
The Return of the Nephilim and The Alien Abduction Connection

2nd Edition



Diligently researched and compiled by [Mark M. Bravura](#)

FAIR USE NOTICE: This document is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes.

This constitutes a fair use of any such copyrighted material as provided for in 17 U.S.C § 107.

Table of Contents

Part I: Nephilim Background

'And Also After That': The Return of the Nephilim?

Return of the Aliens? As The Days of Noah Were

From *Genesis*

From *The Genesis Record*

From *Textual Controversy: Mischievous Angels or Sethites?*

From *SIGNS OF COLLAPSE*

Comments from Bryce Self

The Sons of God

There Be Giants In the Earth

The Sons of God and the Daughters of Men

Easton's Bible Dictionary Excerpts

Selected Relevant Scriptures

Part II: Alien Abduction Notes

Part III: The Vatican and Extraterrestrials

In Closing

Part I: Nephilim Background

Summary

The term Nephilim, transliterated from the Greek is 'earth-born'; translated from the Hebrew, means the 'fallen ones' - 'Earth-born Fallen Ones'.

This half-breed created from the unholy union between (fallen) Angels and human women produced a unique breed of male-only 'living dead' giants.

The term 'sons of God' is a Hebrew term that, in the Old Testament, always indicated Angels. This is definitely the case in the Septuagint Bible (the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures, translated between 300-200 BC); the translation that Christ, Himself quoted from.

Nephilim, Sons of God, and the Heroes of Old

"The Nephilim were on the earth in those days – and also afterward – when the sons of God went to the daughters of men and had children by them. They were the heroes of old, men of renown." – Genesis 6:4 (NIV)

Nephilim- (Hebrew: "nepilim") "The term itself almost certainly means 'fallen ones,' whether morally fallen in the general sense or fallen from (i.e., cast out of) heaven in a more specific sense.

It has been plausibly proposed that the Nephilim were princes born into the royal houses of the 'sons of God' (Gen. 6:4) and that they were 'the mighty tyrants who . . .esteemed their might to be their right.'

A curious book published in 1946, *The Racial Streams of Mankind*, illustrates the persistence of the polygenist view on a popular level.

The author, Clem Davies, who traces the descent of human ethnic groups according to a biblically literal outline of history, regards the mating between human women and fallen angels in Genesis 6:4 as factual history and describes the consequences

in ominous terms:

"The Evil One thus succeeded in introducing another race, the progeny of the sons of God who had married the daughters of Adam. The *nephilim* tincture of evil was thus maintained throughout the strain of Cain, the cause of all the world's evil" (xiii).

Certain Jewish exegetes have ingeniously assumed that the later Nephilim strain of Num 13:33 was preserved through the Flood in the persons of Noah's daughters-in-law.

Though not recognized as part of the fundamental Holy Scriptures, the literature of the intertestamental period, however, takes a different tack.

According to Sir 16:7 the 'ancient giants' were rebellious and deserved divine punishment. Wisd. 14:6 and Bar.3:26-28 are even more specific: The giants were destroyed by the Flood.

If so, the later Nephilim were namesakes, not descendants, of their earlier counterparts." (New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, 1997)

Sons of God- In Job 1:6 and 2:1 the same Hebrew phrase "sons of God" is translated "angels." Heroes- (Hebrew: "gibbor" or "gibborim") and is translated as "mighty men" in 2 Sam. 23:8.

The LXX (Septuagint, a Greek translation of the Hebrew scriptures around 250 BC) translates "gibbor" with the Greek word "gigas" or "gigantes" ("giant") in:
Gen.10:8-9, 1 Chr. 1:10, Ps. 19:5,6, Ps. 33:16, Isa. 3:2, Isa. 13:3, Isa. 49:24-25, Ezek. 32:12; 32:21, 27; 39:18, 20

Nephilim is used in the Hebrew in Numbers 13:32,33: "All the people we saw there are of great size. We saw the Nephilim there (the descendants of Anak come from the Nephilim)."

This was a true report (but, faithless) since Deuteronomy 2:10-12 records: "The Emmites used to live there (Moab) - a people strong and numerous, and as tall as the Anakites.

Like the Anakites, they too were considered Rephaites, but the Moabites called them Emmites. Horites used to live in Seir,

but he descendants of Esau drove them out."

Rephaites was the general name for people like the Anakites, Emites, Horites. In Deut. 2:20 they are called Zamzummites by the Ammonites:

"That too (region of Moab at Ar) was considered a land of the Rephaites, who used to live there; but the Ammonites called them Zamzummites. They were a people as numerous, and as tall as the Anakites."

The Greeks who settle in Philistia (coming from Caphtorites) and became known as the Philistines destroyed a group known as the Avvites in Deuteronomy 2:23.

Emites, Anakites, Horites, Zamzummites, Avvites where all considered to be descendents of Rephaites which is another name for Nephilim since it says "the descendants of Anak come from the Nephilim."

Goliath, who was more than 9 feet tall, was a Rephaite. 1 Sam 17:4, Sam. 21:19; 1 Chron. 20:5. Rapha was one of the ancestors of this distinct group known as the Rephaites: 2 Sm. 21:16, 18, 20, 22; 1 Chron. 20:4, 6, 8.

King Og reigned over the territory of Ashtaroth and Edrei in Bashan. He had a bed that was more than thirteen feet long and six feet wide. (Deut. 3:1-11) "Only Og king of Bashan was left of the remnant of the Rephaites. His bed was more than thirteen feet long and six feet wide."

David's men dealt with four other descendants of Rapha: Ishbi-Benob who had a bronze spearhead that weighed 7 1/2 pounds (2 Sam. 21:16)

A huge Rephaite with 12 fingers and 12 toes (2 Sam. 21:20) Lahmi, Goliath's brother, who had a spear like a shaft of a weaver's rod (1 Chron. 20:5). An Egyptian who was 7 1/2 feet tall (1 Chron. 11:22-23)

There have been skeletons excavated in Palestine that are 3.2 meters or 10 1/2 feet! (New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, 1997, p.678)

Here is a quote from the Jewish historian Josephus who wrote around 70-90 AD:

"For which reason they removed their camp to Hebron; and when they had taken it, they slew all the inhabitants. There were till then left the race of giants, who had bodies so large, and countenances so entirely different from other men, that they were surprising to the sight, and terrible to the hearing.

The bones of these men are still shewn to this very day, unlike to any credible relations of other men." (Antiquities ch.2 vs 3)

Justin Martyr says: "The angels transgressed this appointment and were captivated by love of women. And they begat children, who are those who are called demons."

Irenaeus wrote: "In the days of Noah, He justly brought on the Deluge for the purpose of extinguishing that most infamous race of men then existent, who could not bring forth fruit to God. For the angels who sinned had commingled with them."

Tertullian: "They are the same angels who rushed from heaven on the daughters of men."

Commodianus: "From their seed, giants are said to have been born. By them, arts were made known in the earth."

Early Distant Warning:

"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.

And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.

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.

And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth,

and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the LORD that He had made man on the earth, and it grieved Him at His heart.

And the LORD said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them."

— Genesis 6:1-7

"For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment; 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 Gomorrha, 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.

Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities."

— 2 Peter 2:4; Jude: 6-8

"And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken."

— Luke 21:25,26

"And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay.

And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken.

And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay.

And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever."

- Daniel 2:41-44

"But as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

- Jesus the Christ of Nazareth

Must Hear MP3's:

Return of the Nephilim #1

<http://server.firefighters.org/catalog/1998/00005.mp3>

Return of the Nephilim #2

<http://server.firefighters.org/catalog/1998/00006.mp3>

Doubts about the Nephilim in Genesis 6

[first posted 4/15/06]

Question:

In reading your work on Satan's Rebellion I got stuck on the part where you talk about Satan's platform - and that angels have no physical bodies of their own. Then you talk about the angelic infiltration of Genesis.

How is it that angels - which are invisible to us & lack physical bodies - could 'marry' human women?

Isn't it more plausible to assume that Genesis is talking about the line of Abel (sons of God) became so distant from God and his will, that they began to marry from the line of Cain

(daughters of man).

Just like in Ezekiel, I think it's talking about a covenant (broken) with God that those who are God's people need to steer clear of the outsiders - those who reject God and his word.

You stated that Jude 6 & 2 Peter 2:4 "make clear" the angelic infiltration. "...but abandoned their own homes..." and "they sinned" are not exactly "clear" cases of angelic infiltration. I really enjoyed reading your work. Thank you.

Response:

Thanks for your e-mail. I certainly appreciate your concern. Before you make up your mind on this, I would ask you to have a look at the portion of Part 5 of the Satanic Rebellion series where this issue is treated in full (see the link: [section III.1, Satan's antediluvian attack on the purity of the human line \[the Nephilim\]](#)).

This contains over ten single-spaced pages of material, exegeting the Genesis six passage in full, and considering the passages listed in SR#1 plus all other pertinent references.

I agree that many may not see the brief references in part 1 as being as unquestionably "clear" as I do without this further, detailed explanation.

That said, it is also true that the angelic infiltration of Genesis six is often a "bone of contention".

It is so far outside of our modern, scientific understanding of the way the universe ought to work that even evangelicals have found it expedient to down-play or even discount this teaching.

Much in the same way that it is often felt that the route of the Exodus "must have gone through the swampy lakes of Suez" rather than through the Red Sea, or that the sun really didn't "stand still" at Gibeon (maybe it's just a metaphor), or that the great flood was probably "only local, not universal" ... or skepticism that there is really such a thing as demon possession or causation of disease.

None of these things is plausible, the way the world looks at

things, but I assure you that all of them are real.

If the more detailed explanation doesn't convince you, we can certainly agree to disagree on this point (I certainly would not choose to break fellowship over it), but I do personally believe, when all is said and done, that it is pretty clear that this is what the scripture is teaching (even if it is a teaching that is hard for many to comprehend and accept).

For one thing, the alternatives often suggested (and you're in the mainstream of alternatives here) require explanations which clearly force the language of scripture much more than a simple, straight-forward interpretation (i.e., "sons of God" elsewhere = angels [see prior link]; whereas understanding this as normal human behavior doesn't account for the exceptional nature of the offspring).

And, if that is so, it is always better to let scripture take you where it will by the Spirit, whatever qualms you may have, rather than to try and fit scripture into what may be more comfortable and/or less embarrassing (whatever the teaching may be).

Case in point here is antichrist, who will also have an angelic father (namely, the devil). If one has built one's theology on an interpretation of Genesis six which omits the supernatural aspect, it will be much harder to believe and comprehend that antichrist is half-angelic.

That will be a big problem during the Great Apostasy to come (see the link from [Coming Tribulation part 3A, section II: The Great Apostasy](#)), since the incredible charm, capability, and deeds of antichrist will seem (and actually be) "super-human", leading many to conclude as he will proclaim that he is the Messiah (cf. 2Thes.2:9-12; Rev.13:2-4; 13:13-15).

Sadly, many believers are prophesied to fall into this number (see prior link). In my view, the failure to understand this not unprecedented, supernatural occurrence will increase the vulnerability of many believers who may be weak in their understanding of the Word in general.

The details on this last point can be found in [part 3B the Coming Tribulation series, "Antichrist"](#).

In any case, I very much appreciate your interest, your kind words, and most of all your zeal for the Word of God
Yours in the One for whom nothing is impossible, our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Bob Luginbill

<http://ichthys.com>

'And Also After That': The Return of the Nephilim?

by Chuck Missler

In the last article, *Mischievous Angels or Sethites?*, we explored the importance of understanding Genesis 6.

The straightforward presentation of the text seems to clearly portray a strange union of fallen angels with women to produce a hybrid race called the "Nephilim," or fallen ones.

We enumerated the reasons we accept the "angel" view and why the liberal "Sethite" view is inadequate. Far beyond simply a misunderstanding of the forthright presentation of the text, the "Sethite" view also obscures apprehension of the prophetic Scriptures.

Post-Flood Occurrences

Regarding the Nephilim, Genesis 6:4 also includes the haunting phrase, "...and also after that...." Apparently these strange events were not confined just to the period before the Flood.

We find that there seems to be some recurrence of those things which resulted in unusual "giants" appearing in subsequent periods later in the Old Testament narrative, specifically the giant-races of Canaan.

There were a number of tribes such as the Rephaim, the Emim, the Horim, and Zamsummim, that were giants:

- ✓ The kingdom of Og, the King of Bashan, was the "land of the giants".
- ✓ Later, we also find Arba, Anak, and his seven sons (the "Anakim") also as giants.
- ✓ The famed Goliath, and his four brothers.
- ✓ When Moses sent his twelve spies to reconnoiter the Land of Canaan, they came back with the report of giants in the

land. (The term used was Nephilim.) Their fear of those terrifying creatures resulted in their being relegated to wandering in the wilderness for 38 years.

- ✓ When Joshua and the nation Israel later entered the land of Canaan, they were instructed to wipe out every man, woman and child of certain tribes.

That strikes us as disturbingly severe. It would seem that in the Land of Canaan, there again was a "gene pool problem."

These Rephaim, Nephilim, and others seem to have been established as an advance guard to obstruct Israel's possession of the Promised Land. Was this also a stratagem of Satan?

The Days of Noah

Perhaps the most direct prophetic reference involving these things was the peculiar warning of our Lord Jesus Himself:

"And as it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man." - Luke 17:26

What does that mean? He also warned:

"And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; Men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are *coming on the earth*: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken."

- Luke 21:25,26 (emphasis added)

Is it possible that the UFOs - and their occupants - are part of an end-time scenario?

The Miry Clay of Daniel 2

The famous dream of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel Chapter 2 appears to lay out all of Gentile history until God ultimately intervenes and sets up His own kingdom.

The various metals which make up the image in the dream are

well known to serious students of prophecy. Even our common expression, "the idol has feet of clay," comes to us from this classic passage.

But what is represented by the "miry clay" in this image? It seems to be strangely mixed-but not completely-with the iron in the dream. The term "miry clay" refers to clay made from dust, a Biblical idiom which suggests death.

When Daniel interprets this for us he makes an especially provocative allusion in verse 43:

"And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay."

- Daniel 2:43

As he switches to a personal pronoun, they, "shall mingle themselves with the seed of men..." This is extremely suggestive when viewed in light of the warning of our Lord in Luke 17:26, ostensibly directing us to look more closely at Genesis 6.

Just what (or who) are "mingling with the seed of men?" These would seem to refer to some beings who are not the seed of men themselves!

Could this be a hint of a return to the mischief of Genesis 6? It staggers the mind to consider the potential significance of Daniel's passage and its implications for the future global governance.

Are these "aliens" so prolific that they constitute a political constituency?

Will there be UFO incidents as part of a carefully orchestrated program to lead us toward a political agenda? Or has it started already? Are the UFOs/increasingly widespread abductions part of the preparations for this scenario?

UFO Abductions?

There seems to be a growing concern within the psychiatric community from the strange (and far too frequent) reports from people who claim to have been "abducted" by the occupants of UFOs.

These reports are too bizarre to accept, and yet too frequent (and consistent) to ignore. What is *particularly disturbing* is the estimate from some national polls that as much as 3%-5% of the population may be involved!

Perhaps the most well-known researcher in this area is Dr. John E. Mack, who is professor of psychiatry at The Cambridge Hospital, Harvard Medical School.

A contributor to over 150 articles in professional (peer-reviewed) journals and a former Pulitzer Prize winner, he certainly appears to have highly impressive credentials.

He has been involved in almost a hundred of these cases personally, and has shocked the professional community by declaring that he believes these beings may be real and that they appear to have an agenda to develop a hybrid race!

At a professional conference on abductions at M.I.T., Dr. Mack asked the provocative question, "If what these abductees are saying is happening to them isn't happening, then what is?"

Could all this involve a return to the strange events of "the Days of Noah?"

Can A Christian Be "Abducted?"

In our publication, *The Return of the Nephilim*, I ventured the opinion, based on demonology considerations, that a Christian cannot be abducted.

In response, I have received several letters of rebuttal, and also an interesting phone call from a senior executive at Universal Studios who apparently has extensive background in this area.

He indicated that he had participated with Dr. John Mack in

some of his sessions, as well as with other researchers, and declared that I was wrong. He suggested that I investigate the Andreasson affair.

The Andreasson case involved a spirit-filled Christian...

However, the reports indicate that she *accepted an invitation to participate*. It still appears to me that a Christian cannot be abducted **unwillingly**.

This opens up the entire subject of demonology and is beyond our scope here. (Our book does include a "Checklist for Potential Abductees" for those who are concerned with this issue.)

Bibliography

1. Genesis 14:5; 15:20; Deuteronomy 2:10-12, 22.
2. Deuteronomy 3:11, 13; Joshua 12:4; 13:12.
3. Joshua 14:15; 15:13; 21:11.
4. 1 Samuel 17:4ff.
5. 2 Samuel 21:16-22.
6. Genesis 15:13-21.
7. Numbers 13:33.
8. Joshua 6:21; 9:24; 10:28, 39; 11:24; Deut 2:34; 7:2, 3; 20:16-17; et al. Cf. 1 Sam 15:3, 8, 18, 19; Ps 137:8, 9.
9. See our briefing package Iron Mixed With Clay (out of print - see An Empire Reborn?) for a complete discussion.
10. Mire [Aramaic in the text] is from a root meaning to be swept away; thus, dust, dirt.
11. Rephaim (giants) also translated "dead": Ps 88:10; Prov 2:18; 9:18; 21:16; Isa 14:9; 26:14.
12. John E. Mack, Abduction: Human Encounters with Aliens,

Ballantine Books, NY, 1994, p.411.

13.C.D.B. Bryan, Close Encounters of the Fourth Kind: Alien Abduction, UFOs, and the Conference at M.I.T., Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1995, p.4.

14.Jim Marrs, Alien Agenda, HarperCollins Publishers, New York, p.213-218.

Return of the Aliens? As The Days of Noah Were

by Chuck Missler

There continues to be a flow of articles, books, and entertainment programs dealing with UFO's, aliens, and the like. Many wonder if there is a connection or relationship to the prediction of our Lord in Luke 17:26:

"And as it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of Man."

The emergence of the "Nephilim" was what brought about the Flood of Noah. Who were they? Is the current interest in the possibility of "alien" involvements some how of Biblical relevance?

The Nephilim

Genesis 6 indicates that the "sons of God" (*B'nai Elohim*) took wives of the "daughters of men," which gave birth to the "Nephilim." What on earth was going on?

The *B'nai Elohim* is a term that refers to angels. It occurs four times in the Old Testament and is rendered "Angels of God" in the ancient Septuagint translation.

The intrusion of certain angels into the human family resulted in unnatural offspring termed Nephilim, which derives from the Hebrew *naphal* (to fall), or the *Fallen Ones*.

(The Greek Septuagint renders this term *gigantes*, which actually means "earth-born." This is often misunderstood to mean "giants"--which they also happen to have been, incidentally.)

Line of Seth?

