

A Biblical View OF THE END TIMES

A HISTORY OF HERESY, PART 2

Week #7; Jan. 11, 2026, 6PM

www.solidbreadcommunity.com

A. Review of what we've learned

1. In last week's lesson, "**A History of Heresy, Part 1**," we dove more deeply into the text of **Gen. 6:1-4**, as well as some surrounding passages from that chapter.
 - We examined the term "Nephilim" which shows up in that passage. We explored its Hebrew origins – and we saw how it's accurately rendered as "giants" in some English translations.
 - We reviewed the evidence and we concluded that God's Word makes it clear the Nephilim were hybrid entities.
 - They were part human and part angelic: a complete violation of God's order of things. They were also unredeemable.
 - We then reviewed some of the other parts of God's Word which discusses these 'Nephilim,' and we saw they were consistently imposing fierce, evil, and violence against humanity.
 - We probed deeper into certain Biblical passages which also described these Nephilim as massive - - extremely tall and strong.
2. We then did a fly-by on some historical records that affirm these giants were also present around the globe, even after The Great Flood.
 - We looked at some of the records of this in our own country - - and even in regions nearby to us.
 - We compared the Biblical record of these giants – these 'Nephilim' – with the myths and legends of ancient cultures.
 - Over and over, we saw that everything lines up. It's all consistent.
3. We then shifted gears, and we examined quite closely what the Bible means when it says Noah was found to be "*perfect in his generations*."
 - We saw clearly that this is an assessment of his physical wholesomeness, and his genetic integrity - - and NOT a claim about Noah's spiritual status.
 - We compared the Hebrew term describing Noah with the same Hebrew term used to describe a sacrificial goat or lamb without physical blemish.
 - It became rather clear in all this that the Bible, in **Gen. Ch. 6**, was painting a picture of a pre-flood world that had become physically corrupted when compared against its condition in the original Creation.

4. These things – and other points we discussed – led us to the ONLY conclusions that can responsibly be made when we properly interpret God’s Word.

- **First**, Satan had mounted a massive attack against the human genome to corrupt it and prevent the arrival of the Messiah who would ultimately crush and destroy him. This makes (a.) logical sense, and (b.) it conforms to Biblical information.
- **Second**, God sent the global flood to preserve His Messianic promise. He found a man in Noah who was genetically untainted, which was a key requirement for the future Messiah. (So was Noah’s wife - and Noah’s sons – and all these became the means for God to reboot humanity).
- **And third**, the Great Flood, when viewed soberly and properly, was God’s means for Him to preserve His plan of salvation. It was God’s countermove against Satan who was trying to disrupt the Bible’s first prophecy in **Gen. 3:15**.

NOTE: All this now brings up a significant question: “Why does the text say in **Gen. 6:5-7** that the Lord ‘regretted’ that He’d made man on the earth?”

1. This is an important question which several of you have asked. I expected that. I waited to address it till now.
2. Most of our English translations seem to tread awfully close to the idea that God somehow ‘changed His mind’ from His previous statements.
3. We saw in **Genesis Ch. 1**, several times, that God called His Creation ‘good.’ He said it was ‘very good’ after man was created. In **Gen. 1:31**, it says:

“God saw all that he had made, and it was very good. And there was evening, and there was morning—the sixth day.”

4. What becomes clear in a plain reading of the **Genesis** Creation account is mankind – male and female – is PART of this ‘very good’ assessment by God.
5. What is also clear from the full counsel of Scripture is God is immutable – that means He is ‘unchanging.’
6. Part of His immutable character means that God is NOT going to call something ‘good’ on Monday, then turn around and call it ‘bad’ on Tuesday.
7. Our problem with the **Gen. 6:5-7** passage is we’re tempted to frame God in human terms. Our English translations even encourage us to think this way.
8. We’re further coerced in this direction because – for most of us anyways – we’ve been taught God became so angry with man’s sinful condition on the earth that He opted to drown everyone like a bunch of rats.
9. Something is off here. We’re missing something important in this equation; we’re overlooking something. **What is it?**
 - The Bible rarely mentions God feeling "regret" for something that happened. In fact, this happens only twice, and this passage is one of those.

