

Genesis 6
Angels
Or
Men

Oscar B. Mink
&
Milburn R. Cockrell

Sons Of God

In Genesis 6:3

Angels Or Men

by

Oscar B. Mink & Milburn R. Cockrell

This February, 2021 eBook edition is published by James L. Reynolds

eBook Conversion Notes

The text of this eBook is from two articles published almost 29 years apart

In 1987 Elder Oscar B. Mink published an article in *The Sovereign Grace Advocate* entitled *Genesis 6:1-4 - Angels Or Men*

In 2012 Elder Milburn R. Cockrell published an article in *The Berea Baptist Banner* entitled *The Sons Of God In Genesis 6*.

I personally had the blessing of knowing these two faithful servants of the Lord Jesus Christ for many years. I've heard them preach the Word of God on many occasions, and I continue to be spiritually strengthened whenever I read one of their many articles and books.

James L. Reynolds
Cornersville, TN
February, 2021

Contents

[Section 1 - Genesis 6:1-4 Angels Or Men](#)

[Section 2 - The Sons Of God In Genesis 6](#)

1 - Genesis 6:1-4 Angels Or Men?

Elder Oscar B. Mink

1924-2004

“And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, [2] That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they *were* fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. [3] 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. [4] 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.” (Genesis 6:1-4)

In this text, to whom or what does the term “**sons of God**” refer? This question has perplexed the minds of Bible scholars for the last fifteen hundred years, and at this time there is considerable difference of opinion among Bible commentators as to the identity of the “**sons of God**” referred to in the above text.

I am confident that my interpretation of the text will not bring the readers of this article to a consensus of opinion, or for that matter settle the issue for all those who are halted between two opinions regarding the identity of the “**sons of God**” of Genesis 6.

However, being on the theological fence calls for a balancing act I find beyond my ability to perform, and straddling the fence is painfully difficult for me. So, in order to alleviate the irritation of my mind concerning the matter and question before us, I began a prayerful study and investigation into the subject. The following comments are the results of that study. If the reader disagrees with my comments, let him remember that his interpretation of the text is like mine, the interpretation of a fallible man, and that his disagreement does not necessarily mean I need his yardstick by which to

measure the text. I do not claim to have all the information available on the question, but do believe what I have to offer is correct as far as it goes.

THE TWO MAIN SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT

There are two main schools of thought as to the interpretation of the text, and as to the answer to the question, “Who are the sons of God?” The most popular view with contemporary Bible students is that, the **“sons of God”** are sons of Seth, the third son of Adam. Necessity is laid upon those who hold this view to make the **“daughters of men,”** the off springs of ungodly Cain, and that these two spiritually diverse lines developed affinity one for the other, which resulted in God defying marriages and obliteration of the distinction between the children of God and the children of the devil.

The second most popular view is, the term **“sons of God”** refers to the fallen angels who were in collusion with Lucifer in his original insurrection against the government of God. Both of these views have a number of things in common:

1. They both allow that whoever or whatever the **“sons of God”** are, they were used of the devil in his effort to corrupt all of mankind.
2. Both views further claim that the deluge was God’s countermeasure against the devil’s diabolic effort to corrupt the human race.
3. One other thing which both views have in common is, they both have leveled against them very weighty objections. Some of these objections we will mention in further addressing the question.

My firm conviction is, the **“sons of God”** are the angels who left their own habitation, and came down to earth, where they cohabited with the daughters of men. This cohabitation produced a race of beings, that was neither man nor angel, but demigods. The objector retorts: “That view is too weird!” Not really, one of the cleverest ruses of the devil is to get people to believe he does not exist, and second to that is, to get those who do believe he exists to deny his power. **“And no marvel, for Satan himself is**

transformed into an angel of light” (II Corinthians 11:14). Does that sound strange?

I believe the serpent which Satan used in tempting Eve was a beautiful, shining, flying serpent, which actually talked with Eve. Does that sound weird? It is against the nature of serpents to talk, but the serpent of **Genesis 3** talked, and that most convincingly. The supernatural powers of Satan are displayed in the overthrow of our first parents in the Garden of Eden, which by comparison to his use of fallen angels to cohabit with the depraved and fallen daughters of men is seen to be no great feat.

In adhering to the view that the **“sons of God”** are fallen angels, I do not mean to imply that I fully understand all that relates to the subject, or that my dogmatism has deaf ears.

Following are a number of reasons which I believe support the contention that the **“sons of God”** are fallen angels who had illicit intercourse with the daughters of men.

1. First, Ancient Israel, And Israel Contemporary With Christ, Held That **“The Sons Of God”** were Fallen Angels.

The book of Enoch, dated 200 years before Christ has in **Genesis 6:2 & 4**, “Angels of God,” rather than “Sons of God.”

Josephus, the great Jewish historian, wrote, “Many angels accompanied with women, and begat Sons that proved unjust, and despisers of all that was good” (*Antiquities of the Jews - 3:1*, pg. 28). William Whiston, translator of Josephus, says, “This notion, that the fallen angels, were in some sense, the fathers of the old giants, was the constant opinion of antiquity.” Two hundred years of archeological excavation has proven the reliability of the historical account of Josephus.

Philo, who was contemporary with the apostles held that it was angels who cohabited with the daughters of men, rather than sons of Seth. It was the view of the great majority of Rabbinic writers, and it is the prevailing view of present day Orthodox Judaism.

2. Secondly, The Common Bible Of The Days In Which Peter, Jude, And The Other Writers Of The New Testament Lived, Was The Septuagint.

The Septuagint is a pre-Christian Greek version of the original Hebrew Scriptures. Several passages of the Old Testament which are quoted in the New Testament are taken verbatim from the Septuagint. “Several passages of the Old Testament, which are quoted in the New, are taken thence; and, being thus noticed by the writers of the New Testament, from their mode of using it, we may infer that it was in general circulation among the apostolic churches” (*History of the Bible*, By John Kitto DD. - Pg. 45). The Septuagint was the version in circulation among the New Testament churches, and was read publicly among them. So, when Christ says, “**Search the Scriptures**” (**John 5:39**), it is very likely that He referred immediately to the Septuagint, and indirectly to the original Old Testament. It is agreed by reputable scholarship that Jesus quoted more than once from the Septuagint. Now, I want you to note, while the K.J.V. and most modern versions read in **Genesis 6:2 & 4** “**Sons of God**” the Septuagint reads, “Angels of God.”

