

# Nephilim

## Who were the Sons of God? What Was Their Sin? What Happened?

### Genesis 6

- 1 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.**  
5 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.

### Numbers 13

- 33 **And there we saw the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants:** and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight.

The *sons of God* in Genesis 6:2,4 were men from the godly families of the righteous descending from Seth to Noah. Their sin was to break their covenant with God and lustfully marry into the wicked families on earth descending from Cain and others. The offspring were famous men in the antediluvian world, and God drowned the earth for this sin and the wickedness of man.

Speculators, rejecting even elementary hermeneutics, assume the sons of God to be angels, which they say came to earth for sexual liaisons with women, resulting in a mongrel super race, which they call the *Nephilim*. Though God destroyed all living creatures with the Flood in Noah's day, the consistent speculators find the *Nephilim* again in Canaan from Numbers 13:33.

*Nephilim* is a transliterated Hebrew word, occurring in corrupt Bible versions in two places, and subsequently used by some as a name for the mongrel creatures resulting from angels copulating with women according to a false and foolish interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4 and Numbers 13:33.

**Genesis 6:4** (RV, ASV, RSV, NASV, NIV, NSRV, ESV, WEB, HSCB, GW, NCV, NIRV).

**Numbers 13:33** (RV, ASV, RSV, NASV, NIV, NSRV, ESV, WEB, HSCB, GW, NCV, NIRV, BBE, CEB, The Message, Young's).

The King James Version, God's inspired and authoritative scriptures in English, which may be trusted and argued at the word level, as it was designed and used, has *giants* in both places.

Transliteration creates new words with no established meaning in the receiving language, and in this case, having little or confused meaning in the originating language. This unnecessary transliteration created the mysterious term *Nephilim*, encouraging imaginations to run wild about angels having sex with women resulting in a new race. A certain meaning of *Nephilim* cannot be determined, but since it does not occur in God's Bible anyway, it is of no consequence to saints.

The wild idea of angels having sexual intercourse with human women to generate science fiction supermen should be ignored, if it were not for some publishing speculations based on this bizarre interpretation. Having turned their ears away from sound doctrine and truth for fables, carnal Christians with itching ears have found teachers that will scratch their lusts with these farfetched tales of a super race (II Tim 4:3-4). Rather than learn Christ, truth, and godliness, they want to be entertained with ridiculous propositions based on even more ridiculous interpretational methods.

The texts above do not say or imply anything about angels, and the rest of scripture is totally silent about such an incredible heaven-earth, interracial sexual event and its result. It is the logical fallacy of *begging the question* or *circular reasoning* to assume that angels are intended by a few uses of "sons of God" for angels in Job 1:6; 2:1; and 38:7. There is no reason to connect these passages beyond the mere sound of their words, which is a presumptive mistake violating even elementary hermeneutics for rightly dividing scripture (Neh 8:8; II Tim 2:15).

Rather than leap into the black abyss of angel-human mongrels running around in dark forests or leading international conspiracies, let sane readers weigh the evidence for a much simpler and Biblical explanation of the text. The scriptures themselves will prove that God in this passage ... ***identified the sin of His adopted children (Seth's descendants) marrying the reprobate children of the world (Cain's and others' descendants), thus bringing the Flood on the whole world, except for the family of Noah, which obtained mercy for his faithful obedience.***

1. The sin was by *men of flesh*, not by angels, for God in context and in consequence said He would not always strive with fleshly man (Gen 6:3). The sin was taking daughters for marriage – not a sin of giving daughters in marriage. This must be human males taking human females, for the sin was by fleshly men, not angels, and the sin was taking the wives.
2. The sin was by *men of flesh*, not by angels, for God's consequential judgment came on humanity and other breathing creatures in 120 years, when He drowned the human race by Noah's Flood (Gen 6:3). Nothing happened to any angels 120 years later. Angelic destruction and punishment were thousands of years away, as they confessed to the Lord Christ on earth.
3. The *also* in verse 6:3 compares two things that are flesh. Since God is not flesh, He is not compared. Since angels are not flesh (and not mentioned here), they are not compared. Are there comparable fleshly things in context? Sons of God and daughters of men! The sons of

God, who chose and took wives from the daughters of men, were *also* flesh. Though named after God religiously, they still had bodies and lusts of flesh like the daughters of men.

