat 11:27.

Reading Gen 1:27-28 we read of the creation of men and women as part of the creation by Elohim, meaning more than one. But, when it comes to Adam and Eve's creation, recorded in Chapter 2, everything has already been created but in this chapter 2 we read about a singular God called YaHWeH and He is preparing a garden and after this garden of Eden is finished He, YaHWeH, then makes a man called Adam and puts him into it. Adam is created from the dirt of the Earth and brought to life by YaHWeH and this is all happening outside of the Garden prepared for him.

There appears to be two creations of mankind, one a collective adventure by the Elohim, the Father and the Son and following this another creation, singular adventure by YaHWeH. I am not the first to notice this duality in the Creation but not many teach it because it does not fit in with their accepted theology. Never mind the argument pro and con on this duality of creation of men on the earth because this alone does harm to Chuck's statement so it is not considered by those who see this and reject it because it just does not fit the fantasy Chuck and others are teaching. In fact, if we can see this dual creation of mankind this would explain the Genesis 6 chapter with no need for further interpretation and would explain why the author of Genesis never bothered to say specifically which "sons of Elohim" were being referred to. Son of YaHWeH or "sons of Elohim" – it seems the author did tell us, didn't he? If you see this and understand it then the rest of what Chuck is teaching means very little, but to be fair, please continue. Just for clarity; If mankind were created by YaHWeH and the Heavenly Father, together, as Elohim, and later YaHWeH then created another man, apart from the mankind created earlier then we can see the "sons of God" taking wives

for themselves from among another type of mankind. Either we mean Adams sons began to take wives from among the general population of men (the first creation) was then taking wives from among the daughters of Adam. Either way it was something that led to a corruption of some kind that Noah evaded and then was found, as scripture says, "found perfect in his generations". Whatever was going on Noah had not fallen in to this pit or rebellion, Gen 6:9 – Strong's, H8435 – *descent, that is, family; (figuratively) history: - birth, generations.*

More Chuck:

Furthermore, the line of Cain was not necessarily known for its ungodliness. From a study of the naming of Cain's children, many of which included the name of God,<sup>13</sup> it is not clear that they were all necessarily unfaithful.

### 3. The Inferred Lines of Separation

The concept of separate "lines" itself is suspect and contrary to Scripture.<sup>14</sup> National and racial distinctions were plainly the result of the subsequent intervention of God in Genesis 11, five chapters later. There is no intimation that the lines of Seth and Cain kept themselves separate nor were even instructed to. The injunction to remain separate was given much later.<sup>15</sup> Genesis 6:12 confirms that all flesh had corrupted His way upon the earth.

### 4. The Inferred Godliness of Seth

There is no evidence, stated or implied, that the line of Seth was godly. Only one person was translated from the judgment to come (Enoch) and only eight were given the protection of the ark. No one beyond Noah's immediate family was accounted worthy to be saved. In fact, the text implies that these were distinct from all others. (There is no evidence that the wives of Noah's sons were from the line of Seth.) Even so, Gaebelien observes, "The designation 'Sons of God' is never applied in the Old Testament to believers," whose sonship is "distinctly a New Testament revelation."<sup>16</sup>

*Servant's Comment: This has been covered before but deserves another comment. On the one hand statements used by Chuck to put down any opposing views, all the while making statements to support the erroneous views of the author that have no basis in fact of evidence either. Either everyone is speculating, and should say so, or everyone is trying to deliberately mislead everyone else? The last part of the statement Chuck makes is false, clear and simple, as we have already read; our Savior Himself quoted from the OT when confronted by the Jewish religious leaders about suggesting He is a Son of God, YaHshua reminded them that in their own Law it suggests that they are*

"sons of God" (John 10:34, quotes this also). It actually says, that "you are gods" but the implication is "sons of God" for that is what YaHshua was saying that God was His Father and thus He himself the son and they picked up stones to kill Him for claiming to be God -- see the connection? If you say you are a child of God, thus a son or daughter of God, then by their estimation you are claiming to be God or gods. In all of this falderal one main point gets lost -- YaHshua consistently said He was the "Son of man", a reference the Son of God consistently used in reference to Himself. To suggest this as a New Testament "revelation" and say it does not apply to the Old Testament is ludicrous. What is a *revelation* if not a revealing of an existing truth?