When **Jude** in verse **6** speaks of the angels “**which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation,**” he then adds, “**Even as Sodom and Gormorrah, 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 7**). The language of **Jude 7** demands adherence to the Septuagint, and the ancient view of **Genesis 6:1-4**. It is said by the inspired writer, that the people of Sodom and Gormorrah went after “**strange flesh even as,**” or in like manner as the fallen angels “**which kept not their first estate**” (**Jude 6**). It is said of the angels of **Jude 6** and **7**, that they are “**reserved in everlasting chains under darkness ... suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.**” All fallen angels (**Revelation 12:7- 9**) are not at this time locked up in Tartarus, some are still on the earth working with their nefarious head, Satan.

Alford, commenting on **Jude 6 & 7** in his Greek New Testament, says, “In like manner to these ... the angels above mentioned. The manner was similar, because the angels committed fornication with another race than themselves.”

The Twentieth Century New Testament (1898), taken from the Greek of Wescott and Hort, of which Philip Schaff said, it is “The purest Greek” reads in verses **6 & 7 of Jude**, “And that even those angels that failed to keep their own station and left their proper home have been kept by Him for black darkness. They are like Sodom and Gormorrah and the towns near them, which, as the angels did, gave themselves up to fornication, and went in search of beings of a different nature, and now stand out as a warning, undergoing as they are, punishment by enduring fire.”

3. The Early Church Believed That “**The Sons of God**” Of **Genesis 6:1-4**, Were Fallen Angels.

Justian Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Lactantius, and the great majority of the early church fathers believed that “**the Sons of God**” of **Genesis 6:1-4**, was a reference to reprobate angels. One of the reasons that unanimity prevailed among the early churches as regards this issue was that no other viewpoint was heard of until the latter part of the fourth century.

The Sethite theory, the view that the “**Sons of God**” were the godly line of Seth was first introduced in the latter part of the fourth century by Juihus Afracanius, a contemporary of Origen. He wrote, “What is meant ... in my opinion, is that the descendants of Seth are called the sons of God” (*Ante Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 6, Pg. 131). The Sethite theory spread rapidly and widely, and became the prevailing view of the dark ages.

Eusebius, the great church Historian took exception to the Sethite theory, and declared his position in the dispute by saying, “The original position of the church is correct” (*Jude - The Acts of the Apostates*, Pg. 38 - S.M. Coder). The popularity of the Sethite theory has perpetuated itself, and is today the most common view among Bible students. However, many of these students are having doubts as to the correctness of their conclusions in this matter, and a re-study of the problem has led a large number to adopt the position which the early church held.

There is nothing in the context which suggests, or infers that the Sethites were distinguished for piety. Neither is there anything in the context which

implies that the “**daughters of men**” were more ungodly than the daughters of Seth. In fact, the term “**Daughters of men**” is general, and includes the daughters of Seth as well as the daughters of Cain.

The Sethites were not exempted from the charge of general wickedness which precipitated the flood.

“**And God saw that the wickedness of man *was* great in the earth, and *that* every imagination of his heart was only evil continually.**” (Genesis 6:5) The terms “**man**” and “**his**” in this text are used in the generic sense, and includes both Sethites and Cainites.

“**And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth**” (Genesis 6:12). This text does not say “All flesh has corrupted his way upon the earth, except the Sethites.” No, it is “**all flesh,**” and the family of Seth comes under that heading.

Josephus, says of the Sethites, “In process of time they were perverted, and foresook the practices of their fathers, and did neither pay those honors to God which were appointed them nor had any concern to do justice towards men. But for what degree of zeal they had formerly shown for virtue, they now showed by their actions a double degree of wickedness” (*Antiquities Of The Jews*, Pg. 28). All the Sethites, with the exception of one family perished in the flood.

It is not denied that the Sethite apostasy was fueled by the unlawful marriages of the godly line with the children of Cain, but what is denied is, that these marriages is what is referred to in **Genesis 6:1-4**. The Sethite apostasy did not originate during the days of Noah, but had been long in process, and in league with the children of Cain, corrupted the whole earth. But it was the illicit marriages and intercourse of the aliens of the air, the denizens of devil, with the “**daughters of men**” that is referred to in **Genesis 6:1-4**, and it is this marital action which opened up the judgmental skies of God and immersed the earth in water.

4. The Term “**Sons Of God**” Is Used Exclusively In The Old Testament Of Angels.

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

“**Again there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord ...**” (Job 2:1) The Septuagint renders the term “**Sons of God**” found in Job 1:6 and 2:1, “angels of God.”

“**Give unto the Lord, O ye mighty, give unto the Lord glory and strength.**” (Psalms 29:1) The Hebrew word for “mighty” in this text is “ben, bane” and means “**sons of God**” or sons of the Mighty One.”

Many, in an effort to avoid the force of this argument have equated texts from the New Testament which refer to regenerate persons as “**Sons of God**” with the Old Testament expression. In order to do this sound rules of exegesis are violated, and men must be introduced into Job 38:7, where “**all the sons of God shouted for joy**” at the primordial creation of the earth, when as yet, men did not exist. The “**Sons of God**” of Job 38:7 is clearly a reference to angels.

5. The Hebrew Words For “Giants” In Genesis 6:4 Is “Nephilim”, Which Means “Fallen Ones.”

Genesis 6:4 could have been correctly translated, “There were fallen ones in the earth in those days.” The term “fallen ones” must be distinguished from mankind, for all of mankind was in a fallen state, and exceedingly wicked at this time. The term “fallen ones” has no significance unless it refers to something else other than the fallen ones of Adam, for they were present, not only in “those days,” but had been present since the expulsion from Eden.

The distinguishing feature in the text (“There were fallen ones in the earth in those days”) is they were in the earth at this time, rather than in

heaven. The words constitute an indirect reference to the angelic apostasy in heaven, but is a direct reference to fallen angels on earth.