The early church viewed the *B'nai Elohim* as angels up through the late fourth century: Justin, Athenagoras, Cyprian, Eusebius, et al. (also Josephus, Philo, Judeaus, and the Apochrypha regard this view). Celsus and Julian the Apostate exploited the older common

belief to attack Christianity. Cyril of Alexandria, in his reply, repudiated the orthodox position.

Julius Africanus (a contemporary of Origen) introduced the theory that the "sons of God" simply referred to the genealogical line of Seth, which was committed to preserving the true worship of God.

Seemingly more appealing, the "Sethite theory" prevailed into the Medieval Church, and many still hold this view.

This view, however, has several serious problems. There is no indication that the Sethites were distinguished for piety; they were not exempted from the charge of general wickedness which brought on the flood.

In fact, Seth's son Enosh was the one who introduced apostasy to that world. This is masked by a mistranslation of Genesis 4:25, which should read:

"...then men began to profane the name of the Lord."

Furthermore, when the faithful marry the unfaithful, they do not give birth to unnatural offspring! And the "daughters of men" were not differentiated with regard to the Flood. All were lost.

(Incidentally, the Nephilim didn't completely end with the flood. Genesis 6:4 mentions, "...and also after that..." We find the sons of Anak, the Anakim, later in the Old Testament.)

The Reason for the Flood

It was the infusion of these strange beings into the human predicament that brought on the Flood of Noah. The Flood was preceded by four generations of prophets/preachers warning of the coming judgment: Enoch, Methuselah, Lamech, and Noah.

It seems that this was part of Satan's stratagem to corrupt the line of Adam to prevent the fulfillment of the Messianic redemption. Noah was apparently unique in that his genealogy was still uncorrupted.

The strange events which led to the flood are also alluded to

in ancient mythologies. The legends of the Greek "titans"--partly terrestrial, partly celestial--embrace these same memories (The Greek titan is linguistically linked to the Chaldean sheitan, and the Hebrew satan).

The Angels that Sinned

There is a great deal revealed in the Bible about angels.

They:

- ✓ Spoke as men;
- ✓ Even ate men's food;
- ✓ Took men by the hand;
- ✓ Don't marry (in Heaven);
- ✓ Can appear in human form;
- ✓ Are capable of direct physical combat;
- ✓ Apparently are (or were) capable of much mischief.

Some are the principal forces behind the world powers. The strange events of Genesis Chapter 6 are also referred to in the New Testament. Peter refers to events preceding the flood of Noah:

"For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment..." 2 Peter 2:4

(Peter uses the term **tartarus**, here translated as hell; a Greek term for "the dark abode of woe, the pit of darkness in the unseen world." Homer's Iliad portrays tartarus "as far below hades as the earth is below Heaven...")

Also, in Jude, it mentions them:

"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.

Scripture warns against meddling with the spirit world. The punishment which overtook the angels that sinned was to emphasize the serious nature of apostasy:

Beings of a higher order than ours have been hurled down into a dark place of confinement where they have remained for thousands of years.

God has not changed His attitude toward them; time has not mitigated the seriousness of their sin. False teachers are prewritten into condemnation.

The "Sons of God" Return?

There are many who believe that the recent "alien" involvements are also demonic and are just another precursor to the end-time.

Some also believe that the Coming World Leader (for more information on the Coming World Leader, see our Briefing Package) may boast of an "alien connection." It would be consistent from what else we can infer from Scripture.

(The Restrainer of II Thessalonians 2 may be restraining far more than we have any suspicion of! When He is removed, the world is in for some astonishing surprises!)

In the meantime, what are our weapons of protection against such things? We do, indeed, "wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

Our armor is well defined in Ephesians 6:10-17.

The unprepared are in for some unpleasant surprises. Have you

done your homework?

Bibliography

- 1.The recent video puporting to be an autopsy of an alien (regarded by most experts as a clever hoax) is an example.

Books include:

William M. Alnor, UFO's in the New Age, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids MI, 1992;

I.D.E. Thomas, The Omega Conspiracy, Growth Publishing, Herndon VA, 1986;

Timothy J. Dailey, The Millennial Deception, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids MI, 1995;

David Allen Lewish and Robert Shreckhise, UFO: End-Time Delusion, New Leaf Press, July 1991 (3rd printing in August 1993).

- 2.Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7, as well as Genesis 6. They are said to have "shouted for joy" at the creation.
- 3.This is the translation of the Old Testament into Greek in the third century before Christ. Many of the New Testament quotes are from this translation.
- 4.Targum of Onkelos: "...desisted from praying in the name"; Targum of Jonathan: "surnamed their idols in the name..." Kimchi, Rashi, and other ancient Jewish commentators agree.

Jerome indicated that this was the opinion of many Jews of his day. Maimonides, Commentary on the Mishna (a constituent part of the Talmud), A.D. 1168, ascribes the origin of idolatry to the days of Enosh.
- 5.2 Peter 2:5.
- 6.Numbers 13:3; Dueteronomy 3:11; Amos 2:9; 2 Samuel 21:15-22.
- 7.Genesis 6:9.
- 8.Fallen Angels and the Heroes of Mythology, by John Fleming.

- 9.They rebelled against their father Uranus (Heaven) and after a prolonged contest were defeated by Zeus and condemned into Tartarus, the term used by Peter to refer to hell (2 Peter 2:4).
- 10.Genesis 19:5, 10, 16.
- 11.Genesis 18:8; 19:3, 16.
- 12.Death of the Firstborn in Egypt, Exodus 12; Sodom and Gomorrah, Genesis 19; 185,00 troops slaughtered, 2 Kings 19:35.
- 13.Daniel 10.
- 14.Matthew 22:30.
- 15.Genesis 6:1-2; 2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6.
- 16.See our Thessalonians Commentary for a complete study.

From *Genesis*

James Montgomery Boice, Baker Books, 1998
Compliments of <http://ldolphin.org>

Sons of God/Daughters of Men

When men began to increase in number on the earth and daughters were born to them, the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful, and they married any of them they chose. Then the LORD said, "My Spirit will not contend with man forever, for he is mortal; his days will be a hundred and twenty years." (Genesis 6:1-4)

The Nephilim were on the earth in those days-and also afterward-when the sons of God went to the daughters of men and had children by them. They were the heroes of old, men of renown.

The first verses of Genesis 6 are transition verses. On the one hand, they wrap up the pre-Flood history of the earlier chapters, showing the state of degeneracy to which the race had fallen.

On the other hand, they prepare for the story of Noah and the Flood that follows; it was because of this degeneracy that the Flood came. Unfortunately, the meaning of these verses is not self-evident. They have raised questions that have been discussed for years.

The passage tells us that "When men began to increase in number on the earth and daughters were born to them, the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful, and they married any of them they chose" (vv. 1, 2).

This apparently straightforward statement is actually confusing because the subject of the sentence might refer to either of two things.

"The sons of God" might mean descendants of the godly line of Seth, who according to this interpretation would be said to have married unbelieving women. Or it might refer to angels, as do the only other exact uses of the phrase in the Old Testament (Job. 1:6; 2:1; 38:7).

The thing that makes these verses so interesting is that three New Testament passages seem to refer to them: 1 Peter 3:18-22; 2 Peter 2:4, 5; and Jude 6, 7.

These passages say in part: "Christ died for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous, to bring you to God. He was put to death in the body but made alive by the Spirit, through whom also he went and preached to the spirits in prison who disobeyed long ago when God waited patiently in the days of Noah while the ark was being built" (1 Peter 3:18-20)

"For if God did not spare angels when they sinned, but sent them to hell, putting them into gloomy dungeons to be held for judgement; if he did not spare the ancient world when he brought the flood on its ungodly people, but protected Noah, a preacher of righteousness, and seven others" (2 Peter 2:4, 5)

And "the angels who did not keep their positions of authority but abandoned their own home--these he has kept in darkness, bound with everlasting chains for judgement on the great Day" (Jude 6).

If these passages are related, as they seem to be, the incident of Genesis 6 has bearing on the doctrines of judgement, the afterlife, and even the work of Christ following His crucifixion but before His resurrection or ascension.

The New Testament verses explain what Christ was doing when, as we say in the Apostles' Creed, "he descended into hell."

The Godly and the Ungodly

The interpretation of Genesis 6 which takes "the sons of God" as referring to the godly line of Seth is most natural since it avoids the obvious problem of how spirit beings could copulate with humans.

Moreover, it has weighty support in that it is the view of many theological giants of church history. It is not an early view--we will come back to that later--but it appears in such thinkers as Chrysostom and Augustine in the early church, and is adopted by reformers such as Luther, Calvin, and their followers.

Of the early views Augustine's is most important because he had a great influence on later interpreters. Moreover, he placed his interpretation within a broad theological context.

Augustine's treatment occurs in *The City of God*, in which he is trying to trace the origin, nature and development of the two

cities (the society of those who love God and the society of those who love self).

This is significant, because it fits his objective to view Genesis 6 as continuing the story of the two cities which, according to Augustine, emerges in Genesis 4 and 5.

He writes of the passage, "By these two names [sons of God and daughters of men] the two cities are sufficiently distinguished. For although the former were by nature children of men, they had come into possession of another name by grace....

When they [the godly race] were captivated by the daughters of men, they adopted the manners of the earthly to win them as their brides, and forsook the godly ways they had followed in their own holy society." (1)

This view fits into the pattern of Genesis 4 and 5. Moreover, it fits into the whole of Scripture in which, as Francis Schaeffer notes, "there is a constant prohibition against the people of God marrying those who are not people of God." (2) If this is the proper interpretation of Genesis 6, the point is well taken.

The Spirits In Prison

However, there are reasons for rejecting this interpretation in favor of the angelic or supernatural view, and it these we now come. The first reason is linguistic. That is, so far as the biblical use of the phrase "the sons of God" is concerned, there is every reason to it as referring to angels.

This has been denied by the side, of course. Keil and Delitzsch maintain that the angel view is "not warranted by the usages of the language" and is "altogether unscriptural." (3)

But what is the evidence? The phrase "sons of God" (*bene elohim*) is used only three other times in the Testament, as indicated earlier—in Job 1:6; 2:1; and 38:7.

In each case it clearly means spirit beings, twice those fallen spirits who accompanied Satan in his periodic appearances before the Lord in heaven.

This is so clear that the translators of the New International Version drop the longer phrase entirely and simply substitute the word angels: "One day the *angels* came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came with them." (Job 1:6; cf. also

2:1).

A similar form of this phrase (*bar elohim* used in Daniel 3:25 of the fourth figure Nebuchadnezzar saw when he looked into the burning furnace into which Daniel's three friends had been thrown.

In this case it probably refers to a fallen angel or even a theophany, but the actual identity of the being involved is not given. Nebuchadnezzar merely says, "The fourth looks like a son of the gods."

An objection to this view says that the phrase "sons of God" is used in the New Testament of all believers, hence men and women, as opposed to angels or demons, and that it appears in Luke 3:38 specifically of Adam.

But this actually proves the point. For what is it that distinguishes Adam (but not Eve), believers in the New Testament period (but not necessarily believers in the Old Testament period) and angels from all other beings in the universe?

The answer is that each is directly created by God. Adam clearly was. So were the angels. Believers are termed "sons of God" because they are born of God directly by His Spirit (cf. John 3:3-8).

The second reason why the angel view of Genesis 6 should be preferred is that this was the view of the translators of the Septuagint, who rendered "sons of God" as "angels," and of other Jewish writers prior to the time of Christ.

The key book is 1 Enoch. It is available to us through an Ethiopic text of which only three manuscripts survive.

Yet in spite of this paucity of manuscripts it was probably "the most important pseudepigraph [a work written in the name of someone other than the actual author] of the first two centuries B.C.--the judgement of R. H. Charles. (4)

Enoch writes:

"And it came to pass when the children of men had multiplied that in those days were born unto them beautiful and comely daughters. And the angels, the children of heaven, saw and lusted after them, and said to one another: 'Come, let us choose us wives from among the children of men and beget us children.'

They were in all two hundred[They] took unto themselves wives, and each chose for himself one, and they began to go in unto them and to defile themselves with them, and they taught them charms and enchantments....

And they became pregnant, and they bare great giants, whose height was three thousand ells.... And there arose much godlessness, and they committed fornication, and they were led astray, and became corrupt in all their ways" (chs. 6-8).

The book continues by showing the judgement of God against the fallen angels, in which they are bound up in prison in "the uttermost depths" of the earth.

First Enoch is not a biblical book, of course. Its interpretation of Genesis 6 is not inspired. It could be wrong in many places and undoubtedly is.

Nevertheless, it is significant for our interpretation of the text because it was apparently known by Peter and Jude who, in their oblique references to the same subject, seem to put their stamp of approval on it, at least in this matter.

Several studies ago, when we looked at Enoch and his preaching to the ungodly of his age, we quoted Jude 14, 15:

"Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied about these men: 'See, the Lord is coming with thousands upon thousands of his holy ones to judge everyone, and to convict all the ungodly of all the ungodly acts they have done in the ungodly way, and of all the harsh words ungodly sinners have spoken against him.'"

We did not mention it at the time because it was not pertinent then, but these words are actually from 1 Enoch. The phrase "seventh from Adam" is found in 1 Enoch 60:8.

The prophecy itself, containing the fourfold repetition of the word "ungodly," is found in 1:9.

Since Jude clearly has Enoch in view in verses 14 and 15, how can he not also have Enoch in view in verse 6, just eight and nine verses earlier, when he says that:

"the angels who did not keep their positions of authority but abandoned their own home" have been judged and "kept in darkness, bound with everlasting chains for judgement on the great Day"

When we carry our inquiry to 2 Peter we find the same situation. To begin with, 2 Peter and Jude are closely related

in that most of 2 Peter 2 is paralleled in Jude, and there are parallels in the other two chapters.

This causes us to think that Peter, like Jude, was probably also aware of the angel interpretation. Again, Peter uses language similar to Jude's in referring to the angels who sinned.

He speaks of God's judging the angels by "putting them into gloomy dungeons to be held for [final] judgement" and of God's judging the people by flood.

We are moving in the same realm in 1 Peter, where Peter writes, "Christ died for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous, to bring you to God.

He was put to death in the body but made alive by the Spirit, through whom also he went and preached to the spirits in prison who disobeyed long ago when God waited patiently in the days of Noah while the ark was being built" (1 Peter 3:18-20).

This text adds the idea of a special ministry of Christ to these fallen angels during His descent to hell between the times of His death and resurrection.

It does not mean that He offered the gospel to them; that would suggest that after death there is a "second chance" for salvation--a doctrine repudiated elsewhere (Heb. 9:27; 2 Cor. 6:2).

It is rather that Christ proclaimed His victory over sin and the devil to the demons. Peter refers to this event to encourage believers in their witness before this world's magistrates. (5)

Strange Flesh

The third reason for preferring supernatural interpretation of Genesis is the way in which both 2 Peter Jude connect the judgement of God on the angels with the judgement of God on Sodom and Gomorrah, particularly the way in which Jude refers to the second incident.

Apart from the language of Jude the connection could simply be that of two obvious examples of great judgement.

But Jude seems to say more, after having spoken of the judgement the angels for their sin, he goes on to say, "In a similar way, Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding towns gave themselves up to sexual immorality and version" (v. 7).

In this verse the comparison is not in the matter of judgement itself. Jude does not say, "In a similar way, Sodom and Gomorrah were judged."

The comparison is rather in the area of the sin that occasioned the judgement, and this, as Jude shows, was sexual sin of a particular kind.

In modern versions this is hidden by translations as "sexual immorality perversion" (NIV, PHILLIPS) or "unnatural lust/s" (RSV, NEB).

But the Authorized Version is closer to the Greek text when it speaks of the Sodomites as "giving themselves over to fornication and going after *strange flesh*" [*sarkos heteras*].

The men of Sodom did this in desiring sexual relations with the angels who come to visit Abram and Lot (Gen. 19).

The implication would be that in doing so they recapitulated the sin angels of Genesis 6, who "in a similar way" had desired relationships with women. (6)

The objection to this supposed union of angel flesh and human flesh is that the angels are supposed to be sexless, since Jesus said, "At the resurrection people will neither marry nor be given in marriage; they will be like the angels in heaven" (Matt. 22:30).

But this is not the equivalent of saying that the angels are sexless or that they could not have had sexual relations with women if they had chosen to do so.

In heaven human beings will not marry but will nevertheless retain their identity, which includes their being either male or female. In the same way, the angels could also have sexual identities.

It is significant perhaps that when the angels are referred to in Scripture it is always with the masculine pronoun "he," and they are always described as men.

So, as Henry M. Morris says, "When Jesus said that the angels in heaven do not marry, this does not necessarily mean that those who have been cast out of heaven were incapable of doing so." (7)

The final point of evidence for the angel view of Genesis 6 is the reference to the giants or Nephilim in verse 4:

"The Nephilim were on the earth in those days--and also

afterward--when the sons of God went to the daughters of men and had children by them. They were the heroes of old, men of renown."

Since we have no information about the results of an angel/human union, except what is found here, it is impossible to argue how such a union might produce giants.

It is enough to say that it is conceivable that this could happen and that this is the probable meaning of verse 4.

The New International Version has hedged its translation by refusing to translate, simply transliterating the Hebrew word Nephilim.

But in Numbers 13:33 the word clearly means giants (though not necessarily those produced by an intermarriage of angels and human beings).

What would be more natural than that this union would produce the "mighty men" of antiquity? Since this verse specifically refers to the "heroes of old," what would be more probable than that this is the origin of those stories of half-human, half-divine figures present in virtually all ancient mythologies?

The stories of Homer and other writers would be embellished, of course, but they probably reflect memories of these ancient outstanding figures of the pre-Flood period.

Back at the Ranch

A study like this involves so many technical details that it is easy to find oneself wondering about the point of it all and asking whether the outcome really matters.

In one sense, the natural interpretation is quite valid and its point well taken. But I am convinced that to view Genesis 6 in this way is actually to lose something important.

Earlier we pointed out that one thing in favor of the natural interpretation is that it seems to fit in well with the general theme of chapters 4 and 5, namely, the contrast between the godly and the ungodly lines.

But this is not the only contrast we have seen in the opening section of Genesis. What of the serpent? What of Satan? What of his desire to subvert the race and draw men and women after himself against God?

If Genesis 6 does not refer to demonic activity, Satan apparently fades out of the picture entirely after chapter 3.

But if Genesis 6 refers to a further attempt by Satan to pervert the race, then we have a reminder of his continuing hostility not only to God but to ourselves as well.

Satan was in the garden when the promise of a deliverer was given. He heard God say, "I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will crush your head, and you will strike his heel" (Gen. 3:15).

Like Eve, he too must have thought that Cain, the woman's offspring, was the deliverer and must therefore have plotted to turn him into a murderer. He succeeded! He corrupted Cain by getting him to murder Abel, thereby eliminating one of Eve's children and rendering the other unfit to be the Savior.

Yet Satan failed! For, as he was soon to learn, God simply continued on His unruffled way to develop the godly line through which the deliverer would eventually be born.

