Who Are the "Sons of God"?

Settling the Genesis Six Question

Tests the angelic and the Sethite readings of Genesis 6:1-4 against Scripture, stating the angelic case at full strength and the weight of every argument.

Copyright 2026

Distribution of this study as is in its entirety is permitted & encouraged.

Author: John Lobota

Research Assistant: Claude Cowork

papertiq@bellsouth.net

Anchor Passage

> **Romans 9:7** *Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called.*
>
> **Romans 9:8** *That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.*

Table of Contents

Introduction.....3

The question, the three claims inside it, how every argument is weighed, the opposing case at full strength, and what changed in this edition.

Chapter 1 — The Boundary Fixed Before Genesis 6 Opens.....8

"After his kind" in Genesis 1 and again at the ark, what it rules out, and the counter-examples an honest reader must face.

Chapter 2 — Reading Genesis 6:2 the Way Scripture Reads It Elsewhere.....10

The "saw ... took" pattern, the two lines of Genesis 4 and 5, God's sons among men, and marriage outside the covenant.

Chapter 3 — The Nephilim and the Tall Peoples.....14

What the word means, "men of renown," the spies' evil report, and the tall peoples Scripture does record.

Chapter 4 — Job, Jude and Peter.....17

The angelic use of "sons of God," Jude's "in like manner," the spirits in prison, and Noah "perfect in his generations."

Chapter 5 — What This Settles.....20

The reading stated plainly, its weight, what would change it, and how it bears on the rest of this library.

Appendix A — The Weight of Every Argument in This Study.....22

Every argument tabulated with its rating, its direction, and what the opposing reading fairly answers, including those withdrawn from the earlier edition.

Copyright.....24

Terms of distribution.

Sources Consulted.....24

Texts, lexicons and cross-reference tools used, and how each was used.

Scripture Index.....25

Every verse cited in this study, in canonical order.

Introduction

A. The question, and the three claims inside it

Few verses in the Bible have drawn more speculation than four short verses in Genesis 6:

> **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,*
>
> **Genesis 6:2** *That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.*
>
> **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.*
>
> **Genesis 6:4** *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.*

Two readings have been held for a very long time. One says the "sons of God" were angels who took human wives, and that their children were the Nephilim, a race of giants part angel and part human. The other says the "sons of God" were men, the descendants of Seth who called on the name of the LORD, and that the trouble Genesis 6 describes was God's people marrying outside the faith, with violent and godless men the result.

This study asks which reading Scripture itself supports. The question breaks into three smaller claims. They are named here and referred to by these names throughout.

- **Claim S — Seth's line.** The "sons of God" in Genesis 6:2 and 6:4 were men: the line of Seth, marked as the people who called on the LORD.
- **Claim K — Kind after kind.** No angel fathered a child by a woman. Whatever produced the Nephilim, it was not a union across the boundary God set between kinds.
- **Claim N — No hybrid race.** The Nephilim were violent, famous men, not a race part angel and part human. The tall peoples Scripture records later were real, but they were human.

Here is where the study comes out, so that no reader is kept waiting. All three claims are held as this library's settled reading. None of them is a direct statement; Scripture does not say in so many words

who the "sons of God" in Genesis 6 were. Claim S is a **reasonable inference** with a good deal of textual support. Claim K is a **reasonable inference** drawn from the order of creation. Claim N follows from the other two, with strong support from how the rest of Scripture uses the same words. The angelic reading has real evidence of its own, and Introduction §C sets it out first, at full strength.

Weighing it: Framing only — takes no side on any of the three claims.

In short. Three claims, each weighed separately. The study holds all three, and says plainly that none is a direct statement.

B. How arguments are weighed in this study

Every argument in this study carries a stated weight, in five terms, used with exactly these meanings throughout. Appendix A gathers every one in a single table.

- **Direct statement** — Scripture says it in so many words. The only question is what the words mean.
- **Strong inference** — It follows closely from what Scripture says. The alternative has to strain against the text.
- **Reasonable inference** — It is the more natural reading, but an honest and careful reader can take it otherwise.
- **Corroboration only** — It agrees with this study's position, but it agrees roughly as well with the opposite one. It may be stated; it may not be leaned on.
- **Neutral** — It is often cited by one side or the other and settles nothing.

Every section ends with a short note headed **Weighing it**. Its bold first line says two things: how strong the point is, and which way it points, naming the claim it bears on. The sentences after it say what the other reading can fairly answer. A section that argues nothing says so, with a label such as *Framing only*, *Opposing case*, *stated* or *Concession*.

Weighing it: Method, not argument.

In short. Every point is labelled with how strong it is and which claim it supports, so the reader can weigh it for himself.

C. The opposing case, stated first

The view that the "sons of God" were angels is old and serious. It is held by careful readers who hold Scripture to be true, and its evidence deserves to be set out at full strength, in its own emphases, before anything is said against it.

1. **The phrase itself.** The Hebrew phrase in Genesis 6:2 and 6:4, *bene ha-elohim* ("sons of God"), is used elsewhere in the Old Testament only in Job, and there it plainly means angels: **"the sons of God came to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan came also among them" (Job 1:6)**; also Job 2:1, and **"all the sons of God shouted for joy" (Job 38:7)**, at the creation of the earth. No other Old Testament passage uses this exact phrase for men.

2. **The contrast in the verse.** Genesis 6:1 speaks of "men" in general, mankind multiplying on the earth. When verse 2 sets "the sons of God" against "the daughters of men," the natural sense, says this view, is a contrast between two kinds of being: heavenly beings on one side and human women on the other.
3. **Jude 6-7.** Jude speaks of **"the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation" (Jude 6)**, and goes on: **"Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh" (Jude 7)**. Read one way, "in like manner" compares the sin of Sodom to the sin of those angels, which would make the angels' sin sexual, a going after flesh of another kind. In the Greek the phrase reads "in like manner to these," and the word for "these" (*toutois*) is masculine, while "cities" is feminine. So, says this view, it points back past the cities to the angels.
4. **2 Peter 2:4-5 and 1 Peter 3:19-20.** Peter sets **"the angels that sinned" (2 Peter 2:4)** directly beside the Flood (2:5). Elsewhere he speaks of **"the spirits in prison; Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah" (1 Peter 3:19-20)**. Both passages tie a sin of angels to Noah's day.
5. **Angels have appeared in bodies.** The angels who came to Abraham ate a meal: **"and they did eat" (Genesis 18:8)**. The two angels who came to Sodom ate in Lot's house (19:3), and the men of the city wanted to "know" them (19:5). **"Some have entertained angels unawares" (Hebrews 13:2)**. If angels could appear as men, eat and be desired, the angelic view asks why they could not take wives.
6. **The Nephilim and the giants.** Genesis 6:4 calls the Nephilim "mighty men," and the only other place the word appears, Numbers 13:33, links them to the tall sons of Anak. Scripture goes on to record whole peoples of great height (Deuteronomy 2:10-11, 20-21) and named giants such as Og and Goliath. The angelic view sees these as the survivors or later outbreaks of an unnatural line.
7. **Ancient readers.** The book of 1 Enoch (a Jewish writing from before Christ, not part of Scripture) tells the story of angels who took human wives at length. Josephus, many early Jewish interpreters and several early church writers took the angelic view, and so does E. W. Bullinger in this library's own standing reference, *The Companion Bible* (Appendixes 23, 25 and 26). Jude quotes a prophecy of Enoch (Jude 14-15) that matches a passage in 1 Enoch, and so, says this view, he knew that book's story of the angels and may be assuming it.

