

In our last session, we focused on the seventh generation of Cain's lineage, studying the lives and contributions of Lamech's children. We examined the first recorded instance of polygamy and its implications, the professions of the seventh generation, and the significance of their names that phonetically echo Abel's. We recognized the value and societal contributions of these individuals, challenging the notion of inherent wickedness in Cain's lineage. As we transition into the current session, we plan to investigate a possible connection between Cain and Canaan, suggesting a post-flood existence of Cain's line.

Seemingly, the lineage of Cain concludes with Genesis 4. Genesis 5 delves into the lineage of Seth, ending with Noah, and Genesis 6 commences the account of the flood. The simplest assumption might be that the line of Cain was eradicated in the flood. However, is this the only and therefore inevitable conclusion? In this session, we will explore alternative theories and interpretations, to reconsider this often-accepted belief.

## THE JEWISH THEORY

A common Jewish theory proposes that Naamah, the daughter of Lamech and Zillah from Cain's lineage, was Noah's wife. If this theory holds, it will mean that all three sons of Noah, from whom humanity was repopulated after the flood, were partly of the line of Cain. Consequently, this theory suggests that Cain's lineage continued post-flood, convoluted with Seth's lineage.

One must acknowledge that we do not know the identity of Noah's wife with certainty. Even if we dismiss Naamah as a potential candidate, can we be certain that neither Noah nor any of his sons married women from Cain's lineage? Furthermore, is there any evidence to suggest that intermarriage between the lineages of Cain and Seth had not occurred in previous generations? These questions challenge the assumption that Cain's lineage was completely wiped out during the flood.

The Jewish theory then takes this a step further by suggesting that each of us carries a bit of Cain and a bit of Seth within us. It posits that these ancestral traits manifest themselves in our thought processes and behaviors. Although this idea of genetic linkage to our emotions and behaviors may seem somewhat speculative and akin to "psychobabble" for some, it presents an intriguing perspective that connects us to our ancestors in a way that is hard to dismiss.

In Eastern philosophy, particularly the Chinese concept of Yin and Yang, we see a similar parallel. Yin and Yang represent two opposing yet interconnected forces that make up everything in the universe. They exist within every individual, much like the proposed concept of carrying both Cain and Seth's traits. Yin, often associated with femininity, darkness, and passivity, could be likened to the line of Cain, often viewed negatively due to Cain's actions. Yang, associated with masculinity, light, and activity, could parallel Seth's lineage, generally perceived more positively. The key idea here is that everyone has a balance of Yin (Cain) and Yang (Seth), and these forces influence our behaviors and thoughts.

There may not be a connection between the proposed Cain/Seth balance and the Yin/Yang balance. Nonetheless, it's intriguing that many theories propose Noah as the post-flood ancestor of the Chinese people. Although Genesis 10 contains the "table of nations", it doesn't include the descendants, if any, of Noah and his wife, or of the Indo-China lineage, which leaves a mystery. With its ancient origins, China's civilization adds another layer of interest to this comparison. Although this is mostly speculation, it offers an intriguing perspective on our collective ancestry and its potential links to various cultural philosophies and worldviews.

From my personal perspective, I believe that the Jewish theory significantly challenges the commonly held belief that the lineage of Cain ceased to exist beyond the flood. It presents a compelling argument that calls into question the

assumption that Cain's descendants were entirely eradicated, offering alternative interpretations that are worth considering in our understanding of biblical genealogy.

## A BRIEF RECAP

Genesis 6:1-4 appears to be one of the most fundamental worldview passages in the entire Bible. The way in which one interprets these verses reveals both their perspective on Scripture and their understanding of the world in which we live. This passage, which touches on the interaction between the 'sons of God' and 'daughters of men', has been the subject of various interpretations throughout history. Some believe it refers to fallen angels mating with human women, while others interpret it as the intermarriage between the godly line of Seth and the ungodly line of Cain. These interpretations not only reflect one's understanding of the Bible's teachings but also their worldview, including beliefs about the supernatural, morality, and the nature of humanity.