Chuck Continues:

The "Sons of Elohim" saw the daughters of men that they were fair and took them wives of all that they chose. It appears that the women had little say in the matter. The domineering implication hardly suggests a godly approach to the union. Even the mention that they saw that they were attractive seems out of place if only normal biology was involved. (And were the daughters of Seth so unattractive?)

It should also be pointed out that the son of Seth himself was Enosh, and there is textual evidence that, rather than a reputation for piety, he seems to have initiated the profaning of the name of God.<sup>17</sup>

If the lines of Seth were so faithful, why did they perish in the flood?

Servant's Comment: I do not defend the piety of Seth or Enos but question the reasoning here in order to push this false doctrine concerning the mixing of angels with mere man, a different kind. Again, the reason this is important is that this teaching elevates "angels" to the status of our Savior, our ONE AND ONLY Savior. This teaching also gives mankind a pass in the sin department by suggesting all of the faults of mankind were the result of these renegade angels – mankind is faultless, according to the Book of Enoch. It seems the ability to have giant spirit hybrid children by spirit beings was possible long before our Savior came in the flesh. Do you see the heresy here? This is what the ultimate suggestion and teaching becomes, a doctrine of devils and demons, not of angelic sons. It is a demonic joke and slap at our Savior, YaHshua, and what He did for us and demonstrates the foolishness of men.

If, by my own speculations the "sons of Elohim" were those created in Genesis chapter 1, made in THEIR image and then later a Garden of Eden is made and a single man is made by a single God, YaHWeH, as is recorded, and then that single man is placed in that prepared Garden of Eden, a garden made *after* all of the other creations of sun and

moon, land and animals -- do you see? The son of YaHWeH, Adam, is created, placed in the garden and then later he is put to sleep and woman is created and from them they have children. Adam is called the first *man*, his children would then be known as the *children of man*, or *Adam and Eve*. Knowing that Adam is a special creation, for a special purpose it would be natural to assume that from a human point of view his children would be beautiful. The sons of Elohim (the creation before the Garden of Eden) having been created first and possibly flourishing and having subdued much of the earth by the time Adam was created and had a family, would explain who had the power and why Cain was so afraid of having to leave the Garden -- he was afraid of those others that might kill him. Speculation? Sure, but I did not twist the Word out of shape to get there and I did not violate the sanctity of our Savior's own personal sacrifice for us to prove a point. Enosh, son of Seth, may or may not have been an exemplary follower of the Creator but it was *in his time*, his day that men began to call upon the Name of the Creator -- nowhere is it suggested that they were, at that time, profaning His Name, that would come later, no doubt but in order to profane something you must first treat it as if it is holy or of some special meaning -- it first has to be seen and treated as if it is special, wouldn't it? There is nothing that says Enosh was perfect nor Seth, for that matter, it merely states that in the time of Enosh men began to call on the name of the Creator -- it does not say Enosh did, nor does it say Seth did, that is all assumed and in error. We are not told which men called upon, or began to call upon the name of the Creator, only the timing of this. We are not told men began to profane His Name, another assumption, only that they began to call on His Name and there seems to be no prohibition on this.

Because the Jews think saying His Name is disrespectful is actually a type of profaning, making His Name useless by not using it, by not calling on Him personally. The idea the Name of our God and Creator is not to be used came into being in modern times, not ancient times. This is a false teaching of some Jews for very self-righteous reasons. To profane is to misuse or not to use at all. If you refuse to use His Name in worship then what is the use of it? If you had it in the closet, so to speak, you make it useless. You have done what you claim you are trying not to do, making it little or no use, hiding it it becomes of no value.

Chuck Continues:

## 5. The Unnatural Offspring

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.) It is the offspring of these peculiar unions in Genesis 6:4 which seems to be cited as a primary cause for the Flood.