Weighing it: Opposing case, stated. Points 1, 3 and 5 are the strongest. Point 1 is a real usage. Point 3 rests on a genuine feature of the Greek. Point 5 rests on direct statements that angels appeared in bodies and ate. Each is answered in the chapters that follow, and none is dismissed.

In short. The angelic reading has real evidence: the phrase in Job, Jude's "in like manner," Peter's link to Noah's day, angels who ate with men, and a long line of ancient readers.

D. The crux

Much of the debate turns on one prior question, and it is worth naming before any verse is weighed: **can a spirit being father a child of flesh?** If the answer is yes, the angelic reading of Genesis 6 is open, and

the verses in §C carry real weight. If the answer is no, the angelic reading fails whatever "sons of God" means, because the union it requires could not have produced children. Chapter 1 takes up this question first, because the rest of the debate depends on it.

Weighing it: Framing only — names the question on which Claim K depends.

In short. The real question underneath is whether a spirit can father a child of flesh. Chapter 1 begins there.

E. What changed in this edition

This is the second edition of this study. In keeping with this library's rule that error is not left standing, the corrections are listed here and in Appendix A rather than made silently.

- **The Joseph parallel is withdrawn.** The earlier edition listed Potiphar's wife and Joseph (Genesis 39:6-7) as an example of the "saw ... took" pattern. Genesis 39:7 does not use that pair of verbs. Shechem and Dinah (Genesis 34:2), which does, takes its place.
- **The tall peoples were tall.** The earlier edition treated the giants as violent men rather than tall men, and treated Goliath and Og as isolated cases. That was too simple. Moses himself, not only the frightened spies, calls the Emim and the Zamzummim **"a people great, and many, and tall, as the Anakims" (Deuteronomy 2:21)**, and 2 Samuel 21:15-22 names four giants born to one family in Gath. Chapter 3 now says so.
- **The word for "evil report."** The earlier edition said the "evil report" of Numbers 13:32 used the Hebrew word *ra'*. It does not. The word is *dibbah* (H1681), a defaming or slanderous report. *Ra'* ("evil") appears in the later verse, Numbers 14:37.
- **The count in Genesis 1.** "After his kind" appears ten times in Genesis 1, as the earlier edition said, but in five verses, not six: once in 1:11, twice each in 1:12, 1:21 and 1:24, and three times in 1:25.
- **The weight of the Genesis 1 argument.** The earlier edition called the "after his kind" argument decisive and said Scripture never once records the boundary between kinds being crossed. Both statements went too far. Genesis 1 does not list angels among its kinds, and Scripture does mention mules and forbids cross-breeding cattle (Leviticus 19:19). Chapter 1 now faces these points and rates the argument as a reasonable inference.
- **The opposing case is stated in full.** The earlier edition did not set out Jude 7's "in like manner," 1 Peter 3:19-20, the angels who ate with Abraham and Lot, or the contrast between "sons of God" and "daughters of men." Introduction §C now states all of them, and the chapters answer them.
- **Better verses for God's sons among men.** Exodus 4:22, Deuteronomy 14:1 and Hosea 1:10, where God calls His own people His son or His children, are added to Chapter 2.

None of these corrections changes the study's conclusion. Several of them change how strongly that conclusion may be stated.

Weighing it: Concession — every item above corrects or weakens the earlier edition; none strengthens it.

In short. The conclusion stands, but the earlier edition overstated some arguments and misstated some facts. They are corrected here in the open.

Chapter 1 — The Boundary Fixed Before Genesis 6 Opens

A. "After his kind," ten times

Genesis 1 uses one qualifying phrase more than any other in its account of living things. It is worth reading in full, because its repetition is the point:

> **Genesis 1:11** *And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so.*
>
> **Genesis 1:12** *And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind: and God saw that it was good.*
>
> **Genesis 1:21** *And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that it was good.*
>
> **Genesis 1:24** *And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so.*
>
> **Genesis 1:25** *And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good.*

The phrase "after his kind" (or "after their kind") appears ten times in these five verses. When a passage repeats one expression this often, the repetition marks what the passage is most concerned to say. Here it is that God made each kind of living thing to bring forth its own kind: plant yields seed of its own kind, and every animal reproduces within its own kind. The Hebrew word is *min* (H4327), "a sort," translated "kind."

The same phrase returns at the Flood, in the very chapter where the "sons of God" appear. Noah was to bring the animals into the ark **"after their kind ... two of every sort" (Genesis 6:20)**, and they came **"every beast after his kind, and all the cattle after their kind" (Genesis 7:14)**. The kinds that God created by kind, He preserved by kind.

Man is made differently from the animals. He is not made "after his kind" but **"in our image, after our likeness" (Genesis 1:26)**. Yet the same order holds for him: Adam **"begat a son in his own likeness, after his image" (Genesis 5:3)**. Man reproduces man.

Weighing it: Direct statement — that Genesis 1 sets each kind to reproduce its own kind; this is the ground of Claim K. The other reading can fairly answer that this establishes the rule for plants, animals and men, which no one disputes, and says nothing yet about angels.

In short. God made every living thing to bring forth its own kind, said so ten times, and repeated it at the ark.

B. What the boundary rules out, and what it does not

This boundary is not about variety within a kind. The text allows wide variation within "cattle" or "creeping thing." It is a boundary between kinds: plant and animal, fish and fowl, beast and man.

Two passages must be faced honestly here, because an attentive reader will raise them. Scripture mentions mules, which are bred from a horse and an ass: **"every man gat him up upon his mule, and fled" (2 Samuel 13:29)**. And the Law says, **"Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind" (Leviticus 19:19)**. So Scripture knows of animals bred across some line, and forbids Israel to do it.

