

## Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 223

Q&A 31

July 7, 2018

**Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)**

**Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)**

### Episode Summary

Dr. Heiser answers your questions about:

- Whether Caleb was a Gentile convert [3:30]
- Whether the term “angel of the Lord” always refers to the second Yahweh figure [26:35]
- How the fact that Jesus said there are some things only the Father knows relates to whether the Trinity may be in view in Genesis 1.[31:50]
- The use of the term “rulers of this age” of principalities, even after Jesus conquered death [34:35]
- I Corinthians 6 “judging angels” followed by a discussion on immorality [37:50]
- God’s posture toward the Nephilim if they had not corrupted mankind [39:30]

### Transcript

**TS:** Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, episode 223: our 31<sup>st</sup> Q&A. I’m the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he’s the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey, Mike, how’re you doing?

**MH:** I’m sweating, Trey.

**TS:** Ha! You and me both! So that must mean you’re in my state of Texas.

**MH:** It does. As we’re recording this, I am in the Dallas area, and man, is it hot. [laughs]

**TS:** It is hot, and what makes it even hotter, Mike, is when your air conditioning unit goes out, which is what I’m suffering. [MH laughs]

**MH:** Are you serious?

**TS:** Yes! It makes it even hotter. It's not fun. I'm sitting here right now sweating as we're talking.

**MH:** Boy, oh boy.

**TS:** However bad you have it, just know that I have it a little bit worse than you.

**MH:** Yeah, well, I'm in a hotel, so it's not bad now, but out and about, it's hot.

**TS:** Right, so you were doing some Fringepop recording, I take it.

**MH:** Yep.

**TS:** How did that go? Anything to report there?

**MH:** It went well. We got our full crop of episodes. We got 10 or 12, depending how we divide things up, so yeah, we had a good week.

**TS:** Well, that's good. Since we're talking about other shows, Mike, we ought to remind people about our Peeranormal show. I think we've got a three-part good series about quantum physics and meta-physics. Part one's out now, and over the next two months, the other two parts will come out. So if you haven't checked out our Peeranormal show...

**MH:** Yeah, people are already talking about that. We did two interviews for Fringepop this week, and without giving away too many details, both people we interviewed were heavily involved in the New Age and Satanism and stuff like that, and they were very familiar with the—to put it unkindly—gobbledygook that gets passed off as metaphysical commentary, or theology based on quantum physics. It's a really timely series.

**TS:** Also, Mike, I want to let people know that last week we opened up the voting for the next book of the Bible that we're going to cover on the podcast. The voting ends Thursday, July 12<sup>th</sup> at 12 p.m. Central time. So you've got at least another week or so to vote, so go do it.

**MH:** Yeah, make sure you vote.

**TS:** There you go. You can get it on FaceBook, you can get it on NakedBiblePodcast.com website, or drmsb.com website to vote. Alright, Mike, this episode, we actually have about six questions from two people, so we're going to tackle a bunch of questions here. I'm ready if you are.

**MH:** Yep. Let's jump into it.

**TS:** Our first one is from Margot:

3:30

**I have read arguments that Caleb, a prince of Judah, was most likely a Gentile convert, and I've also read arguments that Caleb was most likely *not* a Gentile convert. This seems to be a lively topic in Messianic circles, with Messianics favoring a Gentile origin for Caleb. Do you take a position on this question?**

5:00

**MH:** Yeah, we should tell everybody that Trey let me see the questions here, and it's fortunate that he did, because this question is extremely complicated. We're probably going to take half the episode to address this question, so it was good to get a heads-up. What I decided here was rather than trying to wing it, since it is so complicated, in the interest of time and clarity, I'm going to quote at length on and off from the *Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary* articles on Caleb (that one's by Mark Fretz and Raphael Pannetz), and the article on Kenaz (which is by a different author whose last name is Kuntz). We're going to have to hit both of those, and I'll make some summary comments along the way to try to tighten things up here. I don't really know why the Messianic movement cares about this. After I go through the material, I'm going to venture a guess here (at least part of the Messianic movement), but I really don't see any importance to it one way or the other. I think in the end you'll see that it's a bit of a moot point, because does it really make much of a difference if someone was born into Abraham's lineage, or married into it, or absorbed into the family of Abraham—the family of God—at some other point or in some other way? So I don't know why it's important, but we'll just jump in here.