Servant's Comment: This is not so, read the context of Genesis 6 and 7 and you will see it is about "man", "men" or "mankind" not the angels -- nothing about angels at all but all about men and what they were doing and how our Creator became so upset He regretted having ever made man. But, in His mercy, He saw one man that refused to go the way of the world and He saved Noah and his family. Apparently man had fallen so far they could not be brought back to sanity. Our Savior commented on this too, "...as the days of Noah..." Mat 24:37-39 It was the wickedness of man, not angels, that the whole Earth is covered with water.

*(Gen 6:5) The LORD (YHWH) saw how great man's wickedness on the earth had become, and that every inclination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil all the time.*

Whose wickedness, whose thoughts? Not one comment about any angel whatsoever but this is what Chuck and others teach – they have found another scripture to follow. This is a fantasy they have accepted from the Jewish fables or the so called "Oral Torahs" and Jewish mystics of old. Just because some fantastic writings turn up dating back before the Christ does not a truth make any more than if generations from now the Books of Harry Potter are dug up and declared by the blind to represent truth.

Chuck:

Procreation by parents of differing religious views do not produce unnatural offspring. Believers marrying unbelievers may produce "monsters," but hardly superhuman, or unnatural, children! It was this unnatural procreation and the resulting abnormal creatures that were designated as a principal reason for the judgment of the Flood.

The very absence of any such adulteration of the human genealogy in Noah's case is also documented in Genesis 6:9: Noah's family tree was distinctively unblemished. The term used, *tamiym*, is used for *physical* blemishes.<sup>18</sup>

Why were the offspring uniquely designated "mighty" and "men of renown?" This description characterizing the children is not accounted for if the fathers were merely men, even if godly.

A further difficulty seems to be that the offspring were only *men*; no "women of renown" are mentioned. (Was there a chromosome deficiency among the Sethites? Were there *only* "Y" chromosomes available in this line?)<sup>19</sup>

Servant's Comment: Here we see a total "assumption" turned into an accepted "fact". Incredibly the "monsters" become "super humans" as the unnatural offspring of a union between angels and human women, Chuck and others say. Scripture does not say any such thing. Read the context and you will see that it says that there were "giants" or "nephilim", if you prefer, *"in those day"*, in the time these events were occurring -- it says nowhere, not in one single place does it say these "nephilim" were the unnatural offspring of angels.

This is actually a remark that may have been a time dinosaurs roamed the earth, not giant angle babies. All of the first remark by Chuck is pure fabrications. Next is the question of purity in the DNA pool. This too is just so much rubbish and can be easily discounted by the fact that Noah had sons and those sons had WIVES and not one of them is said to have been "perfect in his or her generations", only Noah. Do you see? If the whole world had become DNA damaged by the fallen angels taking wives, etc., etc., then Noah's sons would have had wives with messed up DNA -- when you clear away the foggy thinking it all becomes clear, or should. This doctrine of the Nephilim may make for fun movies or for selling books but it is not a biblical fact and besmirches our Savior having come in the flesh as our pure sacrifice -- HalleluYaH.

Chuck Continues:

## 6. New Testament Confirmations

"In the mouths of two or three witnesses every word shall be established."<sup>20</sup> In Biblical matters, it is essential to always compare Scripture with Scripture. The New Testament confirmations in Jude and 2 Peter are impossible to ignore.<sup>21</sup>

For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell [Tartarus], and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment; And spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly; 2 Peter 2:4-5

Peter's comments even establishes the time of the fall of these angels to the days of the Flood of Noah.

Servant's Comments: On the surface this may seem logical but from a "real" and not imagined biblical point of view it insane. What is being presented in Peter's letter is a pattern -- what happens to those, even angels, that follow this pattern of sin. What is the sin? It is not believing God, it is to think He, our Creator, does not mean what He says when He says He is going to destroy the Sinners. It is a lot simpler than many

think -- Abraham believed YaHWeH, without proof of any kind he believed what he was told and because of this "belief" it was accounted to him as righteousness.