- The Hebrew word used here is ‘yin’nā’hem,’ from the root word ‘nacham.’ This word is exclusively used with reference to emotions: like feelings of pain, sadness, or unhappiness.
- This word does not imply that God felt He’d made a mistake, or that He wished He’d done things differently. It’s possible to experience “grief” or “regret” without involving an error or suggesting any lapse in character.
- We need to understand God’s heart is capable of complex combinations of emotions which are infinitely more remarkable and diverse than our own. It’s not unreasonable to suggest God can lament over something that He chose to bring about.
- Regardless, this **Genesis** passage in question DOES mean God became unhappy with the state of humanity. This was a very low point in history.
- God became “troubled,” “grieved,” or “pained,” by the outcome of His act of Creation, even though in His perfect omniscience, He knew it would all come to this.
- Several theologians see this expression “regretted” as being God knowing He **now** faced a time – in fact, a decision – to put things right.
- This conforms to the truth that God knows all things. He KNEW mankind would go its own way. He knew sin would graduate. He knew things would happen exactly as they took place – but now was a moment to take action.
- I mentioned there were two times this expression is used of God ‘regretting’ something He had done. The other is found in **1 Samuel 15:11**, and it concerns King Saul.
- When Saul disobeys Samuel, God says, “*I regret*” — (or, the King James says, ‘*I repent*’) — “*that I have made Saul king, for he has turned back from following me and has not performed my commandments.*”
- But then, as if to clarify and to protect you and me from misunderstanding **verse 11**, God then says in **verse 29**, just 18 verses later, “*The Glory of Israel [God] will not lie or have regret [or repent], for he is not a man, that he should have regret [or ‘repent,’ or ‘change His mind’ – depending on your translation].*”
- It’s the Bible’s way of clarifying itself. In effect, it’s saying to you and me, “Don’t put God in a box. Don’t presume the limitations of human emotions upon Him.”
- **Here’s what this all boils down to:** while human regret happens because we lack foreknowledge to keep something from happening, God’s regrets are unique to God. We need to accept that He is God, and we’re not! He’s different.
- As the Bible **specifically** says, God is NOT a man that he should have regret or change His mind. That means God does not regret **the same way** one of us would regret in our own ignorance of the future.
- When God acts, or when He makes a promise, He does this with complete foreknowledge of all the future circumstances. Tough to understand, but true!
- God is NEVER caught off guard by anything! He would not be God if He was.
- (This is the best way I can explain this challenging passage). Let’s move on...

NOTE: That brings us to today's lesson.

- Today we will glance at this pervasive heresy known as the 'Sons of Seth Theory,' or the 'Line of Seth View.'
- Unfortunately - - this is what is taught by most pastors today. I've heard it from the pulpit a couple times, and perhaps you have too.
- It is an error that is taught in multiple established conservative seminaries today, and as we have seen, this idea often shows up in the uninspired commentary notes of our Bibles.
- I said early on in this class series that I would not spend as much time on errant ideas as I would on the proper doctrines. No need to imply credibility where it's not due.
- But this is one we need to smoke out of its hole. As I have shared several times, if we don't properly glean from **Gen. 3:15** and **Gen. 6:1-4** the information that is there - then ALL remaining prophecies in the Bible risk being misunderstood.

B. There are basically three primary interpretations concerning the text of **Gen. 6:1-4.**

These are as follows:

1. **The Sons of Seth View** (held by Augustine, John Calvin, Martin Luther, Graham Cole, Ken Mathews, and many others today). This theory defines the sons of God as sons of Seth, and the daughters of man as the daughters of Cain.
2. **The Kings of the Earth View** (held by Meredith Kline, Walter Kaiser, Et al.). This interpretation defines 'sons of God' as the great warrior kings of old and the 'daughters of men' as ordinary women that they, like Lamech in **Gen. 4:19** took possession of.
3. **The Fallen Angel View** (held by the apostles, the early church fathers, Gordon Wenham, Douglas Van Dorn, Gary Stearman, myself, and most reputable [as I see it] prophecy scholars today). This interpretation defines the sons of God as fallen angelic beings who had sexual relations with ordinary human women and produced giants with them.

NOTE: Those are the three main views that are out there.

