

This paper is in response to some queries on whether or not the “*Sons of God*” recorded in Genesis 6 refers to angels procreating with humans. My position from Scripture is the “sons of God” were not angels who directly procreated with women, but were either 1) angels who demonically/angelically possessed men; or 2) they were men of stature such as rulers, judges, magistrates, or royalty; or 3) they were sons of Seth. The bottom line is human males procreated with the “daughters of men” and their offspring were 100% human and not angelic half-breeds.

Concept #1: First, to substantiate the position that angels are incapable of procreating with humans, consider the following:

1. Matthew 22:30 – Angels are not given in marriage, therefore, by implication, they do not have the capability to procreate even within their own kind. Note that animals are not given in marriage either, but we should not classify angels as animals. They are a higher order.
2. Luke 24:39 – Jesus says a spirit does not have flesh and bones
3. Hebrews 1:14 – Angels are spirits, therefore a different kind from humans
4. 1 Corinthians 15:38-40 – God created different types of creatures – some earthly, some heavenly – each able to “seed” only within its own kind, if they can procreate at all
5. Genesis 1 – God created each earthly creature after its own kind – able to procreate only within its own kind

That was the easy response. Here are other concepts for consideration.

Concept #2: When is it appropriate to establish doctrine based on logical assumptions, speculations, and conjectures?

Examples:

- Scripture does not give us a clear answer that fallen angels are demons. We logically assume that to be the case. If we are right, cool. If we are wrong, no harm done. No other doctrines are impacted
- How old is the earth? Again, Scripture does not give us a single verse. We have to do some simple tabulation and make a few assumptions to come up with an answer around 6000 years. If we are correct, cool. If we are off by a few million or billion years, then we are going to have problems with many other doctrines beginning with whether or not Adam and Eve are factual or fictional characters – and if the Bible can really be trusted if we are not able to even add up numbers correctly.
- Do apostles like Peter and Paul still exist since Scripture does not say the gift of apostles has ceased or will ever cease? Some churches (i.e., Catholics, Apostolics, and Mormons) believe apostles still exist. Most others believe that apostles have ceased, and this is based not on a verse or two, but the “whole counsel of God” with some logical assumptions thrown in
- In like manner with this topic of procreating angels, everyone attempts to justify their position using various passages of Scriptures. BUT we also need to acknowledge any assumptions, conjectures, and inferences we have on this topic.

Concept #3: Now we come to the concept of male angels procreating with human females. Right away we have some very fundamental issues to deal with even before we look at the hermeneutics involved:

- Can angels procreate? According to Matthew 22:30 – the answer is no. They are not given in marriage, therefore, we can logically deduce they do not procreate between themselves or with other “kinds”
- Are angels corporal beings? According to Hebrews 1:14 – No. They are spirits
 - ◆ One may question that God is a spirit and He procreated with Mary. However, being the creator of reproductive organs, this would be within His realm. Plus humans are made in God’s image. Scripture is silent on whether or not angels are made in the image of God.
- Can angels cross breed with humans? According to Genesis 1 and 1Corinthians 15:38-40, God made everything after its own kind – so, logically, no. Even genetics clearly teaches that cats can’t even cross breed with dogs. If God created a logical world how can a non-corporal being mate with a corporal being – both being different kinds? And if God did give angels the ability to procreate with their own kind (with other angels), why don’t we have scriptural evidence of this? If angels do procreate within their own kind, Matthew 22:30 would either be a contradiction or it would not exist in its present form.
- If angels could procreate with humans – would their offspring be able to be saved? We would have to make 1 of 2 additional assumptions – and neither one is backed up by Scripture:
 1. If God allowed the birth of an angelic half-breed, He might have instilled a soul & a spirit into him or her, and therefore, he or she could be saved – unless they are all viewed as non-elect based on their bloodline or genealogy (this causes other doctrinal problems as we will see later).

2. If God only instilled a soul into an angelic half-breed, it is just an intelligent animal. It cannot be saved since Christ did not die and shed His precious blood for animals or for creatures not made in His image. Then we have a non-human mating with a human to produce a non-human. Again, not logical, or even physically possible.