(Gen 15:6) Abram believed the LORD (YaHWeH), and He credited it to him as righteousness.

(James 4:17) Anyone, then, who knows the good he ought to do and doesn't do it, sins.

The angels that sinned, apparently did not believe their Creator would imprison them, or bring them to judgment and if you look around the world, at world history, you will see that it seems men do not believe this either. The warning of JUDGEMENT is not a declaration angels cohabited with human women, even taking wives -- where does it say that? It does not, it has to be imagined, conjured up, is you will. If our Creator has judged the angels that sinned the He will judge men too.

Please, if you question this, look at the context, once again, and hear what is really being said, not what is "imagined". First we are *not* told the sin of the angels is marrying out of "their kind", which, according to creation biology is not possible (1 Cor 15:38-41), each is created after its own kind. You cannot cross a cat with a dog, even though they are similar, and get a cadog any more than an angel, composed of spirit, can step out of their kind and *marry* another completely different kind making giant babies. According to the Book of Enoch these babies grew into 43+ foot giants called the Nephilim. Did you know the word, "nephilim" is just a word in Hebrew for "giant"? The promoters of this false doctrine like to us the Hebrew word because it sounds so much more provocative -- the KJV translators, however, saw this word for what it is, merely a word meaning "giant". Some will say it means, "fallen ones", pointing to the offspring of angels and human women. An arguable point, if you want this definition, could be applied to the prehistoric animals too. They, the dinosaurs, are definitely fallen. At any rate, the argument is weak and nothing to establish a doctrine, especially a doctrine that overshadows the miraculous birth of our Savior.

Chuck Continues:

Even Peter's vocabulary is provocative. Peter uses the term Tartarus, here translated "hell." This is the only place that this Greek term appears in the Bible. Tartarus is a Greek term for "dark abode of woe"; "the pit of darkness in the unseen world." As used in Homer's Iliad, it is "...as far beneath hades as the earth is below heaven`." <sup>22</sup> In Greek mythology, some of the demigods, Chronos and the rebel Titans, were said to have



rebelled against their father, Uranus, and after a prolonged contest they were defeated by Zeus and were condemned into Tartarus.

Servant's Comment: Of course it is "provocative", it is a warning, *not a revelation* about spirits having sex with flesh and then having giant babies. See how silly it really sounds? It is a warning that if those before us were not spared from judgment neither can men expect to escape judgment. But wait, wasn't Chuck suggesting earlier that the sin of man and the reason for the Flood was the sin of the angels? Yes, he was, so how is it that we lowly humans are being blamed? What Chuck and others are teaching may sell books and *titillate the itching ears*, those who want to hear this kind of nonsense. This all comes right out of the imaginations of men, perhaps inspired by the Devil himself -- I'm just saying.

I am not questioning Chuck Missler's sincerity, maybe his motives, but he is sincerely wrong in this and will have to one day repent of it. I am not saying Chuck Missler is purposely following the Devils advice but someone is influencing someone whether in masses or singularly. Do not kid yourself, the Devil is here, among us and he does have those that follow him and he appears as an angel of light, not like in the movies.

*(2Co 11:14) And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light.*

And, sometimes, very sincere people can be deceived themselves.

*(2Ti 3:13) But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived.*

Chuck:

The Epistle of Jude<sup>23</sup> also alludes to the strange episodes when these "alien" creatures intruded themselves into the human reproductive process:

And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. Jude 6,7

Servant's Comment: The *allusion* is only in the mind of Chuck Missler and others teaching this heresy. Going after strange flesh? Were those of Sodom and Gomorrah angels? No, and this verse uses these are a warning not that angels "giving themselves

over to *fornication*, as Chuck says. Remember, the sons of God took wives, and if wives there is no *fornication*, so the comparison is not valid.