These passages show that the "kind" of Genesis 1 is not the same thing as the modern "species." Horse and ass are close animals, and the fact that they can produce a mule at all is the usual reason for counting them one created kind. What Scripture never records is a union across the great divisions of creation producing offspring: beast with man, or a spirit being with a woman. The earlier edition of this study said Scripture never records the boundary crossed at all. That was too broad. The narrower statement is the true one.

Weighing it: Concession — the mule and Leviticus 19:19 show that some breeding across a line is possible, and the earlier edition's "never once" is withdrawn. What remains bears on Claim K only at the level of the great divisions of creation. The other reading can fairly answer that if the line can be crossed at all, the location of the line is the very thing in dispute.

In short. Some close animals can be crossed, and Scripture mentions it. What it never records is a crossing between man and beast, or between spirit and flesh.

C. Are angels a "kind" that could cross?

Here is the real weakness in the argument from Genesis 1, and it must be stated plainly. Genesis 1 does not list angels among its kinds. Its "after his kind" refrain governs plants and animals, and man by his own likeness. It does not say anything about angels at all. So the argument cannot simply say "Genesis 1 forbids it." It has to ask what Scripture says angels are.

Scripture calls them spirits: **"Are they not all ministering spirits" (Hebrews 1:14)**. And Jesus, risen, drew a line between spirit and body: **"a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have" (Luke 24:39)**. A being whose nature is spirit is not a being of flesh that begets flesh in the order God set in Genesis 1 and 5. Hebrews says the Son **"took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham" (Hebrews 2:16)**, treating the angelic nature and the human seed as two different things.

The opposing case's point 5 must be answered on its own terms. Angels did appear in human form and did eat (Genesis 18:8; 19:3). But to appear in a body for a time and to eat a meal is a different thing from fathering children. Scripture records the first; it nowhere records the second, in any passage that says so in plain words. Genesis 6 is the passage in dispute, so it cannot be used to prove its own reading.

Jesus' words on marriage point the same way: **"in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven" (Matthew 22:30)**; Mark 12:25 has the same. The

other reading answers, fairly, that Jesus spoke of angels "in heaven," keeping their place, and not of angels who had left it (Jude 6). This study accepts that the verse does not settle the question alone. It shows only that marriage is not part of the angelic order as God made it.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for Claim K, that a spirit being does not father a child of flesh. It rests on what Scripture calls angels (spirits), on Jesus' distinction between spirit and flesh, and on the absence of any plain statement that angels ever begot children. The other reading can fairly answer that angels have taken bodies, that what God has not described is not thereby impossible, and that Matthew 22:30 speaks of angels in heaven only.

In short. Genesis 1 does not mention angels, so the argument must rest on what Scripture says angels are: spirits, not flesh. That makes Claim K a reasonable inference, not a proof.

D. What this does, and does not, settle

This chapter does not yet say who the "sons of God" were. Job does use the phrase for angels, and Chapter 4 faces that directly. What this chapter shows is narrower: even if Genesis 6:2 did use the phrase for angels, a second claim would still be needed, that those angels fathered children by women, and that second claim runs against what Scripture says angels are. The identification of the "sons of God" and the question of how the Nephilim came about are two questions, not one.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for Claim K, and it separates Claim K from Claim S. The other reading can fairly answer that if the "sons of God" of Genesis 6 are angels, the verse itself says "they bare children to them," and so would be the plain statement this study says is missing.

In short. Who the "sons of God" were and whether an angel can father a child are separate questions. This chapter has answered only the second, and only as an inference.

Chapter 2 — Reading Genesis 6:2 the Way Scripture Reads It Elsewhere

A. "Saw" and "took"

> **Genesis 6:2** *That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.*

The verse describes two actions in order: the sons of God **saw** the daughters of men, that they were fair, and they **took** them wives. Before reaching for an explanation the text does not supply, it is worth asking how Scripture uses this same sequence elsewhere. The Treasury of Scripture Knowledge, this library's standing cross-reference tool, points from these words to several passages:

> **Genesis 3:6** *And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.*

> **Genesis 34:2** *And when Shechem the son of Hamor the Hivite, prince of the country, saw her, he took her, and lay with her, and defiled her.*
>
> **2 Samuel 11:2** *And it came to pass in an eveningtide, that David arose from off his bed, and walked upon the roof of the king's house: and from the roof he saw a woman washing herself; and the woman was very beautiful to look upon.*
>
> **2 Samuel 11:4** *And David sent messengers, and took her; and she came in unto him, and he lay with her; for she was purified from her uncleanness: and she returned unto her house.*

Eve saw that the tree was pleasant to the eyes, and took. Shechem saw Dinah, and took her. David saw a woman very beautiful to look upon, and sent messengers, and took her. In every case it is the same thing: desire coming in through the eyes and ending in a choice. In every case the one who saw and took was a human being. Job states the other side of the same truth: **"I made a covenant with mine eyes; why then should I think upon a maid?" (Job 31:1)**. And John names the pattern: **"the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world" (1 John 2:16)**.

The earlier edition of this study also listed Potiphar's wife and Joseph here. Genesis 39:7 says she "cast her eyes upon Joseph," but it does not use the pair "saw … took," and that example is withdrawn.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — toward Claim S. Genesis 6:2 describes the same sequence Scripture uses elsewhere for ordinary human desire. The other reading can fairly answer that angels, if they desired women, would see and take in the same way, so the pattern describes the act without proving who did it. That answer is fair, and this section is supporting evidence, not proof.

In short. "Saw … took" is how Scripture describes human lust, from Eve to David. Genesis 6:2 reads the same way.

B. Two lines already drawn in Genesis 4 and 5

Genesis 6 does not begin a new story. It follows two chapters that have just traced two families of mankind.

The first is Cain's. It ends with Lamech, who took two wives and boasted of killing a young man:

> **Genesis 4:23** *And Lamech said unto his wives, Adah and Zillah, Hear my voice; ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech: for I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt.*
>
> **Genesis 4:24** *If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold.*

The second is Seth's, which begins at the close of the same chapter:

> **Genesis 4:25** *And Adam knew his wife again; and she bare a son, and called his name Seth: For God, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew.*
>
> **Genesis 4:26** *And to Seth, to him also there was born a son; and he called his name Enos: then began men to call upon the name of the LORD.*

Genesis 5 then traces Seth's line generation by generation down to Noah. The King James translators noted in their margin that the last clause of Genesis 4:26 may also be rendered "then began men to call

themselves by the name of the LORD." Either way, Seth's family is marked from its first mention as the people who called on the LORD's name.

So when Genesis 6:2 speaks of "the sons of God" and "the daughters of men," the reader has just been shown two lines: one marked by calling on God, the other by violence and boasting. The simplest reading takes the first phrase for the first line and the second phrase for the second.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — toward Claim S. The two lines are a direct statement of Genesis 4 and 5; that Genesis 6:2 names them is an inference, though the immediate context supports it. The other reading can fairly answer that Genesis 6 does not mention Seth or Cain by name, and that "daughters of men" in 6:2 follows "men" in 6:1, which means mankind as a whole.