What was Satan to do now? At this point he conceived the plan of corrupting the entire race by the intermarriage of demons and human beings.

The Savior could not be born of a demon-possessed mother. So if Satan could succeed in infecting the entire race, the deliverer could not come. In narrating this incident, Genesis 6 is saying, in effect, "Meanwhile, back at the ranch the villain is still hatching his plots."

Satan is still doing it today. Because he is a being who learns by experience, he is a much wiser and more dangerous devil today than he was in the time before the Flood.

A person who knows this and who knows that we struggle "not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in heavenly realms" (Eph. 6:12), will fear Satan and draw near to Jesus, who has defeated him.

Again, there is this practical application. Without detracting in the slightest from the fact that the Flood was a real judgement of God on the ungodliness men and women and consequently warning of an even greater judgement come, we can also see that it was at the same time an act of the marvelous grace of God.

For in preserving the race intact uncontaminated by Satan's attempts demonic perversion, God actually provided for our salvation through keeping open the way for the Redeemer to

come.

If Satan had succeeded, Jesus could n have been born and the race as whole--including Adam and Seth a Enoch and all the rest--would have been lost.

But by destroying the contaminated race and saving uncontaminated Noah and his immediate uncontaminated family and by binding the demons who participated in this great sin in Hades until the final judgement God made the salvation to be achieved by Christ both sure and possible.

References:

1. Augustine, *The City of God, Book 15, p. 303.*
 2. F. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time, p. 126.*
 3. C . F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, Vol. 1,*
 4. *The Pentateuch* by James Martin (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.), p. 128.
 5. R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, Vol. 2, Pseudepigrapha* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913), p. 163.
 6. Cf. Bo Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964, pp 109-11.
 7. Paul's discussion of the nature of our resurrection bodies in 1 Corinthians has bearing on this interpretation, for he used the word *heteros*, meaning something that is entirely different, in comparing the glory of "heavenly bodies" and the glory of "earthly bodies" (1 Cor. 15:40). One verse earlier he spoke of the differences between the flesh of men, animals, and birds. But there he used the word meaning different but nevertheless of the same kind.
-

From *The Genesis Record*

1976. Henry Morris

Compliments of <http://ldolphin.org>

Genesis 6:1, 2

Moral and spiritual conditions in the antediluvian world had deteriorated with the passing years, not only among the Cainites but eventually among the Sethites as well.

Materialism and ungodliness abounded, except for the small remnant connected with the line of the promised Seed, along with those few who may have been influenced by the witness of such men as Enoch.

Then, in the days of Noah, a strange and terrible event took place, leading rapidly to such a tidal wave of violence and wickedness over the earth that there was no longer any remedy but utter destruction.

The "sons of God" saw the "daughters of men" and took them as their wives, the children of such unions being "giants in the earth," mighty men of renown, monsters not only in size but also in wickedness (Genesis 6:1, 2, 4).

One's first reaction to this passage (and the standard interpretation of the liberals) is to think of the fairy tales of antiquity, the legends of ogres and dragons, and the myths of the gods consorting with men-and then to dismiss the entire story as legend and superstition.

On the other hand, modern Christians have often attempted to make the story more palatable intellectually by explaining the "sons of God" as Sethites and the "daughters of men" as Cainites, with their union representing the breaking down of the wall of separation between believers and unbelievers.

Another possible interpretation which avoids supernaturalistic implications is that the phrase "sons of God" referred to kings and nobles, in which case the commingling so described is merely an account of royalty marrying commoners.

Neither of these naturalistic interpretations, however, explain why the progeny of such unions would be "giants" or why they would lead to universal corruption and violence.

Although Scripture does teach that believers should not wed

unbelievers (II Corinthians 6:14; 1 Corinthians 7:39), there is no intimation that this particular sin is unforgivable or more productive of general moral deterioration than other sins.

Regardless of intellectual difficulties, it does seem clear that something beyond the normal and natural is described here in these verses.

The interpretation of the passage obviously turns on the meaning of the phrase "sons of God" (*bene elohim*). In the New Testament, of course, this term is used with reference to all who have been born again through personal faith in Christ (John 1:12; Romans 8:14; etc.), and the concept of the spiritual relationship of believers to God as analogous to that of children to a father is also found in the Old Testament (Psalm 73:15; Hosea 1: 10; Deuteronomy 32:5; Exodus 4:22; Isaiah 43:6).

Not one of these examples, however, uses the same phrase as Genesis 6:2, 4; furthermore, in each case the meaning is not really parallel to the meaning here in Genesis.

Neither the descendants of Seth nor true believers of any sort have been previously referred to in Genesis as sons of God in any kind of spiritual sense and, except for Adam himself, they could not have been sons of God in a physical sense.

In context, such a meaning would be strained, to say the least, in the absence of any kind of explanation. The only obvious and natural meaning without such clarification is that these beings were sons of God, rather than of men, because they had been created, not born.

Such a description, of course, would apply only to Adam (Luke 3:38) and to the angels, whom God had directly created (Psalm 148:2, 5; Psalm 104:4; Colossians 1: 16).

The actual phrase *bene elohim* is used three other times, all in the very ancient book of Job (1:6; 2:1; 38:7). There is no doubt at all that, in these passages, the meaning applies exclusively to the angels.

A very similar form (*bar elohim*) is used in Daniel 3:25, and also refers either to an angel or to a theophany. The term "sons of the mighty" (*bene elohim*) is used in Psalm 29:1 and also Psalm 89:6, and again refers to angels.

Thus, there seems no reasonable doubt that, in so far as the language itself is concerned, the intent of the writer was to

convey the thought of angels-fallen angels, no doubt, since they were acting in opposition to God's will.

This also was the meaning placed on the passage by the Greek translators of the Septuagint, by Josephus, by the writer of the ancient apocryphal book of Enoch, and by all the other ancient Jewish interpreters and the earliest Christian writers.

Apparently the first Christian writers to suggest the Sethite interpretation were Chrysostom and Augustine.

The reason for questioning this obvious meaning, in addition to the supernaturalistic overtones, is (for those who do not reject the idea of angels) the opinion that it would be impossible for angels to have sexual relations with human women and to father children by them.

However, this objection presupposes more about angelic abilities than we know. Whenever angels have appeared visibly to men, as recorded in the Bible, they have appeared in the physical bodies of men.

Those who met with Abraham, for example, actually ate with him (Genesis 18:8) and, later, appeared to the inhabitants of Sodom in such perfectly manlike shape that the Sodomites were attempting to take these "men" for homosexual purposes.

The writer of Hebrews suggests that, on various occasions, some "have entertained angels unawares" (Hebrews 13:2).

It is true that the Lord Jesus said that...in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven" (Matthew 22:30).

However, this is not equivalent to saying that angels are "sexless," since people who share in the resurrection will surely retain their own personal identity, whether male or female.

Furthermore, angels are always described, when they appear, as "men," and the pronoun "he" is always used in reference to them.

Somehow they have been given by God the capacity of materializing themselves in masculine human form when occasion warrants, even though their bodies are not under the control of the gravitational and electromagnetic forces which limit our own bodies in this present life.

When Jesus said that the angels of God *in heaven* do not marry,

this does not necessarily mean that those who have been cast out of heaven were incapable of doing so.

It clearly was not God's will or intention that angels mix in such a way with human women, but these wicked angels were not concerned with obedience to God's will.

In fact, it was probably precisely for the purpose of attempting to thwart God's will that this particular battalion of the "sons of God" engaged in this illegal invasion of the bodies of the daughters of men.

Satan had not forgotten God's prophecy that a promised Seed of the woman would one day destroy him. He had implanted his own spiritual seed in Cain and his descendants, but God had preserved the line of the true Seed through Seth.

When Noah was born and Lamech was led to prophesy that "comfort" concerning the Curse would come through him (Genesis 5:29), Satan and his angels must have feared that their opportunities for victory in this cosmic conflict were in imminent danger.

Desiring reinforcements for a coming battle against the hosts of heaven, and also desiring, if possible, to completely corrupt mankind before the promised Seed could accomplish Satan's defeat, they seem to have decided to utilize the marvelous power of procreation which God had given the human family and to corrupt it to their own ends.

Men now were rapidly multiplying on the earth and by implanting their own "seed" in humanity, they might be able to enlist in only one generation a vast multitude as allies against God. So these "sons of God" saw the daughters of men and "took them wives [or, literally, 'women'] of all which they chose."

Some commentators have said that, since the phrase "took them wives" is the same phrase as normally used throughout the Old Testament for "taking a wife," there can be nothing involved here other than normal human marriage.

Therefore, they argue, these "sons of God" must be merely male believers in the Sethite line who married good-looking women of the Cainite (or other) line with no regard to whether or not they were true believers in God.

This argument, however, is weak and is hardly sufficient to overthrow the heavy weight of evidence otherwise. The word used for "wife" (Hebrew *ishah*) is commonly also used for "woman,"

regardless of whether or not she was a married woman.

The word for "take" (Hebrew *laqach*) is a very common verb, and can have any noun as its object. Shechem, for example, "took" Dinah and lay with her, though he was not married to her (Genesis 34:2).

The fact that these creatures could take whatever women they chose further suggests a general state of profligacy which made indiscriminate sexual unions quite commonplace.

This is also suggested by Christ's descriptive phrase "marrying and giving [out] in marriage" (Matthew 24:38) as characteristic of the careless attitudes of the days of Noah.

If, for the sake of argument at least, we assume that the *bene elohim* were, indeed, angels, and that angels can assume such a total human form that they actually have male reproductive systems, then a grave question would have to be posed relative to the nature of the progeny that would result from their sexual intercourse with human women.

The identity of the "giants" is discussed further below, but the seriousness of this problem does have a bearing on how we should interpret these unions.

Fallen angels have no possibility of salvation, but fallen men and women do have at least this possibility. What, then, would be the case with "people" who were half-angel, half-men?

This seems to be such a grotesque situation that it does appear extremely doubtful that God would have allowed it at all, even if it really were physiologically a realistic possibility.

And yet, as already indicated, it does violence to the actual text of the passage if we make it mean merely that the sons of Seth began to marry the daughters of Cain. (If this were what it meant, why did not the writer simply say so, and thus avoid all this confusion?)

And why the giants, and why the universal violence?

The sons of Seth were surely not all godly men; so why should they be called sons of God (remember, they all perished in the Flood)?

Furthermore, Adam had many sons in addition to Cain and Seth; were they spiritual "sons of God," too? Not very likely, at this period of history.

Furthermore, why stress only the union of godly men with

ungodly women? What about the "daughters of God"? Were they being married to "sons of men"?

This naturalistic interpretation is so forced and awkward that it seems to do disservice to the doctrine of divine inspiration to suppose that this is really what the writer meant to say.

He surely *meant* to convey to his readers the idea that, in these days of Noah, such an awful irruption of abnormality and wickedness burst forth on the earth that it could only be explained by a demoniacally supernatural cause.

Rationalistic exegetes, of course, do accept the plain meaning of the text here and agree that it speaks of angel cohabiting with human women.

Then, being rationalists, they maintain that since this sort of thing is impossible, the writer of Genesis was simply drawing on the myths and legends of demigods in various religious traditions.

On the other hand, is it not possible that the Bible has the true record and these various legends of giants and demigods represent the distortions that had accrued through long centuries of verbal transmission of the tales in cultures removed from the true patriarchal transmission line?

It is significant that the Septuagint renders the phrase "sons of God" as "angels of God." This was the Old Testament version in dominant use in the Apostolic period, and thus this would be the way the phrase would have been read by Christ and His apostles.

The apocryphal book of Enoch was extant then, as well, and was apparently known to the New Testament writers (Jude 14); and it intensely elaborated this angelic interpretation.

As an apparent result of these facts, this interpretation is strongly implied, and probably required (as noted below) by three New Testament passages: Jude 6; 1 Peter 2:4-6; 1 Peter 3:19, 20.

Admittedly, however, there is a grave difficulty in the idea of angel/human sexual unions, not only the question of whether such a thing is possible, but even more in the theologically paradoxical and grotesque nature of the progeny of such unions. Is there any way to resolve this dilemma?

A solution seems to consist in recognizing that the children were true human children of truly human fathers and mothers,

but that all were possessed and controlled by evil spirits. That is, these fallen angelic "sons of God" accomplished their purposes by something equivalent to demon possession, indwelling the bodies of human men, and then also taking (or "possessing") the bodies of the women as well.

The men whose bodies they possessed were evidently thereby made so attractive to the careless and rebellious women of the age that they could take over and use any of the women they chose.

The seductive beauty of the women, probably enhanced by various artificial cosmetics and allurements developed by that time, was itself sufficient to induce men to constant obsession with sex, assuring a maximum rapidity of multiplication of the population.

Thus, the "sons of God" controlled not only the men whose bodies they had acquired for their own exploitation, but also the women they took to themselves in this way, and then all the children they bore.

These particular Satanic angels, therefore, compounded their original sin in following Satan in his rebellion against God by now:

- ✓ Leaving "their own habitation"
- ✓ And keeping not their "first estate" (literally, "principality"), "going after strange flesh" as later did the Sodomites "in like manner" (Jude 6, 7).

Therefore, God no longer allows them to roam about the earth like other demons, but has confined them "in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgement of the great day," casting them down to a special "hell" (literally, "Tartarus," not the ordinary place of departed spirits) where they are "to be reserved unto judgement" (2 Peter 2:4).

This fearful phenomenon of demonic "taking" and "habitation" of human bodies has often been repeated since, though apparently never yet on the global scale which Satan attempted in the days of Noah.

Many such cases of demon possession are noted in the New Testament, and missionaries still testify to its common occurrence in heathen lands today.

Even in modern "Christian lands" where the influence of the gospel has until now kept it to a minimum, this form of Satanic

activity is evidently rapidly increasing.

Spiritism, witchcraft, and other forms of occult belief and practice-even Satanism itself-are captivating the minds and bodies of multitudes today, specially among young people.

A closely related phenomenon is the tremendous recent upsurge of interest in the "host of heaven"--in terms of astrology, the so-called chariots of the gods, the various unidentified flying objects, and their strange occupants.

Although scientists quite properly have pointed out the fallacious assumptions and interpretations involved in these, there remains a stubborn residuum of scientifically inexplicable, yet apparently well-verified, phenomena attached to these highly unusual types of data.

It should not be forgotten that there do exist "principalities and powers, rulers of the darkness of this world, spiritual wickedness in the heavenly places" (Ephesians 6:12) and that Satan is "the prince of the power of the air" (Ephesians 2:2).

Evil angels, as well as God's unfallen holy angels, apparently on certain occasions have the ability both to appear in material forms of various sorts (even as "ministers of righteousness" -- II Corinthians 11:15) and also to inhabit and control the bodies of human beings.

Furthermore, Jesus warned that, in the last days, "fearful sights and great signs shall there be from heaven" (Luke 21:11).

It may be that this particular feature of the days of Noah is beginning to be repeated in the modern proliferation of this great complex of unexplained and spiritually intimidating occult phenomena, the purpose of which seems to be to gain direct Satanic control over the minds and bodies of hosts of human beings before Christ returns.

From Textual Controversy: Mischievous Angels or Sethites?

By Chuck Missler

Compliments of <http://ldolphin.org>

Why did God send the judgement 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. (1)

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.

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.)

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

Origin of the Sethite View

It was in the 5th century AD 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." (3)

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, (4) 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. (5)

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.

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.)

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. (6)

In Luke's genealogy of Jesus, only Adam is called a "son of God." (7) 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. (8)

Being born again of the Spirit of God, as an entirely new creation, (9) at their resurrection they alone will be clothed with a building of God (10) and in every respect equal to the angels. (11)

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. (12)

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?)

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, (13) 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. (14) 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. (15) 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 judgement 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, Gaebelstein observes, "The designation 'Sons of God' is

never applied in the Old Testament to believers," whose sonship is "distinctly a New Testament revelation." (16)

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. (17)

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

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.

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 judgement 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. (18)

Why were the offspring uniquely designated "mighty" and "men of reknown?" 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 reknown" are mentioned. (Was there a

chromosome deficiency among the Sethites? Were there only "Y" chromosomes available in this line?) (19)

6. New Testament Confirmations

"In the mouths of two or three witnesses every word shall be established." (20) 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. (21)

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 judgement; 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.

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." (22) 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.

The Epistle of Jude²³ 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 judgement 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)

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, *oiketherion*, refers to their heavenly bodies from which they had disrobed. [24])

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 heavenlies.

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..." (25)

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.

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.

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 (26) and, in particular, the specific delusions to come upon the whole earth as a major feature of end-time prophecy. (27) We will take up these topics in Part 2, next month.)

In 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. (28)

Among those supporting the "angel" view are: G. H. Pember, M. R. DeHaan, C. H. McIntosh, F. Delitzsch, A. C. Gaebelien, 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!)

For further exploration of this critical topic, see the following:

George Hawkins Pember, *Earth's Earliest Ages*, first published by Hodder and Stoughton in 1875, and presently available by Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids MI, 1975.

John Fleming, *The Fallen Angels and the Heroes of Mythology*, Hodges, Foster, and Figgis, Dublin, 1879.

Henry Morris, *The Genesis Record*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids MI, 1976.

Merrill F. Unger, *Biblical Demonology*, Scripture Press, Chicago IL, 1952.

Clarence Larkin, *Spirit World*, Rev. Clarence Larkin Estate, Philadelphia PA, 1921.

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. Gaebeline, The Annotated Bible (Pentateuch), 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 AD.

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 Encyclopedia, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Vol V, p.2835-2836.

Additional Related Resources: (<http://www.khouse.org>)

Return of the Nephilim, by Chuck Missler - Briefing Pack,
Flood of Noah, by Chuck Missler - Briefing Pack,
Alien Encounters Conference, by Chuck Missler and Dr. Mark Eastman - Video,
Alien Encounters Book, by Chuck Missler and Dr. Mark Eastman - Book,

Source: <http://www.khouse.org/articles/biblestudy/19970801-110.html>

Copyright © 1996-2000 by Koinonia House Inc., P.O. Box D, Coeur d'Alene, ID 83816

From *SIGNS OF COLLAPSE*

By Ray C. Stedman

Compliments of <http://ldolphin.org>

In this present series we have been looking at the great principles that govern human society, those principles which produce straining social problems, such as war, crime, poverty, unequal distribution of food, improper use of leisure, and urban blight.

These all arise when men who are made in the image of God, but have lost the likeness of God, seek to fulfill the original command of God to master the earth and fill it, but without the Spirit of God within.

As is so evident in our day, man succeeds only in darkening the skies, ravishing the ground, poisoning the water, setting men against each other in violence and cruelty, and in spreading death, fear, and hatred throughout the earth.

But all this is done in the midst of increasing comfort and luxury and the technical brilliance that builds impressive cities and produces astonishing gadgets of incredible complexity and power. The seeds of all this are found in the first five chapters in Genesis, as we have been seeing.

Now no house built upon such a shaky foundation can long stand, therefore the record of history has been the collapse of one civilization after another.