The first thing we have to establish here is that there are actually three people in the Old Testament that are named Caleb. Fretz and Panitz write this to summarize the getting into the topic here, at least the beginning part here. They say:

Any discussion of the name Caleb and its variant form must of necessity also entail an investigation of the Calebites, or descendants of Caleb.

And that's going to become an issue, as we'll see. It's kind of important because (depending on which Caleb you're talking about) it's going to involve geography and towns and things within a certain geographical area that get absorbed into the tribe of Judah.

So sidebar here before we jump back in to the three candidates or the three Calebs here. The root (someone might be wondering if this has anything to do with the question... I actually don't know, but I'm just throwing this out here)... But the root of Caleb is KLB—*kaph, lamed, bet* in Hebrew—which means dog. That should not be presumed to be automatically a pejorative, or a negative thing. The root occurs in basically every Semitic language. And it can indicate either some

sort of self-abasement or debasement (that would be the negative connotation) or it can denote “faithful servant”—faithfulness, as in servitude. So you’ll actually see... If you ran a concordance search on Caleb (on the Hebrew term through the Hebrew Bible), you’d get examples in the Bible of both a negative and a positive connotation.

So with that sidebar over, let’s go to the three Calebs here, because there are three of these guys. And this is where it gets kind of convoluted. You have to land on one for the sake of the question. Quoting from *Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary* article on Caleb, Fretz and Panitz write:

The son of Jephunneh and the representative of the tribe of Judah among the twelve spies sent out by Moses to reconnoiter the land of Canaan (Num 13:6)... In contrast to God prohibiting the people from entering the land because they rejected this recommendation, God singled out “my servant Caleb” and promised to bring him into the land where he had gone, and to give it to his descendants as a possession (Num 14:24; see also Num 26:65; 32:12; Deut 1:36). This promise set Caleb apart from all his peers, even Joshua, and it raises the issues of geographical location and genealogical identification of Caleb and the Calebites...

The land that came to be owned by Caleb, through apportionment (Josh 14:6–15; 15:13), force (Josh 15:14–19 = Judg 1:11–15), or a combination of the two means was associated with Hebron and Debir in S Palestine. 1 Sam 30:14 identifies part of this area as “the Negeb of Caleb.” If we identify the cities and boundaries of the tribe of Judah it becomes obvious that the land owned by or associated with Caleb is located within Judah’s borders (Josh 15:1–12, etc.; see *KHC*, 115–24, 372–97). Hebron is a key element in this association, in part because of its proximity to other Judahite cities, but in light of the centrality of the Davidic dynasty in the biblical tradition, it was as the first capital city of David that Hebron played an unquestionable and important role. (Note that Nabal, the first husband of David’s wife Abigail, was a Calebite who lived in this region; 1 Sam 25:3.)

10:00 **That’s the guy we’re all thinking of, that the question is really targeting, but it’s actually at this point where things get complicated—with the other two Calebs. So going back to the article, we’ll read some more.**

In 1 Chronicles several genealogies contain the name Caleb, and these reflect inconsistencies of lineage and raise questions in light of other biblical information about individuals named Caleb. First, Caleb the son of Jephunneh is only explicitly mentioned in a genealogy of sons of Kenaz, or the Kenizzites (1 Chr 4:13–15), which is set within a section concerning descendants of Perez. The daughter of this Caleb is named elsewhere as Achsah (Josh 15:16–17 = Judg 1:12–13), while an Achsah is listed as the daughter of Caleb the son of Hezron, and a grandson of

Perez (1 Chr 2:49). Second, the MT never identifies the wife of Caleb the son of Jephunneh.

**So you've got this daughter of Caleb in those references, then you have a daughter of Caleb listed as the daughter of Caleb, the son of Hezron. So you've got the Jephunneh guy, and now you've got the Caleb, the son of Hezron here.**

Achsah is listed as the daughter of Caleb, the son of Hezron, and a grandson of Perez. Second, the Masoretic Text never identifies the wife of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh.

**So right away, you think, are they the same? Are they different? What's going on here? Back to the quote.**

However, Caleb the son of Hezron has several wives and concubines, and his descendants are not easily placed in his genealogy (1 Chr 2:18–24, 42–55). One identifiable descendant, Bezalel (1 Chr 2:20), a great-grandson of Caleb the son of Hezron, was a contemporary of Moses (Exod 31:2; 35:30) and therefore cannot be the great-grandson of Caleb the son of Jephunneh.