In short. Genesis 4 and 5 have just drawn two lines, the godly and the violent. Genesis 6:2 most naturally names those same two lines.

C. God's sons among men

Is it strange for Scripture to call men "sons of God"? Not at all. Luke's genealogy closes with Seth and Adam: **"which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God" (Luke 3:38)**. The Treasury of Scripture Knowledge points from Genesis 6:2 to several more passages in which God calls His own people His son or His children:

- **"Thus saith the LORD, Israel is my son, even my firstborn" (Exodus 4:22)**
- **"Ye are the children of the LORD your God" (Deuteronomy 14:1)**
- **"Ye are the sons of the living God" (Hosea 1:10)**
- **"thou, O LORD, art our father, our redeemer" (Isaiah 63:16)**

The phrase in Genesis 6 is not identical to these. *Bene ha-elohim* is not the same wording as "children of the LORD" or "sons of the living God," and the other reading is right to say so (Introduction §C, point 1). But Moses, who wrote both Genesis and Deuteronomy, did call God's people His sons and children, so the idea that a godly line could be called "sons of God" is not foreign to him.

There is also a distinction worth keeping. Scripture reserves one title for Christ alone: **"his only begotten Son" (John 3:16)**; also John 1:14, 18 and 1 John 4:9. Every other use of "son of God" or "sons of God," whether of Adam, of Israel, or of angels in Job, names a different and derived relationship. Calling Seth's line "sons of God" takes nothing from Christ's unique title.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — toward Claim S. Scripture, including Moses himself, calls God's people His sons. The other reading can fairly answer that the exact Hebrew phrase is used elsewhere only of angels, and that this is the stronger piece of evidence on the wording itself.

In short. Moses calls God's own people His sons and children. A godly line called "sons of God" is not a strange idea in Scripture, even if the exact phrase in Genesis 6 is used elsewhere only in Job.

D. "Daughters of men"

The opposing case's point 2 deserves a direct answer. Genesis 6:1 says that "men began to multiply," meaning mankind as a whole. Does "daughters of men" in verse 2 then mean all women, so that "sons of God" must be something other than men?

It need not. When a verse sets one group against another by their relation to God, both groups can be human. The covenant people and the nations around them are set against each other this way throughout Scripture, and Israel is called God's son (Exodus 4:22) while the nations are not. "Sons of God" and "daughters of men" can name the same kind of contrast: those who belong to God and those who do not. Verse 1's "men" sets the scene, mankind multiplying on the earth. Verse 2 then divides mankind by its relation to God.

This study grants that the other reading's sense of the contrast is natural, and that the wording alone does not decide between the two readings.

Weighing it: Neutral — on Claim S. The contrast between "sons of God" and "daughters of men" fits either reading: heavenly beings against women, or God's people against those outside. Neither side should lean on it.

In short. "Sons of God" against "daughters of men" can be a contrast of kinds or a contrast of faith. The wording alone does not settle which.

E. Marriage outside the covenant

If Claim S is right, Genesis 6:2 is not an isolated event. It is the first appearance of a danger Scripture warns against again and again: God's people marrying outside the faith and being drawn away by it. The Treasury of Scripture Knowledge points from Genesis 6:2 to exactly this thread:

> **Exodus 34:16** *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.*
>
> **Deuteronomy 7:4** *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.*
>
> **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.*
>
> **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.*
>
> **2 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?*

Ezra's words are close to Genesis 6 in thought: **"the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people of those lands" (Ezra 9:2)**. Nehemiah, generations later, reminds the people that even Solomon was led into sin this way (Nehemiah 13:25-26).

On this reading, Genesis 6:5 is the result of that mingling, stated in the next verses:

> **Genesis 6:5** *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.*

This is not a new kind of sin entering the world from outside mankind. It is mankind's own sin, already present in Cain's line, spreading into the one line that had been marked by calling on God's name.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — toward Claim S. Scripture warns against this kind of marriage from the Law to Paul, and the cross-references connect the thread back to Genesis 6:2. The other reading can fairly answer that a later pattern does not prove what happened in Genesis 6, and that the angelic reading also explains why the corruption was so great.

In short. God's people marrying outside the faith and being drawn away by it is one of Scripture's longest warnings. Genesis 6:2 reads naturally as its first instance.

Chapter 3 — The Nephilim and the Tall Peoples

A. The word itself

> **Genesis 6:4** *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.*

The word translated "giants" here is *Nephilim*. Strong's Hebrew Concordance defines it this way:

> **Strong's H5303** — *nephiyl or nephil; from 5307; properly, a feller, i.e. a bully or tyrant: giant.*

The word is built on the verb *naphal* (H5307), "to fall." Strong's reads it as one who makes others fall: a feller, a bully, a tyrant. "Giant" is the King James rendering, not the root sense. The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew lexicon gives the same derivation and notes that the exact form of the word has long been discussed by Hebrew grammarians. So the word's meaning is not as settled as the English "giants" suggests.

The word *Nephilim* appears only here and in Numbers 13:33. The other words translated "giants" in the Old Testament are different Hebrew words. In Deuteronomy 2 and 3 the word is *Rephaim*; in 2 Samuel 21 it is *ha-rapha*, "the giant." The Anakim, the Emim and the Zamzummim are the names of peoples. The English word "giants" covers all of them, but the Hebrew keeps them apart.

Weighing it: Strong inference — for Claim N, that "Nephilim" does not of itself mean a tall race. The gloss "a feller, a bully or tyrant" comes directly from Strong's, and the word is distinct from the other

words translated "giants." The other reading can fairly answer that the derivation of the word is debated, and that Numbers 13:33 does connect the Nephilim with tall men.

In short. *Nephilim* most likely means "fellers," men who made others fall. It is a different word from the ones used for the tall peoples of Canaan.

B. "Men of renown"

Genesis 6:4 explains the Nephilim in its own words: **"mighty men which were of old, men of renown"**. "Men of renown" is literally "men of the name." The Treasury of Scripture Knowledge points to two other passages where the same idea appears:

> **Genesis 11:4** *And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.*
>
> **Numbers 16:2** *And they rose up before Moses, with certain of the children of Israel, two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown:*

The builders of Babel wanted to "make us a name." Korah's two hundred and fifty princes were "famous in the congregation, men of renown." Both were human, and in both the phrase describes pride and rebellion. Read with Strong's definition, Genesis 6:4 describes strongmen of old, tyrants, famous for their power. Whether or not they were tall, the text's own emphasis is on violence and fame, and the next verses confirm it: **"The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence" (Genesis 6:11)**.