- The first two of those interpret 'sons of God' as being ordinary humans.
- The third interprets 'sons of God' as being fallen angels. This one – I believe – is the **correct** view. In fact, I am convinced of that, and we have looked at the reasons why.
- But as I stated, it is the 'Sons of Seth' theory which has gained the MOST traction amongst churches, pastors, and seminaries today. It's a willful departure from God's Word.
- What is remarkable about this is: the Sons of Seth theory is the singular theory of these three which LEAST adheres to the proper standards for Biblical interpretation.

C. First, let's remind ourselves what the apostles believed - - AND the early church fathers. What was their view of **Gen. 6:1-4?**

NOTE: Keep in mind, these were men who walked and worked alongside Jesus. These were also men who studied under those who knew Jesus personally – who were personally discipled by men that God used to write the books of the NT.

1. Even a casual assessment shows the apostles interpreted **Genesis 6:1-4** literally – exactly as we have done here in this series.
 - Passages like **2 Peter 2:4-7** and **Jude 1:6-7** make it clear the earliest Christian leaders from the very start of church history believed that fallen angels engaged in illicit sexual relations with human women who then gave birth to hybrid “Nephilim” giants.
 - Furthermore, early church fathers such as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clement of Rome, Lactantius, and Ambrose were proponents of these specific views in their own writings.
 - Some of these men were discipled by the apostles. These men were the pillars of the early church.
2. The historical record is very clear. A straightforward reading and interpretation of **Genesis 6:1-4** (which is the same approach we have taken in this series) was the official position of the early church up through the fourth century.
 - This position is even recorded in The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume 8 – an early record of the Christian church’s views and doctrines.

D. Now, despite the imperative to always embrace a literal interpretation of God’s Word, heresy still crept in and took root.

1. In dispute to a responsible view of **Genesis 6:1-4**, an alternative theory – a ‘heresy’ – began in the 4th Century which has been propagated for most of church history since that point.
 - It CONTINUES to be advanced now, with strong support for it in the various Reformed denominations, in Catholicism, in some of the Orthodox denominations, and in their leadership (studies: 85% of all churches).
 - This theory springs from **consciously rejecting** the need to humbly seek out and conform to Biblical truth (as heresies always do).
 - This heresy is called the “sons of Seth” theory, though it is also known by other names, including the “sons of Seth and the daughters of Cain” theory. (NOTE: I’ll call it the ‘sons of Seth’ theory in this series).
2. The premise of this errant theory rests entirely on the claim that the “sons of God” in **Genesis 6:1-4** were ordinary men from the “godly line of Seth.”
 - It also believes the “daughters of men” were ordinary women from the “ungodly line of Cain.”
 - In other words, the first gender group was a righteous one. The second gender group was an unrighteous one.

- There was a specific group of males that were very good boys, and there was a specific group of women that were very bad girls.
- It's already sounding very sexist and unlikely. Isn't it?
- The 'sons of Seth' assumption is these two different gender groups were alike **in their physical nature**, but very different **in their spiritual nature**.
- This theory argues that the joining of these two genetically homogenous groups of humans produced atypical offspring.
- This offspring was of such evil character and unnatural physical proportion that God was compelled to wipe the slate clean.

3. Think about that. It makes ZERO sense!

- That's like saying Sally Jones is a God-fearing young lady and she marries Mike Smith who doesn't believe in God.
 - They're both normal humans, but they have a baby which is completely different. That baby breaks all the birth weight records at the local hospital.
 - The event makes the evening news, and Coleman Tents volunteers to design some enormous custom diapers.
 - The kid grows up to be the height of a house and the weight of a bus. He's so misbehaved he makes Attila the Hun look like a choirboy.
 - God's grinding His teeth because He can't stand it. He decides to abandon His unchangeable (immutable) nature (**Cf. Heb. 13:8**), and in a spasm of human-like rage He exterminates the family.
 - It makes no sense, even in a make-believe tale. It also makes us wince if we try to paint God this way.
 - So why do some people insist this is the position of the inspired Holy Scriptures?

NOTE: I've noted in my research that various scholars who support this "sons of Seth" theory ALSO claim that they properly adhere to the Hebrew interpretation of ***b'nai Elohim***.