The plot thickens. Scripture does mention flying female angelic-like creatures in Zechariah 5:9-10. If you have sexes in a species, you usually have procreation going on. HOWEVER, this is the only passage of its kind, and the context is within a vision. So these female angels could be merely a representation of Judah & Benjamin, or of two Judean kings – Jehoiakim and Zedekiah, or of the Babylonians and Chaldeans, or of Ezra and Nehemiah – depending on one's theological bent. Plus, these female creatures had wings 'like the wings of a stork,' which would have helped identify whom they represented to Zechariah and his generation that we can only speculate today. There are no parallel passages to dogmatically define angelic sexes. To speculate beyond what information is provided in Scripture could lead us down a prickly path.

- Compare 1 Corinthians 15:29 where baptizing for the dead is mentioned. It is the only verse of its kind. There are over 60 possible interpretations for this passage alone. If we were to establish a doctrine of baptizing for the dead based on just this lone passage, we could be like the Mormons whose members go through proxy baptisms to theoretically save dead people they may or may not know.

Now, back to the angelic half-breeds. If these half-breeds are able to be saved, we might not have too much of a problem. We may not be able to discern who they are today, unless they play for the NBA, but the doctrines of salvation (Soteriology) are not impacted. They are called "man" for those who believe they existed during Noah's days (Genesis 6:3), and God still had patience to wait for them to be saved (1 Peter 3:20). Their unique genealogy is not an issue or an excuse for not getting saved; Christ still died for them since they are considered "man." They are no more sinful than other humans; and they are still accountable for their behavior just like other humans. In fact, they are humans if God recognizes them as "men." So this argument, by itself, defeats the concept of angelic procreation with humans since their offspring are 100% human. Humans must pro-create with humans to produce humans. And Luke records Paul's teachings in Acts 17:26 that from one man (or one blood), which is Adam, God made all the nations that they would seek after God.

However, if some believe these angelic half-breeds are not able to be saved (they are 100% non-electable), then we have other issues to consider:

- Why did God have patience to wait for them to be saved (1 Peter 3:20)
- If these half-breeds continued to breed and their descendants become 1/4, 1/8, 1/16, etc., when do they ever become 100% human so they can be saved? The answer is never.
- Since some believe these half-breeds also existed after the flood as the giants in the land of Canaan, and since Israel failed to annihilate all of them, they, in all probability still exist today (Joshua 11:21-23 states the Anakim resided in Gaza, Gath, and in Ashdod; and King Og was left of the remnant of the Rephaim as stated in Joshua 13:12; King David battled Goliath of Gath [1 Samuel 17:4] and some of his 6-fingered, 6-toed descendants – 2 Samuel 21:16, 20). Can we tell who they are today? Are all 6-fingered, 6-toed individuals angelic half-breeds or just genetic anomalies? Are they doomed to Hell as 100% non-elect?

NOTE #1: In Numbers 13:32-33 the Israeli spies brought back an "evil report" about those living in the land of Canaan – "the descendants of Anak come from the Nephilim" (verse 33) This evil report could have included misinterpreted facts and even outright lies. And Moses summed up the report in Deuteronomy 1:28 by noting the people [in the Promised Land] were greater and taller, and the spies had seen the sons of the Anakim there (also see Deuteronomy 9:1-3). But because this evil report was used to cause the congregation to grumble against Moses, the spies died by a plague (Numbers 14:36-38), except for Joshua and Caleb who did not presumably participate in this evil report.

NOTE #2: The term Nephilim (Hebrew נפילימ meaning "giants") is only used three times in Scripture. Once to indicate a group of people who lived before the flood (Genesis 6:4), and twice in Numbers 13:33 to indicate a group of people encountered during Moses' trip to the Promised Land. To assume these two people groups were physically related, and to further assume they were angelic half breeds is purely conjecture. In fact, they cannot be related since the Nephilim of Genesis 6:4 totally perished in the flood with no survivors. Only Noah's family escaped the flood. Noah and his sons were definitely descendants of Seth, and we can logically and correctly assume their wives were not part of those who were frivolously marrying in Genesis 6:1-4 and having children by the "sons of God." Noah's daughter-in-laws did not give birth to any children till after the flood (Genesis 10:1), and Noah's wife is recorded not to have had any further children besides her three sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth.