Weighing it: Strong inference — toward Claim N. The same phrase describes ordinary human pride in both other places it is used. The other reading can fairly answer that renowned men can also be tall men, so the phrase does not exclude great size.

In short. "Men of renown" describes proud, powerful men, as it does at Babel and in Korah's rebellion. Genesis 6:4 stresses their violence and fame, not their height.

C. "And also after that"

Genesis 6:4 says there were Nephilim **"in those days; and also after that"**. That is, they existed before the marriages of verse 2 and continued after them. On the angelic reading, a race that needed angelic fathers would have had to be produced again after the Flood to appear in Canaan, or else would have had to survive the Flood through Noah's family. Scripture records neither: no second coming of angels, and no corruption of Noah's line. On this study's reading, nothing further is needed. Violent and famous men can arise in any generation, before the Flood or after it, from the fallen nature that survived the Flood in Noah's own family.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — toward Claim N. The angelic reading needs an event Scripture does not record; this study's reading needs none. The other reading can fairly answer that "after that" may mean after the first such unions, still before the Flood, and that the angelic view does not need the Nephilim to survive the Flood at all if Numbers 13:33 is only the spies' exaggeration.

In short. On the angelic reading, Nephilim after the Flood need an unrecorded second event. On this reading, they need nothing but fallen men.

D. The spies' evil report

The only other mention of the Nephilim comes in the report of the spies sent into Canaan. It must be read with the verse before it:

> **Numbers 13:32** *And they brought up an evil report of the land which they had searched unto the children of Israel, saying, The land, through which we have gone to search it, is a land that eateth up the inhabitants thereof; and all the people that we saw in it are men of a great stature.*
>
> **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.*

Verse 32 calls the report "an evil report" before verse 33 mentions the giants at all. The Hebrew word here is *dibbah* (H1681), a defaming or slanderous report, the word used again in Numbers 14:36 for **"bringing up a slander upon the land."** The verse after that adds the ordinary word for evil: **"Even those men that did bring up the evil report upon the land, died by the plague before the LORD" (Numbers 14:37)**. The earlier edition of this study wrongly said the word in 13:32 was *ra'*; the correction is made above. The point itself is unchanged and stronger for the correction. Scripture calls this report a slander, and the men who brought it died for it.

So the one verse that links the Nephilim to the sons of Anak is part of a report Scripture itself condemns. "We were in our own sight as grasshoppers" is how frightened men saw themselves. Scripture records that they said it; it does not endorse it.

Weighing it: Strong inference — toward Claim N, that Numbers 13:33's link between the Anakim and the Nephilim cannot be relied on. Scripture calls the report a slander in so many words. The other reading can fairly answer that a report can be evil in its unbelief and its conclusion (the land cannot be taken) while still being true in some details, and that the Anakim were in fact tall (§E below).

In short. The only verse that ties the Nephilim to Canaan's giants is in a report Scripture calls a slander.

E. The tall peoples were real

This part of the earlier edition needs the most correction. That edition said the giants were tyrants rather than tall people, and that Goliath and Og were individual cases, not a race. That was too simple. Scripture describes tall peoples plainly, and not only in the spies' report. Moses himself writes:

> **Deuteronomy 2:10** *The Emims dwelt therein in times past, a people great, and many, and tall, as the Anakims;*
>
> **Deuteronomy 2:11** *Which also were accounted giants, as the Anakims; but the Moabites call them Emims.*
>
> **Deuteronomy 2:20** *(That also was accounted a land of giants: giants dwelt therein in old time; and the Ammonites call them Zamzummims;*

> **Deuteronomy 2:21** *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:*

Moses says the same of the Anakim: **"A people great and tall, the children of the Anakims" (Deuteronomy 9:2)**. Og's iron bedstead was nine cubits long (Deuteronomy 3:11), about thirteen feet. Goliath's height was **"six cubits and a span" (1 Samuel 17:4)**, more than nine feet. And 2 Samuel 21 names four giants born to one family in Gath:

> **2 Samuel 21:20** *And there was yet a battle in Gath, where was a man of great stature, that had on every hand six fingers, and on every foot six toes, four and twenty in number; and he also was born to the giant.*
>
> **2 Samuel 21:22** *These four were born to the giant in Gath, and fell by the hand of David, and by the hand of his servants.*

So Scripture does record peoples of great height, families of them, in the narrator's own voice. This is a direct statement, and this study accepts it.

What Scripture does not say is that these peoples were descended from angels. Their names are the names of peoples (Anakim, Emim, Zamzummim, Rephaim), and the words used of them are not the word *Nephilim*. The only link between them and the Nephilim is the slanderous report of Numbers 13:33. Tall peoples are fully explained by the wide range God gave to human stature. A race part angel and part human is not required by any verse that speaks in its own voice.

Weighing it: Direct statement — that the giant peoples of Canaan were tall; reasonable inference — for Claim N, that they were human and not of angelic descent. Their stature is stated outright. That they were not a hybrid race rests on Claim K and on the absence of any link outside the spies' report. The other reading can fairly answer that Numbers 13:33 does make the link, and that peoples this tall need some explanation.

In short. Scripture records tall peoples, and this edition says so plainly. It does not record that they came from angels.

Chapter 4 — Job, Jude and Peter

A. "Sons of God" in Job

> **Job 1:6** *Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan came also among them.*
>
> **Job 38:7** *When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?*

In Job, "sons of God" clearly means angels. They present themselves before the LORD, Satan comes among them, and they shout for joy at the creation of the earth. Psalm 89:6 uses a related phrase, **"the sons of the mighty,"** for heavenly beings as well. This study does not dispute any of this. It is the opposing case's strongest point on the wording, and it is real.

What it establishes is that Scripture uses "sons of God" for angels in Job. It does not by itself establish that Genesis 6 uses it the same way, any more than Luke 3:38's "son of God" for Adam requires every other use to mean Adam. Each passage has to be read in its own context. In Job the context is the heavenly court. In Genesis 6 the context is two human lines, marriage, and the corruption of mankind, and Chapter 2 has argued that this context points to men.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — against Claim S, on the wording alone. This study grants that the exact phrase points toward angels where it is used in Job. It holds that Genesis 6's own context outweighs it. A careful reader may weigh these the other way, and this is the strongest single point against Claim S.

In short. Job uses "sons of God" for angels, and that is the angelic view's strongest point. This study holds that Genesis 6's own context points the other way, but grants that it is a real question.