The Hebrew word “Nephilim” translated “giants” in the King James version and “giantes” in the Septuagint occurs only one other time in Scripture (**Numbers 13:33**), and has to do with the great size and stature of the sons of Anak. “... **And all the people we saw in it *are* men of a great stature. And there we saw the giants (nephilim - same as **Genesis 6:4**), the Sons of Anak” (**Numbers 13:32 & 33**). This is, as no one can honestly deny a reference to the gigantic size of the Sons of Anak, and in no sense speaks of their fame or exploits. As it is here, so it is in **Genesis 6:4**.**

It is without doubt that these “fallen ones” did great exploits which made them renown, but from all of these great feats they became exhausted and needed a super king size bed to rest in, thus it is, we read of one of their bedsteads being thirteen feet long (**Deuteronomy 3:11**).

“For only Og king of Bashan remained of the remnant of giants; behold, his bedstead *was* a bedstead of iron; *is* it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon? nine cubits was the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit of a man.” (**Deuteronomy 3:11**) The conservative cubit of eighteen inches would have king Og’s bed to be thirteen and one half feet long, and six feet wide. It is plain that these dimensions are given to draw attention to the physical size of Og, and unmistakably identifies him as a descendent of the “fallen ones” of **Genesis 6:4**.

At the first appearance of this race of monstrosities, God sent a flood and destroyed them. At their second appearance God orders His people to utterly destroy them, and the prophet Amos in retrospect, quoting God, says, **“Yet destroyed I the Amorite before them, whose height *was* like the height of the cedars, and he *was* strong as the oaks; yet I destroyed his fruit from above, and his roots from beneath”** (**Amos 2:9**).

“There were giants in the earth in those days.” The “giants” spoken of here are literal, not mere men of renown, but men of exceedingly large stature. The question which logically follows, is, seeing that marriages of

believers with unbelievers in our day do not produce actual giants, why should such a union beget them in the days of Noah?

The Sethite theory does not facilitate Satan's purpose to prevent the entrance of the promised Seed of the woman, which was to bruise his head. Cain was of that wicked one, and was used of his spiritual father to slay Abel, for he knew or thought it was through Abel that Christ would come into the world. In the same way, Pharaoh and Herod were used of Satan in an effort to destroy the seed through whom the promised head bruiser would come. All of Satan's efforts to prevent the coming of Christ into the world, miserably failed, and "**when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman ...**" (**Galatians 4:4**). Christ was born of a woman who had a depraved nature, a godly woman, and certainly not as steeped in sin as the antediluvian Sethites, but nevertheless, depraved. Human depravity, even in its most intensified state, is never presented in Scripture as something in itself, per se, that Satan would ever think could be a deterrent to the fulfillment **Genesis 3:15**, for it was to depraved people the promise of a Redeemer was made. Satan knew that it would take something more than the total and ultimately intensified depravity of the human race to prevent the incarnation of Christ. Satan knew, the cohabitation of fallen angels with the daughters of men could eventually abort the human race, and leave no entrance for the Son of Man. What Satan did not know, was, that God would send an earth wide flood and drown all of his monstrous half brothers and sisters, and that God would make an example of their fallen angelic daddies, by shutting them up to the vengeance of eternal fire (**Jude 7**). Yet, Satan will try anything to avert his own destruction as spelled out in **Genesis 3:15**.

All that the Sethite theory of **Genesis 6:14** does, is teach the doctrine of the intensification of human depravity. The depraved state of the Sethites at the time of the flood was every bit and grain as terrible as that of the Cainites, and only one man among them found grace in the eyes of the Lord (**Genesis 6:8**).

6. The Apostle Peter Connects The Sin Of Angels With The Flood.

“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; [5] 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;” (II Peter 2:4-5)

In this text, Peter connects the sin of the angels with the flood therefore it is not the angelic apostasy in heaven which Peter sets before us in this text, but the soul damning work of the “fallen ones” on earth. Peter makes the sin of the angels and the flood to be cause and effect, otherwise the close frame of reference in which they are used is meaningless.

Some reputable scholars believe **Isaiah’s** reference to Lucifer in chapter 14, verses 16 & 17 is also an indirect reference to the sin of the fallen angels. The text reads, “... ***Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms; [17] That made the world as a wilderness, and destroyed the cities thereof; that opened not the house of his prisoners?***”

That this is a reference to the flood is seen in the two clauses, the world made a wilderness, and the cities thereof destroyed. It was the flood that made the earth a veritable waste, it was the flood that destroyed the cities of the earth, not the Adamic curse; for at the time of Adam’s fall there were no cities to be destroyed. Satan, the deposed archangel is head of the fallen angels, and is by God held responsible for the cohabitation of the “fallen ones” with the “**daughters of men**”. The illicit sexual relationship of the fallen angels with the “**daughters of men**” resulted in the flood, and it is in this sense, that God holds Satan responsible for the destruction of the earth and the cities thereof.

7. The Objection, That Angels Are Neuter, And Cannot Reproduce, Is Answerable.

The text most often cited by those who object to the view that the “**sons of God**” of **Genesis 6:1-4** are fallen angels is, **Matthew 22:30**, which

reads; **“For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.”**

A. The term **“angels of God”** in this text, serves as a clear distinction between angels who remained faithful to God, and the angels who in collusion with Lucifer rebelled against God and were cast out of heaven.

B. The text uses a clause which is locative, which clause specifies the place where angels do not marry, i.e. **“in heaven”**. If the text read, **“In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God”** and had left off the last two words (**“in heaven”**), much the objection sued for could be allowed. But the text includes the qualifying clause, **“in heaven”** and the object goes pitifully wanting.

The last two words of the text makes what at first seems to be an insuperable objection, to be utterly groundless, for it is **“in heaven”** that angels neither marry nor or given in marriage. The angels of **Genesis 6:1-4**, referred to as **“sons of God”** were no longer in heaven, but in the earth, and in the earth, they by marrying the daughters of men gave the conjugal relationship its most infernal nature.