If some assume the giants of Canaan were part human and part angel, then there is nothing in Scripture to say angels are not breeding with humans today. Even groups of "giants" (Hebrew *rephaim*) were noted to once have been in the land of Canaan during or just before the time of Moses. Moses shared some history how the Emim (as the Moabites called them in Deuteronomy 2:11) lived in the land prior to the Moabites, and the Zamzummim (as the Ammonites called them in Deuteronomy 2:20) occupied territory prior to the Ammonites. Both of these people groups (Emim & Zamzummim) were as tall as the Anakim (see Deuteronomy 2:10, 11, 20, 21). Moses even told how only Og, the king of Bashan was left of the remnant of the giants – and his iron bed was 12 feet long and 6 feet wide (Deut 3:11). Again, how can we discern if these giants were angelic half breeds? In fact, angelic blood would statistically be in many people today. What blood type would these angelic-humans be? It should be discernable there are 2 distinct species of humanoids running around the world today – but that is just not the case. This argument also defeats angelic procreation with humans.

Plus Joshua 14:15 states that a man by the name of Arba "was the greatest man ("adam") among the Anakim." Arba was the father of Anak according to Joshua 15:13. And the next verse (15:14) shows that the Anakims came from the 3 sons of Anak, whom Caleb drove out of his Judean territory. These passages further give credence these giants were 100% human.

And the plot thickens again with women angels. If male angels can procreate directly with human females, then we should see human males procreating with female angels to produce offspring as well (if there are female angels). If it goes one way, it can go the other.

Hopefully, you see my point of following this line of reasoning that if angels can or could procreate with humans it is a Pandora's Box taking us down rabbit holes we will never get out of. Do men need outside forces such as Satan to sin, and do men need to be half-breeds to sin horribly? Truthfully, men can do a pretty horrible job of sinning all by them selves.

Concept #4: Now, I'll try to tackle the concept hermeneutically.

We all know that Scripture can be used to prove any conceivable doctrine. We can show that all babies go to heaven, or none; we can also prove 5-point Calvinism or 5-point Armenianism; we can show that Catholicism is true or not true, or we can show that Pentecostalism is true or not true. We can even prove or disprove the existence of space aliens using the Bible; and the list goes on and on.

To determine the right doctrinal stance on any issue we have to go to something very fundamental and universally acceptable – and those are the principles of hermeneutics which are the science and art of linguistic interpretation. Just like the Bible is subject to the universal law of gravity (if we throw our Bibles up in the air they will fall down), the Bible is subject to these fundamental linguistic principles as well – and God intentionally made it that way since He is a logical, reasonable deity willing to reveal His truths to us in a logical, convincing, and substantiated way no matter what language we use.

When Jesus corrected the Scribes and Pharisees, or even Satan, for example, for their wrong biblical positions it wasn't because they misquoted a passage – it was because they got a tense wrong, or they twisted the passage to make it say what they wanted it to say. In other words, their hermeneutics were off.

Let me also add this. To elevate reputable sources such as theologians, historians, and even external biblical & non-biblical evidences to being on the same level as the inerrant Bible, can pose other problems. Many reputable sources and early church fathers may have had many things right, but many still held to false beliefs. Here are a few simple examples:

Jerome: He rejected the Apocryphal books as canonical, yet, he believed in the perpetuity of Mary's virginity

Augustine: He accepted 11 Apocryphal books as canonical, but rejected the perpetuity of Mary's virginity

Commentary on the Mishnah (1168 A.D.) may point out that ancient Hebrew sages (and the Book of Enoch) understood and accepted the direct Angelic procreation point of view in Genesis 6 – but most of the ancient Hebrew sages still missed the Messiah. A few wise men (Arabs) from the East figured it out though. So, who would you put your faith in?

It is not that we throw out everything great men of faith or other reputable resources have to say, but we need to be careful when we quote such notable sources to support a particular view – because the notable source can still be in error if their hermeneutics are off somewhere. These extra-biblical sources should fall under the same scrutiny as we put the Bible under.