**So right away, we're getting confusion here, with these two Calebs and their relatives. They can't be the same.**

Third, a Caleb the son of Hur can be identified according to the MT of 1 Chr 2:50, but according to his genealogy (1 Chr 2:42–55), this Caleb appears to be his own grandfather. Fourth, the names of some of Caleb's descendants are place names (i.e., Tekoa, Ziph, Madmannah, and Hebron), which complicates an attempt to understand the purpose of the genealogies (see Noth 1932). Williamson (*1 and 2 Chronicles* NCBC, 48–55) resolves these problems by assuming that the Chronicler pulled together most of the genealogies but was not concerned with the details of genealogical consistency. Rudolf (*Chronikbücher* HAT, 10–25), on the other hand, attributes the inconsistencies to later additions which disrupted the consistency of the Chronicler's composition. It is generally agreed that one section (1 Chr 2:42–50) derives from a tradition which predates the Chronicler, probably from the united monarchy or shortly thereafter (Williamson *1 and 2 Chronicles* NCBC, 55).

**Now, the Anchor Bible article continues and says:**

The key to resolving the tensions in these genealogies is the fact that Caleb is part of Judah's genealogy. Caleb the son of Jephunneh is a Kenizzite who gained special status through his deeds in the wilderness wandering and conquest stories. On the other hand, Caleb the son of Hezron plays a role only in the genealogies of Judah, and Bezalel the tabernacle builder seems to be the central

character in his genealogy. The Chronicler does not attempt to relate Caleb the son of Jephunneh to Caleb the son of Hezron because neither of them is central to his purpose of establishing a royal and cultic origin in the tribe of Judah (Williamson *1 and 2 Chronicles* NCBC, 52). Caleb the Kenizzite is important, rather, because of things he did (Numbers 13–14; Josh 14:6–15) and associations he had (Josh 15:13–19 = Judg 1:11–15; Judg 3:9; see Boling *Judges* AB, 82) outside the Chronicler's framework, although these were not unknown to the Chronicler. Therefore, in addressing the questions raised above, Caleb the Kenizzite who appears in 1 Chr 4:15 within the lineage of Perez is to be identified with the individual so well known from the tradition of Calebites in S Palestine (Numbers 13–14; Joshua 14–15; Judges 1). To ask whether his daughter Achsah is the same as the daughter of Caleb the son of Hezron in 1 Chr 2:49 misses the point of the genealogy there.

### **So we have to distinguish these two.**

This introduces the final issue of the function of genealogies. According to Wilson...

### **Little rabbit trail here—Wilson is one of the recognized experts in biblical genealogies. He's got a bunch of articles and a book on it.**

According to Wilson (1977: 183), genealogies can be used to delineate social and political ties between two groups [catch that: not necessarily blood ties], and, in particular, to incorporate marginally affiliated clans into a central group.

### **Genealogies are not always about lineal biological descent. They can be about social and political relationships.**

The genealogy of Caleb is related in this way to the tribe of Judah (Yeivin 1971: 13–14) and was assimilated into the Israelite tribal system thereby (Johnson 1969: 6). Not only the individuals and groups of people but the places associated with them became part of the tribe [of Judah]. Thus, the genealogy provided a means for legitimizing social relations and for defining the geographical domain of the individuals or groups concerned.

### **And here's their conclusion:**

It would appear that Caleb the son of Jephunneh is the name of a Kenizzite whose personal exploits became the tradition of the clan which took his name as patronym [it's who the clan was named after]. This clan existed independently in S Palestine, but through political, economic, and religious ties it eventually became part of the tribe of Judah. Even within the larger Israelite tradition, the distinctive stories of the Calebites were retained into the postexilic period.

The thing to take away from this is that you can see why some would insist that Caleb is an Israelite because of this relationship to Judah, but what the article points out is that you can't rely on the genealogies to talk about biological relationships—blood relationships. Sometimes genealogies are about social and political circumstances. And the evidence points to Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (which is the Caleb that everybody's thinking about with the conquest story)—that that Caleb (he and his relatives, he and his tribe) were incorporated into Judah, not because of blood relationships (they're not Judahites). But the incorporation of Caleb and that tribe into Judah is based really on geography and political relationships and social relationships that really are tied to geography.