B. Jude 6-7 and "in like manner"

> **Jude 1:5** *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.*
>
> **Jude 1:6** *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.*
>
> **Jude 1:7** *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.*

Jude gives three examples of God's judgment in a row: unbelieving Israel in the wilderness (verse 5), the angels who left their own habitation (verse 6), and Sodom and Gomorrha (verse 7). They are three separate examples, not one event told three times.

The angelic view's strongest verse is verse 7, and it must be weighed honestly. "In like manner" can be read two ways. It can compare Sodom's sin of "going after strange flesh" to the sin of the angels in verse 6, which would make the angels' sin sexual. Or it can compare "the cities about them" to Sodom and Gomorrha themselves: those cities sinned in like manner to Sodom and Gomorrha. The Greek reads "in like manner to these," and the word for "these" (*toutois*) is masculine while "cities" is feminine, which the angelic view takes as pointing back to the angels. But Greek writers often refer to a city by its people, and "Sodom and Gomorrha" can be referred to as the men who lived there. Careful scholars hold both readings.

This study holds that Jude 7 does not settle the question either way. It does not mention Genesis 6, the daughters of men, or children. Even on the angelic view's reading, it says only that the angels' sin was in some way like Sodom's.

There is a further point, and it cuts both ways. Jude quotes a prophecy of **"Enoch also, the seventh from Adam" (Jude 14)**, which matches a passage in 1 Enoch, so Jude knew that book, and that book does tell the story of angels taking wives. The other reading can fairly say Jude therefore had the story in mind. This study answers that Jude names his references plainly when he means them: "the way of Cain," "the

error of Balaam," "the gainsaying of Core" (Jude 11), and Enoch by name (verse 14). In verse 6 he names no connection to Genesis 6 or to women. Quoting one true prophecy from Enoch does not endorse everything else in that book.

Weighing it: Neutral — on Claim K and Claim S. Jude 7's "in like manner" is genuinely debated, and Jude's use of Enoch can be read either way. Neither side should lean on these verses. The other reading can fairly answer that its reading of Jude 7 is a natural one and that Jude's knowledge of 1 Enoch makes it more likely.

In short. Jude's "in like manner" is the angelic view's best verse, and honest scholars read it both ways. It does not mention Genesis 6, and this study holds that it does not settle the question.

C. 2 Peter 2:4-6

> **2 Peter 2:4** *For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment;*
>
> **2 Peter 2:5** *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;*
>
> **2 Peter 2:6** *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;*

Peter's list runs the same way as Jude's: the angels that sinned (verse 4), the Flood (verse 5), Sodom and Gomorrha (verse 6). Each is a separate example of God judging sin without exception. Peter does not say the angels' sin caused the Flood, or that it involved women. That they sit next to each other in the list is the strongest thing the angelic reading can say about this passage, and it is an inference from placement, not a statement.

Weighing it: Neutral — on Claim S and Claim K. The passage is a list of separate judgments. The other reading can fairly answer that Peter put the angels next to the Flood for a reason.

In short. Peter lists the angels, the Flood and Sodom as three separate judgments. He does not say the first caused the second.

D. The spirits in prison

> **1 Peter 3:18** *For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:*
>
> **1 Peter 3:19** *By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison;*
>
> **1 Peter 3:20** *Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.*

The angelic view reads these "spirits in prison" as the angels of Genesis 6, disobedient "in the days of Noah." Even if that is right, the passage says only that some spirits were disobedient while the ark was being built. It does not say what their disobedience was, and it says nothing of marriage or children.

Who these spirits are, and what was preached to them, is itself one of the most debated questions in the New Testament. A debated passage cannot settle a debated passage.

Weighing it: Corroboration only — for the angelic reading, at most. If the spirits are angels, the passage ties some angelic disobedience to Noah's time, but it does not describe what that disobedience was. The other reading can fairly answer that the link to Noah's day is direct and specific.

In short. Peter mentions spirits disobedient in Noah's day, but not what they did. It cannot carry the weight the angelic view puts on it.

E. Noah "perfect in his generations"

> **Genesis 6:9** *These are the generations of Noah: Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God.*

The angelic view often reads "perfect in his generations" as meaning that Noah's bloodline was free of angelic mixture. The Treasury of Scripture Knowledge glosses "perfect" here as **"or, upright"** and points to these passages:

> **Job 1:1** *There was a man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job; and that man was perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil.*
>
> **Psalms 37:37** *Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright: for the end of that man is peace.*
>
> **Luke 1:6** *And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.*

In every one, "perfect" means moral integrity and faithfulness to God: Job "perfect and upright," the psalmist's "perfect man," Zacharias and Elisabeth "blameless." None of them is about bloodline. Genesis 6:9 itself confirms the sense by restating it at once: **"and Noah walked with God."** Noah stood out from his generation for the same reason Job stood out from his. He was a just man in a world Genesis 6:5 has just described as thinking only evil continually.

Weighing it: Strong inference — toward Claim N, that "perfect in his generations" is moral, not genetic. Every cross-reference uses the word morally, and the verse explains itself. The other reading can fairly answer that "in his generations" could refer to descent, though no other passage uses the phrase that way.

In short. "Perfect" in Genesis 6:9 means upright, as it does of Job. It says nothing about Noah's bloodline.

Chapter 5 — What This Settles

A. The reading, stated plainly

"Sons of God" in Genesis 6:2 and 6:4 names the godly line descended from Seth, marked from Genesis 4:26 as those who called on the name of the LORD. "Daughters of men" names women outside that line.

Their marriages followed the pattern Scripture uses everywhere for ordinary desire, "saw … took," from Eve to David, and they began the long danger of God's people being drawn away by marriage outside the faith. The Nephilim were the violent, famous strongmen of that age, "men of renown" in the same human sense the phrase has at Babel and in Korah's rebellion. They were not a race part angel and part human. The tall peoples of Canaan were real and are recorded as such, but Scripture nowhere says they came from angels; the only verse that links them to the Nephilim is in a report Scripture calls a slander. No angel fathered a child by a woman, because angels are spirits and Scripture nowhere says that a spirit begets flesh. Job's use of "sons of God" for angels is real, but it is a different passage in a different context. Jude and Peter list the angels' sin, the Flood and Sodom as separate judgments and do not say they were one event. Noah was "perfect" in that he was upright, not in his bloodline.

This departs from E. W. Bullinger's angelic reading in *The Companion Bible* (Appendixes 23, 25 and 26). His work on figures of speech remains this library's standing reference. His conclusion on this particular question is not adopted, for the reasons given in Chapters 1 to 4.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for Claims S, K and N taken together. This is the study's summary. The other side's best evidence is the phrase's use in Job and Jude 7's "in like manner"; neither has been dismissed, and both have been answered.

In short. Seth's line married outside the faith, violence followed, and no angel fathered a race. That is this library's reading, held at the weight stated.