- That's preposterous! Ridiculous! They cannot have it both ways since these two positions are saying two very different things.
 - It's like driving north while arguing you're headed south. That's being delusional.
 - It's like saying men can get pregnant. It's abandoning ALL logic and common sense.
 - But unfortunately, this senseless and double-minded posture appears frequently within Christian circles -- especially now.
 - Since the 'sons of Seth' theory emerges from an **absence** of common sense and a **presence** of arrogance, I personally believe it calls into question the credibility of anyone who subscribes to it.

- While it's obvious that I do not hold this "sons of Seth" theory in high regard, I understand others may disagree with my stance.
- I will share why I do not subscribe to it and why I feel it's illogical to do so.

E. Where did the 'sons of Seth' theory come from?

1. Most records agree that the first official denial that the ***b'nai Elohim*** of ***Genesis 6:1-4***, or the 'sons of God' in our English translations were fallen angels - - came from St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430 AD).
2. There is some evidence that suggests Sextus Julius Africanus (200–275 AD) had considered this same position before Augustine's time.
 - But - it was Augustine who formalized this 'sons of Seth' theory and publicly launched it roughly 75 years after The First Council of Nicaea in 325 AD.
 - Augustine, then, was influential – but not always in a responsible way – much like Tim Keller, Rick Warren, Bill Hybels, or even John Piper today.
 - Consequently, many church leaders which followed Augustine fell into step with his point of view. Augustine tended to allegorize the Bible – he claimed **it meant something other than what it said**.
 - It's reasonable to assume the church leaders which followed Augustine were persuaded by Augustine's influence and legacy. Human nature was then as it is now.
 - As I said, many pastors today mimic the irresponsible methods and beliefs of prominent emergent or reformed church leaders which they admire; the situation's no different NOW than it was THEN.
 - Because Augustine did much to allegorize the content of the Bible, others in his wake did similarly.
 - Augustine was not the first to treat the Scriptures this way, but he WAS the one to mainstream this approach.
 - Where certain passages had historically been handled with a straightforward reading and understanding, Augustine promoted non-literal interpretations instead. He was responsible for turning many in the wrong direction.
 - So, it's no surprise to me that Augustine supported and advanced the patently-errant "sons of Seth" theory.

F. NOTE: It's VERY important to get God's Word right!

1. There are great perils when we abandon responsible Biblical interpretation, and when we subordinate the counsel of God's Word to man's preferences.
 - There are always consequences to doing this.
 - Every time we depart from God's truth, conflict, depravity, and confusion enters.

2. A sobering illustration of this specific danger is also lifted from Augustine's life, and I want to take a brief scenic tour on the side here to address this matter.
 - Augustine was also a passionate promoter of Replacement Theology, a profane departure from sound doctrine that flies in the face of the clear Biblical message.
 - (I told you before that I would revisit this matter briefly).
 - (I had questions given to me about this a few weeks ago, and I will take a few moments here to respond to them.)
 - The irony of Replacement Theology is it has indeed replaced true Biblical theology.
 - The central conviction of Replacement Theology is God has replaced Israel with the church – in other words, He was compelled – **because of man's choices** - to move on to “Plan B.”
 - This heresy contends that God has abandoned His **unilateral, irrevocable, and unconditional** promises to the Jewish nation - which by virtue of God's character is impossible.
 - It further argues that these same promises will now see fulfillment within the church instead.
 - This heresy advances the notion that God broke His promises before, but...He's different now. He's not going to break them again.
 - Augustine, besides being a promoter of the senseless ‘sons of Seth’ heresy, upheld the fallacies of Replacement Theology by “spiritualizing” or “allegorizing” key passages of Scripture.
 - He insisted that the true intention of certain passages was ‘veiled.’
 - He felt the text meant something other than what it was saying - for example, “Israel” means “the church.”
 - This departure from common sense and responsible Biblical interpretation permitted Augustine to support whatever alternate explanation his personal biases preferred.
 - **Replacement Theology became the official position of the church during Augustine's time.**
 - His publications on the issue, including his books “*The City of God*”, and his corrosive “*Tract Against the Jews*,” aided this development to no small degree.

