

## The Sons of God, Nephilim, and Giants of Genesis Six

**Gen. 6:1** And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, <sup>2</sup>That the **sons of God** saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.

<sup>4</sup>There were **giants** [Nephilim] 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.

From the above, some teach that the *sons of God* mentioned in Verses 2 & 4 are the spirits or lost souls of a pre-Adamic race of people. Others disagree – teaching that these are not the lost souls of a pre-Adamic race of people, but the fallen angels or demonic spirits that fell with Lucifer when he was cast out of Heaven.<sup>1</sup> But whether it be lost souls or fallen angels, they’re both teaching that some sort of spirit-being is having intercourse with mortal women thus producing the giants, or Nephilim, found in Verse 4.

Still others disagree with both – teaching that these are people from the godly lineage of Seth intermarrying with the ungodly lineage of Cain. But spiritually mixed couples have children all the time, and their children aren’t growing into giants – and so there’s no merit to this argument. But the question remains. Who are these *sons of God* and where did they come from?

### The Sons of God

In several places the book of Job refers to God’s angels as being his *sons*.<sup>2</sup> So when people read about his *sons* having intercourse with the “daughters of men” in Genesis Six, then it’s assumed that these are angels copulating with mortal women. But since these ‘angels’ are obviously sinning, then it’s reckoned that these ‘sons’ are the lost souls of a pre-Adamic race of people, fallen angels, or some other type of evil spirit-being. To this its commonly added that nowhere in the Old Testament will you ever find *men* being referred to as *sons of God*, but that in the New you will.<sup>3</sup> But the problem with this rationale is that they’re looking at the Bible as if it’s two books under one cover instead of ONE book with two major sections. This leads them to pit the Old against the New when what they should be doing is reading it as one continuous book (Dt. 8:3; Mt. 4:4). That aside, Scripture disagrees.

**Ex. 4:22** And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the LORD, Israel is my son, even my firstborn:

**Hos. 1:10** Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, ..., there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God.

---

<sup>1</sup> Is. 14:12; Lu. 10:18.

<sup>2</sup> Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Jn. 1:12; Rom. 8:14, 19; Gal. 4:5; Phil. 2:15; 1 Jn. 3:1-2, etc.

**Hos. 11:1** When Israel was a child, then I [God] loved him, and called my son out of Egypt.

**Jn. 1:12** But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name:

So as you can see, the Old Testament DOES refer to *men* as being the *sons of God*. Granted, it doesn't happen often, but it does happen. And it isn't limited to men only. In each instance the reference to *sons* always includes women and children. In Exodus 4:22, for example, ALL of Israel is God's firstborn son. But the nation of Israel includes men, women, and children, and so the term isn't just limited to men. The New Testament defines this as ALL who've called upon the name of the Lord – men, women, and children (Rom. 10:13). And so the Old Testament clearly teaches that God does refer to men as his *sons* as does the New. (A point of which reinforces the notion that the Bible is to be read as one book with two major sections instead of two books under one cover.) But in fairness, we've only proven these could be men; we haven't disproven that it could be some sort of spirit-being. But thankfully, the answer is found in the context of the passage.

### **The Context: Men or Spirits?**

**Gen. 6:1** And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, <sup>2</sup>That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. <sup>3</sup>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.

From the above, note that it was *man* who was multiplying upon the face of the earth, and none other. In Verse 3, God says that his Spirit will not always strive with *man* because *man* is doing nothing but lusting after the daughters *of men* listed in the two previous verses; and we're reminded that the kind of men that God is talking about are those *made of flesh* (3). (And from Verse 2, note that they're taking more wives than they should.)<sup>4</sup> Also note that it was *man* who'd be judged and his days limited to 120 years *and not any lost souls or (fallen) angels*.<sup>5</sup> So from what we've seen so far, the context is solely that of man, his sin, and his impending judgment.

<sup>4</sup>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.

---

<sup>4</sup> Gen. 1:27; 2:24; Mt. 19:3-6.

<sup>5</sup> The 120 years is how long it would be until man was judged for his sin and not his maximum life span as there were those born after The Flood who lived beyond 120. There were 8 descendants of Shem (Gen. 11:10-32), Sarah lived to be 127 (Gen. 23:1); Abraham 175 (Gen. 25:7); Isaac 180 (Gen. 35:28); Jacob 147 (Gen. 47:28), and Ishmael lived to be 137 (Gen. 25:17). Bible chronology also supports this interpretation.