Having left their first estate? Sounds good and tricky and with a gentle *suggestion* that this *estate* is their spirit bodies, well, where does it say that exactly? If these angels left their first bodies, then what happened to these first bodies (estates) and what did they become after leaving their bodies, humans? Do you see the nonsense of this? The “estate” they left had nothing to do with marrying human women or having giant babies, it had to do with them leaving a place of habitations given to them.

Remember Satan’s grand desire? To rise above the Heavens to the throne of the Creator in an attempt to take His place, to place his Creator, and he convinced a third of the angels that they could abandon what they were give and claim the whole Kingdom and to do this the left their own place – they rebelled and assaulted the Heaven of heavens. Once they did this and took action to do this they left where they were supposed to be and went to take control of a different place, or estate. Of course they were stopped and as we are told in the letter of Jude these rebel angels were *imprisoned*. Another small point; If imprisoned how were they able to cohabit with human women, never mind marrying them. I wonder where the prison of darkness might be?

*(2Co 4:4) In whom the god of this world has blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them..*

*(Eph 2:2) Wherein in time past you walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now works in the children of disobedience:*

Sounds to me like Satan and his boys are imprisoned on this Earth. Read Revelation 12 and you will see this is the case. Satan and his followers were cast to the Earth and Heaven rejoiced, but woe to mankind for the Devil is among us. Where is this plain wording like we read in Rev 12 to be found in Genesis 6, if it is to say what the deceivers are teaching?

This, unfortunately for many, cannot be ignored -- there is a Satan, a disobedient spirit by nature and influencing not only a few people but the vast majority of the world. What we see today, in the world, is like the times of Noah, just as our Savior told us -- Mat 24:37-39 -- “...just as the days of Noah...” , and I think most believe we are in those days or very, very near that time and this being the case do you see angels marrying

women? Where is the abominable offspring of angels crossed with women? We do not, so what is the comparison of the days of Noah? It is the disobedience of men and their willingness to follow or believe the lies and doctrines of devils, just as in the days of Noah. We need to be saved again, as Noah was, only this time from the fire that is to come.

*(2Pe 3:6-6) Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.*

Our Creator promised not to flood the world again and He is true to His word – this time it will, one day, be a baptism by fire.

Yes, as the days of Noah life will be going on as if nothing is going to happen, and being deceived into blaming others for our own sin and refusing the acceptance of the one and only one by whom we can come to salvation and survive the baptism of fire.

Angels taking wives, able to cross DNA, creating monsters that eat everything in sight, all the animals of the world then eating mankind then even themselves – so, what was left for God to destroy by the flood? We can see the stupidity of this kind of manipulation. The itching ears hearing only what they want to hear and to what glory for the Gospel message of salvation? None!

*(2Ti 4:3) For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; ("itching -- Strong's Greek Dictionary, "...by implication, tickle...")*

Chuck Continues in his allusions:

The allusions to "going after strange flesh," keeping "not their first estate," having "left their own habitation," and "giving themselves over to fornication," seem to clearly fit the alien intrusions of Genesis 6. (The term for habitation, oivkhth,rion, refers to their heavenly bodies from which they had disrobed.<sup>24</sup>)

Servant's Comment: Slow down, slow down – fornication? Say it isn't so, after all, if you are married it is not "fornication" (as mentioned earlier). Of course some women's libbers of the 60s and 70s would argue the point as they saw all sex as the rape of women. Anyway, if we stay with the Word, and if Chuck really believes that these "sons of god" are angels then they cannot be committing *fornication* because it clearly says they "*married*" them.

See how silly this all begins to sound? You cannot have a legal act of mankind, seen in the marriage act, or the laws and rules evidently governing the institution of marriage, recognized by nearly every civilization and culture and then accuse that husband of rape, or fornication. Fornication usually means sex outside of marriage, or some illicit sexual act outside of marriage.