C. **Matthew 22:30** speaks of the post resurrection state of believers, wherein they become unmarriageables, and the place of this state is **“in heaven”**. Then too, the text speaks of unmarriageable angels, who reside **“in heaven”**. In this text we see God, His angels, and all the elect of God, and their abode is **“in heaven”**. On the other hand we have a text of Scripture in which we see the devil, his angels, reprobate mankind and the place of their eternal residence: **“Then shall He say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from Me ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels”** (**Matthew 25:41**). But there are ages of time between the creation and resurrection of the saints and their translation to a heaven where marriage vows are never spoken. It is in this interim of time on earth saints marry and are given in marriage. It is in the same earth and time that the angels which kept not their first estate marry the daughters of men, and are soon thereafter cast into a marriage-less hell.

The remonstrant may say: “It is contrary to the nature of angels to marry.” What we mere mortals know about the nature of angels is practically nil. We know they have at different times assumed physical bodies, and were referred to as men. Angels in their corporeal form on earth have spoke as men speak, ate the food of men, handled men and were handled by men (**Genesis 18:8, 19:3 & 16**). What the nature and power of fallen angels consist of, is known only to God. The little we know about them tells us, that sinful angels left their proper habitat, and were granted access to the earth, wherein they had illicit intercourse with the daughters of men, including both, Sethites and Cainites.

(The Sovereign Grace Advocate - February, 1983)

2 - The Sons Of God In Genesis 6

Elder Milburn R. Cockrell

1941-2002

“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” (Genesis 6:1-4).

These verses have been debated for centuries by good and great theologians. What I am about to say on these verses will not end the debate, but it will probably add to it. Our paper has in times past set forth the traditional view in the Forum and in other articles. The Editor has remained silent to date. It is only proper and fair that I should make known my views on this subject. Some, of course, have their minds made up and do not want to give a fair hearing to the other side. Such individuals should stop here and read no farther.

THE TWO VIEWS

Two general views have been held as to the identity of the sons of God and the daughters of men in Genesis 6. One school of interpretation holds that the sons of God is the godly line of Seth and the daughters of men is the ungodly line of Cain. This is and has been the view of some able scholars. This no intelligent and informed person would deny.

The second school of interpretation holds that the sons of God were fallen angels who cohabited with the daughters of Adam. This resulted in a

race of giants and brought the flood. Some good men have held this view such as A. W. Pink, Robert Govett, Clarence Larkin, G. H. Pember, Henry Morris, and others. The first view is generally held today, but the second view is the oldest and is more in line with other Scriptures as I see it.

PROBLEMS WITH THE TRADITIONAL VIEW

It seems to me that those who make the sons of God to be the godly line of Seth and the daughters of men to be the ungodly line of Cain have a number of problems in their view. First, if they are correct “it would appear that at the time the amalgamation took place God’s people were limited to the male sex, for ‘the sons of God’ were the ones who ‘married’ ‘the daughters of men’” (*Gleanings in Genesis* by A. W. Pink, pp. 92-93). Why did not some of the daughters of God marry some of the sons of men? The traditional view cannot answer this question. The use of the word “**men**” in “**daughters of men**” (vv. 2, 4) signifies the whole human race. The word “**man**” in the Hebrew is the word “Adam,” meaning the race that came from Adam (**Genesis 5:2**). This same Hebrew word is rendered in the early parts of Genesis “**Adam**” in the following places (**2:19, 20, 21, 23; 3:8, 9, 17, 20, 21; 4:1, 25; 5:1-5**, etc.). It is *bnoth-ha-Adam* and could read “**daughters of Adam**.” There is no suggestion of contrast if the sons of God were also men.

Second, there is no proof the race of Seth were all godly and the race of Cain were apostates. This is a pure assumption and contrary to all human history and experience. Did not the Sethites partake of the same fallen nature as the Cainites? The traditional assumption is a hypothesis to get rid of difficulty. Children of godly parents are not always godly. Consider the sons of Eli (**I Samuel 2:12-25**). Did not David have his Absalom and Solomon his Rehoboam? Nor is it always true that all children born to ungodly parents are ungodly.

Third, there is no evidence in the Divine Record that God had at this time forbidden the godly and ungodly to marry. In the early days of the race brothers and sisters had to marry each other and later near of kin. There can be no doubt that the descendants of Seth and Cain had been intermarrying for some time. In all ages of man there has been some intermarriage of the

righteous and the wicked, but there has only been one world-wide flood that destroyed the race save eight souls.

Fourth, the union of believers and unbelievers does not produce giants. Nevertheless, when the sons of God married the daughters of Adam, giants were born (**Genesis 6:4**).

Fifth, where were these sons of God when the flood came? Why were they not in the ark with Noah? Had they apostatized? If so, down the drain goes our teaching of the security of the saints and the fifth point of sovereign grace (perseverance of the saints). **Genesis 6:11-12** gives no hint of the godly line of Seth in great numbers. Peter tells us the flood came “**upon the world of the ungodly**” (**II Peter 2:5**). When the flood came there were only eight righteous souls on earth (**I Peter 3:20**). Hence there were no sons of God outside the ark. Let those who hold to the traditional view tell us what happened to them.

Sixth, Noah was the only one “**perfect**” in his generation (**Genesis 6:9; 7:1**). This not only suggests the moral purity of Noah, but it reveals that none of his parents or present family had cohabited with the fallen angels and had children by them. There were no demigods in Noah’s family tree. Why was no one else perfect in his generation? Let those of the traditional view give the answer.

Seventh, the Hebrew text could read in **Genesis 6:4**: “... **when the sons of Elohim came in unto the daughters of Adam, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men ...**” The daughters of Adam can hardly be limited to the so-called ungodly line of Cain. The text in **Genesis 6** does not say nor imply that the daughters of men were all ungodly. This must be read into the text, for it simply is not there.

THE SONS OF GOD WERE ANGELS

The true identity of the “**sons of Elohim**” is crucial to the correct interpretation of **Genesis 6**. This expression occurs but six times in the Old Testament. In all cases the meaning seems to be angels. Consider **Job 1:6-7**:

“Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan came also among them. And the LORD, said unto Satan, Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the LORD, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it.”