Arnold Toynbee has indicated there have been in the past some twenty-one or more different civilizations, each one in turn collapsing and giving way to another.

Therefore we should not be at all surprised to find here, in this definitive passage of Scripture, a description of the signs that accompany the imminent collapse of a civilization.

Since many of us feel that we are living in such an hour today, it is easy to see how contemporary this is.

The Bible, as you know, speaks of "times and seasons" in the affairs of men (cf, Dan 2:21, Acts 1:7, 1 Th 5:1). *Times* are those major divisions of history which are marked by a special character.

The Bible speaks, for instance, of the "times of ignorance,"

(Acts 17:30) and by that it is referring to the ages before the coming of Christ, when men lived in relative ignorance of the understanding of God.

It speaks again of the "times of the restitution of all things," (Acts 3:21 KJV) in the future when God would work out all his purposes and unite all things together in Christ.

We use language somewhat similar. We speak of the *Dark Ages*, characterized by widespread ignorance and moral darkness.

But *seasons* are those divisions of time in which certain events come to the fore. I do not think I can do better than to quote Archbishop Trench, from his *Synonyms of the Old Testament*, in this respect:

"The 'seasons' are the joints or articulations in the times; the critical epoch-making periods, ordained of God, when all that has been slowly, and often without observation, ripening through long ages, is mature and comes to the birth in grand decisive events which constitute at once the close of one period and the commencement of another."

Remember that Jesus said to his disciples after his resurrection, "the times and seasons are not for you to know," (cf, Acts 1:7).

They will unfold as history goes on its way, but we cannot predict when they will occur in the span of time.

It is very important that we recognize these divisions when they do occur, and especially to understand what our Lord meant when he said, "As it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be in the days of the coming of the Son of Man," (cf, Matt 24:37).

Now we are studying the days of Noah. Our Lord linked these two epochs together and said that one is the parallel of the other. If we are living in the days immediately preceding the return of Jesus Christ we shall find similar conditions to the days of Noah.

So in Genesis 6 we have the real story behind the headlines of history. Here we find three steps traced for us that mark the signs of the imminent collapse of civilization.

The first one is given to us in Verses 1 through 4 and, as we shall see, it is that of a demonic invasion:

When men began to multiply on the face of the ground and daughters were born to them, the sons of God saw that

the daughters of men were fair; and they took to wife such of them as they chose. Then the Lord said, "My a spirit shall not abide in man forever, for he is flesh, but his days shall be a hundred and twenty years." The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore children to them. These were the mighty men that were of old, the men of renown. (Gen 6:1-4 RSV)

Interest immediately focuses on the question, Who were these sons of God? What kind of beings did these strange things?

One suggestion that we must take note of is that here we have the blending of two lines; the line of Cain, and the line of Seth (which have been followed briefly in previous chapters); and that here is the intermarriage between these two lines, that of the godly (the line of Seth), and the ungodly (the line of Cain).

But there are several severe objections to this idea. One, of course, is that this would make the line of Cain the "sons of God," and that hardly seems fitting in view of the character that is given to us in the Bible of Cain and his descendants.

It seems much more likely that that description would be applied to the sons of Seth, rather than those of Cain. Then, too, it appears that the ungodly have only sons, while the godly have daughters.

Now that is a perfectly acceptable view as far as I am concerned, since I have four daughters. But it hardly seems possible to accept such a view. It is all too clear that this theory does not take account of all the factors evidenced.

There is an alternative view that takes note of the fact that in Scripture it is only by a specific divine act of creation that any being can be termed a *son of God*.

God is a Spirit, and man is flesh, and in the New Testament we are told that "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, but that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," (John 3:6 RSV).

So you cannot have men of the flesh termed *sons of God*, except a divine creative act be performed.

In the New Testament, Adam is called a *son of God* because he is the direct result of divine creation, Jesus Christ is called

the Son of God because he is eternally begotten of the Father; and believers are called *sons of God* because they are born again by faith in Jesus Christ, in a divine creative act.

Also, in the Bible, angels are called *sons of God* for they came directly from the creating hand of God and are not reproduced sexually, as men are.

It is interesting that in the Old Testament every other use of this term *sons of God* refers to the angels. You will find in the book of Job that the angels are called sons of God (Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7).

Now we learn from Jude and Peter in the New Testament that there was a fall of angels, and the time of that fall is given as "the days of Noah."

There are two very interesting passages that link up with Genesis 6. In First Peter, Chapter 3, we have a passage that has been a puzzle to many but which does directly apply to this account:

Peter says of Jesus that he went "in the spirit" and preached to "the spirits in prison," (1 Pet 3:19). Now, there has been much controversy as to what this meant.

Some have thought it meant that Jesus descended into hell and preached to the spirits in hell during the three days between his crucifixion and resurrection.

Personally, I do not ascribe to that theory at all.

I think it means that it was through the Spirit that Jesus preached in the days of Noah, speaking in the person of Noah. Noah, we are told, was "a preacher of righteousness" (2 Pet 2:5), and the Spirit of Christ preached through him. But, at any rate, that is somewhat beside the point.

The passage goes on to say that these were spirits in prison,

...who formerly did not obey, when God's patience waited in the days of Noah, during the building of the ark, in which a few, that is, eight persons, were saved through water. (1 Pet 3:20 RSV)

Also in Second Peter, Chapter 2, Verse 4, Peter recounts a fall of the angels:

For if God did not spare the angels when they sinned, but cast them into hell and committed them to the pits,

of nether gloom to be kept until the judgement; if he did not spare the ancient world, but preserved Noah, (2 Pet 2:4-5a RSV)

Note that he links this fall with the days of Noah. Then in the book of Jude we have another reference to this event:

And the angels that did not keep their own position but left their proper dwelling have been kept by him in eternal chains in the nether gloom until the judgement of the great day; just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities, which likewise acted immorally and indulged in unnatural lust, serve as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire. (Jude 1:6-7 RSV)

There Jude gives us the nature of the sin of the angels. He said it was like that in Sodom and Gomorrah; it was "unnatural lust."

This you can see is directly in parallel with the statement in Genesis 6, that the "sons of God" came in to "the daughters of men" and married them, taking wives as they chose. This is evidently regarded in the Scriptures as an unnatural act.

Thus we have the picture of fallen angels joining in sexual intercourse with the daughters of men and producing a strange race.

There have been those who object to this idea by pointing out that Jesus said that angels are sexless. In Matthew 22, Verse 30, he does say that those who are in the resurrection "will neither marry nor be given in marriage, but are like the angels in heaven."

It must be noted, however, that he adds the words, "in heaven," as opposed to the angels in hell. Some have suggested that perhaps there was a time when angels did have sexual powers, and this, of course, would permit the kind of thing recorded here.

However, it seems more likely that the explanation is given to us by Jude when he says of these angels that they "left their proper dwelling" (Jude 1:6), and presumably took up improper dwelling places.

Now bodies, in Scripture, are called dwelling places. The very term Jude uses is, elsewhere in Scripture, applied to the body.

Its use here implies that the angels took up residence where they did not belong.

This, therefore, is suggestive of what we have in the New Testament in the days of our Lord, in the many, many cases of demonic possession recorded so frequently in the pages of the gospels.

Evil spirits, fallen angels, possessed the bodies of men, and these demon-possessed men married women and produced a race of strange beings called here in Genesis 6, "the Nephilim."

They were a race of giants. The word *Nephilim* is confirming of this whole idea, because it means "the fallen ones."

All this strongly suggests that demonic possession has the ability to affect genetic structure. The chromosomes are changed so that the progeny are markedly different; a sort of mutation takes place, and the result is a pronounced change in the children of such a union.

We know today that LSD has this kind of an effect upon the genetic structure. Chromosomal changes take place and children can be malformed and mentally deficient because of the use of LSD by their parents.

It is interesting that, in the book of Revelation, the Bible links drugs with demonism and suggests that drugs are a means by which the human spirit is opened up to the control of demonic beings.

Time Magazine reported a new theory to the effect that "a genetic abnormality may predispose a man to antisocial behavior, including crimes of violence..."

A normal male baby has an XY chromosome pattern, but occasionally one is found with an XYY pattern. According to an all-woman team of researchers in Scotland, this "may be a supermale, over aggressive and potentially criminal."

It was further noted that "the XYY (males) averaged 6 ft 1 inch tall whereas the average for (others tested) was 5 ft 7 inches."

It is clear that the result of this union of demon-possessed men with women was a race of mighty men, "men of renown." Here, I think, is the explanation for the stories of mythology with which many of you are familiar, the demi-gods -- half man and half god -- such as Hercules, and others.

Mythology is no mere invention of the mind of man; it grows out of the traditions, memories, and legends which were a corruption and perversion of primitive truths.

We are told in this passage that this occurred "also afterward." This "also afterward" means that after the Flood a similar incursion of demonic beings took place.

This second invasion resulted in the presence in the land of Canaan of certain gigantic races which are called in our Bible, the Canaanites.

Many of you who have stumbled over those long lists of "ites" in the Old Testament are familiar with these various races -- the Jebusites, the Geshurites, the Hittites, etc.

All of these are divisions of the Nephilim (they are also called the Rephaim in the Old Testament) who were already in the land when Abraham came to the promised land.

They represent an attempt on the part of demonic powers to derail the divine program of bringing a Redeemer into the world through the human race.

It is interesting that archaeologists have now discovered the giant-cities of Bashan, and they confirm the fact that there did exist in this area races of gigantic beings whose beds are ten, eleven, or twelve feet long.

(They had king-size beds in those days, but only because they needed them.)

It was these people that the Israelites were commanded to exterminate completely. It was these giant cities they were to wipe off the face of the earth; to exterminate the whole populace and their animals.

When this invasion of demonic powers into mankind takes place, notice that God, in his governing grace, immediately limits it:

Then the LORD said, "My spirit shall not abide in man forever, for he is flesh, but his days shall be a hundred and twenty years." (Gen 6:3 RSV)

That is sometimes regarded as a reference to the length of life of man before the Flood, but in this context I think it is clear that it means, rather, the number of years before the Flood, the length of time in which God would permit this kind of thing to go on in human society.

The one thing the Bible makes clear everywhere is that God controls human society; he restrains demonic forces and only permits them to operate to a limited degree and for a limited period of time.

Here we have clearly suggested the idea that he marked off before the Flood a hundred and thirty years, which would be the time when Noah would be permitted to preach the grace of God and extend an invitation to the people of his day to turn from their wicked ways and revive the promise of salvation.

This First Peter confirms. Noah was indeed a preacher of godliness, of righteousness, and the people refused to hear his word during the one hundred and twenty years of the preaching of grace.

Dr. Charles Malik, who was for a long time President of the United Nations and delegate from Lebanon, once said,

... we are still living, as the Germans say, *zwischen den zeiten* (between the times) when demonic forces can quickly soar very high and can take possession of the world in very short order.

There is a word from a world statesman confirming the fact that demonic forces are at work in human society. The first mark of an imminent collapse of civilization is this appearance of demonic powers at loose. They manifest themselves primarily in open and unchecked wickedness.

We shall see that this is the second mark given to us in the first part of Verse 5:

The Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, (Gen 6:5a RSV)

Unusually intense (that is the meaning of "great") and very widespread (in the earth) wickedness -- that is the second mark. The whole of the world of that day was involved in this. This wickedness is described in detail in various portions of Scripture. Wickedness is always the absence of the life of God at work in human society.

It is always opposed to the things of God. Perhaps the most vivid, most accurate and detailed description of wickedness given to us in the New Testament is in the book of Galatians,

where the apostle describes the works of the flesh.

It is the flesh that is "enmity against God" and produces wickedness. He says,

Now the works of the flesh are plain [i.e., they are easy to identify; they are obvious]: **immorality, impurity, licentiousness** [notice how he begins on the sexual level], **idolatry, sorcery** [witchcraft, or anything to do with the occult], **enmity, strife, jealousy, anger, selfishness, dissension, party spirit, envy, drunkenness, carousing, and the like.** (Gal 5:19-21a RSV)

That is wickedness. It is very noteworthy that in every listing of wickedness you will find, first, sexual wickedness. In the gospels it was "unclean" spirits that were possessing the bodies of men.

This word unclean is used elsewhere in the New Testament as the word for lust, therefore these were lustful spirits, i.e., sexually twisted and distorted spirits.

Their presence in society is always marked by outbreaks of sexual perversity. This is what Paul describes in Romans 1, where he is tracing the decline and fall of a society.

He gives there, as the ultimate sign of imminent collapse, the turning of men to unnatural lusts with other men, and women to unnatural lusts with other women, and the breakdown of society at this sexual level.

Thus we have clearly, as the second mark, a widespread and unusual manifestations of sexual wickedness; not sporadic, but continuous; not localized, but everywhere.

Naturally there have been occurrences of this sort in every civilization at some time. But here, it has a double character; it becomes a continuous thing and is everywhere taking place.

Now in the second half of that same verse we have the third mark of the imminent collapse of civilization. It is what Moses calls here, evil (debased) imaginations.

The Lord saw...that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. (Gen 6:5a, 6:5c RSV)

The outward wickedness rested upon a deeper corruption within.

The "imagination of the heart" are the desires and urges for ever more stimulating experiences, what Paul calls in Ephesians "deceitful lusts," which constantly urge men and women, boys and girls, to try to find something more exciting; what in modern parlance we call *kicks*, something that satisfies and is exciting.

Now this urge for kicks constitutes debased imaginations. They would find expression in any society in the creative arts, those which depend upon imagination for their motivation and expression, such as literature, art, and drama.

It is most significant that more and more today we are finding this area given over to the expression of the salacious, the lewd, and the sensual.

Recently I heard of a teacher in public school who refused to teach literature anymore because of the salacious content of what he had to teach. He simply gave up his training and professional background in order to avoid having to teach this kind of stuff.

All of this is summed up for us in two words in Verse 11:

Now the earth was corrupt in God's sight, and the earth was filled with violence. (Gen 6:11 RSV)

Corruption is inward pollution, the polluting of the mind, the heart, the imagination, the inner nature. The inner kingdom becomes extremely sensual and is polluted.

The result is outward *violence*, destructiveness, the outbreak of cruelty and violence on every side.

There you have the marks of an impending collapse of civilization. Rather sobering, isn't it? When civilization reaches this stage then the Bible clearly implies that judgement is certain, by divine fiat. We read on in Verse 6:

And the LORD was sorry that he had made men on the earth, and it grieved him to his heart. So the LORD said, "I will blot out man whom I have created from the face of the ground, man and beast and creeping things and birds of the air, for I am sorry that I have made them." But Noah found favor in the eyes of the LORD. (Gen 6:6-8 RSV)

When the account says, "God is sorry," it is really the word,

"God *repented*." We know from other Scriptures that it is impossible for God to repent. He does not change his mind like man does.

But this is a powerful figure to express in a vivid way the anger and determination of God. When society reaches this stage of dissolution and deterioration, God's anger burns.

It appears that he has changed his mind completely even though he is but acting on principles that are entirely consistent with his own being.

Yet, in the midst of this, we read that it grieved him, and grief is always the activity of love.

What we finite human beings do not understand is that God's love and wrath are exactly the same thing. They are two sides of the same coin.

What entrances us and warms us about God, and draws us to him, is love, the manifestation of his total being. He is the God of love, who loves regardless of merit.

This is what attracts us. But it is because we respond that he appears to us in that way. To those who reject his love, the same quality in God becomes wrath and it seems to be a wall of fire, burning and consuming everything.

We can see this also in ourselves.

It is our love that causes us to be angry at anything which injures what we love. You injure a mother's child in the mother's presence and watch her love flame out in wrath and anger against you.

Thus we have here clearly described a time when man, in his rejection of God, passes beyond the place of seeing God as love, and begins to experience his love as wrath. But it is exactly the same thing.

With mankind goes the whole creation because the creation is linked with man. The animals were made for man, so when man goes, the animals must go as well. But always there is the shining of grace, Verse 8:

But Noah found favor [or, literally, grace] in the eyes of the LORD. (Gen 6:8 RSV)

God was calling throughout this whole age, just as he is calling in our age today, pleading with men to turn from their

ways, to resist the widespread lie of Satan.

One man and his family turned and found grace in God's sight. He did not deserve it, and he could equally have turned and gone the other way, but he responded to the wooing and pleading of God and found grace in his sight.

That same grace is why we are here this morning. Bring this down to this 20th-century hour, and draw the parallel between the days of Noah and the days in which we live. You can see it plainly everywhere.

We must remember that if we are delivered from the wrath to come, if we escape the judging hand of God upon society, it is not because of anything we have done; it is the manifestation of God's grace.

Remember the Christian who saw a drunkard staggering down the street wallowing in his own vomit, and turned to his friend to say, "There but for the grace of God go I." We can all say that.

What has kept us? What has brought us to the truth? Was it any goodness on our part? No, it is God's grace.

It is that he loved us and called us, he wooed us and won us, seeking us out and, through many influences upon us, bringing us at last to see that the age in which we live is an age under the bondage of a lie. He has opened our eyes, partially at least, to the truth, till we have turned to the Lord Jesus and rested under the grace of God.

As our age deteriorates, as other ages have done before us, and our civilization nears the point of utter collapse, we can thank God that we have been snatched away as brands from the burning, like Noah and his family, if our hearts are responsive to the appeal of God's grace.

Source: <http://raystedman.org/genesis/0325.html>

Comments from Bryce Self

(onesimus@ix.netcom.com; June 11, 2002)

Compliments of <http://ldolphin.org>

Regarding Genesis 6 -- where the apostle says that certain angels left their "first estate" the word used is '*oikoterion*', a word used only one other place in Scripture, referring to our spiritual bodies after the resurrection.

Secondly, the difficulty we have in thinking of angels cohabiting with mortal women stems from our un-Biblical idea that 'spirit' equals immaterial or insubstantial.

In fact, spirit is MORE substantial than matter and governs matter. Jesus in his resurrected body ('*oikoterion*') could pass through the walls or locked doors behind which the disciples were hidden.

I think it is C.S. Lewis who in this connection points out that spiritual beings (or resurrected humans) are so much more "real" and "solid" than matter that they can pass through it similarly to the way we pass through a fog.

Third, if the angels were DESIGNED to providentially govern various material realms providentially under God, they are able by nature to manipulate matter in ways far beyond our technological tinkering.

We do know they can take physical form as men, and walk, speak, eat and otherwise manipulate matter as we do while in our form.

With their abilities to mold matter at a spiritual level to the extent even of taking on an apparently fully functional human body, we cannot logically rule out an ability to engender semi-human offspring through use of manufactured DNA from those bodies (or, less likely to my thinking, to make alterations to the genetic structure of normal humans of whom they have taken possession).

Lastly, remember, these are *fallen* angels whose work is rebellion and corruption of all that God has made good.

And we do know that they are especially involved in blaspheming the Lord through attacking and destroying His image in mankind, spirit, soul, and body.