The Apostle Paul probably had to wrestle with this same issue as well, if not similar or even tougher doctrinal issues. He had three common principles which we should heed:

1. Colossians 2:8 – *See to it that no one takes you captive through philosophy and empty deception, according to the tradition of men, according to the elementary principles of the world, rather than according to Christ*

2. 1 Timothy 1:4 – *Nor pay attention to **myths and endless genealogies**, which give rise to mere speculation rather than furthering the administration of God which is by faith*
3. Titus 3:9 – *But avoid **foolish controversies and genealogies** and strife and disputes about the Law, for they are unprofitable and worthless.*

When we wrestle and debate tough theological issues we need to be able to take things only as far as Scripture takes them. To go any further can cause the problems Paul mentions above. Sometimes we just have to acknowledge Deuteronomy 29:29 – the secret things belong onto God.

Here are some of my simple thoughts on a few related passages on this angelic procreation topic:

Matthew 24:38 – *For as in the days that were before the flood **they** were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage...*

Luke 17:27 – ***They** were eating, drinking, marrying [during the days of Noah]*

Luke 17:28 – *"It was the same as happened in the days of Lot: **they** were eating, they were drinking*

- The contexts for Matthew 24 and Luke 17 seem to be referring to humans as "**they**." There is no indication to suspect non-humans or angelic/human half-breeds were the object of Noah's day, Lot's day, or the future day these verses allude to. To make these passages indicate otherwise would be subjective conjecture.
- Hermeneutic principle – when common sense makes perfect sense, seek no other sense.

Genesis 6:1 – *Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them,*

Genesis 6:2 – *that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose.*

Here are some common interpretations of this Genesis 6 passage:

1. Sons of God were male angels; Daughters of men were human females
 2. Sons of God were judges/magistrates/leaders (i.e., royalty); Daughters of men were commoners
 3. Sons of God were descendants of Seth from whom the Jews and our Savior, and even all of us eventually descended from through the sons of Noah; and the daughters of men were descendants of Cain.
 4. Sons of God were male angels who demonically possessed human males to procreate with human females (Daughters of men)
- Sons of "God" [Strong 0430. *elohim*; plural of 0433; used over 2600 times. It typically means "gods" in the ordinary sense; but specifically used of the supreme God when the definite article "the" is present; occasionally applied by way of deference to magistrates, judges, or in the case of Job 1:6 to angels; and sometimes as a superlative (e.g., 'great' as in 'great wrestlings' in Genesis 30:8; or 'mighty' as in 'mighty thunderings' in Exodus 9:28)]
 - The context of Genesis 6 does not provide supportive or confirmative information of who these *sons of God* were since this passage covers possibly hundreds of years of history very quickly. To inject a bizarre meaning would be by inference – that is where a pre-conceived belief is made to fit the passage.
 - Hermeneutic principle – Look for a reasonable, plausible meaning instead of a bizarre interpretation unless the context dictates otherwise.
 - "...they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose." This phrase gives the indication they were living immorally by seeking to satisfy their sensual desires and not to accomplish God's purpose in their lives. It is feasible this passage indicates they were living with anybody and everybody, and/or they went beyond what God had envisioned for the marriage bed (monogamous sex – 1 man and 1 woman) and seemingly progressed into orgies (multiple sex partners at a time) and possibly other forms of deviant or perverted practices. Either case, they had no interest in living for God.
 - Sexual sins (sins of the body) are different from other sins as indicated by 1 Corinthians 6:13-18. "...the **body** is not meant for sexual immorality, but for the Lord..." and "...All other sins a man commits are outside his body, but he who sins sexually sins against his own body."

Principle of monogamous sex – God's intent for marriage was for 1 man and 1 woman for life. As men opted to acquire multiple wives the practice of monogamous sex (1 wife in bed at a time) still seemed to be the norm. Anything else was considered perverted and worthy of condemnation by man and God.