So from that last paragraph, it would appear that Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, is the name of the Kennizite who's from southern Palestine. That last paragraph means we now need to think about Kennizites. What's up with them? And for that, I'll go to a different article in the *Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*—the article on Kenaz. If you don't have the resource, I highly recommend it. It's very detailed. The Kennizites are ostensibly related to Kenaz, but there are three Kenazes in the Old Testament. So here's how the author of this article (his last name is Kuntz) summarizes the three Kenazes. He says:

1. The son of Eliphaz, the firstborn son of Esau and Adah (Gen 36:11; 1 Chr 1:36), who functioned as an Edomite clan chief (Gen 36:15, 42; 1 Chr 1:53). Though Kenaz of Gen 36:11 is ordinarily understood to be the eponymous ancestor of the Kenizzites [their remote progenitor] (Gen 15:19), this connection is not buttressed by hard evidence.

2. The younger brother of Caleb and father of Othniel (Josh 15:17; Judg 1:13; 3:9, 11). In 1 Chr 4:13 Kenaz is credited with a second son, Seraiah.

3. The grandson of Caleb through Elah (1 Chr 4:15). The plural gentilic adjective "Kenizzites" surfaces but once in the OT (Gen 15:19), within a promise that Yahweh makes to Abraham in a theophany. Listed in second position, just after the Kenites, this is one of ten peoples whose land Yahweh intends to deliver to Abraham's descendants. In the singular form, this gentilic adjective is thrice attested (Num 32:12; Josh 14:6, 14) in the phrase "Caleb the son of Jephunneh the Kenizzite." This predication probably should be associated with the Kenizzites of Gen 15:19.

The Kenizzites were a non-Israelite ethnic group that presumably penetrated the Negeb from the SE. What little is known about them emerges mainly from a consideration of their wider geopolitical context....

Though scholars lack the necessary data for reconstructing the early history of these tribes in any detail, it is nonetheless clear that, owing to the prominence of

20:00



David and the increasingly sturdy position of the tribe of Judah from whence he came, these S tribes were eventually subsumed under the category of “Greater Judah” (*HAIJ*, 103). From the narrative in Numbers 13–14, we may infer that the Calebites [these non-Hebrew people] settled into the city of Hebron and subjected its quite promising agricultural environs to their advantage. In Josh 15:13–19 (and Judg 1:11–15, its parallel), the spotlight falls on the Othnielites. We are told that Othniel, the son of Kenaz, the younger brother of Caleb, took possession of the city of Debir (Tell Beit Mirsim?) SW of Hebron. Though the text is too laconic to be of much help to biblical historians, it does attest that the Othnielites, residing in the hill country directly SW of Hebron, clustered around Debir. To the SE of Hebron, the Kenites held sway in the vicinity of Arad (Judg 1:16). The precise extent of the territories claimed by the Calebites, the Othnielites, and the Kenites is unknowable, and, as de Vaux (*EHI*, 538) observes, there was some territorial overlap.

Several biblical genealogies denote that the Kenizzites, Calebites, and Othnielites were closely related tribal groups, and that from their tent encampments along the foothills of S Palestine, all three maintained intimate associations with their eastern Edomite neighbors. Caleb and Othniel are both recognized for their genealogical linkage with Kenaz... In due course, the Kenizzites and other neighboring S tribal groups became thoroughly absorbed by Judah.

So you take all of that, and where you land is that the best position seems to be that Caleb is not an Israelite, but that he and his family (or his tribal group) were absorbed into Israel, becoming part of Judah. As I said at the beginning, I really don't have any idea why this is an interest to Messianic Christians. It's no shock that outsiders became part of Israel in the Old Testament period. Rahab did. Job was from Uz, which is Edomite territory. Othniel is one of the judges. He would have also been an outsider. God uses outsiders and makes them part of his people. If anything, Caleb and these other examples showed non-Israelites becoming part of Israel. That's not news.

I hope that this isn't some sort of quirky argument used by Hebrew Roots folks (again, that's a subset of the Messianic category). So I hope it's not some argument used by the Hebrew Roots people to say that Gentiles need to become Jews. And the New Testament says the exact opposite. Gentiles are the seed of Abraham (that's a quote from Galatians 3) and heirs according to the promise (also point-blank from Galatians 3), not because of circumcision and not because of other laws, but because of *Christ*. Abraham is the example of faith *apart from the Law*, prior to his circumcision, and prior to the giving of the Law at Sinai, so I don't know how much clearer the Bible could be on this sort of stuff, but if you want to make the Bible say what your group prefers, I suppose you're going to find a way.