Satan, a fallen angel (**Isaiah 14; II Corinthians 11:14**), had been on earth. Hence the scene in **Job 1** is in Heaven. That angels are meant by “**sons of God**” or “**sons of Elohim**” is in the highest degree probable. The scene is quite parallel that of **I Kings 22:19**: “**And he said, Hear thou therefore the word of the LORD: I saw the LORD sitting on His throne, and all the host of heaven standing by Him on His right hand and on His left.**” Most scholars are agreed that the sons of God in **Job 1:6-7** and **Job 2:1-2** are the angels of God in Heaven.

An almost indisputable verse is **Job 38:7**. The context is about the creation of the earth (vv. 4-6). Then we read in verse 7: “**When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?**” No men were present when the earth was created. Both the morning stars and the sons of God are angels, for they only were present when the foundations of the earth were laid. Nearly all scholars agree these sons of God were angels. It is strange they give “**sons of Elohim**” a new meaning in **Genesis 6:1-4**.

The term “**sons of Elohim**” seems confined to those who were directly created by God, and not born of other beings of their own order. Hence, in Luke’s genealogy of Christ, Adam is called a son of God (**Luke 3:38**). In **John 1:12** Christ is said to give to some the power to become sons of God. These are born of the Spirit of God in their inner man in the present life on earth. At the resurrection they will be clothed with a spiritual body, a building of God (**II Corinthians 5:1**), and then they will be in every respect equal to the angels, being altogether a new creation (**Luke 20:36**).

The sons of Elohim are seen again in **Psalm 29:1**: “**Give unto the LORD, O ye mighty, give unto the LORD glory and strength.**” The Septuagint reads: “**Bring to the Lord, ye sons of God ...**” In the Emphasized Bible Joseph B. Rotherham renders it: “**Give to Yahweh, ye**

sons of the mighty.” Again most scholars concede these are probably angels also.

The sons of Elohim are seen again in **Psalm 82:6**: “**I have said, *Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the most High.***” Rotherham has it: “**Yea sons of the Highest are all ...**” In verse **1** of this Psalm God is said to judge in the congregation of the gods (Elohim). In verse **7** these angels are threatened that, if they go on in evil of which God complains in verse **2**, they will die like men (Adam). Now if the sons of God are children of Adam, it was superfluous so to warn them, for death would be a fact of depraved human nature.

The Alexandrian manuscript of the Septuagint reads in **Genesis 6:2** and **4** “**the angels of God.**”

The Book of Enoch, written about 200 years before the birth of Christ, gives this information about **Genesis 6**: “And it came to pass when the children of men had multiplied in those days that beautiful and comely daughters were born unto them. And the angels, the sons of the heavens, saw and lusted after them, and spake to one another, ‘Come now let us choose us wives from among the children of men and beget children’” (Sec. I, VI:1-2). It continues: “And they took unto themselves wives, and each chose for himself one, and they began to go in unto them and they mixed with them, and taught them charms and enchantments, and made them acquainted with the cutting of roots and of woods. And they became pregnant, and they bear great giants, whose height was three thousand ells” (Sec. I, VII:1-2).

Flavius Josephus (A.D. 37-100), the Jewish historian, writing upon **Genesis 6**, says: “For many angels of God accompanied with women, and begat sons that proved unjust, and despisers of all that was good, on account of the confidence they had in their own strength; for the tradition is, that these men did what resembled the acts of those whom the Grecians call giants” (*Antiquities of the Jews*, Book I, Chap. III, Sec. 1).

William Whiston, who translated the writings of Josephus, has a footnote at the bottom of this page (36) which reads: “The notion, that the

fallen angels were, in some sense, the fathers of the old giants, was the constant opinion of antiquity.”

W. F. Albright has written: “Yahweh was believed to have created astral as well as terrestrial beings and the former were popularly called, ‘the host of heaven’ or ‘the sons of God.’ In **Genesis 6:1** ff1, for example, ... the (astral) gods had intercourse with mortal women who gave birth to heroes (literally, meteors, nephilim), an idea that may often be illustrated from Babylonian and Greek mythology. But the Israelites who had this section recited, unquestionably thought of intercourse between angels and women (like later Jews and Christians)” (*From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 226).

The oldest of the church fathers contended that the sons of God in **Genesis 6** were angels who married the daughters of Adam. Justin Martyr (A.D. 100-165) wrote in his Second Apology: “But the angels transgressed this appointment, and were captivated by love of women, and begat children who are those that are called demons; and besides, they afterwards subdued the human race to themselves, partly by magical writings, and partly fears and the punishments they occasioned, and partly by teaching them to offer sacrifices, and incense, and libations, of which things they stood in need after they were enslaved by lustful passions; and among men they sowed murders, wars, adulteries, intemperate deeds, and all wickedness. Whence also the poets and mythologists, not knowing that it was the angel and those demons who had been begotten by them that did these things to men, and women, and cities, and nations, which they related, ascribed them to God himself, and to those who were accounted to be his very offspring, and to the offspring of those who were called his brothers, Neptune and Pluto, and to the children of these offspring. For whatever name each of the angels had given to himself and his children, by that name they called them” (*The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I, p. 190).

In the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs we find this information: “For moreover the angel of God told me concerning them, and taught me that women are overcome by the spirit of fornication more than men, and they devise their hearts against men; and by means of their adornment they

deceive first their minds, and instill the poison by the glance of their eye, and then they take them captive by their doings, for a woman cannot overcome a man by force ... For thus they allured the Watchers before the flood; and as these continually beheld them, they fell into desire each of the other, and they conceived the act in mind, and changed themselves into the shape of men, and appeared to them in their congress with their husbands; and the women, having their mind's desire toward their apparitions, gave birth to giants, for the Watchers appeared to them as reaching even unto heaven" (*The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VIII, p. 10). The translator has a note at the bottom defining the "Watchers." It reads: "This name, occurring once again in the Testaments (Naph. 3), is one frequently applied to the angels as the custodians of the world and of men."

Robert Govett comments: "That the 'sons of God' were angels, was a belief held by Justin Martyr and Tertullian, who both allude to it in their respective Apologies; by Athenagoras, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyprian, Methodius, Lactanius, Eusebius, Ambrose, and Sulpitius Severus, as the author of 'Evuvin' affirm" (*The Sons of God and Giants of Rephaim*, the book has no page numbers).