But in believing that Verse 4 refers to fallen angels (or similar), many then interpret the first part to mean that their union with mortal women led to the birth of giants. But this isn't what the text says! It only says that there were giants in the earth in those days. However, the second part of the verse ("and also after that") restates Verses 1-2 and adds that when these *sons* came unto the daughters of men that the result was the birth of "children" – children who later grew to become mighty *men*, *men* of renown. It doesn't say that they gave birth to giants – only that they gave birth to children! Thus the first nine words of Verse 4 are only there to remind us that giants still exist. *It's not explaining where the giants came from; it's only reminding people that they're still present.* Giants are the result of men and women having intercourse, but not the result of spirit-beings and women. And again, the context of Verses 1-3 was clearly that of *man*, *his* sin, and *his* impending judgment. And so Verse 4 must be interpreted in that same light. Verses 5-7 agree.

<sup>5</sup>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. <sup>6</sup>And it repented the LORD that he had made **man** on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. <sup>7</sup> And the LORD said, I will destroy **man** whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made **them**.

Contrary to the popular notion that everybody is basically a good person, these verses teach that the *wickedness of man* was so great that judgment was inevitable. Later, in Verses 11-13, this same point is corroborated when it says that the earth was "corrupt" and "full of violence" because "all *flesh* had corrupted his way." Therefore the whole context of this passage is one of *man* and *his sin* and not that of a spirit-being. It was all *flesh* that would be destroyed, and none other. If spirit-beings were involved in the sin, then why is God judging man and not them? Or at least along with them? Again, the answer should be obvious.

### **A Brief Look at Angels**

In the Bible, angels always appear as men and they always appear with bodies, whether it's a glorified body in the heavenlies or a mortal body on earth. And although it's assumed here, nowhere else in Scripture will you ever find fallen angels appearing with their own bodies. In stark contrast to the unfallen angels, fallen angels are always trying to inhabit a body (demon possession), whether it be man or beast.

Furthermore, angels can't reproduce nor is there any proof they desire to do so (Mt. 22:29-30). So while they always appear masculine, they're not male. They lack the reproductive systems. This suggests that their number is fixed and innumerable. Or to put it another way, angels are the *created* sons of God while we're *procreated*. Spiritually we become sons of God through salvation unto Jesus Christ. Although it should be noted that, in the context of Gen. 6, the phrase *sons of God* is used in the most general sense of the word – entailing all men because all men are inevitably part of his Creation. But the true sons of God are those who carry within

them the nature and character of the Father.<sup>6</sup> So while God is everyone's Creator, he's not everyone's Father. So biblically, angels do not and cannot reproduce. And since fallen angels don't have bodies, the *best* that anyone could offer is that these are demon possessed men, which is well within the realm of possibility. Thus the context of Genesis Six is, again, that of *man* and his sinfulness, and none other.

---

### The Jude Defense

#### 2 Peter 2:4-6

<sup>4</sup>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;

<sup>5</sup>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;

<sup>6</sup>And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha into ashes condemned them with an overthrow,

making them an ensample

**unto those that after should live ungodly;**

#### Jude 5-7

<sup>5</sup>I will therefore put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this, how that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterward **destroyed them that believed not.**

<sup>6</sup>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.

<sup>7</sup>**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.**

In a final attempt to retain their doctrine, those who teach that spirit-beings are copulating with mortal women point to the book of Jude. The logic is that the angels who were cast down from heaven (6) are the ones copulating with women thus producing the giants found in Genesis Six. And because of this great sin, Sodom and Gomorrah were later destroyed (7). This would seemingly explain why the earth isn't filled with giants and women having sex with 'angels' today. For by their logic, they all lived and died in Sodom and Gomorrah. How convenient. But there's a problem. Look at the text. Because they "believed not" (5), the angels were reserved for judgment because of their rebellion against God *in heaven* while those who died in Sodom were reserved for judgment because of their rebellion against God *on earth*. By this, God is simply saying that whether you're an angel in Heaven **or** a man on earth, all those who rebel against him are eternally damned. So just as the 'angels' were cast down from Heaven to be reserved for judgment, so too were the people of Sodom and Gomorrah. Or, the angels fell from Heaven to earth and the people of Sodom and Gomorrah fell from earth to Hell – but both are being reserved for final judgment. Satan and his "angels" aren't in Hell, that's where they're going! But if we die unsaved, then we go straight to Hell (Lu. 16:19-31). So what they

---

<sup>6</sup> Rom. 8:14; Gal. 4:6 etc.

share in common is their sin, rebellion, and impending judgment (7; *in like manner*), but it occurs in two different locations: Heaven and earth. But what supporters of this doctrine do is combine the locations and then focus on one specific sin: sex, even though the context of the passage focuses on the type of sin that leads to eternal damnation, which is a failure to acknowledge Jesus as our Saviour. This is *the great sin* – they *believed not* – and not sex (5). So essentially they’re reading the text backwards. They read where Sodom was destroyed because of sex-sin, then read that the angels had sinned *in like manner*, and so they deduce that the angels were having intercourse with women who were then giving birth to giants. This subtle shift greatly affects the interpretation. But the context doesn’t allow for that because there’s a definitive contrast between what happened in Heaven and what happened on earth (not to mention the fact that it’s pure mythology). Eternal rebellion against God is the common element here and not sex-sin, which is where, and why, they err. But there’s more.