B. What would change this study's mind

A reader should be able to go looking for the evidence that would overturn this study. Here it is.

1. **A plain statement that angels fathered children.** If any passage outside Genesis 6 said in so many words that angels begot children by women, Claim K would fall, and with it most of the case against the angelic reading. No such passage exists.
2. **An unambiguous New Testament reading of Genesis 6.** If Jude, Peter or any other writer named Genesis 6, the daughters of men, or the Nephilim in connection with the angels' sin, Claim S would fall. None does.
3. **A use of *bene ha-elohim* for men.** On the other side, if the exact phrase were found used for men anywhere else, Claim S would become a strong inference rather than a reasonable one. It is not; Claim S rests on context, not on the phrase.

Weighing it: Method, not argument.

In short. A plain statement that angels begot children, or a New Testament writer naming Genesis 6, would overturn this study. Neither exists in Scripture.

C. How this bears on the rest of this library

Several studies in this library pass through Genesis 6 on the way to something else. *God: Deliverer*, *Not Destroyer* rests its reading of the corruption before the Flood on this study and carries a condensed form

of it in its own appendix. Studies that deal with the Flood, the conquest of Canaan or the giant peoples follow the same reading: the danger before the Flood was moral, not genetic; the giant peoples were tall but human; and no hybrid bloodline was created that could survive the Flood.

Weighing it: Framing only.

In short. Wherever this library touches Genesis 6, it follows this reading.

Appendix A — The Weight of Every Argument in This Study

Every argument made in the body of this study, with its rating, its direction, and what the opposing reading can fairly answer. Ratings use the scale defined in Introduction §B. Arguments the earlier edition made and this edition withdraws or demotes are listed at the end and marked as such, so that no returning reader is misled.

#	Argument	Where	Weight and direction	What the other reading fairly answers
1	Genesis 1 sets each kind to reproduce its own kind, ten times; repeated at the ark	Ch1 A	Direct statement, ground of Claim K	Says nothing yet about angels
2	Some close animals cross (mules; Leviticus 19:19), so "kind" is not species	Ch1 B	Concession, narrows Claim K	If a line can be crossed, where it lies is the question
3	Angels are spirits; a spirit does not beget flesh (Hebrews 1:14; Luke 24:39; Hebrews 2:16)	Ch1 C	Reasonable inference, for Claim K	Angels took bodies and ate; what is undescribed is not impossible
4	Angels appearing and eating is not the same as begetting	Ch1 C	Reasonable inference, for Claim K	Genesis 6:4 would be the plain statement, if the sons are angels
5	Angels "neither marry" (Matthew 22:30)	Ch1 C	Corroboration only, for Claim K	Said of angels in heaven, not of those who left it
6	Who the sons were and whether angels can father children are separate questions	Ch1 D	Reasonable inference, separates K from S	"They bare children to them" joins them
7	"Saw … took" is Scripture's pattern for human desire (Genesis 3:6; 34:2; 2 Samuel 11:2-4)	Ch2 A	Reasonable inference, toward Claim S	Angels would see and take the same way
8	Genesis 4 and 5 draw two lines just before Genesis 6	Ch2 B	Reasonable inference, toward Claim S	Genesis 6 names neither Seth nor Cain
9	Moses calls God's people His sons and children (Exodus 4:22; Deuteronomy 14:1)	Ch2 C	Reasonable inference, toward Claim S	The exact phrase is used elsewhere only of angels

#	Argument	Where	Weight and direction	What the other reading fairly answers
10	"Sons of God" against "daughters of men"	Ch2 D	Neutral, on Claim S	Fits either reading
11	Marriage outside the covenant is a sustained warning that begins here	Ch2 E	Reasonable inference, toward Claim S	A later pattern does not prove the first event
12	*Nephilim* means "fellers, bullies, tyrants" and is a different word from Rephaim	Ch3 A	Strong inference, toward Claim N	The derivation is debated; Numbers 13:33 links them to tall men
13	"Men of renown" is human pride at Babel and in Korah	Ch3 B	Strong inference, toward Claim N	Renowned men may also be tall
14	"And also after that" needs no second event on this reading	Ch3 C	Reasonable inference, toward Claim N	"After that" may still be before the Flood
15	Numbers 13:32 calls the giants report a slander (*dibbah*)	Ch3 D	Strong inference, toward Claim N	An evil report may still be true in details
16	The giant peoples were tall	Ch3 E	Direct statement	—
17	The giant peoples were human, not of angelic descent	Ch3 E	Reasonable inference, toward Claim N	Numbers 13:33 makes the link; such height needs explaining
18	Job's "sons of God" are angels	Ch4 A	Reasonable inference, against Claim S on the wording	This study holds Genesis 6's context outweighs it
19	Jude 7's "in like manner"	Ch4 B	Neutral, on Claims K and S	The angelic reading of Jude 7 is natural
20	Jude knew 1 Enoch but names no link to Genesis 6 in verse 6	Ch4 B	Neutral	Jude's knowledge of 1 Enoch makes the link likely
21	2 Peter 2:4-6 is a list of separate judgments	Ch4 C	Neutral, on Claims S and K	Placement next to the Flood is deliberate
22	1 Peter 3:19-20 does not say what the spirits' disobedience was	Ch4 D	Corroboration only, for the angelic reading at most	The link to Noah's day is direct
23	Noah "perfect" means upright, not pure of bloodline	Ch4 E	Strong inference, toward Claim N	"In his generations" could refer to descent
24	Summary of the settled reading	Ch5 A	Reasonable inference, for Claims S, K and N	Job and Jude 7 remain the opposing side's best evidence
25	*Withdrawn:* Potiphar's wife and Joseph as a "saw … took" example	Earlier edition Ch2	Withdrawn	Genesis 39:7 does not use the pair; Shechem replaces it
26	*Withdrawn:* "Scripture never once records the boundary between kinds being crossed"	Earlier edition Ch1	Withdrawn	Mules and Leviticus 19:19
27	*Demoted:* "after his kind" as the decisive, load-bearing finding	Earlier edition Ch1, Ch5	Demoted to reasonable inference	Genesis 1 does not list angels among its kinds

#	Argument	Where	Weight and direction	What the other reading fairly answers
28	*Withdrawn:* the giants were tyrants rather than tall; Goliath and Og were isolated cases	Earlier edition Ch3	Withdrawn	Deuteronomy 2:10-11, 20-21; 9:2; 2 Samuel 21:15-22
29	*Corrected:* the "evil report" of Numbers 13:32 is *ra'*	Earlier edition Ch3	Corrected to *dibbah* (H1681)	The point stands; the word was wrong

Copyright

Copyright 2026. Distribution of this study as is in its entirety is permitted and encouraged. Scripture quotations are from the King James Version of the Holy Bible, which is in the public domain.