Have you read Jude 6 & 7 lately? Sure, a clever suggestion leads to a false "assumption", when we read about the "fornication" which is applied or in reference to the evil people of Sodom and Gomorrah, not about the angels -- what is being compared is the punishment, not the act -- and their punishment was death by fire and brimstone falling on them. If it were about the angels sin then it would mean the angels were fornicating with one another (forgive me Father). No, these "sons of Elohim (Gods or Judges)" saw the daughters of men, or man, and saw how beautiful they were and took wives from among these "daughters of the man" (Adam?). The daughters of Adam were beautiful, not doubt. With this understanding (speculation) we don't have to twist the inspired word upside down and backward, or even bend it by word manipulation to make it say what we want it say. If this were to really be applied to angels and their vision of beauty then this would be extremely odd -- the glory of an angel, even a fallen angel would be so much greater than that of the flesh that to see the reason these angels would give up eternity for the lower glory of the flesh is not reasonable. Spirits? Marry? Not according to our Savior --

**(Mat 22:29-30)** YaHshua answered and said to them, **You do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.**

*(Gen 6:2) ... the sons of God (Elohim) saw that the daughters of men were beautiful, and they married any of them they chose.*

This teaching by our Savior, YaHshua, should be the nail in the coffin but guess what? I heard the author, Chuck Missler, bring this question up himself, not being able to get around this verse and still pursuing this false teaching he said it finally came to him, the solution around this teaching of our Savior, and it is this -- "It says the "angels in heaven" not on earth". Incredible, and this coming from a highly respected bible teacher. If not in heaven then not on earth either, the comparison is still there and is not negated by Chuck's faulty reasoning. If you want to believe something strong enough to overcome good sense you can, as is proven here.

Back to Chuck's allusions:

These allusions from the New Testament would seem to be fatal to the "Sethite" alternative in interpreting Genesis 6. If the intercourse between the "sons of God" and the "daughters of men" were merely marriage between Sethites and Cainites, it seems impossible to explain these passages, and the reason why some fallen angels are imprisoned and others are free to roam the heavens.

*Servant's Comments: No shame here as Chuck plainly says, "...intercourse between the sons of God and daughters of men..." which would be fine if we are speaking about mankind of different backgrounds but not if, as Chuck means, spirit beings having intercourse with flesh.*

Chuck and more faulty reasoning:

## 7. Post-Flood Implications

The strange offspring also continued after the flood: "There were Nephilim in the earth in those days, and also after that..."<sup>25</sup> The "Sethite" view fails to meaningfully address the prevailing conditions "also after that." It offers no insight into the presence of the subsequent "giants" in the land of Canaan.

*Servant's Comment: Here it is assumed that the "giants" or the "nephilim" are people, are giant offspring from the angel human union, or from those diabolical UFO Aliens messing with our DNA – alien angels? It always leads back to "Alien invasion" sooner or later. Anyway, if you keep going in this stuff that is where you end up, and Chuck and his followers have ended up there -- in the UFO scene. Read the word, it does not say these "giants" were the product of this supposed union of angel (alien) and human women. What the Scripture says is that in that time, when these marriages occurred, when the "sons of God" went chasing after beautiful women there were "giants" in the land, and even after that and this does not mean, nor say, after the Flood, does it? This could very well have been Dinosaurs, giving a time stamp on when all of this was happening, right at the turn of mankind passing by that point of no return, leading to the total destruction of the World -- this did not happen in only a few years but hundreds of years. In those days they, dinosaurs, would have been called "giants", "nephilim", later dragons, today, dinosaurs. In no way does the wording say these were the offspring of angels fornicating with women, as Chuck and many others say.*

Chuck speculates some more:

One of the disturbing aspects of the Old Testament record was God's instructions, upon entering the land of Canaan, to wipe out every man, woman, and child of certain tribes inhabiting the land. This is difficult to justify without the insight of a "gene pool

problem" from the remaining Nephilim, Rephaim, et al., which seems to illuminate the difficulty.