3. As I said, Augustine influenced other Christian leaders after him.
 - That included some very prominent ones. There was a cascade effect.
 - Replacement Theology advocates even included Martin Luther and John Calvin. This is very tough for many people to accept since they are icons.
 - But Luther and Calvin cultivated and published caustic antisemitic attitudes.

- Most people do not realize Martin Luther and John Calvin regarded the Jews with extreme prejudice and dislike.
- And because these two men contributed so much to the Reformed movement and structure, we still find similar anti-Jewish biases in prominent Reformed leaders of our time, like John Piper.
- But the situation is much worse than what we see on the surface.
 - Hitler even claimed he'd found personal inspiration in the antisemitic views and writings of Martin Luther.
 - Hitler, and the Nazis, widely distributed and utilized Luther's 1543 publication, "*On the Jews and Their Lies*", as a blueprint for their policies to ravage, persecute, and exterminate the Jews.
 - Martin Luther's writings created a fertile soil to cultivate anti-Jewish sentiment in Germany before WW2.
 - The bottom line is history underscores the dangers of reading into God's Word what's not there in the first place.
 - Replacement Theology provides a sobering reality check to our present "sons of Seth" discussion.
 - To suggest it's not a bad thing to spiritualize "this passage or that one" - - as many proponents of the "sons of Seth" theory admit they're doing - - is to display extreme disconnect and arrogance.
 - This pride and arrogance is a necessary ingredient for modern day Reformers to alter divine Biblical intent.
- There are ALWAYS consequences to distorting the meaning of Scripture. It is ALWAYS wrong to do, and the results are ALWAYS predictable:
 - Where truth is suppressed, that means deception is elevated - and where deception is elevated, division and destruction follow.
 - While few choices to suppress truth go so far as to endorse the holocaust as many German churches did in Hitler's time, most such choices simply expose the immaturity and false nature of those individuals who make them. It puts these folks in a bad spot.
 - We must consider **2 Timothy 2:15**, where the distinction of being "approved" is measured by the accuracy with which one studies and declares the Scriptures.
 - A decision to refute the divine intentions of God's Word shows a lack of good judgment, and it further suggests one is "not approved."

G. That was the brief 'scenic tour' that illustrates some VERY important points -- but let's now get back to the problems with the 'sons of Seth' theory.

1. Remember my paraphrase of D. L. Cooper's quote? Here it is: "*If the plain sense of Scripture makes good sense, seek no other sense lest it result in nonsense.*"
- With respect to the "sons of Seth" theory, the application of this quote is on full display.
- Now, let's look at a few obvious problems with this 'sons of Seth' idea....

2. Adherents of the ‘sons of Seth’ theory believe the “sons of God” were **good** people. They were upright, virtuous, holy, and pure.
 - These folks who subscribe to the ‘sons of Seth’ notion believe that the ‘sons of God’ had an amended, unique, or elevated constitution.
 - This elevated spiritual constitution somehow – or some way - kept them from experiencing universal depravity (**Cf. Romans 3:23; 5:12**).
 - But this is **entirely** unbiblical; Scripture teaches ALL have sinned. However, these folks obstinately hold to their conclusions.
 - They look at **Genesis 4:25-26**. That’s where Seth first appears along with the statement, “*At that time people began to call on the name of the Lord.*”
 - Basically, these folks think Seth got everything back onto a proper spiritual track.
 - This is an extremely wobbly assumption since **chapters 5 and 6 of Genesis** show the contrary.
 - The genealogical record from Adam to Noah - **including Seth and his descendants** - is a detailed account featuring the universal effects of sin.
 - As a result of sin’s curse, people continued to die. Over time, corruption increased. It’s the same thing we see today.
 - At no point – get this right, AT NO POINT - does any Bible make the case that Seth’s descendants were recipients of God’s unusual favor, or that they were somehow quarantined or insulated from the effects of sin.
 - That shouldn’t be hard for us to understand. **Romans 5:12** reminds us that sin entered the world through Adam.
 - It reminds us that everyone since that point inherited the scourge of death because “all have sinned.” That includes Seth and his lineage.
 - So, Seth and his lineage were nothing special from the standpoint of sin.
3. Moreover, the word “began” in **Genesis 4:26** comes from the Hebrew word “châlal” (HAH-luh).
 - “Châlal” can also mean “to profane, defile, pollute, or desecrate,” and some translations even reinforce this specific definition.
 - I think it’s a problem of rigid personal agenda to insist that “châlal” (HAH-luh) simply means “begin” when the context which follows **Genesis 4:25-26** shows that “profane” or “defile” is the MUCH better fit.
 - I think it’s much more accurate to see humanity’s relationship with God suffering sin’s consequences (which is Biblical) - rather than they suddenly and inexplicably began worshiping Him in some unusual way because they were ‘special.’