What’s often overlooked is that Jude and Second Peter must be compared with one another because they’re essentially the same story: the main difference being that Peter is warning that false teachers are coming while Jude is saying that they’re already here. But in both cases, they’re warning of impending judgment for those who’ve eternally rebelled against God because they “believed not,” both man and ‘angel.’ But when compared as they are above, the readers of Jude are forced to reconcile their interpretation with The Flood that came next in Second Peter, and not the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah – a point of which takes us right back to Genesis Six because it provides us with the explanation as to why The Flood occurred – *man’s sin* – and so Jude offers them no real proof or defense. And even without Second Peter, this is historically true. The Flood occurred in Genesis Six and Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed in Genesis Nineteen.

### The Book of Enoch

It’s said that the Book of Enoch, in conjunction with Genesis Six, teaches that the giants will reappear and have input into the judgment of the Last Days. But for good reason, the Jews have never included this book in their canon (Rom. 3:1-2). That aside, the main verse used to support its inspiration is Jude 14:

<sup>14</sup>And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, **prophesied** of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints,

Since Enoch prophesied, it’s assumed that he also wrote it in a book: the Book of Enoch. And since he wrote it in a book, then it should be included as part of the canon of Scripture. But since it’s not, then it’s being suppressed. Logical, but not biblical. Because what they fail to realize is that speaking a prophecy and writing it down are two different things. There are biblical examples of this. Matthew 2:23, for example, quotes a prophecy that’s found nowhere else in Scripture, and so there is a precedent for this. But to be brief, the Book of Enoch isn’t the inspired Word of God. We don’t know who wrote it (Rom. 3:1-2), it’s full of heresies, the Jews have never accepted it, and it supports what this study is disproving – Roman and Greek mythology.

## Additional Thoughts

But there's yet more. As it pertains to Gap Theory or a pre-Adamic race of people, note that...

- In Verses 4, 10, 12, 18, 21, and 25 of Genesis One, God refers to his Creation as being "good;" yea moreover, "very good" (31). Therefore all Creation occurred and was completed before Satan entered into the Garden. That eliminates any opportunity for anyone to sin and be transformed into a lost soul or fallen angel because sin wasn't yet present in the world of human affairs.
- Similar to the previous thought, the Bible tells us that Eve is the mother of all living (Gen. 3:20). This implies two things. First, that even though animals are alive, they're not "living" (no Spirit). And second, if Eve isn't the mother of all living, then God lied by telling us that she is when she wasn't. And since lying is something that God cannot do, we're then forced to accept the obvious – there is and was no pre-Adamic race of people (Num. 23:19; Tit. 1:2 etc.).
- Romans 5:12-14 and 1 Cor. 15:22 teach that Jesus Christ died for the sins of the descendants of Adam (i.e. us). To teach that there was a pre-Adamic race of people immediately raises the question, who died for their sins? This is an argument that quickly degenerates into heresy. It teaches that either God created an imperfect world or that Jesus died for the sins of the world twice, when Scripture says that he only died once; or, that there's another Saviour of which we know nothing about (Heb. 9:28; 1 Pet. 3:18).

The Bible teaches that when you die you immediately go to Heaven or Hell (Lu. 16:19-31; 2 Cor. 5:6-8), and so there's no time to linger about the earth – much less engage in sexual relations with women. To teach otherwise is to teach spiritism (dead spirits walking around) or perhaps necromancy (communication with the dead), which is also sin (Dt. 18:10-13; Is. 8:19-20). Furthermore, Scripture reveals that everything gives birth after its "kind," including men.<sup>7</sup> And that mixing kinds is sin (Lev. 19:19). And finally, teaching that some sort of spirit-being is having intercourse with mortals is nothing more than Greek and Roman mythology. The Bible was written first and so mythology is a perversion of the Truth, and not the other way around.

## Summation

Thus altogether it should be clear that the context of Genesis Six is that of man, his sin, and his impending judgment. Therefore the opening nine words of Gen. 6:4 are there to serve as but a brief reminder to us that giants are still being born. But that's all it is – a brief reminder. Hence the entirety of Genesis Six ***is not to inform or reveal where the giants originated, but to explain God's justification for bringing about The Flood.*** Again, the context is that of man, his sin, and his impending judgment. But by reading into the text an interpretation that isn't supported by the rest of Scripture, we've missed this very important lesson, which is still true today. Selah.

---

<sup>7</sup> Gen. 1:11-28; Jn. 3:6 cp. Gen. 1:27-28; 4:1.