Matthew 22:30 and Mark 12:25 are very specific -- "in the

resurrection/when they shall rise from the dead" (future tense, and referring explicitly to humans being only) --

"they neither marry nor are given in marriage" (the relationship of marriage first and foremost, and only by implication to include sexual cohabitation and procreation) -- "but are as the angels of God in heaven/as the angels which are in heaven"

(only and explicitly the unfallen good angels who have been confirmed forever in their right standing before God -- this says nothing whatsoever about fallen angels, their natures, capacities or activities in the past, present or future.)

These verses bear the unparalleled stamp of Dominical authority, but simply cannot exegetically be used in connection with Genesis 6.

In his "Plea for the Christians," Athenagoras (2nd Century apostolic father), identifies Satan as the angel originally placed in charge of matter in the universe (the 'covering' cherub), so that with his fall the material cosmos became impregnated with evil, just as all under Adam's dominion (animals, etc.) fell with him.

This is a very good explanation of how universal corruption and futility came about effecting a much more extensive domain than merely what had been committed to Adam.

It also explicates Christ's being exalted above ALL fallen creation, so that our final state in Christ is on a much higher level in the ontological "chain of being" than mankind held at creation.

Incidentally, he grounds his interpretation of Genesis 6 on the Scriptures and apostolic tradition.

In this public appeal on behalf of Christians, he would certainly only have used arguments and expositions which were in the common stream of the Faith in that day. This was the universally held view of the early Church.

From *Plea for the Christians* (Athenagoras of Athens, circa A.D. 177)

CHAP. XXIV.--CONCERNING THE ANGELS AND GIANTS.

What need is there, in speaking to you who have searched into every department of knowledge, to mention the poets, or to

examine opinions of another kind? Let it suffice to say thus much.

If the poets and philosophers did not acknowledge that there is one God, and concerning these gods were not of opinion, some that they are demons, others that they are matter, and others that they once were men, there might be some show of reason for our being harassed as we are, since we employ language which makes a distinction between God and matter, and the natures of the two.

For, as we acknowledge a God, and a Son his Logos, and a Holy Spirit, united in essence, the Father, the Son, the Spirit, because the Son is the Intelligence, Reason, Wisdom of the Father, and the Spirit an effluence, as light from fire; so also do we apprehend the existence of other powers, which exercise dominion about matter, and by means of it, and one in particular, which is hostile to God:

Not that anything is really opposed to God, like strife to friendship, according to Empedocles, and night to day, according to the appearing and disappearing of the stars (for even if anything had placed itself in opposition to God, it would have ceased to exist, its structure being destroyed by the power and might of God), but that to the good that is in God, which belongs of necessity to Him, and co-exists with Him, as color with body, without which it has no existence (not as being part of it, but as an attendant property co-existing with it, united and blended, just as it is natural for fire to be yellow and the ether dark blue),

--to the good that is in God, I say, the spirit which is about matter, who was created by God; just as the other angels were created by Him, and entrusted with the control of matter and the forms of matter, is opposed.

For this is the office of the angels,--to exercise providence for God over the things created and ordered by Him; so that God may have the universal and general providence of the whole, while the particular parts are provided for by the angels appointed over them.

Just as with men, who have freedom of choice as to both virtue and vice (for you would not either honour the good or punish the bad, unless vice and virtue were in their own power; and some are diligent in the matters entrusted to them by you, and others faithless), so is it among the angels.

Some, free agents, you will observe, such as they were created by God, continued in those things for which God had made and over which He had ordained them; but some outraged both the constitution of their nature and the government entrusted to them:

Namely, this ruler of matter and its various forms, and others of those who were placed about this first firmament (you know that we say nothing without witnesses, but state the things which have been declared by the prophets); these fell into impure love of virgins, and were subjugated by the flesh, and he became negligent and wicked in the management of the things entrusted to him.

Of these lovers of virgins, therefore, were begotten those who are called giants. And if something has been said by the poets, too, about the giants, be not surprised at this: worldly Wisdom and divine differ as much from each other as truth and plausibility:

The one is of heaven and the other of earth; and indeed, according to the prince of matter,- "We know we oft speak lies that look like troths."

CHAP. XXV.--THE POETS AND PHILOSOPHERS HAVE DENIED A DIVINE PROVIDENCE.

These angels, then, who have fallen from heaven, and haunt the air and the earth, and are no longer able to rise to heavenly things, and the souls of the giants, which are the demons who wander about the world, perform actions similar, the one (that is, the demons) to the natures they have received, the other (that is, the angels) to the appetites they have indulged.

But the prince of matter, as may be seen merely from what transpires, exercises a control and management contrary to the good that is in God:

"Ofttimes this anxious thought has crossed my mind, Whether 'tis chance or deity that rules The small affairs of men; and, spite of hope As well as justice, drives to exile some Stripped of all means of life, while others still Continue to enjoy prosperity."

Prosperity and adversity, contrary to hope and justice, made it impossible for Euripides to say to whom belongs the administration of earthly affairs, which is of such a kind that one might say of it:

"How then, while seeing these things, can we say There is a race of gods, or yield to laws?"

The same thing led Aristotle to say that the things below the heaven are not under the care of Providence, although the eternal providence of God concerns itself equally with us below, "The earth, let willingness move her or not, Must herbs produce, and thus sustain my flocks," -

And addresses itself to the deserving individually, according to truth and not according to opinion; and all other things, according to the general constitution of nature, are provided for by the law of reason.

But because the demoniac movements and operations proceeding from the adverse spirit produce these disorderly sallies, and moreover move men, some in one way and some in another, as individuals and as nations, separately and in common, in accordance with the tendency of matter on the one hand, and of the affinity for divine things on the other, from within and from without,--some who are of no mean reputation have therefore thought that this universe is constituted without any definite order, and is driven hither and thither by an irrational chance.

But they do not understand, that of those things which belong to the constitution of the whole world there is nothing out of order or neglected, but that each one of them has been produced by reason, and that, therefore, they do not transgress the order prescribed to them.

And that man himself, too, so far as He that made him is concerned, is well ordered, both by his original nature, which has one common character for all, and by the constitution of his body, which does not transgress the law imposed upon it, and by the termination of his life, which remains equal and common to all alike; but that, according to the character peculiar to himself and the operation of the ruling prince and of the demons his followers, he is impelled and moved in this direction or in that, notwithstanding that all possess in common the same original constitution of mind.

CHAP. XXVI.--THE DEMONS ALLURE MEN TO THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES.

They who draw men to idols, then, are the aforesaid demons, who are eager for the blood of the sacrifices, and lick them; but the gods that please the multitude, and whose names are given to the images, were men, as may be learned from their history.

And that it is the demons who act under their names, is proved by the nature of their operations. For some castrate, as Rhea; others wound and slaughter, as Artemis; the Tauric goddess puts all strangers to death.

I pass over those who lacerate with knives and scourges of bones, and shall not attempt to describe all the kinds of demons; for it is not the part of a god to incite to things against nature.

"But when the demon plots against a man, He first inflicts some hurt upon his mind."

But God, being perfectly good, is eternally doing good. That, moreover, those who exert the power are not the same as those to whom the statues are erected, very strong evidence is afforded by Troas and Parium.

The one has statues of Neryllinus, a man of our own times; and Parium of Alexander and Proteus: both the sepulcher and the statue of Alexander are still in the forum.

The other statues of Neryllinus, then, are a public ornament, if indeed a city can be adorned by such objects as these; but one of them is supposed to utter oracles and to heal the sick, and on this account the people of the Troad offer sacrifices to this statue, and overlay it with gold, and hang chaplets upon it.

But of the statues of Alexander and Proteus (the latter, you are aware, threw himself into the fire near Olympia), that of Proteus is likewise said to utter oracles; and to that of Alexander- "Wretched Paris, though in form so fair, Thou slave of woman" - sacrifices are offered and festivals are held at the public cost, as to a god who can hear.

Is it, then, Neryllinus, and Proteus, and Alexander who exert these energies in connection with the statues, or is it the nature of the matter itself? But the matter is brass.

And what can brass do of itself, which may be made again into a different form, as Amasis treated the footpan, as told by Herodotus? And Neryllinus, and Proteus, and Alexander, what good are they to the sick?

For what the image is said now to effect, it effected when Neryllinus was alive and sick.

CHAP. XXVII.--ARTIFICES OF THE DEMONS.

What then? In the first place, the irrational and fantastic movements of the soul about opinions produce a diversity of images (eidwla) from time to time:

Some they derive from matter, and some they fashion and bring forth for themselves; and this happens to a soul especially when it partakes of the material spirit and becomes mingled with it, looking not at heavenly things and their Maker, but downwards to earthly things, wholly at the earth, as being now mere flesh and blood, and no longer pure spirit.

These irrational and fantastic movements of the soul, then, give birth to empty visions in the mind, by which it becomes madly set on idols.

When, too, a tender and susceptible soul, which has no knowledge or experience of sounder doctrines, and is unaccustomed to contemplate truth, and to consider thoughtfully the Father and Maker of all things, gets impressed with false opinions respecting itself, then the demons who hover about matter, greedy of sacrificial odours and the blood of victims, and ever ready to lead men into error, avail themselves of these delusive movements of the souls of the multitude; and, taking possession of their thoughts, cause to flow into the mind empty visions as if coming from the idols and the statues; and when, too, a soul of itself, as being immortal, moves conformably to reason, either predicting the future or healing the present, the demons claim the glory for themselves.

The Sons of God

By Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum, Th.M., Ph.D., [Ariel Ministries](#)

In discussing Genesis 6:1-4, one of the early echoes of the promise of Genesis 3:15, it has been stated that these verses describe the intermarriage of fallen angels with human women.

Because this view is contested by some, it will be necessary to study these verses in some detail and provide a justification of the interpretation which has been given.

The Multiplication of Humanity - Genesis 6:1

1:1 Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them,... (NASB)

Verse 1 emphasizes the multiplication of humanity before the Flood. The Hebrew word for "men" used here is generic and refers to humanity in general, including male and female.

The word, as such, cannot be limited to the sons of Cain. It included both Sethites and Cainites, and both of these groups died in the Flood.

Another key word found in verse 1. is "daughter," a Hebrew word that means "females."

The emphasis in the second part of verse 1, "daughters were born unto them," is on the female portion of humanity. Again, the expression cannot be limited to the female descendants of Cain, as some teach.

It simply is a word that means "the female portion of the population." Verse 1 can read: "Man [humanity] multiplied and daughters (females) were born unto them."

The distinction in verse 1 is not between male Sethites and female Cainites, but the emphasis is on the female portion of humanity in general which would include both Cainites and Sethites.

The Intermarriage - Genesis 6:2

2 that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. (NASB)

Verse 2 describes an intermarriage. The first key phrase is, "sons of God." The term "sons of God" is a general term which means "to be brought into existence by God's creative act."

Because the term carries this meaning, it is used very selectively. Throughout the Old Testament the term "sons of God" is always used of angels. This is very clear when the usages of the term are compared in the Old Testament.

Elsewhere, the term is used in Job :1:6; 2:1, and 38:7. No one debates that the other places where "sons of God" is found in the Old Testament clearly refer to angels.

But some want to make Genesis 6:1-4 the one exception, and there is simply no warrant for making an exception here.

In the New Testament the term "sons of God" is expanded. Adam is called the son of God (Luke 3:38) because he was brought into existence by creation.

Believers are called sons of God (John 1:12) because believers are considered to be a new creation (Galatians 6:15). But in Genesis, the text is dealing with a specific Hebrew expression, *benei elohim*, and, as it is used in the Hebrew Old Testament, it is a term that is always used of angels.

The distinction in this passage, then, is not between Sethites and Cainites, but between humanity and angels. The word *men* here emphasizes humanity. The term "sons of God" emphasizes angels.

The second key expression in verse :z is "daughters of men." This is a generic term for women, which includes females of both Sethites and Cainites. What the verse is saying is, "the sons of God saw the daughters of men."

There is no justification for this verse to be interpreted to mean "godly males" intermarried with "ungodly females." Would truly godly men marry ungodly females? The "daughters of men" simply means womankind, and the "sons of God" refers to angels.

If the meaning is kept consistent with its usage elsewhere in the Old Testament, the passage is clearly speaking of fallen angels intermarrying with human women. This is obvious in two ways.

First, it is always a one-way intermarriage; it is always "sons of God" marrying "daughters of men." There is no record of "daughters of God" marrying "sons of men."

If the distinction was between Sethites and Cainites, it simply would not happen this way. In human society, intermarriage occurs both ways. Today, saved males sometimes marry unsaved females, and sometimes saved females marry unsaved males.

If the other claim was true, it would mean that male Sethites married female Cainites, but male Cainites never married female Sethites, which is entirely unlikely. Inter-marriage would thus be confined to godly men with ungodly women, but not godly women with ungodly men.

But in Genesis 6 there is only a one-way inter-marriage, the "sons of God" inter-marrying with the "daughters of men."

Second, the context clearly speaks of a cohabitation that is unusual and unnatural and causes the worldwide Flood. Verses 1-4 deal with the angelic cause of the worldwide Flood, while verses 5-6 deal with the human cause.

Cohabitation between Sethites and Cainites would not be unusual or unnatural, while cohabitation between angels and humans would be.

Those who do not like this teaching object to it by quoting Matthew 22:30, claiming that this verse clearly teaches that angels are sexless:

22:30 "For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven." (NASB)

What Jesus said is that human beings "in the resurrection" and "in heaven" do not marry, nor are [they] given in marriage." The angels that Jesus was speaking of are angels in heaven."

The comparison is not with angels in general, but with angels "in heaven." The emphasis is that in heaven, good angels neither marry nor are given in marriage.

Matthew 22:30 makes the same point about human beings. Humans in heaven do not marry, nor are they given in marriage. What about humans here on earth? Humans on earth certainly do marry and are given in marriage.

This is a contrast between what happens in heaven as compared to what happens here on earth. Genesis 6, however, is speaking of angels on earth. So in heaven, angels do not marry, nor are they given in marriage, and humans in heaven will not marry nor be given in marriage. But Genesis 6 discusses things happening on earth.

Angels are never declared to be sexless. In fact, the male gender is always used. Matthew 22:30 teaches that angels do not procreate after their kind, meaning that angels do not give birth to other angels. But angels are always described in the masculine gender, not in the feminine, nor in the neuter.

They are always masculine gender in both the Old and New Testaments. Whenever angels became visible, they always appeared as young men.

Anytime an angel appeared to a person he always appeared as a young man and never a woman (Genesis 18:1 - 19:22; Mark 16:5-7; Luke 24:4-7; Acts 1:10-11).

Matthew 22:30 cannot be used as an argument against the angelic interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4, because it is dealing with a situation on earth, not in heaven; nor does Matthew 22:30 teach that angels are sexless.

Another question is: Why did Satan have some of his fallen angels intermarry with human women? Why bother? The reason for this can be understood by investigating the greater context of Genesis.

Three chapters earlier (Genesis 3:15), the first messianic prophecy is recorded. The prophecy declared that the Messiah would be the seed of the Woman, and this Seed would crush the head of Satan.

What is happening in Genesis 6:1-4 is a Satanic attempt to corrupt the Seed of the Woman by having some of his angels take on human form - angels always appear as young males when they take on human form - and intermarry with humankind to try to corrupt the seed. Therefore, the events of Genesis 6:1-4 were a Satanic attempt to cancel out the prophecy of Genesis 3:15.

The Result of the Intermarriage - Genesis 6:3

The result of this intermarriage was the judgement of God:

3 Then the LORD said, "My Spirit shall not strive with man forever, because he also is flesh; nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years." (NASB)

In verse 3 God pronounced the judgement: the Holy Spirit would not continue to strive with this kind of evil forever, and God decreed the destruction of humanity to be fulfilled 120 years later.

The means of the destruction would be the Flood. The purpose of the Flood was to destroy the product of the union of angels and women, discussed in the next verse.

The Product of the Intermarriage - Genesis 6:4

4 The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of

men, and they bore children to them. Those were the mighty men who were of old, men of renown. (NASB)

To get a clearer concept of what this verse is saying as a whole, individual parts need to be discussed first.

First is the name Nephilim. In some translations the word Nephilim has been translated by the word "giant." People reading it picture huge human beings. But the word does not mean "giants"; rather, it means "fallen ones."

The word does not refer to giants in the sense of huge beings, but to a race of fallen ones.

The reason it was translated as "giant" is because in the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament made around 250 B.C., the Jewish scholars translated verse 4 by the Greek word gigantes which means "Titan."

Our English word "giant" comes from this Greek word gigantes. But what were the Titans in Greek mythology? They were part man and part god, because they were products of gods and men.

When the Jewish scholars in 250 B.C. translated the word Nephilim to Greek, they used the Greek word for Titans because they recognized this to be a union not of two types of human beings, but of angels and humans which produced a being that was neither angelic nor human.

So at least the Jewish scholars Of 250 B.C., who lived much closer to the time when Moses originally wrote this passage, clearly understood this to be an intermarriage between angels and human women.

As a result of this union, a new race of beings called the Nephilim, a race of fallen ones, came into being. They were gigantes, they were superhuman, but not in size.

They had human characteristics but were, at the same time, superhuman. They had extra capacities, both mentally and physically, though they may not have been any larger than normal human beings.

It is from the events of Genesis 6:1-4 that the source of Greek and Roman mythologies were derived.

These mythologies record how gods from Mount Olympus intermarried with human beings on earth and produced children who had superhuman characteristics, who were greater than men but less than the gods.

The book of Genesis gives the true history of what really happened, while Greek and Roman mythologies give the corrupted account.

In Greek and Roman mythologies the human perspective is given, and what happened is elevated to something special and glorified, but God called it sin.

The second word to note in this verse is giborim, which is translated as "the mighty men... the men of renown." Again, because this was a product of fallen angels and human women, they were unique.

They were the giborim. Notice that there is no mention of mighty women, which would be strange if this were a product of a normal union.

After all, a normal union produces both males and females. If this were a natural union, then the product should have been mighty men and mighty women.

But there are only mighty men because this is a new race of beings that is neither human nor angelic. The only way to explain the origin of the giborim is that they were the product of this union, the point of verse 4.

Only by the angelic explanation of chapter 6 do other areas of biblical teaching make sense.

It provides the only adequate explanation for certain statements in II Peter and Jude which will be studied next. It is a peculiar sin, it is connected to the flood, and it is different from the original fall of the angels; otherwise, all fallen angels would be permanently confined.

II Peter 2:4-5

2:4 For if God did not spare angels when they sinned, but cast them into hell and committed them to pits of darkness, reserved for judgement; 5 and did not spare the ancient world, but preserved Noah, a preacher of righteousness, with seven others, when He brought a flood upon the world of the ungodly; ... (NASB)

Verse 4 gives the location of the permanently confined demons. The temporarily confined demons are found in the Abyss, but the permanently confined demons are elsewhere.

The Greek word translated in this passage as "hell" is Tartarus. Tartarus is a section of Sheol or Hades where the

permanently confined demons are located.

Both the Abyss and Tartarus are sections of Sheol or Hades. The Abyss is for demons that are temporarily confined, but Tartarus is for demons who are permanently confined.