25:00



Unfortunately, this has become sort of routine for this little community in Middle Earth—to prefer your pet position on something ahead of the gospel of the Kingdom. But again, I’m just guessing on what might be the motive here, and that Hebrew Roots is lurking behind this question—not on the part of the questioner, but this real interest in this... I don’t know if I can call it a fight, since I don’t lurk on Facebook or anywhere else to find out what Hebrew Roots groups are saying. So I’m just guessing here, but if it is some sort of argument that Gentiles have to become Jews, it’s a bad one. It’s one that just point-blank ignores the language of the New Testament, and it ignores the fact that Abraham is the litmus test—he is the point of reference for Paul as the example of faith. It has nothing to do with his circumcision; it has nothing to do with the Law. The Law didn’t even exist, and Abraham was justified before he was circumcised. God knew his heart, and he *believed* before he was circumcised. I don’t know how much clearer this could be, but there are some that just kind of don’t really care. So maybe Hebrew Roots is behind this, looking for another non sequitur argument. I don’t know; it’s just a guess.

**TS:** Alright, Sean has our next few questions, and he wants to know:

26:35

**In certain Bible passages, the Angel of the Lord sometimes doesn’t seem to mean what we say it means in terms of second Yahweh figure. Is the term sometimes used more generally? Also, does Matthew 28:2 run counter to Jesus being the angel entirely?**

**MH:** Yeah, in the Old Testament... Let me just preface it by saying this: you can’t assume in the New Testament, particularly, that when it says “the angel of the Lord” in an English translation that we’re talking about the Old Testament figure. It gets a little bit confusing because of translation. I’ll try to explain that.

In the Old Testament, the phrase *malach Yahweh* is definite. When you see that combination (it’s called a construct phrase in Hebrew)—*malach Adonai* or *malach Yahweh*—it is *The Angel of the Lord* by rule of Hebrew grammar. When you have a noun (*malach*, messenger, angel) linked to a following noun that is definite (and Yahweh is definite—there’s only one of those)... Proper personal names are definite by definition in Hebrew grammar. When you have one noun joined to a definite noun, it makes the whole chain definite, so it’s *The Angel of Yahweh*. So that’s Hebrew grammar. There’s no way in Hebrew to just say an angel of the Lord—just an angel of the Lord—in terms of the construct phrase. You have to have literally something like *malach l’Adonai*. That’s *malach*, the preposition *lamed*, plus the divine name, which never occurs in the Hebrew Bible. In fact, you only get *l’Adonai* and *malach* in the same verse four times, but they’re never in a possessive construction. So you really don’t have, in the Hebrew Bible, a way to say “an angel of the Lord.” When you have this construct phrase, it’s always definite: the Angel of the Lord.

That is not the case in Greek, and it's not the case in the New Testament. In the New Testament, you can express "an angel of the Lord," just an indefinite one, because Greek allows you to do that. It doesn't have the same rules—syntactical, grammatical rules—as Hebrew. And Matthew 28:2 is actually an example. There's no definite article (the word "the" before "angel"—*angelos*) in that verse, and the genitive relationship in Greek does not require definiteness. So a good translation is, "an angel of the Lord." There's no necessary link back to that figure in the Old Testament. It's just generic. It's indefinite.

Now I'm going to read a little section from a footnote from my forthcoming Angels book where I talk about this. Nice little commercial here for the Angels book. This is just part of a footnote.

30:00

The phrase "angel of the Lord" occurs eleven times in the New Testament. Only once does it occur with the definite article, suggesting a translation "the angel of the Lord" (Matthew 1:24). It is the angel of the Lord (*ho angelos kyriou*) with a definite article before *angelos*. It is the angel of the Lord who tells Mary to marry his betrothed, Mary, because her conception [which would be Jesus] is from the Holy Spirit. There's no conflict between this occurrence and the idea that Jesus and the angel of the Lord from the Old Testament are the same Second Person of the Trinity. The definite article in Matthew 1:24 is there. It's used to refer back to the angel who appeared to Joseph [a specific angel] in a dream four verses earlier in Matthew 1:20, where the phrase lacks the article.