4. The Flood was provoked by *men of the earth*, not by angels, for God saw the wickedness of man and the evil imaginations of his heart (Gen 6:5-7). He did not see the wickedness of angels. If the angels were guilty of corrupting humanity, as would be the case if the wicked sexual perpetrators were angels, they would be mentioned. They are not mentioned. If the angels were guilty of this horrible sexual transgression, why did God punish humanity for it?
5. There is no mention in Genesis 6:1-4 of angels or anywhere else in scripture regarding such an incredible event as angel-human marriages, sexual intercourse, conception, reproduction, mongrel birth, mongrel nursing, etc. The Bible is a closed system of truth, and honest men never argue for an incredible thing like angel-human mongrels when there is not a mote of Biblical evidence for anything even resembling such a wild, Greek mythology fantasy. The burden of proof is upon them, for the doctrine they construct is entirely based on Job alone.
6. The phrase *sons of God* does not have to apply to angels. To suggest it does is presumption without evidence. There is no reason to run to Job for the three usages there, since there are several other uses of *sons of God* in the rest of the Bible. Such a forced connection and identity of meaning is only of convenience for those rejecting real Bible study. They must prove the connection necessary and scripturally correct, or they must ignore Job's usage.
7. The phrase *sons of God* does not have to apply to angels. To suggest it does is presumption without evidence. How many times must Jehovah refer to His people under the O.T. as His sons or children to prove this much more sensible meaning of the phrase (Ex 4:22-23; Deut 14:1; 32:19; Ps 82:6-7; Is 1:2; 45:11; 43:6; 63:16; Jer 31:9; Hos 11:1)? By comparing the Spirit's words as commanded, there is an obvious interpretation fitting scripture (I Cor 2:13).
8. The phrase *sons of God* does not have to apply to angels. To suggest it does is presumption without evidence. The N.T. uses the specific phrase *sons of God* six times to refer to God's elect children, who believe the gospel and live righteous lives. These passages are John 1:12; Romans 8:14,19; Philippians 2:15; and I John 3:1-2. This does not include all the other related N.T. passages describing believers as God's adopted and religious children.
9. The phrase *sons of God* does not have to apply to angels. To suggest it does is presumption without evidence. The O.T. does not even introduce the word or concept of *angel* until Genesis 16:7, and it does not introduce the plural word *angels* until Genesis 19:1. These two events are about 350 years after Noah's Flood. Prior to those events, there is no revelation of any kind that these spirit beings were in the world or interested in intercourse with women.
10. The phrase *sons of God* does not have to apply to angels. To assume it so is presumption without evidence. This is the logical fallacy of *circular reasoning* or *begging the question*. You cannot assume a connection that you have not proven! It is a *non sequitur* – it does not follow. Such fallacious logic carries no weight at all in reasoning. Nothing has been proven, for it is only a speculation assumed as a premise with no evidence, proof, or support for it.