Tartarus is referred to as "pits of darkness" and these angels are reserved there unto the "judgement." This will be the Great White Throne judgement, the final judgement.

This means that at no time will these angels ever be released. When the time comes, they will go directly from Tartarus to stand before the Great White Throne judgement and then be cast into the Lake of Fire.

There will never be a time when they will be free to roam - they are permanently confined.

Verse 5 reveals the timing of their confinement: it was in conjunction with the Flood. This agrees well with the events of Genesis 6:1-4 which are also connected with the Flood.

The purpose of the Flood was to destroy this product of fallen angels and human women.

So by comparing the II Peter passage with the Genesis passage, there is good evidence to show that Genesis is not speaking about Sethites intermarrying with Cainites, but fallen angels intermarrying with human women.

This is a valid conclusion just from a study of the Old Testament passages themselves. However, the New Testament also supports this particular interpretation.

Jude 6-7

6 And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgement of the great day. 7 just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh, are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire. (NASB)

Verse 6 emphasized the fall of a select group of angels and described their fall in four statements.

First, "they kept not their own principality." The word "principality" is frequently used of the angelic realm and is one of the various ranks within the angelic realm.

It means that they did not remain in their position and place of rank within the Satanic cosmos. Second, they "left their proper habitation."

They left the demonic angelic sphere of operation and entered into the human sphere by taking on the form of young men and intermarrying with human women. Third, they are now "kept in everlasting bonds under darkness."

Here Jude mentioned the same thing as Peter, that these angels are now permanently confined. Peter also revealed the place of their confinement: Tartarus.

Fourth, they are to be kept there until "the judgement of that great day," Again, Jude reaffirms Peter's statement that they are being kept in bondage until the judgement of that great day.

This is the Great White Throne judgement. Once again, it is reaffirmed that these demons will never be free to roam around but are permanently confined in Tartarus.

When the time comes, they will be taken out of Tartarus to stand before the Great White Throne judgement, and then be cast into the Lake of Fire.

Verse 7 deals with the nature of their sin. The key phrase is "in like manner." In like manner, as Sodom and Gomorrah, they went after "strange flesh."

The sin that these angels committed is similar to the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah, the sexual sin of going after strange flesh. "Strange flesh" means sexual union that is unnatural; it goes contrary to nature.

In the case of Sodom and Gomorrah, the strange flesh was homosexuality; in the case of these angels, the strange flesh was female flesh. Instead of remaining in their usual state of residence, they invaded a new state of residence, one of alien flesh, to commit gross sexual immorality.

Sodom and Gomorrah and these angels have one thing in common: they are guilty of sexual sins. In the case of Sodom and Gomorrah it was homosexuality; in the case of these angels, it was intermarrying into the human sphere.

By comparing the Genesis passage with the passages in II Peter and Jude, it is clear that these are angels who intermarried with human women, and not simply Sethites who intermarried with Cainites. ((From *Messianic Christology* Appendix I, Ariel

Ministries, 1998, PO Box 3713, Tustin, CA 92781)

There Be Giants In the Earth

Rick Lanser

"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" (Gen. 6:4, KJV).

With this verse in Genesis the Bible introduces to us the existence of giants. The Hebrew term Nephilim used here fundamentally means "fallen ones" rather than giants per se, though the trait of huge size seems inextricably linked to the term.

Present in the days of the antediluvians -- "in those days" hearkens back to Gen. 6:1, "when men began to multiply on the face of the earth" -- at first glance the expression "and also after that" may lead one to think they reappeared after the Flood.

This is by no means clear, however; the phrase may simply mean they continued to coexist with "normal" humans for an indeterminate period of time.

The additional phrase that further describes them as "mighty men which were of old" implies they were no longer extant at the time Moses penned these words.

The identity of the Nephilim is much debated by theologians and Bible students, with a key issue being the identification of the "sons of God" -- but that is a topic for another day! Let us press on...

Continuing through the Old Testament, one finds numerous further verses touching on the subject of giants. Other passages dealing with them include Num. 13; Deut. 1, 3, 9; Josh. 11, 12; I Sam. 17; 2 Sam. 21; and I Chr. 20.

As they undertook the conquest of the Promised Land under Joshua and continued to extend their dominion over it into the time of David, the Israelites reported a number of encounters with the enormous men known as the Rephaim and Anakim.

It should be noted that Numbers 13:33 reports the spies saying that "the sons of Anak are part of the Nephilim," but this is likely nothing more than their personal opinion which Moses simply reports, rather than a statement of fact.

Most Bible translations include this phrase as part of the

spies' quoted words, not as a separate parenthetical observation by Moses; and further, the phrase is textually suspect, being absent from the Septuagint.

Scholars such as Eryl Davies (commentary on Numbers in the New Century Bible Commentary) regard it as an explanatory scribal gloss rather than part of the original text.

For these reasons, it is safest to understand Numbers 13:33 as simply expressing the opinion of some that the size of the sons of Anak brought the Nephilim to mind.

Regardless of whether the Anakim were actually related to the Nephilim, it is obvious that the Israelites were dealing with giants.

If our understanding is correct that a cubit was approximately 18 inches, then Goliath, at "six cubits and a span," was somewhat over 9 feet tall.

Og, the King of Bashan whose bed is described in Deut. 3:11 as being about 14 feet long by 6 feet wide, was thought to be 10 to 12 feet tall.

As difficult as it may be for us to imagine such huge people today -- Shaquille O'Neal is a mere stripling compared to them! -- the clear impression one receives from these reports is that they record factual information, not mere legend.

If we consider for a moment that from dogs we can breed not only toy poodles but also mastiffs, we ought to keep an open mind to the size possibilities incorporated by the Creator into the genes of the earliest humans.

But the skeptic has a right to ask: If the Bible is true, where is the EVIDENCE for these huge beings? Where are the displays in the museums? Where are the archaeological reports that record the discovery of their remains?

This is a fair question.

If one goes to any of the major museums, you will not find any exhibits of giant human beings. Search the Smithsonian galleries, for example, and you will see not a single giant bone or footprint cast on display.

The clear impression given is that evidence of giants has never been found, and, intentionally or not, this tends to cast the Biblical record in an unfavorable light.

Yet concluding such evidence does not exist at all would be

quite wrong! Reputable reports, found in the pages of older newspapers and magazines and given by credible witnesses, of the discovery of such remains HAVE come to light from time to time.

The problem is, there is a reigning paradigm within the enclave of professional anthropologists which spills over into our museums, and which allows no place for such "anomalous artifacts."

The gatekeepers of our major museums adhere to an orthodoxy which mandates that such oddities as giant skulls be kept under wraps, reserved for the eyes of insiders only, presumably lest the unsophisticated begin to doubt the officially-sanctioned history of humanity.

As Joseph R. Jochmans has written (*Strange Relics from the Depths of the Earth*), online at http://joe3998.tripod.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/s_trangerelics.pdf

It is becoming increasingly apparent that not all facts from the past find their "proper" place. Other discoveries have been made that [compellingly] contradict the accepted model.

Yet these discoveries are largely ignored, since it is far easier for the majority of scientists and historians to uphold what is "established," than to try to build a new model based on the "exceptions."

It is not unlike the end of the movie "Raiders of the Lost Ark." Having recovered the Ark of the Covenant from the clutches of the Nazis, Indy finds himself compelled in the end to leave it in the hands of the authorities, who promise to "take care of it."

And what is the outcome? We find the Ark packed up in a nondescript crate and spirited away to disappear into the bowels of an endless warehouse, conveniently taking along with it all of the uncomfortable questions it might raise.

Many feel that this is exactly what has happened to most of the giant artifacts dug up by past generations, and why newer discoveries receive no notice.

Contrary to the impression given by the museums, however, we HAVE discovered evidence that "there were giants in the earth." Space precludes listing more than a few mentioned in Jochmans' article:

- Eureka, NV, 1877: "...the prospector was surprised to find a human leg bone and knee cap sticking out of solid rock....When the surrounding stone was carefully chipped away, the specimen was found to be composed of a leg bone broken off four inches above the knee, the knee cap and joint, the lower leg bones, and the complete bones of the foot.

Several medical doctors examined the remains, and were convinced that anatomically they had indeed once belonged to a human being, and a very modern-looking one. But an intriguing aspect of the bones was their size: from knee to heel they measured 39 inches. Their owner in life had thus stood over 12 feet tall" (Jochmans, p. 4).

- Carson City, NV, 1882: "...several human tracks were found. The tracks were in six series, each with alternate right and left tracks. The stride was from two and a half to over three feet, and the individual prints were from 18 to 20 inches in length - that of a giant. The straddle - the distance between the left and right prints - was 18 to 19 inches" (Jochmans, p. 5).

- Carrizo Valley, OK, 1970's: "The shoe prints...reveal their wearers to have been above normal size with the imprints averaging 20 inches long and 8 inches across the ball of the foot [suggesting a height of roughly 12 feet] (Jochmans, p 7).

I recently received a copy of an e-mail about a living missionary who, prior to becoming a Christian, was an anthropologist. It includes the following fascinating information, which I have not yet been able to verify firsthand, but has the ring of truth about it. (Not having been able to confirm the details, I am leaving out the missionary's name.)

... She was privy to things that they don't let the public readily see. They display anomalies for study. They don't prohibit people from seeing them, but they do keep it real quiet and pretty much among themselves. ...The thing I remember most out of the dozens of examples she gave, was that she professed to have seen and held in her hands, a DOZEN human skulls that were TWICE the size of a normal human skull. That would make a 12' tall man, who might weigh over 1000 pounds.

She testified that when she was being witnessed to by the person who eventually led her to Christ, she was encouraged to read the Bible.

She finally started to do just that, and opened a Bible to the beginning and started reading. She didn't get six chapters into the book when she came across Gen 6:4 -- "There were giants in the earth in those days ..."

She said a chill went down her spine, because she knew she had handled evidence that this verse was true. She knew that this was exactly the kind of thing the Bible is mocked for, except in this case, she knew the Bible was right.

This gave her confidence that she could trust the Bible and doubt the skeptics, instead of the other way around. Shortly afterward she got saved, and the rest is history.

I think it would be an enormous help in setting the record straight if archaeological work could be done at Biblical sites mentioned in Scripture as being the home of giants.

If remains of some of the Anakim or Rephaim were freshly unearthed by professionals who are not married to the reigning paradigm, this could go a long way toward getting the other skeletons out of the closet!

Possible locations for such work include the sites mentioned in the Biblical passages alluded to earlier - Hebron, Debir, Gaza, Gath, Ashdod, Ashtaroth and Edrei, among others.

Unfortunately, the continuing unrest in most of these areas makes formal research infeasible right now. But one way or another, hopefully the day will soon come when the wraps will be removed from this hidden facet of human history, and our museums will pull out of mothballs the "anomalous" remains that have long been kept hidden.

In summary, there are giants in the earth... and some have been excavated, but not put on display for the public to see.

I, for one, want to see them with my own eyes, for they are part of the ancient history of this world which the Bible so faithfully records, as it does all the matters of our fact-based faith in the Living God.

ABR ELECTRONIC NEWSLETTER, Vol. 4, Issue 1 Circulation: 3425, January 15, 2004, <http://www.biblearchaeology.org/>, 1-800-430-0008, abrofc@aol.com

The Sons of God and the Daughters of Men

(Genesis 6:1-8)

By: Bob Deffinbaugh, Th.M.

Introduction

Attempts to produce a master race did not begin with Adolf Hitler, nor have they ended with him. Our generation seems to have a fixation on super human. Superman, the Bionic Man, the Bionic Woman, Hulk, and many other television characters contribute to the same theme.

And this super-race is not to be understood as dominating only the realm of fiction. It is most frightening to realize that genetic scientists are seriously working to create the master humans ([transgenics](#)), while abortions can be employed to systematically eliminate the undesirables.

I read an article in the paper the other day which gave an account of one organization that makes available to certain women the sperm of contributing Nobel Prize winners.

It is much more difficult to determine the ultimate outcome of these attempts than it is to find the origin of the movement.

Its inception is recorded in the sixth chapter of the book of Genesis.

I must say as we begin to study these verses that there is more disagreement here per square inch than almost anywhere in the Bible.

By-and-large it is the conservative scholars who have the most difficulty with this passage.

That is because those who don't take the Bible either literally or seriously are quick to call the account a myth. Conservative scholars must explain the event for what Moses claimed it to be, an historical event.

While great differences arise in the interpretation of this passage, the issue is not one that is fundamental -- one that will affect the critical issues which underlie one's eternal salvation. Those with whom I most heartily disagree here are usually my brothers in Christ.

Who Are the 'Sons of God?

The interpretation of verses 1-8 hinges upon the definition of three key terms, the sons of God, (verses 2,4), the daughters

of men, (verses 2,4), and the Nephilim (verse 4).

There are three major interpretations of these terms which I will attempt to describe, beginning with that which, in my mind is the least likely, and ending with the one that is most satisfactory.

View 1:

The Merging of the Ungodly Cainite with the Godly Sethites

The sons of God are generally said by those who hold this view to be the godly men of the Sethite line. The daughters of men are thought to be the daughters of the ungodly Cainite. The Nephilim are the ungodly and violent men who are the product of this unholy union.

The major support for this interpretation is the context of chapters 4 and 5. Chapter four describes the ungodly generation of Cain, while in chapter five we see the godly Sethite line.

In Israel, separation was a vital part of the religious responsibility of those who truly worshipped God. What took place in chapter six was the breakdown in the separation which threatened the godly seed through whom Messiah was to be born.

This breakdown was the cause of the flood which would follow. It destroyed the ungodly world and preserved righteous Noah and his family, through whom the promise of Genesis 3:15 would be fulfilled.

While this interpretation has the commendable feature of explaining the passage without creating any doctrinal or theological problems, what it offers in terms of orthodoxy, it does at the expense of accepted exegetical practices.

First and foremost this interpretation does not provide definitions that arise from within the passage or which even adapt well to the text. Nowhere are the Sethites called the sons of God.

The contrast between the godly line of Seth and the ungodly line of Cain may well be overemphasized. I am not at all certain that the line of Seth, as a whole, was godly.

While all of the Cainite line appears to be godless, only a handful of the Sethites are said to be godly. The point which Moses makes in chapter 5 is that God has preserved a righteous remnant through whom His promises to Adam and Eve will be

accomplished.

One has the distinct impression that few were godly in these days (cf. 6:5-7, 12). It seems that only Noah and his family could be called righteous at the time of the flood. Would God have failed to deliver any who were righteous?

Also, the daughters of men can hardly be restricted to only the daughters of the Cainites. In verse 1 Moses wrote, 'Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them' (Genesis 6:1).

It is difficult to conclude that the men here are not men in general or mankind. It would follow that the reference to their daughters would be equally general.

To conclude that the daughters of men in verse two is some different, more restrictive group is to ignore the context of the passage.

For these reasons and others(83), I must conclude that this view is exegetically unacceptable. While it meets the test of orthodoxy it fails to submit to the laws of interpretation.

View 2: The Despot Interpretation

Recognizing the deficiencies of the first view, some scholars have sought to define the expression the sons of God by comparing it with the languages of the Ancient Near East.

It is interesting to learn that some rulers were identified as the son of a particular god. In Egypt, for example, the king was called the son of Re.(84)

In the Old Testament, the Hebrew word for God, Elohim, is used for men in positions of authority:

Then his master shall bring him unto the judges who acted in God's name (Exodus 21:6, following the marginal reading of the NASB).

God takes His stand in His own congregation; He judges in the midst of the rulers (literally, the gods, Psalm 82:1, cf. also 82:6).

This interpretation, like the fallen angel view, has its roots in antiquity.⁸⁵ According to this approach the sons of God are nobles, aristocrats, and kings.

These ambitious despots lusted after power and wealth and desired to become men of a name that is, somebodies (cf. 11:4)!

Their sin was not intermarriage between two groups--whether two worlds, (angels and man), two religious communities (Sethite and Cainite), or two social classes (royal and common)Ñbut that the sin was polygamy.

It was the same type of sin that the Cainite Lamech practiced, the sin of polygamy, particularly as it came to expression in the harem, the characteristic institution of the ancient oriental despot's court.

In this transgression the sons of God frequently violated the sacred trust of their office as guardians of the general ordinances of God for human conduct. (86)

In the context of Genesis 4 and 5 we do find some evidence which could be interpreted as supportive of the despot view. Cain did establish a city, named after his son Enoch (verse 4:17).

Dynasties would be more easily established in an urban setting. So, also, we know that Lamech did have two wives (verse 4:19). Although this is far from a harem, it could be viewed as a step in that direction.

Also the view defines the daughters of men as womankind, and not just the daughters of the Cainite line.

In spite of these factors, this interpretation would probably never have been considered had it not been for the problems which the fallen angel view is said to create.

While pagan kings were referred to as sons of a foreign deity, no Israelite king was so designated. True, nobles and those in authority were occasionally called gods, but not the sons of God.

This definition chooses to ignore the precise definition given by the Scriptures themselves. Further, the whole idea of power hungry men, seeking to establish a dynasty by the acquisition of a harem seems forced on the passage.

Who would ever have found this idea in the text itself, unless it were imposed upon it?

Also, the definition of the Nephilim as being merely violent and tyrannical men seems inadequate. Why should these men be sorted out for special consideration if they were merely like all the other men of that day (cf. 6:11,12)?

While the despot view does less violence to the text than does

the Cainite/Sethite view, it seems to me to be inadequate.

View 3: The Fallen Angel Interpretation (Angel View)

According to this view, the sons of God of verses 2 and 4 are fallen angels, which have taken the form of masculine human-like creatures. These angels married women of the human race (either Cainites or Sethites) and the resulting offspring were the Nephilim.

The Nephilim were giants with physical superiority and therefore established themselves as men of renown for their physical prowess and military might.

This race of half human creatures was wiped out by the flood, along with mankind in general, who were sinners in their own right (verse 6:11,12).

My basic presupposition in approaching our text is that we should let the Bible define its own terms.

If biblical definitions are not to be found then we must look at the language and culture of contemporary peoples. But the Bible does define the term the sons of God for us.

Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, Satan also came among them (Job 1:6).

Again there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came among them to present himself before the Lord (Job 2:1).

When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy? (Job 38:7, cf. Psalm 89:6; Daniel 3:25).

Scholars who reject this view readily acknowledge the fact that the precise term is clearly defined in Scripture.(87) The reason for rejecting the fallen angel interpretation is that such a view is said to be in violation of both reason and Scripture.

The primary passage which is said to be problematical is that found in Matthew's gospel, where our Lord said:

'You are mistaken, not understanding the Scriptures, or the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven (Matthew 22:29-30).

We are told that here our Lord said that angels are sexless,

but is this really true? Jesus compared men in heaven to angels in heaven.

Neither men nor angels are said to be sexless in heaven but we are told that in heaven there will be no marriage. There are no female angels with whom angels can generate offspring.

Angels were never told to be fruitful and multiply as was man.

When we find angels described in the book of Genesis, it is clear that they can assume a human-like form, and that their sex is masculine.