Servant's Comment: While the warriors of Israel were given those instruction for complete annihilation of the inhabitants of Canaan they did not do as told. It seems they knew better and preserved things of value -- you know -- like the prettiest of the women and children, some animals and valuables. They were warned about this, not because of some DNA pollution but because of their religion. The religion of Canaan appealed to the flesh and would tempt the people of Israel and that is just what happened. The sin of Canaan had gotten so far off the path of true worship and recognition of the True Creator that to let them continue would have meant the eventual and total religious pollution of the world, just like what happened in the pre-flood world of Noah. And here we are just like in the days of Noah, everyone chasing after some image of the Babylonian/Canaanite gods. If you get into a study of those religions you can go around the world and see the near identical copies, different names, in some cases but following the same demonic worship. It was not because of some angel contamination of human gene pool. As the days of Noah, remember, and where are those supposed, monstrous giants today? They don't exist do they, at least not as Chuck Missler and other teach.

## 8. Prophetic Implications

Another reason that an understanding of Genesis 6 is so essential is that it also is a prerequisite to understanding (and anticipating) Satan's devices<sup>26</sup> and, in particular, the specific delusions to come upon the whole earth as a major feature of end-time prophecy.<sup>27</sup> We will take up these topics in Part 2, "The Return Of The Nephilim.")

Servant's Comment: Here Chuck is alluding to the coming envision of the Nephilim as UFO aliens coming to earth -- see, I told you it would eventually come to this. Everything in this kind of fantasy eventually is tied in with this UFO invasions and religion. Have you ever wondered how our Creator is going to gather all of the nations to the Middle East where He is going to destroy them, just as the scripture says?

*(Zec 12:9) And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem.*

*(Zec 14:12) And this shall be the plague wherewith the YaHWeH will smite all the people that have fought against Jerusalem; Their flesh shall consume away while they stand upon*

*their feet, and their eyes shall consume away in their holes, and their tongue shall consume away in their mouth.*

What if everyone buys into the idea that we are going to experience an alien invasion of the Nephilim, the return of the sons of the rebel angels and one day it is reported that an invasion is coming – looking into the heavens an assault appears to be eminent as scientists begin tracking what appears to be an invasion force approaching Earth. Like tracking an asteroid they calculate the incoming light, whatever it is, will hit, or land in the Middle East, what then. Hey, the UFO, Nephilim invasion? Or, perhaps this will be the coming of our Lord and all His Angels. The forces of the world join together to do battle against our Lord, and there in the valley of Megiddo they will be destroyed. I am speculating, of course, but my speculation, I believe is more a possibility than what Chuck and other UFO enthusiasts say.

#### In Summary -- Chuck's Summary

If one takes an integrated view of the Scripture, then everything in it should "tie together." It is the author's view that the "Angel View," however disturbing, is the clear, direct presentation of the Biblical text, corroborated by multiple New Testament references and was so understood by both early Jewish and Christian scholarship; the "Sethite View" is a contrivance of convenience from a network of unjustified assumptions antagonistic to the remainder of the Biblical record.

It should also be pointed out that most conservative Bible scholars accept the "angel" view.<sup>28</sup> Among those supporting the "angel" view are: G. H. Pember, M. R. DeHaan, C. H. McIntosh, F. Delitzsch, A. C. Gaebelein, A. W. Pink, Donald Grey Barnhouse, Henry Morris, Merrill F. Unger, Arnold Fruchtenbaum, Hal Lindsey, and Chuck Smith, being among the best known.

For those who take the Bible seriously, the arguments supporting the "Angel View" appear compelling. For those who indulge in a willingness to take liberties with the straightforward presentation of the text, no defense can prove final. (And greater dangers than the implications attending these issues await them!)

*Servant's Comment: Again, Chuck witnesses against himself and those he has listed as authorities on this subject. Now, what does the Word say? Something about a broad gate and a narrow gate?*

*(Mat 7:13-15) Enter through the narrow gate. For wide is the gate and broad is the road that leads to destruction, and many enter through it. But small is the gate and narrow the*

*road that leads to life, and only a few find it. Watch out for false prophets. They come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ferocious wolves.*

What do they look like? How do they appear?