Sources Consulted

Primary text. The King James Version is the base text throughout. Every verse block was generated by machine from the 1769 text of the King James Version, in the open-source edition of the aruljohn *Bible-kjv* project, and every inline quotation was checked against the same text. The marginal reading of Genesis 4:26 is the King James translators' own.

Hebrew and Greek. The Strong's Hebrew Concordance (KJV) in this library's Sources folder supplied the definitions of *Nephilim* (H5303), *naphal* (H5307) and *min* (H4327). The Hebrew of Numbers 13:32 (*dibbah*, H1681) was checked in an interlinear. The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew lexicon confirmed the derivation of *Nephilim* and the long discussion of its form. The Greek of Jude 7 is described from the standard text.

Cross-references. The Treasury of Scripture Knowledge supplied the cross-references on which Chapters 2, 3 and 4 are built: from Genesis 6:2 to Exodus 4:22, Deuteronomy 14:1, Isaiah 63:16, Genesis 3:6, 2 Samuel 11:2, Job 31:1, 1 John 2:16, Exodus 34:16, Deuteronomy 7:3-4, Ezra 9, Nehemiah 13, Malachi 2:11 and 2 Corinthians 6:14; from Genesis 6:4 to Numbers 13:33, Deuteronomy 2:20-21, 3:11, 1 Samuel 17:4, 2 Samuel 21:15-22, Genesis 11:4 and Numbers 16:2; and from Genesis 6:9 ("perfect," "or, upright") to Job 1:1, Psalm 37:37 and Luke 1:6.

Bullinger. *The Companion Bible*, Appendixes 23, 25 and 26, is named as this library's standing reference on this question. This study departs from its conclusion on the grounds given in Chapters 1 to 4, not by appeal to any other authority.

This library's own studies. *God: Deliverer, Not Destroyer*, whose Appendix A condensed this study and first made several of the corrections now carried into this edition.

What was not used. No commentary was used to reach this study's conclusion. 1 Enoch and Josephus are named only as part of the opposing case, and are not treated as authorities.

Scripture Index

Genesis 1:11 Ch1 A

Genesis 1:12 Ch1 A

Genesis 1:21 Ch1 A

Genesis 1:24 Ch1 A

Genesis 1:25 Ch1 A

Genesis 1:26 Ch1 A

Genesis 3:6 Ch2 A

Genesis 4:23 Ch2 B

Genesis 4:24 Ch2 B

Genesis 4:25 Ch2 B

Genesis 4:26 Ch2 B, Ch5 A

Genesis 5:3 Ch1 A

Genesis 6:1 Intro A, Intro C, Ch2 D

Genesis 6:2 Intro A, Intro C, Ch1 D, Ch2 A, Ch2 B, Ch2 C, Ch2 E, Ch5 A

Genesis 6:3 Intro A

Genesis 6:4 Intro A, Intro C, Ch3 A, Ch3 B, Ch3 C

Genesis 6:5 Ch2 E, Ch4 E

Genesis 6:9 Ch4 E

Genesis 6:11 Ch3 B

Genesis 6:20 Ch1 A

Genesis 7:14 Ch1 A

Genesis 11:4 Ch3 B

Genesis 18:8 Intro C, Ch1 C

Genesis 19:3 Ch1 C

Genesis 34:2 Intro E, Ch2 A

Genesis 39:6 Intro E

Genesis 39:7 Intro E, Ch2 A

Exodus 4:22 Intro E, Ch2 C, Ch2 D

Exodus 34:16 Ch2 E

Leviticus 19:19 Intro E, Ch1 B

2 Samuel 21:16 Intro E

2 Samuel 21:17 Intro E

2 Samuel 21:18 Intro E

2 Samuel 21:19 Intro E

2 Samuel 21:20 Intro E, Ch3 E

2 Samuel 21:21 Intro E

2 Samuel 21:22 Intro E, Ch3 E

Ezra 9:2 Ch2 E

Nehemiah 13:25 Ch2 E

Nehemiah 13:26 Ch2 E

Job 1:1 Ch4 E

Job 1:6 Intro C, Ch4 A

Job 2:1 Intro C

Job 31:1 Ch2 A

Job 38:7 Intro C, Ch4 A

Psalms 37:37 Ch4 E

Psalms 89:6 Ch4 A

Isaiah 63:16 Ch2 C

Hosea 1:10 Intro E, Ch2 C

Malachi 2:11 Ch2 E

Matthew 22:30 Ch1 C

Mark 12:25 Ch1 C

Luke 1:6 Ch4 E

Luke 3:38 Ch2 C, Ch4 A

Luke 24:39 Ch1 C

John 1:14 Ch2 C

John 1:18 Ch2 C

John 3:16 Ch2 C

Romans 9:7 Anchor

Romans 9:8 Anchor

Numbers 13:32 Intro E, Ch3 D

Numbers 13:33 Intro C, Ch3 A, Ch3 C, Ch3 D, Ch3 E

Numbers 14:36 Ch3 D

Numbers 14:37 Intro E, Ch3 D

Numbers 16:2 Ch3 B

Deuteronomy 2:10 Intro C, Ch3 E

Deuteronomy 2:11 Intro C, Ch3 E

Deuteronomy 2:20 Intro C, Ch3 E

Deuteronomy 2:21 Intro C, Intro E, Ch3 E

Deuteronomy 3:11 Ch3 E

Deuteronomy 7:3 Ch2 E

Deuteronomy 7:4 Ch2 E

Deuteronomy 9:2 Ch3 E

Deuteronomy 14:1 Intro E, Ch2 C

1 Samuel 17:4 Ch3 E

2 Samuel 11:2 Ch2 A

2 Samuel 11:4 Ch2 A

2 Samuel 13:29 Ch1 B

2 Samuel 21:15 Intro E

2 Corinthians 6:14 Ch2 E

Hebrews 1:14 Ch1 C

Hebrews 2:16 Ch1 C

Hebrews 13:2 Intro C

1 Peter 3:18 Ch4 D

1 Peter 3:19 Intro C, Intro E, Ch4 D

1 Peter 3:20 Intro C, Intro E, Ch4 D

2 Peter 2:4 Intro C, Ch4 C

2 Peter 2:5 Intro C, Ch4 C

2 Peter 2:6 Ch4 C

1 John 2:16 Ch2 A

1 John 4:9 Ch2 C

Jude 1:5 Ch4 B

Jude 1:6 Intro C, Ch1 C, Ch4 B

Jude 1:7 Intro C, Intro E, Ch4 B, Ch5 A

Jude 1:11 Ch4 B

Jude 1:14 Intro C, Ch4 B

Jude 1:15 Intro C