So in Matthew 1:20, you have angel of the Lord without the article, and then four verses later, as the story continues, the writer (Matthew) puts the definite article in front of *angelos kyriou* to make sure that you know that this angel I'm talking about now is the one that I talked about four verses earlier. That is a function of the definite article in Greek.

[Quotation within MH's footnote] "The article preceding *angelos* is, in grammatical parlance, grammarians call 'anaphoric,' that is, it denotes previous reference, reminding the reader of who or what was mentioned previously, which is the most common use of the article and the easiest to identify."

That's a quote from Dan Wallace's book *Greek Grammar, Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*.

So the presence of the article in Matthew 1:24 is, therefore, not to be taken as language that imitates the Old Testament wording.

That's the end of my footnote. So no, there's not a conflict here, but it's easy to get a little bit confused because of the way English handles the phrases.

31:50

**TS: You've mentioned before that the Trinity view of Genesis 3 was wrong because (among other reasons) why would God tell Jesus and the Holy Spirit something he already knew? But doesn't Jesus say that there are things only the Father knows?**

**MH:** Right, well, first of all, my comments didn't pertain to Genesis 3, so I think that's got to be a typo. My comment was in reference to the plural exhortation in Genesis 1:26, "Let us create humankind in our image," saying that's not a conversation among the Trinity, in part because God doesn't need to announce something to the other members of the Trinity. They're co-eternal and co-omniscient, and they already know. Now, the answer to the question, "Doesn't Jesus say that there are things only the Father knows?" is: yeah. Jesus doesn't know something that the Father does, like when the Lord is going to come back. But that was spoken when Jesus was incarnate. In the incarnation, the Son surrendered the independent use of his attributes. It doesn't mean he surrendered the attributes, by the way—just the use of them. He surrenders the exercise of them, and that was voluntary. It's limited by the incarnation and/or the Father's will. Just think about it. Jesus could also get hungry, he could get tired, he could die, he could get sick, he had to learn things. Jesus grew in wisdom and stature, in favor with God and men (Luke 2:52). That doesn't mean Jesus, having these limitations, isn't God, but there's something different going on. He is limited by being incarnate—by having a body, by being a man. The other two members of the Trinity aren't men. They are not embodied; they're not humans. The Second Person becomes human, and that changes the circumstances. It doesn't change his divine ontology, but it changes his whole relationship to his attributes in terms of functioning as God in an unfiltered circumstance. And so my comment about Genesis 1:26 is a different context. It's pre-incarnation. The Son (the Second Person in the Trinity) was not limited, so it's perfectly fine to say, "Back in Genesis 1:26, all of the members in the Trinity would have known the same thing—they're co-eternal, co-omniscient. There's no limitation on any of them." It's a different circumstance when Jesus (because of the incarnation) is incarnate. So that's when you get this language of limitation, where Jesus doesn't know something that the Father knows. So the circumstances are different.

**TS:** Sean's next question is:

34:35

**If Jesus conquered death and his kingdom is at hand (Mark 9, for instance) then why are principalities still called "the rulers of this age" (I Corinthians 2)? He does say they are doomed to pass away, so is this more of the "already but not yet" phrasing?**

35:00

**MH:** Yeah, let me take the first part of that: why are they called rulers of this age? Really, it's because that language is based on or derived from the Deuteronomy 32 worldview. They're described as... It's true that the rulers (you have other

terms here, as well) in the New Testament are described as defeated, but such titles—these sorts of labels—are the way to identify who he's talking about in the context of the Old Testament, specifically the Deuteronomy 32 worldview.