Let's take a moment to recall the events in Genesis 6:1-4. In these verses, we observe the 'sons of God' selecting and taking wives from the 'daughters of men'. This action incites the Lord's wrath, leading to a declaration in verse 3. God, identifying mankind as 'flesh', imposes a limitation - a limit of 120 years. Rather than interpreting this as a cap on human longevity, I see it as a restriction on the duration of the described activity. This 120-year span is approximately the time it would take for God to call upon Noah, provide instructions, build the ark, and initiate the flood.

Genesis 6:4 introduces us to the Nephilim, stating "There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown." The term 'Nephilim', which is often translated as 'giants' in the King James Version, is derived from the Hebrew root 'npl', meaning 'to fall'. This, along with comparison of Scriptures concerning the sons of God, has led to interpretations that the Nephilim were the offspring of the 'sons of God' and 'daughters of men'.

In this light, verses 1-4 present an unnatural union between the 'sons of God' and human women. The result of this union were the hybrid offspring we call the Nephilim, a race of beings noted for their size and strength. While this view might seem extraordinary, it is supported by the Hebrew texts, as well as certain ancient Jewish texts, and has been considered a valid interpretation throughout much of church history.

This theory not only provides an explanation for the existence of the Nephilim, but also for the harsh judgement that followed. The unnatural union and the resulting offspring would have been seen as a severe violation of the natural order, prompting the divine judgement of the flood.

However, what piques our interest, particularly for the purpose of this book, is that there were giants not only "in those days" but "also after that." Post-flood, the existence of the Nephilim is undeniable, with several examples such as the Anakim, the Rephaim, and the famous Goliath. This raises the question - where did they come from after the flood had supposedly wiped out all life except for those aboard Noah's Ark? Could it be possible that they descended from the line of Cain, thereby suggesting the survival of Cain's lineage past the flood?

## NAAMAH AS HAM'S WIFE

After the flood, Genesis 9:18 provides an interesting piece of information: "And the sons of Noah, that went forth of the ark, were Shem, and Ham, and Japheth: and Ham is the father of Canaan." The mention of Canaan here is peculiar. No other grandchildren are mentioned until the genealogy of chapter 10. Moreover, as soon as Canaan is introduced, we are presented with the account of Ham's transgression. In this account, Ham is introduced as "Ham, the father of Canaan." Why is Canaan highlighted in the context of his father's sin? Lastly, Noah's response to this situation was, "Cursed be Canaan" (v. 25). It raises the question of why Noah chose to curse Canaan, and not Ham, who was directly involved in the sin.

As we have stated previously (in session 5), there is clear evidence of Nephilim existing after the flood. Before the flood, they came into being through the union of the 'sons of God' and the 'daughters of men'. However, the genesis of their presence post-flood is not explicitly addressed in the text, leading us to speculate on the possible scenarios. It's important to clarify here that speculation, when done responsibly, isn't a threat to our understanding of the biblical narrative. In fact, if we were to forbid speculation wherever the text is not explicit, we would risk eradicating a vast majority of our Christian doctrine. Instead, what we must do is engage in thoughtful speculation, question the assumptions underlying our speculation, and then put forth plausible scenarios that align with the biblical narrative and its wider context.

In the post-flood era, all instances of the Nephilim can be traced back to the lineage of Canaan. The Table of Nations in Genesis 10 provides a genealogical account of the post-flood population, listing Canaan's descendants, among whom we find tribes known for their giant stature - a characteristic trait of the Nephilim.

For instance, the Anakim, notoriously known as a race of giants in the Bible, are traced back to Canaan. In Numbers 13:33 (KJV), we find the report of the spies sent by Moses to explore the land of Canaan: "And there we saw the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants: and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight."

Another example is the Rephaim, a tribe noted for its size and strength. Deuteronomy 3:11 (KJV) mentions King Og of Bashan, who was of the remnant of the Rephaim, and describes his iron bed as being nine cubits in length and four cubits in width, indicating his giant stature.

Making a clear connection between Canaan and the Nephilim is, as we have shown, quite straightforward given the genealogical accounts and descriptions provided in the Bible. Nonetheless, attempting to establish a definitive connection between Canaan and Cain is considerably more challenging. The Bible does not provide a direct lineage or clear textual evidence to link these two individuals. Therefore, any claim of a Cain-Canaan connection would require a degree of speculation and interpretation, which should be approached with cautious and critical consideration.