11. Once one chooses to connect words by merely their sound or spelling, there is no end to the false interpretations and heresies to arise. Adam must be equal to Jesus Christ, since both are the *son of God* (Luke 1:35; 3:38). Since that is just as logical as connecting Job 1:6; 2:1; and 38:7 to Genesis 6:2,4; go ahead and use John 1:12 and Romans 8:14 to make yourself equal to Adam and Christ! Here are three meanings for *sons of God*, and not one of them is angels.
12. Once one chooses to connect words by merely their sound or spelling, there is no end to the false interpretations and heresies to arise. Angels are called *saints* (Deut 33:2; Acts 7:53; Ps 68:17), so should we assume that Roman believers were angels, since they were called *saints* (Rom 1:7; etc.)? Such connections are ludicrous. Angels are called *watchers* (Dan 4:17), so should we assume the Chaldeans were angels, because they were called *watchers* (Jer 4:16)?
13. The next consistent and logical step in heresy for those forcing angels into Genesis 6:1-4 is the serpent seed heresy of British-Israelism, Daniel Parker, and William Branham. This heresy assumes Cain was the result of sexual intercourse between Satan and Eve, because Jesus said the Jews were of their *father* the devil (John 8:44). The ridiculous error is made by assuming every occurrence of *father* must mean physical progenitor. If those promoting the Nephilim fable were consistent and logical, they would also teach Satan-Eve intercourse.
14. The Bible teaches a rule of study called “rightly dividing the word of truth” (II Tim 2:15). Though the Bible may use the same words, approved ministers study the context and rightly separate different uses and senses of the same words to avoid shameful doctrine. This is real preaching: declaring the sense regardless of sound (Neh 8:8). Israel must be divided between spiritual and national Israel (Rom 9:6). Temptation must be divided between the lust of sin and the occasion for sin (Jas 1:13; Gen 22:1). Salvation has at least five senses in the N.T.
15. The children resulting from the union of the *sons of God* and the *daughters of men* were *mighty men* and *men of renown* – they were not the giants of Genesis 6:4. There is a clear distinction between these two classes of persons in the antediluvian world by the language and grammar chosen. Here is an elementary and foolish mistake of connection in the very passage under study. The four words, *and also after that*, found in Genesis 6:4 emphasize clearly by quadruple evidence that two separate classes of men are under consideration.
16. The *sons of God* in Genesis 6:1-4 are the Jehovah-worshipping descendants of Seth (Gen 4:25-26), for God saw His children and holy seed distinct from Cain. Two generations after Adam, men began to call upon the name of the LORD, showing their difference from the Cainite world. A few generations later came the prophet Enoch (Gen 5:21-24; Jude 1:14-15), then the prophet Lamech (Gen 5:28-31), and then the godly Noah (Gen 6:8-10).
17. If the argument is raised that Seth’s line did not seem very godly, we answer that they have identified the issue! The key by the words *sons of God* in Genesis 6 is divine adoption or profession, not physical nature. God ended His striving with His people, just as He finished striving with Israel in the wilderness and dropped all their carcasses there for their iniquity. If a search is made, there was a godly line of men as Seth, Enos, Enoch, Lamech, and Noah.

18. The *men and daughters* are worldly descendants of Cain and others, for in 6:1-2 they are distinguished from the *sons of God* and described as mere fleshly reproduction. Referred to merely as *men* by God's slight of them – for there was nothing noble about them – they were distinct from the *sons of God*. The worldly men had likely invented polygamy to noticeably multiply, as Lamech had (Gen 4:19-24), violating the godly purpose of marriage (Mal 2:15).
19. God's harsh words and extreme judgment by the Flood in Genesis 6 are fitting for His people marrying pagans, which sin He has always hated. Repeated warnings, severe language, and promised judgment are throughout the Bible (Gen 24:3; 27:46; Ex 34:16; Deut 7:3-4; Josh 23:12-13; Judges 3:4-8; I Kgs 11:1-11; II Chron 18:1; 19:2; Ezra 9:1-2; Neh 13:24-27; Mal 2:11,15; I Cor 7:39; 11:11; II Cor 6:14-16; Jas 4:4). The judgment of this sin by a universal flood is not too severe for the crime, if God's holiness and jealousy are rightly grasped.
20. The sin included seeing and taking beautiful women. There is no reason to think angels desire sexual intercourse with a woman any more than picking a female nose. Angels are spirits without sexual orientation, so sex is irrelevant (Luke 20:34-36). Angels are greater in power and might than men (II Pet 2:11), let alone women, so they would hardly be attracted to them. When the Bible speaks of angels desiring to look into human things, it is about the eternal salvation of men, not the pleasure of human sex (I Pet 1:12; Heb 2:14-17; Eph 3:10).
21. The sin included legitimate marriage resulting in husbands and wives, not merely fornication, adultery, rape, or whoredom. The sinning males took *wives* (Gen 6:2). Why would angels go through courtship, dating, dowries, and ceremonies to impregnate human females, if their purpose was a satanic conspiracy, mongrel creation, or some other imagined purpose? Why would the fathers of those daughters not inquire at all as to the families of these men? The sin here is the sin of Balaam, the righteous marrying pagans (Num 25:1-3; 31:16; Rev 2:14).
22. The sin included as a result the procreation of children. But angels are spirits without sexual orientation or apparatus, so reproduction is impossible. Angels do not reproduce. Humans cannot reproduce with angels. The ludicrous idea of angel-human reproduction contradicts everything the Bible teaches about angels, men, women, conception, reproduction, etc.
23. Furthermore, every creature God made to procreate or reproduce did so and does so after its own kind. If so, how did angels reproduce men, since the Holy Ghost calls them *men* of renown that resulted from the union of the *sons of God* with the *daughters of men* (Gen 6:4)?
24. Though morally and physically impossible, even if it were possible for angels and humans to have sexual intercourse and reproduce, God would not have allowed it, as it was contrary to creation and His stated laws for gendering with a diverse kind (Luke 19:19; Deut 22:10).
25. Since stronger genes win, the angels' DNA would have crushed the human contribution from the daughters of men and resulted in a spiritual being little like a human, likely capable of space travel and choice of invisibility. The whole point is ludicrous, but is just one more legitimate concern raised by those applying a Greek mythology mentality to God's word.