Moving into the rest of the question here, the fact that they are defeated and are progressively losing people and losing control is part of the already-but-not-yet matrix of ideas, so I think that Sean is tracking well on this. As the great commission is carried out, they're going to be displaced. They have lost legitimacy of rule. Remember that these rulers (to use New Testament language) had their position by virtue of Yahweh himself giving it to them at Babel—the disinheritance of the nations and assigning the nations to the sons of God. But the work of the cross (the plan, God's plan, the plan of the Most High) withdrew that authority or nullified that authority—terminated that authority. Their rule is now illegitimate. It's over, because when the whole incarnation—the cross event... The Son of the Most High comes, and part of his mission—the effect of his mission—is to reclaim the nations. And so their legitimacy is over and done with. Gentiles are authorized to (put it this way) return to the family of God. God wants them to return. They are included now in the covenant with Abraham (back to Galatians 3). If you are Christ's, you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. He's speaking to the Galatians. He's speaking to a predominately Gentile audience there. They're included in the covenant with Abraham, but all of that doesn't mean that the supernatural powers hostile to God are not going to fight back or oppose God's will. I mean, goodness, they've been opposing God's will all along! So why would the cross event be any different? The whole point of the language is that their authority over the Gentiles—over the nations—is illegitimate now. It has been removed by the Most High, who gave it to them. He has withdrawn it and terminated it. But that doesn't mean they're just going to roll over and say, "Oh, I guess we'd better be good now. I guess we'd better not be hostile to God. I guess we'd better not oppose God." That's what they've been doing the whole time. So you would expect them to resist, and that's what they do, and that's why Paul says our battle is not against flesh and blood but against spiritual wickedness in high places and all that language.

37:50

**TS: Is it merely coincidental that I Corinthians 6 begins with Paul mentioning judging angels, and later in the verse, discusses sexual immorality, which was the sin of the very angels we will judge?**

**MH:** You know, I actually tend to think that it is coincidental here, and I'll try to explain why. The reason is because in the context, it's not the only statement. You don't have the judging angels, and then only talk of the sexual immorality. You actually don't even have the sexual immorality emphasized in the context. The problem when Paul brings up his comment that you're going to judge angels is taking each other to court—the lawsuit problem—and then he moves on to sexual immorality and some other things. You've got theft, drunkenness, reviling, and swindling in I Corinthians 6:10, so there's a lot going on there. It's not just the judging and then the sexual immorality stuff. Now if you had *only* the statement of

I Corinthians 6:3 (“you will judge angels”) coupled with the sexual stuff, *then*—if that was the pairing, if that was the two sides of the coin, so to speak—then I think a connection back to the transgression of the Watchers might be in view, but since we don’t have that exclusivity, I tend to think it is coincidental.

**TS:** Sean’s last question is, maybe, counter to the last question:

39:30 **In Genesis 6, God doesn’t seem to wipe out the Nephilim for merely being born, but for the corrupting of humanity subsequently. Would God have been angry had they not corrupted man? Is there a distinction to be made here, or am I inferring something that isn’t there? Does Jude 1:6-7 indicate that the two are not distinguishable?**

40:00 **MH:** Yeah, we have a problem here with conflating two related but different things. Jude 1:6-7 talks about “angels who left their first estate.” I think that’s King James language. “The angels that sinned” is the parallel (2 Peter 2). ESV has “angels who did not stay within their position of authority but left their proper dwelling.” They’re the ones who end up in chains (2 Peter 2). The angels that sinned end up in chains in the abyss. So you have angels who sinned. The Nephilim are not angels. You’ve got two different things here. It’s the Watchers (that’s the Second Temple Jewish term, the Enochian term) for the angels that sinned—for the sons of God of Genesis 6. The Nephilim aren’t those guys. The Nephilim are the byproduct. So the Nephilim are only in view in the biblical story in terms of their being a lethal threat later on—their descendants being a lethal threat to the people of Israel during the conquest. And then they’re also important because of the origin of demons. When you killed a Nephilim, then the disembodied spirit becomes what’s known as a demon. And you get hints of that in Ezekiel 32 and Isaiah 14 when you have the Rephaim—the disembodied Rephaim—in Sheol (in the underworld, in the realm of the dead). So there are little vestiges of them in the Old Testament, and it gets more developed in the Second Temple period—the whole idea of where demons come from. They’re the disembodied spirits of the giant clans, specifically the Nephilim. But the sons of God are the ones that are the progenitors of the other ones. So we need to keep separate the angels that sinned, or the sons of God who transgress, or the Watchers (those are all three terms that refer to these heavenly beings in Genesis 6)... The Nephilim are not those guys. So I really don’t know what else to add. I think that answers the question, because the elements of the question sort of presume that the Nephilim are the angels, which is not the case.

**TS:** Alright, Mike, that’s all the questions we have for this episode. Again, I want to remind everybody to go vote on the next book of the Bible that we’re going to cover here on the podcast. Voting ends Thursday, July 12, at 12 p.m. Central time, so get your vote in. Alright, Mike, well, we want to thank you for answering our questions, and I want to thank everybody else for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God Bless.