The writer to the Hebrews mentions that angels can be entertained without man's knowing it (Hebrews 13:2). Surely angels must be convincingly like men. The homosexual men of Sodom were very capable of judging sexuality.

They were attracted by the male angels who came to destroy the city (cf. Genesis 19:1ff, especially verse 5). In the New Testament, two passages seem to refer to this incident in Genesis 6, and to support the angel view:

For if God did not spare angels when they sinned, but cast them into hell and committed them to pits of darkness, reserved for judgement; (II Peter 2:4).

And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgement of the great day (Jude 6).

These verses would indicate that some of the angels who fell with Satan were not content with their proper abode and therefore began to live among men (and women) as men.

God's judgement upon them was to place them in bonds (88) so that they can no longer promote Satan's purposes on earth as do the unbound fallen angels who continue to do his bidding.

The result of the union between fallen angels and women is rather clearly implied to be the Nephilim.

While word studies have produced numerous suggestions for the meaning of this term, the biblical definition of this word comes from its only other instance in Scripture, Numbers 13:33:

There also we saw the Nephilim (the sons of Anak are part of the Nephilim); and we became like grasshoppers in our own sight, and so we were in their sight.

I therefore understand the Nephilim to be a race of super-

humans who are the product of this angelic invasion of the earth.⁸⁹

This view not only conforms to the biblical use of the expression sons of God, it also best fits the context of the passage. The effects of the fall were seen in the godly offspring of Cain (chapter 4).

While Cain and his descendants were in Satan's pocket, Satan knew from God's words in Genesis 3:15 that through the seed of the woman God was going to bring forth a Messiah who would destroy him. We do not know that the entire line of Seth was God-fearing.

In fact we would assume otherwise.

Noah and his immediate family alone seem to be righteous at the time of the flood.

Genesis 6 describes a desperate attempt on the part of Satan to attack the godly remnant that is named in chapter 5. So long as a righteous seed is preserved, God's promise of salvation hangs over the head of Satan, threatening of his impending doom.

The daughters of men were not raped or seduced as such. They simply chose their husbands on the same basis that the angels selected their physical appeal.

Now if you were an eligible woman in those days, who would you choose?

Would you select a handsome, muscle-bulging specimen of a man, who had a reputation for his strength and accomplishments, or what seemed to be in comparison a ninety-pound weakling?

Women looked for the hope of being the mother of the Savior. Who would be the most likely father of such a child? Would it not be a mighty man of renown, who would also be able to boast of immortality?

Some of the godly Sethites did live to be nearly 1000 years old, but the Nephilim did not die, if they were angels. And so the new race began.

Does God Change His Mind?

While verses 1-4 highlight the angelic invasion in the beginning of a new super-race, verses 5-7 serve notice that mankind in general was deserving of God's destructive intervention into history at the flood.

But it is here that we come upon a very serious problem, for it would almost appear that God changed His mind, as though the creation of man was a colossal error on His part.

Let us, then, address the question, 'Does God change His mind? Several factors must be considered. First, God is immutable, unchanging in His person, His perfections, His purposes, and His promises.

God is not a man, that He should lie, nor a son of man, that He should repent; has He said, and will He not do it? Or has He spoken, and will He not make it good? (Numbers 23:19).

And also the Glory of Israel will not lie or change His mind, for He is not a man that He should change His mind (I Samuel 15:29, cf. also Psalm 33:11; 102:26-28; Hebrews 1:11-12; Malachi 3:6; Romans 11:29; Hebrews 13:8; James 1:17).

Second, there are passages in which God Appears to change His mind.

"And the Lord said to Moses, I have seen this people, and behold, they are an obstinate people. Now then let Me alone, that My anger may burn against them, and that I may destroy them; and I will make of you a great nation.

So the Lord changed His mind about the harm which He said He would do to His people" (Exodus 32:9-10,14).

When God saw their deeds, that they turned from their wicked way, then God repented concerning the calamity which He had declared He would bring upon them. And He did not do it (Jonah 3:10).

The Lord changed His mind about this. It shall not be, said the Lord. The Lord changed His mind about this. 'This too shall not be, said the Lord God (Amos 7:3,6).

Third, in those cases where God appears to change His mind, one or more of these considerations may apply:

- ✓ The expression, 'God repented' is an anthropomorphism, that is, a description of God which likens God's actions to man's.

How else can man understand then by thinking of God in human terms and comparisons?

God's change of mind may only be the way it looks from man's perspective. In both Genesis 22 (cf. verses 2, 11-12) and Exodus 32, that which God proposed was a test.

In both cases, His eternal purpose did not change.

- ✓ In cases where either judgement or blessing are promised, there may be an implied or stated condition. The message preached by Jonah to the Ninevites was one such instance:

"Then Jonah began to go through the city one day's walk; and he cried out and said, 'Yet forty days and Nineveh will be overthrown.

Then the people of Nineveh believed in God; and they called a fast and put on sackcloth from the greatest to the least of them.

When the word reached the king of Nineveh, he arose from his throne, laid aside his robe from him, covered himself with sackcloth, and sat on the ashes.

And he issued a proclamation and it said, 'In Nineveh by the decree of the king and his nobles: Do not let man, beast, herd, or flock taste a thing. Do not let them eat or drink water.

But both man and beast must be covered with sackcloth; and let men call on God earnestly that each may turn from his wicked way and from the violence which is in his hands.

Who knows, God may turn and relent, and withdraw His burning anger so that we shall not perish?" (Jonah 3:4-9).

What the Ninevites hoped for, Jonah knew for a fact. They cried for mercy and forgiveness in case God might hear and forgive.

When the Ninevites repented and God relented, Jonah was hopping mad:

"But it greatly displeased Jonah, and he became angry. And he prayed to the Lord and said, 'Please Lord, was not this what I said while I was still in my own country?

Therefore, in order to forestall this I fled to Tarshish, for I knew that Thou art a gracious and compassionate God, slow to anger and abundant in lovingkindness, and one who relents concerning calamity." (Jonah 4:1,2).

Jonah knew God to be loving and forgiving. The message he preached implied one exception. If Nineveh repented, God would forgive them.

This is what Jeremiah had written, saying:

"At one moment I might speak concerning a nation or concerning a kingdom to uproot, to pull down, or to destroy it; if that

nation against which I have spoken turns from its evil, I will relent concerning the calamity I planned to bring on it.

Or at another moment I might speak concerning a nation or concerning a kingdom to build up or to plant it; if it does evil in My sight by not obeying My voice, then I will think better of the good with which I had promised to bless it." (Jeremiah 18:7-10).

- ✓ While God's decree cannot be altered, we must grant that God is free to act as He chooses. While God's program may change His purposes do not, 'For the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable (Romans 11:29).

God promised to bring His people into the land of Canaan. Due to their unbelief the first generation did not possess the land, but the second generation did.

When Jesus came, He offered Himself to Israel as the Messiah.

Rejection has made possible the offer of the gospel to the Gentiles. Nevertheless, when God's purposes for the Gentiles have been accomplished, God will once again pour out His grace and salvation upon the Jews.

God's program changes, but not His purposes (cf. Romans 9-11).

- ✓ While God's will (His decree) cannot and does not change, He is free to change His emotions. Genesis 6:6-7 describes the response of God to human sin. Grief is loves response to sin.

God is no stoic; He is a person Who rejoices in men's salvation and obedience, and Who grieves at unbelief and disobedience.

While the purpose of God for mankind never changed, His attitude did. Surely a Holy God must feel differently about sin than about obedience.

That is the point of verses 6 and 7. God is grieved about man's sin and its consequences. But God will accomplish His purposes regardless.

While such a state was ordained from eternity past, God could never rejoice in it, but only regret man's wickedness and willfulness.

A similar illustration is the emotional response of our Lord in the garden of Gethsemane (cf. Matthew 26:36). The Lord Jesus had in eternity past, purposed to go to the cross to purchase

man's salvation.

Yet when the moment for His agony drew near He dreaded it. His purpose did not change, but His emotions did.

The Meaning of this Passage for Ancient Israel

For the Israelites of old this passage would teach several valuable lessons. First, it provided them with an adequate explanation for the flood. We can see that this super-race had to be eliminated.

The flood was not only God's way of judging sinful men, but of fulfilling His promise to bring salvation through the seed of the woman. Had the intermingling of angels and men gone unchecked, the godly remnant would have ceased to exist (humanly speaking).

Second, this passage would illustrate the word of God to the serpent, Adam and Eve: 'And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; (Genesis 3:15a).

Israel dared not forget that there was an intense struggle going on, not just between the Cainites and the Sethites, but between Satan and the seed of the woman.

While we are accustomed to such emphasis in the New Testament, the Old has few direct references to Satan or his demonic assistants (cf. Genesis 3; Deuteronomy 32:17; I Chronicles 21:1; Job 1,2; Psalm 106:37; Daniel 10:13; Zechariah 3:1,2).

This passage would be a vivid reminder of the accuracy of God's word.

Third, it underscored the importance of maintaining their racial and spiritual purity. God's believing remnant must be preserved.

When men failed to perceive the importance of this, God had to judge them severely. As the nation entered the land of Canaan, few lessons could be more vital than that of the need for separation.

The Meaning of Genesis 6 for Christians Today

While the New Testament has much more to say about the activities of Satan and his demons, few of us seem to take our spiritual warfare seriously.

We really believe that the church can operate on human strength and wisdom alone, or with a little help from God. We often

attempt to live the spiritual life in the power of the flesh. We urge people to rededicate their lives and redouble their efforts, but we fail to remind them that our only strength is that which God supplies.

The battle today between the sons of Satan and the sons of God (in the New Testament sense, (1:12; Romans 8:14,19) is even more intense than it was in the days of old. Satan's doom is sealed, and his days are numbered (cf. Matthew 8:29).

Let us, then, put on the spiritual armour by which God equips us for the spiritual warfare of which we are a part (Ephesians 6:10-20).

Second, let us learn that Satan attacks us through similar instruments today. I am not aware of any instances in our times when fallen angelic beings have invaded the earth in human form to further Satan's cause. Nevertheless Satan still works through men.

For such men are false apostles, deceitful workers, disguising themselves as apostles of Christ. And no wonder, for even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light.

Therefore it is not surprising if his servants also disguise themselves as servants of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their deeds (II Corinthians 11:13-15).

Just as Satan sought to corrupt men by disclosing himself (or rather, his angels) in the form of superior human beings, so he works through angels of light today.

We are inclined to suppose that Satan works most often and most effectively through the reprobate. We almost expect to find Satan in the pathetic demonic or in the hopeless derelict.

It is easy to attribute such tragedy to Satan.

But Satan's best work and, in my estimation, his most frequent work is through those seemingly moral, devout, and pious men who stand behind the pulpit or sit on the governing board and talk about salvation in terms of society (rather than souls), and by means of works rather than faith.

Satan continues to advance his cause through men who are not what they appear to be.

Finally, notice that Satan does his best work in the very areas where men and women place their hope of salvation. When the angel-men proposed to the daughters of men they appeared to be

the most promising fathers.

If these creatures were immortal, then would their offspring not be so also? Was this the way God was going to overrule the fall and the curse? So it must have seemed to these women.

That is precisely what Satan does today. Oh, he is not above promoting himself through atheism or other Isms, but he finds great success in the arena of religion.

He wears his most pious expression and uses religious terminology.

He does not seek to abolish religion only to abort it by cutting out its essential element, faith in the shed blood of Jesus Christ as the substitute for sinful men.

He will readily join any religious cause so long as this ingredient is omitted, or distorted, or lost in a maze of legalism or libertarianism.

Watch out, my friend, for Satan in the realm of religion. What better way to sidetrack souls and to blind the minds of men (II Corinthians 4:4)?

Where is your hope for immortality? Is it in your offspring? That way did not work for Cain. Is it in your work? Do you wish to build an empire or to erect a monument to your name?

It will not last. All of these things perished in the flood of God's judgement. Only faith in the God of the Bible and, specifically, faith in the Son He has sent will give you immortality and liberate you from the curse.

The only way to become a son of God is through the *Son of God*.

Jesus said to him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father, but through Me. (John 14:6).

(83) A more serious problem for this prevalent view is posed by verse 4. From all appearances, the giants (Nephilim) and mighty men (Gibborim) are the offspring of the marriages of the sons of God and the daughters of men.

As Kline says:

It is not at all clear why the offspring of religiously mixed marriages should be Nephilim-Gibborim, however these be understood within the range of feasible interpretation.

But his (the biblical author's) reference to the conjugal act and to childbearing finds justification only if he is

describing the origin of the Nephilim-Gibborim.

Unless the difficulty which follows from this conclusion can be overcome, the religiously mixed marriage interpretation of the passage ought to be definitely abandoned.

To summarize the problem: Why does one find the kind of offspring mentioned in verse 4 if these are just religiously mixed marriages?

Manfred E. Kober, *The Sons of God of Genesis 6: Demons, Degenerates, or Despots?*, p. 15. Kober quotes here Meredith G. Kline, *Divine Kingship and Genesis 6:1-4*, *Westminster Theological Journal*, XXIV, Nov. 1961-May 1962, p. 190.

(84) In Egypt the king was called the son of Re (the sun god). The Sumero-Akkadian king was considered the offspring of the goddess and one of the gods, and this identification with the deity goes back to the earliest times according to Engell. In one inscription he is referred to as the king, the son of his god.

The Hittite king was called son of the weather-god, and the title of his mother was Tawannannas (mother-of-the-god). In the northwest Semitic area the king was directly called the son of the god and the god was called the father of the king.

The Ras Shamra (Ugaritic) Krt text refers to the god as the king's father and to king Krt as Krt bn il, the son of el or the son of god.

Thus, on the basis of Semitic usage, the term *be ne ha elohim*, the sons of god or the sons of gods, very likely refers to dynastic rulers in Genesis 6.

An Exegetical Study of Genesis 6:1-4, *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, XIII, winter 1970, pp. 47-48, as quoted by Kober, p. 19.

(85) In an excellent article presenting this view, Kline writes that this view anciently rose among the Jews that the sons of God of Genesis 6 were men of the aristocracy, princes, and nobles, in contrast to the socially inferior daughters of men.

This interpretation came to expression, for example, in the Aramaic Targums (the Targums of Onkelos rendered the term as sons of nobles) and in the Greek translation of Symmachus (which reads the sons of the kings or lords) and it has been followed by many Jewish authorities down to the present. Kober, pp. 16-17, referring to Kline, p. 194.

(86) Kober, p. 16, quoting Birney, p. 49 and Kline, p. 196.

(87) For, example, W. H. Griffith Thomas, who holds the Cainite/Sethite view, says:

Verse 2 speaks of the union of the two lines by inter-marriage. Some writers regard the phrase sons of God as referring to the angels, and it is urged that in other passages--e.g. Job i. 6; Ps. xxix. 1; Dan. iii. 25--and, indeed, always elsewhere in Scripture, the phrase invariably means angels. Genesis: A Devotional Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1946), p. 65.

(88) Is this bondage not that which the demons feared in Mark 5:10 and Luke 8:31?

(89) Does the fact that the Nephilim are mentioned after the flood mean that this practice continued after the flood? Some have thought so, emphasizing the phrase and also afterward (Genesis 6:4).

If so, we would have to say that this practice did not threaten the promise of God at this time. It would intensify the importance of not intermarrying with any of the Canaanites, among whom the Nephilim were to be found.

Easton's Bible Dictionary Excerpts

Giants: (1.) Heb. *nephilim*, meaning "violent" or "causing to fall" (Gen 6:4). These were the violent tyrants of those days, those who fell upon others.

The word may also be derived from a root signifying "wonder," and hence "monsters" or "prodigies."

In Num 13:33 this name is given to a Canaanitish tribe, a race of large stature, "the sons of Anak." The Revised Version, in these passages, simply transliterates the original, and reads "Nephilim."

(2.) Heb. *rephaim*, a race of giants (Deu 3:11) who lived on the east of Jordan, from whom Og was descended. They were probably the original inhabitants of the land before the immigration of the Canaanites.

They were conquered by Chedorlaomer (Gen 14:5), and their territories were promised as a possession to Abraham (15:20). The Anakim, Zuzim, and Emim were branches of this stock.

In Job 26:5 (R.V., "they that are deceased;" marg., "the shades," the "Rephaim") and Isa 14:9 this Hebrew word is rendered (A.V.) "dead."

It means here "the shades," the departed spirits in Sheol. In 2 Sa 21:16, 18, 20, 33, "the giant" is (A.V.) the rendering of the singular form *ha raphah*, which may possibly be the name of the father of the four giants referred to here, or of the founder of the Rephaim.

The Vulgate here reads "Arapha," whence Milton (in Samson Agonistes) has borrowed the name "Harapha." (also 1 Ch 20:5,6,8; Deu 2:11,20; 3:13; Jos 15:8, etc., where the word is similarly rendered "giant.")

It is rendered "dead" in (A.V.) (Psa 88:10; Pro 2:18; 9:18; 21:16); in all these places the Revised Version marg. has "the shades." (See also Isa 26:14.)

(3.) Heb. 'Anakim (Deu 2:10,11,21; Jos 11:21,22; 14:12,15; Num 13:33; 13:22; Jos 15:14), a nomad race of giants descended from Arba (Jos 14:15), the father of Anak, that dwelt in the south of Palestine near Hebron (Gen 23:2; Jos 15:13).

They were a Cushite tribe of the same race as the Philistines and the Egyptian shepherd kings. David on several occasions encountered them (2 Sa 21:15-22). From this race sprung Goliath

(1 Sa 17:4) .

(4.) Heb. *'emin*, a warlike tribe of the ancient Canaanites. They were "great, and many, and tall, as the Anakims" (Gen 14:5; Deu 2:10,11) .

(5.) Heb. *Zamzummim* (q.v.), Deut 2:20 so called by the Amorites.

(6.) Heb. *gibbor* (Job 16:14), a mighty one, i.e., a champion or hero. In its plural form (*Gibborim*) it is rendered "mighty men" (2 Sa 23:8-39; 1 Ki 1:8; 1 Ch 11:9-47; 29:24.)

The band of six hundred whom David gathered around him when he was a fugitive were so designated. They were divided into three divisions of two hundred each, and thirty divisions of twenty each.

The captians of the thirty divisions were called "the thirty," the captains of the two hundred "the three," and the captain over the whole was called "chief among the captains" (2 Sa 23:8) .

The sons born of the marriages mentioned in Gen 6:4 are also called by this Hebrew name.

Selected Relevant Scriptures

Numbers 13:33: "We saw the Nephilim there (the descendants of Anak come from the Nephilim). We seemed like grasshoppers in our own eyes, and we looked the same to them."

Deuteronomy 1:28: "Where can we go? Our brothers have made us lose heart. They say, 'The people are stronger and taller than we are; the cities are large, with walls up to the sky. We even saw the Anakites there.'"

Joshua 11:20-22 (New International Version): "For it was the LORD himself who hardened their hearts to wage war against Israel, so that he might destroy them totally, exterminating them without mercy, as the LORD had commanded Moses.