26. The text calls them *children* (Gen 6:4). But they would not be children, if they were the offspring of kinky angel-human sex, any more than the offspring of goats (kids) are called children. Would they be mules, sterile for reproducing, or are there family trees of *Nephilim*?
27. Error leads to confusion and folly, if the error is taken to its logical conclusions. If there were *Nephilim*, did they drown in the Flood? If they did, then there are no *Nephilim*, contrary to what *Nephilim*-believers assume from Numbers 13:33. If they did not drown in the Flood, then what did they breathe other than the breath of life, for all with the breath of life drowned in the Flood? If they did not drown in the Flood, where are they today? Did men eventually breed the angel DNA out of them? Or vice versa? Are they the CEO's of renown today?
28. Error leads to confusion and folly, if the error is taken to its logical conclusions. If there were *Nephilim*, were they fathered by the elect and holy angels, or the rejected and sinning angels? If the elect and holy angels, was this sexual intercourse with women a sin or not? If not, why not? If yes, where is it stated in the Bible that the elect angels sinned? If the fathers were the fallen angels, did they transmit a sin nature to their innocent children? If the fathers were the fallen angels, was it a further sin on their part? If yes, where is it identified and explained?
29. Jesus described the men of Noah's day without any mention of angels, though He certainly mentioned marriage and their destruction by the Flood (Matt 24:37-42; Luke 17:26-27). He ignored any angel complicity in that generation's wickedness, and the angels would not have been affected by water anyway. As the Flood took away the lives of compromising *sons of God* and worldly *men and their daughters*, so did the Roman armies in 70 A.D.
30. Satan and the angels sinned and were judged by God for their proud rebellion, rejecting the heavenly offices and authority God had given them, not for wild and kinky sex with wanton women in Mesopotamia to gender mongrels (Isaiah 14:12-14; I Tim 3:6; II Pet 2:4; Jude 1:6).
31. If there were *Nephilim*, they no longer exist, for the earth was populated by Noah's family (Gen 9:19). Yet, consistent *Nephilim* advocates say they were still around in Numbers 13:33. And the majority of false Bible versions agree by using this ridiculous word in both places. If they still were found after the Flood, when did the second sexual integration take place, and what did God do about this one? The whole subject is ludicrous as reasoning quickly shows.
32. Sin is transmitted by the man, so were the mongrel offspring of male angels and human females sinners (Rom 5:12-14)? Did they inherit a sin nature? Were they legally liable to death? If they were sinners, how many gained eternal life through Christ? Did the *Nephilim* beget their offspring in their own likeness and after their own image like Adam (Gen 5:3)?
33. If there were *Nephilim*, could any of them be saved? Jesus specifically came with a human body of flesh and blood to obtain redemption for elect humans with flesh and blood (Heb 2:14-16). He specifically did not take on him the nature of angels, which is unrelated to human nature – confounding this heresy again, so how could any of the mongrels be saved?