4. And here's another problem for these 'sons of Seth' proponents.

- Just as they regard the arrangement with the good guys, these "sons of Seth" advocates argue that the "daughters of men" ALSO had a nature that was exceptionally marked.
- But in **this** case, they feel this second group was inclined in the OPPOSITE direction – that means the girls were exceptionally bad.
 - Again, their assumption is that the condition of these "daughters of men" was somehow distinguished as being **uniquely** depraved, or something much worse than mankind's baseline sin nature.
 - Again, **Romans** makes the clear case that we are all sinful and depraved **the very same way**.
 - But, supporters of this "sons of Seth" heresy construct this "good guys and bad girls" idea by **spiritualizing / allegorizing the truth**.
 - Remember, that's insisting something is there in the Biblical text when it's not - - or it's not there **when it is!**
 - The assumption of the "sons of Seth" proponents is that the "daughters of men" was a special group which was genetically corralled into having sprung from the "ungodly lineage of Cain."
 - Given Cain's distinction as the first murderer in human history, it justifies their view to regard him and his offspring with a keen prejudice and distaste.
- John Calvin did exactly this. Through choices to engage in irresponsible spiritualization - - just like his choices that he demonstrated with Replacement Theology - - he makes these sorts of assumptions clear.
 - In his commentary, he writes on this very matter:

"The principle is to be kept in memory, that the world was then as if divided into two parts; because the family of Seth cherished the pure and lawful worship of God, from which the rest had fallen. It was, therefore, base ingratitude in the posterity of Seth, to mingle themselves with the children of Cain, and with other profane races; because they voluntarily deprived themselves of the inestimable grace of God."

- This is a bunch of gobbledegook. It forces the rational mind to ask, "Where in Scripture does it say anything like that?"
- The answer is, 'Nowhere.' No text, no passage, no verse in the Bible identifies Seth's lineage as being special or extra-dimensional in moral clarity and character.
- John Calvin pursued a fictitious thread of thought. It had no basis.

5. But – just for the sake of argument – let's run down Calvin's train of thought for a moment.

- John Calvin says the "*family of Seth cherished the pure and lawful worship of God.*"

- OK, in other words, Calvin claims they were all about doing what was right! He says they were exemplary in their righteousness.
 - Well, if they WERE what Calvin says they were, then why did they make such a horrible and evil decision as he insists they made?
 - Why did they marry a bunch of bad girls who he claims were uniquely depraved and wicked because they descended from Cain?
 - The fact is it doesn't add up. And the reason it doesn't add up is because John Calvin did not approach the Bible responsibly.
- Furthermore, if "sons of God" is really a reference to men who descended from Seth, then why doesn't the Bible state it that way?
 - Why doesn't the Bible call them "sons of Seth" rather than "sons of God" (or *b'nai Elohim*) which is clearly an OT reference to angels?
 - After all, Seth is plainly introduced in the story as a human baby just two chapters prior, and his lineage is outlined in very human parameters from that point onwards.
 - Moreover, Augustine and Calvin made the claim - as plenty of others since them have done - that the Bible designates the "daughters of men" as coming from the family tree of Cain.
 - But again -- **where** do we see that the Bible even remotely suggests that? We don't! And we don't see it because it's NOT there.
- And finally -- what about the fact that the Nephilim were GIANTS? How do Augustine and John Calvin deal with that?
 - How do they deal with the fact that two ordinary humans produced extraordinary giants.
 - The answer is they don't. It's an inconvenient truth for them, and so this issue is simply ignored.

H. Let this fact land with a thud: Augustine and Calvin - and others just like them (including pastors and seminaries today) - have not supported their "sons of Seth" view with any responsible treatment of the Biblical text.