- ◆ Jacob had 2 wives and 2 concubines, but monogamous sex was the norm for his conjugal relationships. Leah even bought the right to go to bed with Jacob from her sister, Rachel (Genesis 30:14-16)
- ◆ Esther's husband, the Persian King, Ahasuerus, called one virgin at a time from his harem. Even a heathen king such as this was not noted for group sex

- ◆ Group sex (orgies) was a mark of wickedness worthy of condemnation, as was adultery, homosexuality, bestiality, child molestation, and other forms of sexual immorality or deviance (see Leviticus 18)
- ◆ These practices were probably exemplified in Noah's Day; in Sodom & Gomorrah; and in the land of Canaan during the time of Israel's march into the Promise Land
 - God purged these lands when their sins were "completed" (Genesis 6:5-12; 15:16; 19:13; Leviticus 18:20-30)
- ◆ Romans 13:13; Galatians 5:21; 1 Peter 4:3 – Orgies (NIV), rioting/revellings (KJV), carousing (NASB)
- ◆ The Apostle Paul tells us it is a shame to even talk about such things (Ephesians 5:12)
- ◆ God still patiently waits for sinners to repent – "Such were some of you..." 1 Corinthians 6:9-11

Genesis 6:3 – *Then the LORD said, "My Spirit shall not strive with man forever, because he also is flesh; nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years"*

Genesis 6:4 – *The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore children to them. Those were the mighty men who were of old, men of renown [NASB]*

- ◆ Genesis 6:3 confirms that God is talking about not abiding or striving or contending with "man" – not angelic half-breeds. So the less bizarre interpretation seems to be the better interpretation. In other words, the Sons of God, the Nephilim and/or giants are 100% human. In the case of demonic possession of men by angelic sons of God, "man" would still be the by-product of this union with daughters of men.

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

- To do a word search to see how many times "sons of God" occurs to determine the possible meaning is bypassing the context of the passage where the true meaning should be derived. Doing word searches sometimes helps, sometimes not. You only have 2 incidences in the Old Testament (Genesis 6:2 and Job 1:6) to base a possible decision on who the "sons of God" were. We should also factor in that Genesis and Job are 2 totally different books (though, both were probably written by Moses). Genesis is predominantly historical, and Job is poetry – so to draw a dogmatic conclusion that sons of God only equates to angels is more conjecture than true parallelism.
- Also note in Job 1:6, we can logically assume in this passage that the "sons of God" were angels, but they were good angels. Satan was called out separately and not as a son of God. Would it be fair to speculate that Satan's minions or other non-righteous angelic beings also would not be referred to as "sons of God?"
- In like fashion, we also have difficulty interpreting Ezekiel's vision of living creatures and a wheel within a wheel in Ezekiel 1 and 10. Some take these passages as representing space aliens and their space ship – which means God would be nothing more than a space man seeding the universe.
 - ◆ If we can interpret "sons of God" as angels and Nephilim as angelic half-breeds, then to consistently use the same hermeneutic principles of inference for Genesis 6 we could easily see Klingons and space ships in Ezekiel and Revelation – and that creates a totally new and indefensible dimension to our biblical world view
- Can we truly equate the Nephilim to be angelic half-breeds or the byproduct of women and angelic-possessed men; or is it just because the word is in proximity to the term "sons of God," and we have to make an "inference" to them being angelic in nature?
- Can we dogmatically say the Nephilim were physical giants or political/judicial/military leaders? If they were physical giants could it be due to genetics, good nutrition, or due to their longevity (900+ yrs) rather than angelic breeding?
- Can we dogmatically say the Nephilim were worse sinners than humans and were the reason for the flood?
 - ◆ The passage calls them "men" so what justification do we have to think they are angelic half-breeds?
 - ◆ In the case of demonic possession of men by angelic sons of God, any children in this union definitely would not be raised under a godly influence, so it is conceivable the children raised by a demon-possessed father could be acknowledged as "men of renown" for their evil tendencies (but this is conjecture)
 - ◆ 1 Peter 3:20 gives us the "logical" indication that God patiently waited for men (not angels) to repent during the days of Noah (the context is dealing with humans and their spiritual state)
 - ◆ Even in 1 Peter 3:19 we have to logically deduce, based on the context, the "spirits in prison" are human and not the angels of Jude 6. To do otherwise would force an inference or a unwarranted conjecture

Genesis 6:5 – *Then the LORD saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and that every intent of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.*

- ◆ Men were wicked. Neither the "sons of God" nor the Nephilim or giants (presumably the children of the sons of God and daughters of men) are singled out as being the wicked ones. All men seem to be at odds with God. To draw any other conclusion, I feel, would be conjecture or an erroneous speculation.