34. Giants in the Bible, as in Genesis 6:4 and Numbers 13:33 shown above, were sometimes called Anakims (Deut 1:28; etc.), Emims (Deut 2:10-11; etc.), Zamzummims (Deut 2:20), and Rephaims (Gen 14:5; 15:20). But there is no mention in the King James Version of *Nephilim*. This transliterated word is worthless for any valid meaning or historical evidence.
35. I Peter 3:18-20 teaches that the Holy Spirit assisted Noah's preaching to the wicked men of his generation that were in the prison of hell when Peter wrote. This text has absolutely nothing to do with angels, angel-human sex, or angel-human mongrels, and it does not say anything about these figments of imagination by men esteeming their thoughts over scripture.
36. II Peter 2:4-5 does not describe one event and its consequence or one period of time, but rather two different events and different consequences at different times. Such wresting of scripture to create support for presumptive speculation about angel-human sex is a travesty of Bible usage. These two events are merely two of three listed examples of God's judgment.
37. Jude 1:6-7 is two events and two judgments. The events are not connected. The angels left their first estate and habitation as pride cost them their offices in heaven (I Tim 3:6; Is 14:12-14; II Pet 2:4). The male sodomites of Sodom went after the strange flesh of the same sex instead of the natural use of the woman (Rom 1:27). This passage offers no support for angels seeking sex with human woman or human men desiring sex with angels as angels, but rather sodomites desiring sex with male angels as men. Read Genesis 19 and flush this junk!
38. The foolish *sons of God* were led to their sinful marriages with worldly women the same way their first mother sinned – she looked (Gen 6:2 cp Gen 3:6). They should have heeded their fathers' advice, which would have been the same as Solomon's by the Spirit (Pr 6:25; 31:30). Angels had observed females among the human race for 1656 years and had shown no interest during that time, so what happened all of a sudden with merely increased population?
39. The matter of affinity by marriage with the wicked is crucial. God and the godly blast against it before the Law, under the Law, and under grace (Gen 24:3; 27:46; Ex 34:16; Deut 7:3-4; Josh 23:12-13; Judges 3:4-8; I Kgs 11:1-11; II Chron 18:1; 19:2; Ezra 9:1-2; Neh 13:24-27; Mal 2:11,15; I Cor 7:39; 11:11; II Cor 6:14-16; Jas 4:4). The Holy Spirit used the distinction *sons of God* versus *daughters of men*, and it is to be noted that very similar language is used in II Corinthians 6:14-18 about God's relationship to His people depending on separation.
40. Where did giants come from? Who cares! They existed before and after the Flood, in spite of humanity starting over with Noah (Gen 6:4; Num 13:33). Robert Wadlow (1918-1940) was 8 feet and 11 inches tall. Was he a Nephilim? Goliath was about 9 feet and 9 inches tall (I Sam 17:4). Was he a Nephilim? Ascribe giants to anything you wish, for the giants had nothing to do with the offspring of the sons of God and the daughters of men (Gen 6:4). Ascribe it to inbreeding by incest, which was a sin of Egypt and Canaan (Lev 18:3-6,24-29; 20:22-23).
41. Why were those born to the unholy union *mighty men* and *men of renown*? Since the Bible does not provide details, it is rather unimportant, and we can only speculate. It may have been the mixing of the DNA of the two family lines and/or their character and training – the

physically-oriented and domineering nature of the Cainites with the superior character and refinement of the Sethite line. It should be kept in mind that these *mighty men* and *men of renown* are presented in a very negative light as leaders in earth's evil violence (Gen 6:5-13).

42. Why complete silence in the Bible elsewhere about this most incredible event and/or the mongrel creatures – neither truly angelic nor human – roaming the earth before the Flood (Gen 6:5), after the Flood (Num 13:33), or both? It is a presumptuous and profane approach to the Bible to build such a significant and wild event from a passage that does not support it and hold to it against the complete and total silence of the Bible elsewhere.
43. Who started this heresy? Since it is a lie, we should first ascribe it to the devil himself, who is the father of lies and loves to distract the people of God with lies (John 8:44; I Tim 4:1-3). The earliest references seem to be in the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Enochic and Old Testament Pseudepigrapha literature. Supposedly Tertullian and Lactantius held this heresy. The Septuagint's version of Genesis 6:2 renders *sons of God* as “the angels of God.”
44. Who perpetuates this heresy? Two Catholic Bibles, the *New American Bible* and the *Jerusalem Bible*, suggest angel-women intercourse and/or a superhuman race. It has become common in modern Bible commentaries. Atheist Darren Aronofsky's movie *Noah* released in 2014 had six-armed, stone creatures called watchers representing the Nephilim. Fringe thinkers like conspiratorialists will use the Nephilim for teaching demonic influence in governments or the actual heads of state, etc. Carnal Christians opt for this kind of diversion, since they have turned from sound doctrine and truth (II Tim 4:3-4; I Tim 6:19-20).
45. Who has opposed this heresy? The Dead Sea Scrolls Qumran fragment 4Q417 uses “children of Seth” for the *sons of God*. Other uses of similar wording include Shimon bar Yochai, Augustine of Hippo, Julius Africanus, and the *Letters attributed to St. Clement*. It may also be found in the *Amharic Ethiopian Orthodox Bible*. Nine conservative commentators stretching from John Calvin (1509-1564) to Albert Barnes (1798-1870) wrote against it in their commentaries, and many others have done so as well. The nine are shown below.