It is freely granted that these quotes are not inspired as is the Bible, but they do most certainly prove what the ancient Jews and early Christians believed about **Genesis 6:1-4**.

THE SINNING ANGELS

There are two passages in the New Testament that speak of sinning angels. The first is **II Peter 2:4-5**: "**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 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.**"

We are not, in this passage, told what their sin was, although the passage immediately speaks of the days of Noah and the flood as if to give a close connection between the two events. We are merely told that they did sin and

that they are now imprisoned in Tartarus (our version has “**hell**”). Generally “**Hell**” is a translation of the Greek word *Hades*, but here only in the New Testament the Greek has *Tartarus*. This word is right out of Greek mythology. In Homer it is *tartaros*, and it is found in **Job 40:15; 41:23** of the Septuagint. It is also found in the Book of Enoch 20:2 where it is the place of punishment of fallen angels, while *Gehenna* is for apostate Jews (See *Word Pictures in the New Testament* by A. T. Robertson, Vol. VI, p. 162). The judgment Peter makes mention of is most likely the great White Throne Judgment in **Revelation 20:11-15**. These angels are in prison while Satan angels are still loose on earth. The sons of Elohim in **Genesis 6** may have rebelled in the days of Noah, and their rebellion may have had no connection with the rebellion of Satan and his angels (**Revelation 12:7-10**) who are yet to be imprisoned (**Matthew 25:41; Isaiah 24:21-22**).

The second passage is **Jude 6-7**: “**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.**”

The passage in Jude discloses the sin of the angels. They “**Kept not their first estate,**” or “their own principality,” or “first place of power” (**I Corinthians 15:24a; Romans 8:38**). The reference is to the lordship held by angels in creation in the kingdom of the air. They “**left their own habitation,**” or “their own proper habitation” (*oiketerion*). They left the kingdom of the air and descended to earth. The Greek word for “**habitation**” is the word for “dwelling place” (from *oiketer*, dweller at home, from *oikos*). It is found only here and in **II Corinthians 5:1** where it refers to the body as the abode of the spirit of man (See A. T. Robertson on this). The meaning in Jude is that the angels left their normal spiritual bodies to assume an abnormal physical form to cohabit with human women.

The words “**even so**” and “**in like manner**” in verse 7 about the Sodomites are very significant. It can mean no less than like the fallen angels in verse 6. The Sodomites went after the unnatural use of the men (**Genesis**

19:1-17; Romans 1:27), even as the sinning angels went after the daughters of Adam. Both the angels and Sodomites were guilty of the indulgence of passion contrary to nature. Both the Sodomites and the fallen angels are set forth as an example of eternal fire, suffering punishment for their sins.

ANGELS CAN ASSUME HUMAN BODIES

Those who have studied the doctrines of angels in the Scriptures know that they have the power to assume a human body, or to dismiss it, as they please. It is also well known that when they assume human bodies they appeared as men. In the Bible angels are always spoken of in the masculine gender. Abraham welcomed three “**men**” in the plains of Mamre (**Genesis 18:1-8**). They walked, talked, and ate with him as “**men**,” but they were in truth angels (**Genesis 18:22; 19:1**). The angels at the empty tomb of Christ is by Mark described as “**a young man**” (**Mark 16:5**) and by Luke as “**two men ... in shining garments**” (**Luke 24:4**). The “**two men ... in white apparel**” in **Acts 1:10** were probably angels. Belshazzar, the king of Babylon, during his feast saw only a “**hand**” of an angel which wrote on the wall of his palace (**Daniel 5:5**), showing an angel can assume only a part of a human body.

The physical realism of angels in human bodies is seen in the visit of two angels to Lot in Sodom. The Sodomites sought to misuse them sexually: “**And they called unto Lot, and said unto him, Where *are* the men which came in to thee this night? bring them out unto us, that we may know them**” (**Genesis 19:5**; cf. **Judges 19:22; Leviticus 18:22; Romans 1:27**). In the Old Testament a lawful copulation with a man’s wife is expressed by knowing her (**Genesis 4:1, 17, 25**), and the unlawful and shocking copulation of man with man is expressed by the same phrase. To properly convey the meaning of **Genesis 19:5** to the modern mind it might read: “Bring them out to us, that we may sodomize them.” The two angels smote the Sodomites with blindness so they were unable to perform this evil act (**Genesis 19:6-11**). Why was this miracle performed if angels in human bodies could not be sodomized? And if this was possible why would it not be possible for them in human bodies to have sex with the daughters of Adam?

The sinning angels are now in prison in *Tartarus* and cannot get out until the judgment of the great day (**II Peter 2:4**). Satan and his angels are loose on earth. In Greek mythology *Tartarus* was a dark abode of woe, as far beneath Hades as Earth is below Heaven (*Homer II*, Vol. VIII, 16). This idea corresponds to Peter's pit of darkness. In Greek mythology Zeus put the rebelling Titan in *Tartarus*. In Christian theology *Tartarus* is the prison house of the fallen angels who copulated with the daughters of Adam in **Genesis 6:1-4**.

We know from **Genesis 6:4** that "*children*" were born as a result of the unlawful union of angels and the daughters of Adam. These were giants, and I doubt not that some were men as well as women. There are legends of Hercules and of Amazonians (strong women). The bodies of these offspring of fallen angels and the daughters of Adam were destroyed in the flood. Since the flood came "**upon the world of the ungodly**" (**II Peter 2:5**) we can safely assume these giants, men and women, had their bodies destroyed in the flood. What about their spirits which could not be destroyed? I believe they are still loose on the earth and are the demons we read about in the Bible. Justin Martyr held this view. This would account for why the demons seek to take over the bodies of men and women. It would also allow for male and female demons, a belief held by the ancient nations of the earth, including the Hebrews. I shall say more on this later.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED

First, those who oppose this view I am advocating say that angels cannot marry. It is true that angels are immortal beings who do not need to maintain their number by procreation as do men. It is not the ordinary nature of angels to seek the marriage relationship. Jesus said in **Matthew 22:30**: "**For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven**" (cf. **Mark 12:25**; **Luke 20:35-36**). Those who remain unfallen "**in heaven**" do not marry. This is the general rule, but it does not follow that angels are sexless, for they are always spoken of in the masculine gender. Could it be there are no female angels for them to marry? **Matthew 22:30** could hardly be the rule for fallen

angels. **Genesis 6:1-4** plainly teaches that angels can assume human bodies and cohabit with women and have children who are giants.