Gen 6:9 – ...*Noah was a righteous man, blameless in his generation. Noah walked with God.*

- ◆ Some render this passage as showing Noah was of noble blood (100% human). In other words, Noah and his family were genetically pure based on this passage. This causes other problems throughout scripture using that type of hermeneutics. Every time you come across this word blameless you have to inject this concept of having a physically pure bloodline.
- ◆ For example, Genesis 17:1 – God commands Abraham to be perfect/blameless. Well, if he doesn't already possess pure blood, he cannot fulfill that command. By implication, we are also commanded to be perfect/blameless in the same way.
- ◆ One contradiction we would run into is Proverbs 28:18 – He who walks blamelessly will be delivered/saved. So, having blue blood doesn't save one after all. It is spiritual blue blood, not physical blue blood that saves. And I think that would be true whether pre-flood or post-flood.

Just a minor point regarding being a son/daughter/child of God

- The New Testament has clear references that we humans can become or are the “sons/daughters/children of God.” (John 1:12; Romans 8:14,19; Philippians 2:15; 1John 3:1,2)
- 1John 3:10 gives a nice definition for a son of God – *By this the children of God and the children of the devil are obvious: anyone who does not practice righteousness is not of God, nor the one who does not love his brother. [NASB]*
- Therefore, I do not think we can be dogmatic about the “sons of God” being only angels. Anyone – angel or human – living righteously can be called a son/daughter/child of God

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

- Those who hold to angelic procreation with humans in Genesis 6 use Jude 6 to help justify their position. But there is no substantiation to prove the linkage between these two passages. This is another case of unwarranted and subjective conjecture or inference. In other words, to get Jude 6 to fit with Genesis 6 a doctrine has to be inserted into it rather extracted from it.
- Now, if the correct interpretation is that a group of angels who did not follow Satan when he broke away from Heaven but later opted to leave their original estate to “demonically or angelically possess” men for the purpose of perversely mating with a different kind, then this Jude 6 passage might apply. But again, this belief is based on ‘what if’ scenarios. So it is unsubstantiated conjecture.
 - ◆ We have precedence in Scripture of other demonically possessed people possibly cohabitating with a spouse and/or other family members. See Luke 13:11-17 for the story of a woman afflicted by Satan for 18 years, and Acts 19:13-16 for the story of how the sons of a Jew named Sceva tried to perform an exorcism. The afflicted woman was more than likely married and had children, while the demon possessed man in Acts 19 was able to abide in a house (verse 16) presumably with other family members. So not all demon-possessed people are wandering around destitute and homeless. But notice the purpose of this satanic affliction and demonic possession was not for sexual activity but for mental, socio and physical anguish.
 - ◆ Also note in Acts 19, the demon was the object of discussion in verse 15 (“*And the evil spirit answered...*”) much like the *sons of God* were the object of discussion in Genesis 6:2. If this could be construed as a parallelism, then the *sons of God* of Genesis 6 could possibly have been angels possessing men and not procreating directly with the daughters of men.
- We do not have enough information in Jude to fully comprehend what he is alluding to in verse 6. True, we can speculate, but we have to acknowledge that we cannot be dogmatic about what it truly means.

CONCLUSION:

- When all is said and done, can we dogmatically say angels did or did not impregnate humans? I think the biblical evidence leans far away from direct angelic procreation
- The angelic or demonic possession position would be more plausible if the “sons of God” were, indeed, angels
- Also, just as relevant, is the position that the “sons of God” could very possibly have been men in the form of earthly leaders, judges, magistrates or possibly the sons of Seth
- What is great about difficult passages such as Genesis 6 and Jude 6 is they provide a grand opportunity to walk through various points of logic and hermeneutic principles so we can discern for ourselves. We may not be able to determine the true interpretation this side of Heaven on some issues, but God accomplishes what He wants – He keeps us delving into His word with the end result of drawing closer to Him and closer to one another.