Building on the speculation from session 5, it is possible that Naamah, who was of Cain's lineage, could have been Ham's wife. There are two theories that could support this. The first, and most robust, is that Naamah might have been pregnant with Canaan, fathered by one of the "sons of God," before boarding the ark. The second theory is that Naamah herself carried Nephilim DNA, passed down through Cain's lineage. Either scenario could offer an explanation for the survival of the Nephilim lineage post-flood, as well as the emergence of giants traced back to Canaan.

## WHAT'S IN A NAME?

The names Cain and Canaan may seem similar, but they have different linguistic origins in Hebrew. The name Cain is generally considered to derive from the Hebrew verb "qanah" (קָנָה), meaning to acquire, create, or possess. This connection is explicitly made in Genesis 4:1 where Eve says, "I have gotten (acquired) a man from the LORD," using the verb from the same root as Cain's name, "qaniti" (קָנִיתִי). The name Canaan, on the other hand, is likely derived from the Semitic root word "k-n-", signifying to be low, humble, or subdued. So, while they may appear phonetically similar, there's no clear linguistic or etymological connection between the two names.

Interestingly, the name "Canaan" translates to low, humbled, or subdued, while Abel signifies vanity, breath, or fleeting. Could it be that Ham, akin to Lamech's attempt to elevate the name Abel, sought to develop a "lowly" version of the name "Cain" given the controversial circumstances of Canaan's birth? This theory is based on phonetic reasoning, and thus it may not be the most robust argument. However, it does provoke thought as to why the name Abel was phonetically raised up and the name Cain brought down, if nothing else.

If this theory holds true, then we might be looking at a situation where both the daughters of Seth and Cain participated in the illicit activities with the fallen 'sons of God'. This continued to the point where Noah and his family

were the only ones who did not have Nephilim or tainted DNA. God chose this family to board the ark and redeem humanity. However, Naamah, a daughter-in-law, had relations with one of the Nephilim before boarding the ark. On the ark, she gave birth to a child. Ham, in a linguistic attempt to curse Cain's name, named the child Canaan. When the unseemly act of Genesis 9 occurred, Noah, aware of the circumstances, chose to curse Canaan rather than Ham.

Yes, this scenario is indeed pure speculation. However, it is speculation that endeavours to weave together the explicit revelations of Scripture, filling in the gaps in our understanding. While we could choose to leave these gaps unfilled, we are also free to probe, ask questions, and ponder possibilities. I firmly believe that the explicit revelation is of the utmost importance and serves as the foundation of our truth. Yet, God has endowed us with sharp minds and a curious spirit, encouraging us to ask "what if" and explore potential narratives within our lives. Life, indeed, is not so short that we should avoid such intellectual curiosity and exploration.

## DID GOD FAIL?

If God's intention during the flood was to eradicate the Nephilim, does the speculative scenario we've painted imply a failure on God's part? In its simplest interpretation, the answer is yes; God failed in that particular regard. However, if the premise is that God's intention was to eradicate the Nephilim, then the failure is independent of the specific scenario, for the Nephilim clearly existed after the flood.

Our choice is two-fold, it seems. Firstly, we could change the premise, that is, God's desire to eradicate the Nephilim. However, this approach seems challenging when the Genesis text is taken literally. Secondly, we could recognize that God's desires are not always fulfilled, since He does allow a freedom of will. This holds true even in cases where He is acting in the physical sphere with supernatural power, such as the flood. This perspective accepts that the divine plan can incorporate human freedom and agency, and that outcomes may not always align perfectly with God's initial intentions.

An example from scripture where the God's plan incorporates human freedom and agency, and outcomes do not always align perfectly with God's initial intentions, can be seen in the story of Jonah. God commanded Jonah to go to the city of Nineveh and preach against it because of its wickedness. However, Jonah chose to disobey God's command and fled in the opposite direction. This resulted in Jonah being swallowed by a big fish, only to be spat out three days later after Jonah prayed for forgiveness. God's master plan for Jonah was circumvented by Jonah's free will, and Jonah simply paid the consequences.

## CONCLUSION

In the next session, we will continue our journey by tracing the lineage of Canaan. We'll investigate where this path leads us, digging deeper into the genealogical and historical implications of this intriguing biblical narrative.