**For Further Study:**

1. The PowerPoint intro, “Nephilim – Sons of God,” ... <http://www.letgodbetruer.com/pdf/nephilim-sons-of-god-ppt.pdf>.
2. The sermon, “Marriage – Only in the Lord,” ... <http://www.letgodbetruer.com/pdf/marriage-in-the-lord.pdf>.
3. The sermon, “Why We Believe the KJV,” ... <http://www.letgodbetruer.com/pdf/proving-the-kjv.pdf>.
4. The sermon, “Author of Confusion?” ... <http://www.letgodbetruer.com/sermons/god-is-god-the-author-of-confusion/sermon.php>.
5. The sermon, “Truth, Lies, and Compromise,” ... <http://www.letgodbetruer.com/pdf/truth-lies-and-compromise.pdf>.
6. External link against Nephilim ... <http://www.rationalchristianity.net/nephilim.html>.
7. External link against Nephilim ... <http://www.creationhistory.com/Nephilim.shtml>.
8. External link against Nephilim ... <http://herescope.blogspot.com/2012/07/nephilim-eschatology.html>.
9. External link against Nephilim ... <http://www.apologeticspress.org/rr/reprints/Sons-of-God-in-Genesis-6.pdf>.
10. External link for Nephilim ... <http://www.mt.net/~watcher/enoch5.html>.



## Commentators Regarding the “Sons of God” of Genesis 6:2,4

The RIGHTEOUS from Seth	ANGELS
Albert Barnes	
John Calvin	
Adam Clarke	
Geneva Bible	
John Gill	
Jamieson, Fausset, Brown	
Matthew Henry	
Matthew Poole	
John Trapp	

**Albert Barnes (Presbyterian; 1798-1870)**, commenting on Genesis 6:1, “*The phrase ‘sons of God’, means an order of intelligent beings who ‘retain the purity of moral character’ originally communicated, or subsequently restored, by their Creator. They are called the sons of God, because they have his spirit or disposition. The sons of God mentioned in Job 38:7 are an order of rational beings existing before the creation of man, and joining in the symphony of the universe, when the earth and all things were called into being. Then all were holy, for all are styled the sons of God. Such, however, are not meant in the present passage. For they were not created as a race, have no distinction of sex, and therefore no sexual desire; they ‘neither marry nor are given in marriage’. {Mt 22:30} It is contrary to the law of nature for different species even on earth to cohabit in a carnal way; much more for those in the body, and those who have not a body of flesh. Moreover, we are here in the region of humanity, and not in the sphere of superhuman spirits; and the historian has not given the slightest intimation of the existence of spiritual beings different from man.*”

Commenting on Genesis 6:4, “*Two classes of men, with strong hand and strong will, are here described... ‘The giants,’ the well-known men of great stature, physical force, and violent will, who were enabled by these qualities to claim and secure the supremacy over their fellow-men. ‘Had been in the land in those days.’ In the days when those intermarriages were beginning to take place, the warriors were asserting the claim of might. Violence and rapine were becoming rampant in the land. ‘And after that.’ The progeny of the mixed marriages were the second and subsequent class of leading men. ‘The sons of God’ are here contradistinguished from the ‘Nephilim, or giants,’ who appear therefore to have belonged to the Cainites.*”

**John Calvin (Presbyterian; 1509-1564)**, commenting on Genesis 6:1, “*That ancient figment, concerning the intercourse of angels with women, is abundantly refuted by its own absurdity; and it is surprising that learned men should formerly have been fascinated by ravings so gross and prodigious.*”

Commenting on Genesis 6:4, *“For in the first place, Moses relates that there were giants; then he subjoins, that there were also others from among that promiscuous offspring, which was produced when the sons of God mingled themselves with the daughters of men... The giants, then, had a prior origin; but afterwards those who were born of promiscuous marriages imitated their example.”*