At that time Joshua went and destroyed the Anakites from the hill country: from Hebron, Debir and Anab, from all the hill country of Judah, and from all the hill country of Israel.

Joshua totally destroyed them and their towns. No Anakites were left in Israelite territory; only in Gaza, Gath and Ashdod did any survive."

1 Samuel 17:4: "A champion named Goliath, who was from Gath, came out of the Philistine camp. He was over nine feet tall."

1 Chronicles 20:5" "In another battle with the Philistines, Elhanan son of Jair killed Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, who had a spear with a shaft like a weaver's rod."

Deuteronomy 3:11: "(Only Og king of Bashan was left of the remnant of the Rephaites. His bed was made of iron and was more than thirteen feet long and six feet wide. It is still in Rabbah of the Ammonites.)"

Deuteronomy 2:11: "Like the Anakites, they too were considered Rephaites, but the Moabites called them Emites."

Additional Notes:

- Arthur Custance discusses Genesis 6 in [Appendix I of Journey out of Time.](#)
- [The Demi-gods of Genesis 6 \(author unknown\)](#)
- [Ooparts and Ancient High Technology](#)
- [Omniology \(Joe Taylor\)](#)

- [The New Testament, the Nephilim, and the Flood, \(William Barclay\)](#)
 - [Who Were the Nephilim? \(with numerous links\) Creation Science Resource](#)
 - [The Days of Noah and the "Sons of God," by J. Timothy Unruh](#)
 - [Post Flood Nephilim, by Chuck Missler](#)
 - [Topical Study, Aliens/Nephilim, by Chuck Missler](#)
 - [Wikipedia: Nephilim](#)
 - [The Nephilim \(author unknown\)](#)
 - [Encyclopedia Mythica: Nephilim](#)
 - [Who Were the Sons of God in Genesis 6?, by Dr. David Livingston](#)
 - [Historic Interpretations of Genesis 6:2-4](#)
 - <http://returnofthenephilim.com/>
-

Part II: Alien Abduction Notes

Abductees are possibly interacting with interdimensional beings which have been described in philosophical, historical and religious writings, and in folklore and legend, from every major culture of the world and in minor cultures as well.

These beings reportedly delight in harrassing and deceiving human beings, often in a sexual manner. Specific examples are the "jinns" described in the Koran, the Celtic "Sidhe" or "faery folk", the "incubi" of Europe, the "Old Hag" in Newfoundland and the "elementals" in Buddhist cultures.

They are also known by many other names in many different languages. They are described in Malaysia and Indonesia, in Iceland, by the aboriginals of Australia and by various Native American tribes.

Because these beings reportedly have the ability to shapeshift, it is surmised that they have now taken on a form which would logically frighten even modern, technically-advanced human beings.

The creatures reported in folklore and legends, *as well as in present-day accounts*, have at least eight characteristics in common with our so-called "UFO alien abductors". All of them reportedly:-

- ✓ Materialize and de-materialize;
- ✓ Harass human beings, frequently in a sexual manner;
- ✓ Reportedly "steal" human babies and/or unborn foetuses;
- ✓ Distort the witnesses' perception of time;
- ✓ Pass through solid matter;
- ✓ Enter temporarily into Earth space-time, sometimes leaving physical traces;
- ✓ Shape-shift into various forms and sizes including,

at times, animals;

- ✓ Exist normally on what is described as a "hidden plane" which co-exists alongside our normal earthly space-time.

--

Excerpted from an article by Terry W. Colvin

How do we decipher the strange and unfamiliar tales of experiencers? Abduction stories from around the world contain paradoxes:

Some abductees are raped and sometimes tortured with painful procedures; some are healed, educated, cared for; others experience all of the above.

Abduction taunts us with possibilities - some terrifying, some tatalizing. How do we decipher the information and stories we hear? How does one live in closer proximity to that "world beyond the veil"?

A glimpse of the alien "other" invites one to betray earthly assumptions, a suspension of belief that is part of the pleasure of anthropological fieldwork.

It is by finding and occupying what anthropologists call "limbic" space that one can free oneself to perceive anew, investing in a reinvented vision of life and reality.

Excerpted from Dominique Callimanopulos

Another interesting theory suggests that what is occurring is a form of displacement from another kind of trauma, especially sexual abuse.

While it is true that abduction experiencers do show some of the symptoms associated with post-traumatic states, Mack asserts "these symptoms appear to be the result, not the cause,

of what the experiencers have undergone." (Mack, 1994)

Many therapists attempt to explain abduction accounts as "screen" memories masking the repression of sexual abuse.

However, "no abduction screen memories have ever been stripped away to reveal a past history of abuse." (Jacobs, 1992) While it is true that some abductees are also victims of sexual or physical abuse, they usually have a clear memory of the abuse and feel the abduction experience to be unrelated.

There have been other physiological effects noted as well.

Some women abductees have suffered from a various internal complications, including a high incidence of ovarian cysts.

There have also been cases of what is known as "missing fetus syndrome," in which a pregnant woman's fetus mysteriously and inexplicably disappears overnight, without any indications of a miscarriage. In some cases problems have been so severe as to require a total hysterectomy.

Facts in Respect to Alien Abductions (Karla Turner):

We don't know with any certainty exactly what these entities may be; they may be extraterrestrial, inter-dimensional, earthly or some combination of the above.

At least some of the aliens lie. [Predictions, warnings, promises, and contradictions.]

During encounters, the human's perceptions are controlled as are the conscious memories of the encounters.

False memories can overlay and disguise the actual events of an encounter.

Abductees report alien controlled information to the research community. While reporting their experiences honestly and sincerely, abductees are really reporting alien-controlled data.

There is a serious element of human involvement in the abduction phenomenon, in addition to the very real alien participation.

Many abductees are monitored and harassed by human agents of some sort and the cases involving phone and mail interference, helicopter surveillance are only part of the story.

The abduction agenda involves quite physical aims and procedures that belie the idea of a primary spiritual motivation on the aliens part, as well as refuting the notion that all they're doing in their agenda is crossbreeding.

There are physical procedures and aims that have nothing to do with reproduction.

These include: various types of implants in parts of the body; insertion of wires and tubes into the chest, kidneys wrist and knees; brain operations, deliberate pain experiments; abductees immersed in water, forced ingestion eating or drinking of unknown fluids, cloning of humans et.al.

The agenda involves long-term mental and psychological programming of the abductee, it targets among other concepts:

Our social and personal relationships, our sexuality, our political ideas, and our religious and spiritual concerns.

These are targets of programming that begin in almost every instance, with the abductee in early childhood.

Aliens through technology create virtual reality scenarios that are absolutely real to the perceptions of the targeted person. All five senses are involved.

The aliens show an extraordinary interest in human souls and in using those souls.

Warning: Very Disturbing -

<http://www.alienvideo.net/0805/alien-abduction-mutilation.php>

Astronomer Carl Sagan wrote about the theory that the alien abduction experience is remarkably similar to tales of demon abduction common throughout history.

"...most of the central elements of the alien abduction account are present, including sexually obsessive non-humans who live in the sky, walk through walls, communicate telepathically, and perform breeding experiments on the human species.

Unless we believe that demons really exist, how can we understand so strange a belief system, embraced by the whole Western world (including those considered the wisest among us), reinforced by personal experience in every generation, and taught by Church and State?

Is there any real alternative besides a shared delusion based on common brain wiring and chemistry?"

Articles on the possible spiritual relation to alien abductions:

<http://www.abduct.com/worley/worley52.php>

<http://www.abduct.com/worley/worley17.php>

Part III: The Vatican and Extraterrestrials

Excerpted from an article by Author Unknown

May 14, 2008, MSNBC News Story: "The Extraterrestrial Is My Brother." Updated 3:57 p.m. ET, Tues., May. 13, 2008

VATICAN CITY - The Vatican's chief astronomer says that believing in aliens does not contradict faith in God.

The Rev. Jose Gabriel Funes, the Jesuit director of the Vatican Observatory, said that the vastness of the universe means it is possible there could be other forms of life outside Earth, even intelligent ones.

In an interview published Tuesday by Vatican newspaper L'Osservatore Romano, Funes said that such a notion "doesn't contradict our faith" because aliens would still be God's creatures.

Funes said that ruling out the existence of aliens would be like "putting limits" on God's creative freedom.

From *Nephilim Stargates – The Year 2012 and the Return of the Watchers*; by Thomas R. Horn, pages 116-119:

"...Coast to Coast asked eminent theologian and former Jesuit priest Malachi Martin why the Vatican was heavily invested in the study of deep space at Mt. Graham Observatory in southeast Arizona.

Martin said: 'Because the mentality, the attitude, mentally among those who are at the highest levels, highest levels of the Vatican administration and geopolitics know that, now, knowledge of what's going on in outer space, and what's approaching us, could be of great import in the next five years, or ten years' ".

(The next 5 years from this interview was 2007--the thing approaching--the watched big thing coming down through the planets and stars--most possibly the New Jerusalem.

NASA has picked up a huge unknown glistening object slowly descending towards the earth).

"Martin's historical dialogue is seen as a 'sign' by many Ufologists. If ET really is confirmed, most believe that the Vatican will play an important role during the Official Disclosure.

Learned researchers therefore keep an open ear for hints by the Vatican that disclosure is nearing."

From *The Return of Planet X* by Dr. Jason Rand, pages 192 and 193:

"Apparently not agreeing with Pope John XXIII's difficult decision to conceal this 'third secret', close Vatican insiders decided to leak at least part of it to the Italian Press.

So on October 15, 1963, the newspaper, Nues Europa, printed what they claimed to be (at least) the third Fatima prophecy... the leaked segment of the 'third' prophecy stated:

'For the Church, too, (at the end times) the time of its greatest trial will come. Cardinals will oppose cardinals and bishops against bishops. Satan will march in their midst and there will be great changes at Rome.

What is rotten will fall, never to rise again. The Church will be darkened, and the world will shake with terror. The time will come when no king, emperor, cardinal, or bishop will await Him, who will, however, come but in order to punish according to the designs of My Father'...

This partial release of the third Fatima message is only the proverbial tip of the iceberg.

Vatican insider, Father Malachi Martin, furnished an even more revealing glimpse into the actual 'root cause' of this upcoming catastrophe contained in the third prophecy of Fatima.

Father Martin was a former Jesuit priest and a full professor at the Vatican's Pontifical Biblical Institute. He held doctorates in history, archeology, and Semitic languages.

A brilliant scholar, he served in Rome at the prestigious Vatican Observatory from 1958 to 1964, where he was the associate of Cardinal Augustine Bea and none other than the Pontiff himself who had opened the prophecy of Fatima, Pope John XXIII.

Father Martin was privy to the entire third prophecy of Fatima, and although he would not break his vow to keep secret the exact content...he did inadvertently release the main theme of the prophecy in a nationally syndicated radio...on April 5, 1997 with Art Bell.

Father Martin indicated that a large celestial object, possibly a comet, was approaching earth and its affects were going to be disastrous.

The end result of this comet's passage was in fact, going to be worse than anything that could be imagined on earth, causing a global catastrophe on a scale unknown to modern-day humanity.

The objects passage would also lead to massive conflicts within the leadership of the Catholic Church and ultimately its absolute destruction.

According to the interview, Father Martin mentioned this planetary cataclysm possible taking place within 10-12 years. (Note: 1997-2009 =12 years)"

[The first passing of Planet X by earth is slated for September 18, 2009, a Yom Teruah, beginning 2010 on the Hebrew creation calendar), and its second pass-through to be on December 21, 2012, the ending date of the Mayan calendar.]

Dr. Rand continues: "It is an interesting side note, the Vatican recently built several 'state-of-the-art' solar observatories around the world.

Suspiciously, all the doors of these expensive/high-tech observatories are sealed to the public. And further, the Vatican subsequently refuses to discuss the real purpose of these observatories, or what their telescopes are currently searching for.

Now why would the Vatican, a religious institution, be so

interested in what's going on in outer space? And why would they need several exotic observatories strategically located at key points around the planet?" Good questions...

We see from Revelation 17 that the "great whore"—"mystery Babylon the great"—a combination of end-time Babylon and Rome, creating the "eighth beast"—will be destroyed by fire.

Oftentimes Lucifer gives his plans ahead of time, to give credibility to certain false illusions—like the appearance of Mary at Fatima, Portugal. But, her first two "secrets" did come to pass—World War I in 1917.

Continuing on in *Nephilim Stargates* by Tom Horn: "Martin is not the only priest to have believed something is approaching. Argentinean Jesuit priest and astrophysicist, Jose Funes, told an international conference in Rome a couple of years ago that 'extraterrestrials exist and are our brothers'.

In April of 2000, Zecharia Sitchin sat down with leading Vatican theologian, Monsignor Corrado Balducci and discovered that the idea of ancient astronauts creating man is 'something that Christianity is coming around to' ".

Ruth Gledhil reported not long ago: "There is probably intelligent life elsewhere in the Universe and there is evidence in the Bible to suggest that it could be Christian, according to the Roman Catholic Church."

In a document published by the Catholic Truth Society, the official publisher for the Vatican, a papal astronomer speculates that 'sooner or later, the human race will discover that there are other intelligent creatures out there in the Universe'.

Brother Guy Consolmagno, a Jesuit, who is one of the Vatican's leading astronomers, concedes that he could be wrong.

Ultimately, he says, 'we don't know'. With so many billions of planets, stars and galaxies, he says, 'surely, somewhere in that number, there must be other civilized, rational beings'...

To back of his hunch that aliens will have been subject to Christ's saving grace, he cites the verses from John's Gospel known as the Good Shepherd passage...John 10:14-16."

Pages 118-120: "Of course, when thinking of the history of the Catholic Church, appearing saviors, extraterrestrial intelligence, flying discs, and signs in the sky, one cannot help but remember the story that took place in Fatima Portugal, in 1917."

According to on-looker's reports: "What first looked like the sun, appearing as a flat silver disc revolving on its own axis. The object plunged towards the crowd, zigzagging erratically across the sky, causing thousands of witnesses...to fall on their faces in repentance.

The Reverend General Vicar of Leiria, one of the witnesses, thought it was the Virgin Mary in an 'aero plane of light', an 'immense globe, flying westwards, at moderate speed. It irradiated a very bright light'.

Another witness, Dr. Almeida Garrett, a professor Coimbra, described it this way, 'The sun had broken through the thick clouds. It seemed to be drawing all eyes and I saw it as a disc which a clean cut rim, luminous and shining, but which did not hurt the eyes.

The clouds did not obscure the light of the sun; one could fix one's eyes on this brazier of heat and light without pain in the eyes of blinding of the retina.

The sun's disc spun around on itself in a mad whirl—the, whirling wildly, seemed to loosen itself from the firmament and advance threateningly upon the earth as if to crush us with its huge fiery weight.'

Many other witnesses at Fatima described the fiery disc that appeared through an opening in the sky, descended in a rush, moved erratically overhead and then flew away".

From page 147 of *Nephilim Stargates*: "Vatican officials have gone so far recently ('07) as to release a series of calculated responses meant to reassure Catholics that evidence of ET or sudden visitation by such world not prove 'everything we believe in is wrong'.

Rather, we're going to find out that everything is truer in ways we couldn't even yet have imagined".

From page 159 of *Nephilim Stargates*: "Vatican publications...have recently released a series of publication dealing with the possibility of Extraterrestrial or multi-dimensional intelligence, hinting that a greater-than-not possibility of ET contact now exists".

From *Nephilim Stargates* pages 207-209: "Official Disclosure (of the aliens) could pave the way for a new religion according to Jacques Vallee:

`I think the stage is set for the appearance of new faiths centered in UFO belief'. Yet, Vallee senses malevolence in this `salvation from above'.

`I believe there is a machinery of mass manipulation behind the UFO phenomenon...In turn this expectation makes millions of people hope for the imminent realization of that age-old dream: salvation from above, surrender to the greater power of some wise navigators of the cosmos'."

"UFO researcher Richard Boylan says of this: `One of the predictions is that there will be a very large rift in human society as a result of ET contact becoming publicly known...

`The Aviary' (a super secret group of government and military officials, according to Bolan) are quite concerned that fundamentalist Christians will experience spiritual...shock at the revelation of ET visitation...the theological and religious social implications may be the most serious ones resulting from open extraterrestrial contact...".

"The Aviary were reportedly alarmed last year when stories appeared then quickly vanished about Vatican experts briefing government representatives from several countries on the Fatima Prophecies and what allegedly to be descriptions of ET visitations.

According to Boylan, a spokesman for the Vatican verified that the briefing took place. Recent press from Vatican officials confirms the Catholic Church interest in and concern for the effect upon the world's religions by Official ET Disclosure.

Catholics are being reassured by church theologians including Jose Funes, Monseignor Corrado Balducci and Astronomer Guy

Consolmagno that ETs...`are God's creatures and no challenge to Rome's authority'. In fact Consolmagno says, `The discovery of extraterrestrial life...might...help us discard the bad ideas in religion—the narrow view, the hubris, and the divisiveness'".

The Truth will always surface and win! So, now to suppress the truth, they are promoting the old myths as myths, to destroy the faith of the "believers".

I wonder if the anti-missionaries of Judaism are working with the Vatican on this faith-destroying enterprise? Paul warns us in II Thessalonians 2 that great apostasy will take place and the rise of an anti-messiah world ruler, before Messiah comes. The great apostasy has begun!

The great "secret" to be revealed publicly at the coming of the anti-messiah will come in the mouths of "aliens" (fallen angels/Nephilim) as many believe, and near two billion people, Catholic and Protestant, will lose their faith in Jesus—never knowing about the real Jewish Torah-observant Messiah—whom they were never taught to know by the Church. What a horrible tragedy!

II Thessalonians 2:9:

"The coming of the lawless one is according to the working of Satan, with all power and signs and wonders of falsehood and with all deceit of unrighteousness in those perishing, because they did not love the truth in order for them to be saved".

In Closing

"Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.

For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.

Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.

Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.

And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God:

Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints; and for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in bonds:

That therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak."

- Ephesians 6:10-20

The only way to withstand this 'spiritual wickedness in high places' (as well as all of the spiritual wickedness surrounding this unprecedented time in history) is found in II Chronicles 7:13-15; an embedded principle from the LORD God, who is immutable:

"When I shut up the heavens so that there is no rain, or command locusts to devour the land or send a plague among my people, if my people, who are called by my name, will humble

themselves and pray and seek my face and *turn from their wicked ways*, then will I hear from heaven and will forgive their sin and will *heal their land*. Now my eyes will be open and my ears attentive to the prayers offered in this place." (emphasis added)

Aside from the Israelites, who are His people? Those that are within the Body of Christ.

I strongly urge you - right this very moment, onward - to once and for all (proactively) make *all of the following* your **#1 priority**:

- ✓ Turn away from sin,
- ✓ *Earnestly* seek repentance,
- ✓ Find out what God has called you to do,
- ✓ Raise the bar on your personal spiritual walk with Him.
- ✓ Search out the depth of meaning (and critical importance) in putting on the *whole* armor of God.