*(2Co 11:14-15) And no wonder, for Satan himself masquerades as an angel of light. It is not surprising, then, if his servants masquerade as servants of righteousness. Their end will be what their actions deserve.*

I am not saying, or trying not to say that Chuck Missler is an agent of Satan but he is most definitely mistaken and has chosen to go down a path that is not truly rooted in the Word but is leached from the tables of Jewish fables going back centuries and this from the very people that have denied YaHshua as Savior. Look where ever you might and you will see this trail of lies goes back to So, what does this mean? It means that you can name drop all the names you can find, the more the better, and it means nothing when it comes to the Truth of the Word. In fact, the more you can round up to support your crazy idea the more apt it is to be just that, a crazy idea and not true at all. When it comes to a majority vote among Christians you should chose the minor side and you will be right most of the time. Better still, study the Word for yourself, judge everything by what the word says, not by what some man says. Peace to you who seek the real truth.

Chuck's Notes;

1. Matthew 24:37.
2. Matthew 24:37.
3. Matthew 24:37; Luke 17:26, as well as Old Testament allusions such as Daniel 2:43, et al.
4. Cf. Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7 (where they are in existence before the creation of the earth). Jesus also implies the same term in Luke 20:36.
5. A footnote in an edition of the famed Scofield Bible, in suggesting that "sons of Elohim" does not always denote angelic beings, points to one ostensible exception (Isaiah 43:6) but the term in question is not there used! God simply refers to Israel as "my sons" and "my daughters." Indeed, all of Adam's race are termed God's "offspring" in Acts 17:28 (although Paul is here quoting a Greek poet).
6. The sons of Elohim are even contrasted with the sons of Adam in Psalm 82:1, 6 and warned that if they go on with the evil identified in verse 2, they would die like Adam (man). When our Lord quoted this verse (John 10:34) He made no mention of what order of beings God addressed in this Psalm but that the Word of God was inviolate whether the beings in question were angels or men.
7. Luke 3:38.
8. John 1:11, 12.



9. 2 Corinthians 5:17.
10. 2 Corinthians 5:1-4.
11. Luke 20:36.
12. This term appears only twice in the Bible: 2 Corinthians 5:2 and Jude 1:6.
13. Genesis 4:18.
14. Genesis 11:6.
15. This instruction was given to the descendants of Isaac and Jacob. Even the presumed descendants of Ishmael cannot demonstrate their linkage since no separation was maintained.
16. A.C. Gaebelien, *The Annotated Bible (Penteteuch)*, p. 29.
17. Gen 4:26 is widely regarded as a mistranslation: "Then began men to profane the name of the Lord." So agrees the venerated Targum of Onkelos; the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel; also the esteemed rabbinical sources such as Kimchi, Rashi, et al. Also, Jerome. Also, the famed Maimonides, *Commentary on the Mishnah*, 1168 a.d.
18. Exodus 12:5, 29; Leviticus 1:3, 10; 3:1, 6; 4:3, 23; 5:15, 18, 25; 22:19, 21; 23:12; Numbers 6:14; et al. Over 60 references, usually referring to the freedom from physical blemishes of offerings.
19. Each human gamete has 23 pairs of chromosomes: the male has both "Y" (shorter) and "X" (longer) chromosomes; the female, only "X" chromosomes. The sex of a fertilized egg is determined by the sperm fertilizing the egg: "X+Y" for a male child; "X+X" for a female. Thus, the male supplies the sex-determining chromosome.
20. Deut. 19:15; Matthew 18:16; 26:60; 2 Corinthians 13:1; et al.
21. Jude 6, 7; 2 Peter 2:4-5.
22. Homer, *Iliad*, viii 16.
23. Jude is commonly recognized as one of the Lord's brothers. (Matthew 13:55; Mark 6:3; Gal 1:9; Jude 1:1.)
24. The only other use in the New Testament is 2 Corinthians 5:2, alluding to the heavenly body which the believer longs to be clothed.
25. Genesis 6:4.
26. 2 Corinthians 2:11.
27. Luke 21:26; 2 Thess 2:9, 11; et al.
28. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Vol V, p.2835-2836.