**Adam Clark (Methodist; 1760-1832)**, commenting on Genesis 6:1, *“The others were sons of God, not angels, as some have dreamed, but such as were, according to our Lord’s doctrine, born again, born from above, John 3:3, 5, 6, etc., and made children of God by the influence of the Holy Spirit, Gal 5:6.”*

**John Gill (Baptist; 1697-1771)**, commenting on Genesis 6:2, *“...those ‘sons of God’ were not angels either good or bad, as many have thought, since they are incorporeal beings, and cannot be affected with fleshly lusts, or marry and be given in marriage, or generate and be generated;... but rather this is to be understood of the posterity of Seth, who from the times of Enos, when men began to be called by the name of the Lord, Gen 4:25 had the title of the sons of God, in distinction from the children of men; these claimed the privilege of divine adoption, and professed to be born of God, and partakers of his grace, and pretended to worship him according to his will, so far as revealed to them, and to fear and serve and glorify him.”*

Commenting on Genesis 6:4, *“There were giants in the earth in those days, &c.] That is, in the days before the sons of God took the daughters of men for wives.... ‘and also after that,’ which shows that the preceding clause respects giants in former times.”*

**Geneva Bible Notes (Reformed; 1599)**, commenting on Genesis 6:2, *“(a) The children of the godly who began to degenerate. (b) Those that had wicked parents, as if from Cain. (c) Having more respect for their beauty and worldly considerations than for their manners and godliness.*

Commenting on Genesis 6:4, *“(f) Who usurped authority over others, and degenerated from that simplicity, in which their father’s lived.”*

**Jamieson, Fausset, Brown (Presbyterian; 1871)**, commenting on Genesis 6:2, *“By the former is meant the family of Seth, who were professedly religious; by the latter, the descendants of apostate Cain. Mixed marriages between parties of opposite principles and practice were necessarily sources of extensive corruption.”*

**Matthew Henry (Presbyterian; 1662-1714)**, commenting on Genesis 6:2, *“The sons of God (that is, the professors of religion, who were called by the name of the Lord, and called upon that name), married the daughters of men, that is, those that were profane, and strangers to God and*

godliness. The posterity of Seth did not keep by themselves, as they ought to have done, both for the preservation of their own purity and in detestation of the apostasy. They intermingled themselves with the excommunicated race of Cain: They took them wives of all that they chose.”

**Matthew Poole (Nonconformist; 1624-1679)**, commenting on Genesis 6:2, “Or rather, 2. The children of Seth and Enos, the professors of the true religion. For, 1. Such, and only such, in the common use of Scripture, are called the sons and children of God, as Deut 14:1 32:19 Isaiah 1:2 45:11 Hosea 11:1 Luke 17:27, &c. 2. This title manifestly relates to Gen 4:26, where the same persons are said to be called by the name of the Lord, i.e. to be the sons and servants of God. 3. They are opposed to the daughters of men, the word men being here taken in an ill sense, for such as had nothing in them but the nature of men, which is corrupt and abominable, and were not sons of God, but foreigners and strangers to him, and apostates from him. 4. These unequal matches with persons of a false religion are everywhere condemned in Scripture as sinful and pernicious, as Gen 26:35 Ex 34:16 1Kings 11:2,3 Ezra 9:12 Neh 13:23 Mal 2:11 1Cor 7:39 2Cor 6:14, and therefore are fitly spoken of here as one of the sins which brought the flood upon the ungodly world.”

Commenting on Genesis 6:4, “Giants; men so called, partly from their high stature, but principally for their great strength and force, whereby they oppressed and tyrannized over others: for this is mentioned as another sin, and cause of the flood; and therefore they seem to be here noted, not for the height of their stature, which is no crime, but for their violence, which also is expressed beneath. ‘After that’ time there arose a new generation or succession of that sort of men, ‘when the sons of God came in,’ were united and incorporated with them.”