NOTE: Let's assess their choices through the protocols of proper Biblical interpretation:

1. First, they have not validated their view by filtering it through the original Biblical meaning.
 - They've completely ignored what is meant by the Hebrew terms and phrases.
2. Second, they have not affirmed their choice by questioning whether it's in harmony with other passages on the same subject.
 - In fact, in their commentaries, they avoid evaluating their conclusions against other passages that would call their choices into question.

3. And third, they haven't substantiated their position by evaluating its compliance with the development of the context.
 - The development of the context makes it very clear their conclusions hold no water.
 - The development of the context shows Luther and Calvin (and others like them) have stepped away from common sense.
4. The reason they haven't done anything that responsible Biblical interpreters do is they cannot do those things and remain where they want to stay.
 - Their choices steer clear of the enduring proofs of Scripture.
 - They are instead marinated with presumption, pride, and prejudice.
 - They want to believe their position is true – and they will chafe and foam at great length to try to support their presumptions.
 - But they are only showing themselves to be foolish – the same way many pastors, teachers, Christian leaders, and seminaries are doing today.

I. I will start wrapping up here, but I want to state that I have thought long and hard about all of this. I've done a lot of research on these issues.

1. The posture of Augustine, Luther, and Calvin (and others like them today) seems to reside somewhere between ignorance and arrogance.
 - It's probably more the latter: arrogance. This is evidenced by Calvin's commentary in which he further states the following:

"That ancient figment, concerning the intercourse of angels with women, is abundantly refuted by its own absurdity; and it is surprising that learned men should formerly have been fascinated by ravings so gross and prodigious."

- When Calvin mentions 'learned men,' he's including Jesus' disciples and all the early church fathers.
- I must shake my head at this. **Really? Is he serious here?**
 - Was Calvin SO blinded by his own biases that he failed to see that every supernatural event of the Scriptures conforms to being "...abundantly refuted by its own absurdity?" Apparently so.
 - Let me put John Calvin's obstinate biases another way. John Calvin approached God's Word like it was a buffet.
 - He found something that God had divinely placed there, but Calvin didn't like it.
 - He thought the idea of fallen angels having sexual relations with human women was ridiculous, and so he exclaimed, "Yuck! What's this? I don't want any of it. I can't believe they put that there!"
 - Rather than humbly submitting himself to the inerrant, authoritative, and inspired Word of God, Calvin – like Augustine, Luther, and so many others today - soothed his own intolerances

by choosing to believe, “It must mean something other than what it is actually saying.”

- As Calvin had already done elsewhere and before, he spiritualized the text so he could disregard the plain truth that was staring him in the face.

2. Everything I’ve said here underscores a massive problem in the church today.

- When one claims the Bible does not mean what it says, they sacrifice what is most **important** to believe to protect what they most **want** to believe.
- As I stated earlier, there is always a personal agenda behind any refusal to accept the inspired truths of Scripture.
- This also says a GREAT DEAL about one’s true spiritual condition. One cannot disagree with the obvious tenets of Scripture and simultaneously claim a proper relationship with Jesus Christ.

NEXT WEEK: We will examine the underlying story within the Bible that ***Genesis 6:1-4*** is a part of.

- That underlying story opens the greater gates of Bible prophecy.
- We will see how a proper interpretation of ***Gen. 6:1-4*** exposes the true agenda of these ***b'nai Elohim*** – these fallen angels - of ancient times.
- We’ll see how that agenda played out beyond the juncture of The Great Flood, and how and why it will manifest again in times that are future to you and me.



Solid Bread Community was started with a passion to teach the truth of God’s Word – every part of it, as it was divinely inspired to be understood.

The rules are simple. First, teach what IS there. Don’t pretend the Bible is not saying what it is saying.



Second, don’t teach what is NOT there. Don’t force a passage to mean something it really doesn’t.

And – number three, if the Bible states it plainly, we should too.

Solid Bread Community, PO Box 431, Windsor, CO 80550

Website: www.solidbreadcommunity.com

Email: connect@solidbreadcommunity.com

Please follow Solid Bread Community on Facebook and subscribe to our YouTube channel.