Second, some will say this is a new light teaching which they have never heard of before except for this article. They may not have heard of it before, but it is certainly not a new teaching. It is as old as **Genesis 6:1-4**. It was the view of the ancient Jews and the church fathers. In fact this view was not ever questioned until about the Fourth Century of the Christian Era.

Clarence Larkin writes: “That the ‘Sons of God’ of **Genesis 6:1-4** were ANGELS was maintained by the ancient Jewish Synagogue, by Hellenistic Jews at, and before the time of Christ, and by the Christian Church up until the Fourth Century, when the interpretation was changed to ‘sons of Seth’ for two reasons. First, because of the worship of angels had been set up, and if the ‘Sons of God’ of **Genesis 6:1-4** were angels and fell, then angels might fall again, and that possibility would affect the worship of angels. The second reason was, that Celibacy had become an institution of the Church, and if it was taught that the angels in heaven did not marry, and yet that some of them seduced by the beauty of womanhood came down from heaven to gratify their amorous propensities, a weakness of a similar kind in one of the ‘earthly angels’ (Celegates) might be the more readily excused. In the Eighteenth Century the ‘Angelic Interpretation’ was revived, and is now largely held by Biblical scholars” (*The Spirit World*, pp. 26-27).

So in truth the angelic interpretation of **Genesis 6:1-4** is not new light; it is old light. The Seth and Cain idea is a carryover among our Baptist churches from the heresies of Roman Catholicism. The angelic interpretation is an old landmark which has fallen and needs to be reset. Hence this article.

Third, some say that Israel is called “sons of God.” But according to the Old Testament it would be better to say that Israel is called “**my son**” (**Exodus 4:22**) and “**my sons**” (**Isaiah 43:6; (45:11)**). **Hosea 1:10** says: “**Ye are** the sons of the living God.” But in none of these verses is Israel called “**the sons of Elohim**” as the expression is in **Genesis 6:1-4**. Most of the verses about Israel concern her future conversion when she is brought into the blessings of the New Covenant. In the Old Testament the “**sons of**

Elohim” is restricted to angels, but in the New Testament it is applied to sons of God by regeneration (**John 1:12; Romans 8:14-16; Galatians 4:6; I John 3:1-2**). In this age the inner man is born anew by the Spirit of God. At the resurrection we will be clothed with a spiritual body, a building of God (**II Corinthians 5:1**). Then we will be “**equal unto the angels**” (**Luke 20:36**), being altogether a new creation!

THE GIANTS

The Seth and Cain interpretation does little to explain the “**giants**” in **Genesis 6:1-4**. These are played down or explained away. Look again at **Genesis 6:4**: “**There were giants in the earth in those days** (the days before the flood); **and also after that** (after the flood, **Numbers 13:33**), **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.**”

Like our KJV, the Septuagint has “**giants**” (from *gigantes*). In the Hebrew it is *nephilim* which Robert Young in his Analytical Concordance to the Bible says means “fallen ones, fellers.” The “fallen ones” (*nephilim*) points to the offspring of the fallen angels and the daughters of Adam. These are also called “**mighty men**” in **Genesis 6:4**, a word commonly used for military men of great strength. The giants were the results of the union of heavenly natures with earthly natures. Angels, a higher order of being than man, have great knowledge of genetic manipulation. If man can now make a clone just think what a fallen angel might be capable of with his great wisdom.

The word *nephilim* occurs again in **Numbers 13:33**: “**And there we saw the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants (nephilim): and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight.**” Here are some of the mighty men like those in **Genesis 6:1-4**. These were also doubtless some more demigods or half man and half angel. This sin did happen after the flood, but it would seem never to the point of corrupting all flesh as in the days of Noah.

It appears from the Old Testament that the Land of Canaan was a land of giants. There were Rephaims who inhabited Canaan, Edom, Moab, and Ammon. At the conquest of Canaan, Og, king of Bashan, was of the race of giants (**Deuteronomy 3:11; Joshua 12:4; 13:12**). In **Deuteronomy 3:11** it is written: **“For only Og king of Bashan remained of the remnant of giants; behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron; is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon? nine cubits was the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit of a man”** (cf. **Deuteronomy 3:13**). Scholars differ as to the length of a cubit. But taking the shortest length his bedstead was 10 feet and 6 inches, or, taking the longest, it was 11 feet and 9 inches.

There was the Emims who were giants in the land of Moab: **“The Emims dwelt therein in times past, a people great, and many, and tall, as the Anakims; Which also were accounted giants, as the Anakims; but the Moabites call them Emims”** (**Deuteronomy 2:10-11**). There was also the Zamzumins of Ammon: **“That also was accounted a land of giants: giants dwelt therein in old time; and the Ammonites called them Zamzummims; A people great, and many, and tall, as the Anakims; but the LORD destroyed them before them; and they succeeded them, and dwelt in their stead”** (**Deuteronomy 2:20-21**). From a remnant of the Anakims in Philistine Gath came the famous Goliath (**I Samuel 17:4**; cf. **II Samuel 21:16-22**). He was 6 cubits and a span. Either 9 feet and 9 inches, taking the shortest length, or 10 feet and an inch, taking the longest.

The existence of giants in Canaan is very significant. It would seem that these offspring of angels and the daughters of Adam were there to keep Israel out of her promised land. This is doubtless one of the reasons the Israelites were to exterminate the Cainites (**Deuteronomy 20:12-13**).