**John Trapp (Anglican; 1601-1669)**, commenting on Genesis 6:2, “Sons of God; such as had called themselves by his name, {Gen 4:26} his peculiar professing people, called sons of Jehovah, {De 14:1} yea, his firstborn, and so higher than the kings of the earth. {Ps 89:27}”

## **What Does Jehovah Think of Marriage with Unbelievers?**

“Now Jehoshaphat had riches and honour in abundance, and **joined affinity with Ahab.**”

II Chronicles 18:1

“And Jehu the son of Hanani the seer went out to meet him, and said to king Jehoshaphat, Shouldest thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the LORD? **therefore is wrath upon thee from before the LORD.**”

II Chronicles 19:2

Genesis 24

2 And Abraham said unto his eldest servant of his house, that ruled over all that he had, Put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh:

3 And **I will make thee swear by the LORD, the God of heaven, and the God of the earth, that thou shalt not take a wife unto my son of the daughters of the Canaanites, among whom I dwell:**

4 But thou shalt go unto my country, and to my kindred, and take a wife unto my son Isaac.

Genesis 27:46

And Rebekah said to Isaac, I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth: **if Jacob take a wife of the daughters of Heth, such as these which are of the daughters of the land, what good shall my life do me?**

Exodus 34:12-16

Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee: . . . And thou take of their daughters unto thy sons, and their daughters go a whoring after their gods, **and make thy sons go a whoring after their gods.**

Deuteronomy 7

3 Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son.

4 For they will turn away thy son from following me, that they may serve other gods: **so will the anger of the LORD be kindled against you, and destroy thee suddenly.**

Joshua 23

12 Else if ye do in any wise go back, and cleave unto the remnant of these nations, even these that remain among you, and shall make marriages with them, and go in unto them, and they to you:

13 **Know for a certainty that the LORD your God will no more drive out any of these nations from before you; but they shall be snares and traps unto you, and scourges in your sides, and thorns in your eyes, until ye perish from off this good land which the LORD your God hath given you.**

### Judges 3

5 And the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites, Hittites, and Amorites, and Perizzites, and Hivites, and Jebusites:

6 And they took their daughters to be their wives, and gave their daughters to their sons, and served their gods.

7 And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the LORD, and forgot the LORD their God, and served Baalim and the groves.

8 **Therefore the anger of the LORD was hot against Israel, and he sold them into the hand of Chushanrishathaim king of Mesopotamia: and the children of Israel served Chushanrishathaim eight years.**

### I Kings 11:1-11

1 **But king Solomon loved many strange women**, together with the daughter of Pharaoh, women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites;

2 Of the nations concerning which the LORD said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall not go in to them, neither shall they come in unto you: for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods: Solomon clave unto these in love.

3 And he had seven hundred wives, princesses, and three hundred concubines: and his wives turned away his heart.

4 For it came to pass, when Solomon was old, that his wives turned away his heart after other gods: and his heart was not perfect with the LORD his God, as was the heart of David his father.

9 **And the LORD was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the LORD God of Israel, which had appeared unto him twice.**

10 And had commanded him concerning this thing, that he should not go after other gods: but he kept not that which the LORD commanded.

11 Wherefore the LORD said unto Solomon, Forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my covenant and my statutes, which I have commanded thee, **I will surely rend the kingdom from thee, and will give it to thy servant.**

### Ezra 9

2 For they have taken of their daughters for themselves, and for their sons: so that **the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people of those lands**: yea, the hand of the princes and rulers hath been chief in this trespass.

3 And when I heard this thing, **I rent my garment and my mantle, and plucked off the hair of my head and of my beard, and sat down astonished.**

Nehemiah 13:23-27

23 **In those days also saw I Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab:**

24 And their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews' language, but according to the language of each people.

25 **And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God,** saying, Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters unto your sons, or for yourselves.

26 **Did not Solomon king of Israel sin by these things? yet among many nations was there no king like him, who was beloved of his God, and God made him king over all Israel: nevertheless even him did outlandish women cause to sin.**

27 Shall we then hearken unto you to do all this great evil, to transgress against our God in marrying strange wives?

Malachi 2:11

**Judah hath dealt treacherously, and an abomination is committed in Israel and in Jerusalem; for Judah hath profaned the holiness of the LORD which he loved, and hath married the daughter of a strange god.**

I Corinthians 7:39

The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; **only in the Lord.**

I Corinthians 11:11

Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, **in the Lord.**

II Corinthians 6

14 **Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?** and what communion hath light with darkness?

15 And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?

16 And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and **I will be their God, and they shall be my people.**

17 Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you,

18 **And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.**

James 4:4

Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? **whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God.**