The Hebrew **“Rephaim”** is found eight times in the Old Testament, although it is somewhat obscured by our English translation. The Septuagint of **Job 26:5** reads: **“Shall giants (Rephaim) be born from under the water and the inhabitants thereof,”** an allusion to the drowning of the offspring of angels and the daughters of Adam by the flood. It is seen again in **Proverbs 2:18**: **“For her house inclineth unto death, and her paths unto the dead**

(Rephaim or giants).” Here Solomon dissuades from sexual impurity because it brings the transgressor to the assembly of the giants. **Proverbs 9:18** is similar to this verse: “**But he knoweth not that the dead (Rephaim or giants) *are there*; and that her guests *are in the depths of Hell* (Sheol in Hebrew or Hades in the Greek).” Wicked women caused the sons of Elohim to sin and suffer punishment. If angels could not resist an adulterous woman, how much less a depraved man?**

Proverbs 21:16 says: “**The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead (Rephaim or giants).**” While the word “giants” is not mentioned in **Proverbs 7:26** it is surely implied: “**For she hath cast down many wounded: yea, many strong *men* (note “*men*” is in italic, showing there is no word in the Hebrew for “*men*” which is supplied by the Translators) have been slain by her.**”

Rephaim is also in **Isaiah 14:9** and **Isaiah 26:19** where it is rendered “**the dead.**” In **Isaiah 26:14** Rephaim is rendered “**deceased.**” The New Berkely Version makes it easier to see: “**The dead do not live; the ghosts (Raphaim or giants) do not stand up. Accordingly, Thou hast visited and destroyed them and caused all memory of them to perish.**”

OTHER THINGS WHICH SEEM TO CONFIRM THIS

Where did the heroes of heathen mythology come from? Persius, Esculapius, Hercules, and others came from the tradition of the giants, offspring born to the sons of Elohim and the daughters of Adam. The heathen confused the sons of Elohim with the gods and made these giants the sons of earthly women and the gods.

During the Middle Ages it was a common belief that a demon could put on a male body (incubus) and impregnate a woman, or put on a woman’s body (succubus) and tempt a man. Long before this many ancient civilizations had their incubus and succubus. The early Assyrian Lili was a sexually insatiable female demon who roamed the night looking for a mortal man to lie with. A Hebrew tradition about Lilith existed in very ancient time. In **Isaiah 34:14** the words “**the screech owl**” in Hebrew is *Lilith*, which

occurs no other place in the Hebrew Old Testament. *Lilith* was the name of a female demon, or some say the mother of succubi. Satyrs (**Isaiah 13:21; 34:14**) are believed to be male demons behind idol gods.

GENESIS 6:3

Notice again **Genesis 6:3**: “**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.**” What is meant by the words “**he ALSO is flesh**”? It would seem some other nature beside man had become flesh. The giants had been born of marriage of fallen angels with the daughters of Adam. The Seth and Cain theory cannot make any sense out of the word “**also**” here. The meaning of **Genesis 6:3** is that as the Spirit had ceased to strive with these rebellious angels, so it would be also with man, for he too had become corrupt (**Genesis 6:5, 11-13**).

WHY BOTHER WITH ALL OF THIS?

I can hear some pious souls ask, “Why go to such length to deal with this? of what profit is it to God’s people? Does it edify?” I would answer that “**all scripture ... is profitable for doctrine**” (**II Timothy 3:16**). This includes **Genesis 6:1-4**. Please do not call something “unprofitable” that God has called “**profitable.**” To do such would be to attack both God and His Word. A number of important truths are seen in **Genesis 6:1-4**.

First, the account in **Genesis 6:1-4** shows an early plan of Satan to corrupt the human race by angels marrying the daughters of Adam. There is no salvation for fallen angels and no Messiah could be born of a race of demigods or demons. The Messiah must be the Seed of the woman, not the woman and an angel. This is just the sort of work we might expect from Satan, a fallen angel.

Second, when Israel was ready to enter the promised land the giants (the offspring of fallen angels and the daughters of men) were there to resist them. Israel faced some of the greatest military men who ever lived on earth (**Numbers 13:33**). These Hercules scared them to death. Satan had his best

fighters there to make Israel fearful and afraid in hopes of keeping them out of Immanuel's land (**Isaiah 8:8**). Who do you think is making all the trouble in the Middle East today? It is Satan, a fallen angel!

Third, there is to be a revival of the days of Noah before Christ comes back and sets up the kingdom on earth: **“And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all”**(**Luke 17:26-27**). Note the stress upon **“they married wives, they were given in marriage”** by Christ here. As we near the end of this age, I believe fallen angels may again marry the daughters of men and produce giants. The modern-day sexual revolution is being carried on by men possessed by male demons and women possessed by female demons. Young girl, beware of this sleeping around with just any person. Young men take warning! Don't go to bed with a girl possessed by a female demon! Worse still young girl take warning. You could entertain a fallen angel unaware and give birth to a demigod!

Genesis 3:15 declares: **“And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.”** All will concede that the Seed of the woman was Christ, and I believe the Seed of the Serpent is Antichrist. Satan, a fallen angel, will impregnate a woman who will give birth to a superman, Antichrist. Has this already happened? Or, is it soon to happen? God only knows. Satan leads men to perdition, and Antichrist is **“the son of perdition”** (**II Thessalonians 2:3**) and will do the same work as his father.

To those who want to argue that a spirit cannot impregnate a woman, I ask them to consider that the Holy Spirit impregnated the womb of the virgin Mary (**Luke 1:35**). Don't forget the Devil will heal the deadly wound of Antichrist (**Revelation 13:3, 12**) and give life to the image of Antichrist (**Revelation 13:15**). Do not be so foolish as to make too little of his power. If ordinary angels could produce children of the daughters of Adam, doubt not the greatest of the fallen angels can do as much. Satan by doing this will

attempt to imitate the virgin birth of Christ. Satan is not an originator; he is an imitator.

The days of this present dispensation are near an end. If there ever existed a generation which ought to repent and believe the gospel it is the generation now living. How is it with your soul? Do you know Christ as your Savior? Are you ready to go out into eternity? Repent and believe the good news about Christ.

I conclude this article with a poem given to me by Elder Ernest Parks, Winston-Salem, NC:

SONS OF GOD

The sons of God must have been

Angelic beings and not men.

Does not one teach an awful mess,

In proving they were sons of Seth?

And could men so heep-um tall

Become such giants without the fall?

Some say my poem makes not good sense

To you, my friend, it was not meant!

(The Berea Baptist Banner - February 05, 2012)