

TOPIC XX

THE “SONS OF GOD” AND THE “NEPHILIM”

GENESIS 6:1-4

“Who or what are the ‘sons of God?’” And the same questions are raised about the “Nephilim?” Every nuance of the passage in Genesis 6:1-4 ff. begs giving the best answer possible to this question.

A key factor here is not the challenge of who all these beings are, but that this short narrative explains why God decided to destroy mankind from off the earth with the exception of Noah and his family. So, the narrative is about God’s will to accomplish His plan of redemption and no human wickedness or evil will railroad it regardless of how corrupt and wicked they have or may become.

With that being said, there is a definite challenge to giving a clear and specific answer to this subject as opinions differ even among the best scholars. We will do our best.

First, the “Sons of God.” Here is the text:

Genesis 6:1-2,

1: “Now it came about, when mankind began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, 2: that the sons of God saw that the daughters of mankind were beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose.”

There are three main ideas about who these could be. The most prevalent, but not universal thought is that, I. These are some sort of divine or spiritual heavenly being or angel. The next view is that II. They are the unnamed descendants of the line of Seth intermarrying the ungodly line of Cain, and the third view is that III. They are some outside dominate human force who have invaded the people and intermarried the daughters descendant from Adam and Eve. We have mention of these daughters in Genesis 5:3 mentioned along with additional sons. So, views two and three conjecture that these are human males. Other views have been suggested, but these remain the principal ones.

I. There are some passages supporting the view that these “sons of God” are angelic, spiritual or heavenly creatures. Here they are,

A. 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.”

This does suggest that these “sons of God” are some sort of spiritual beings. Chapter 2, verse 1 repeats this scene.

B. Job 2:1, “Again, there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan also came among them to present himself before the LORD.”

C. Job 38:4-7, 4: “Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth? Tell *Me*, if you have understanding, 5: Who set its measurements? Since you know. Or who stretched the measuring line over it? 6: “On what were its bases sunk? Or who laid its cornerstone, 7: When the morning stars sang together And all the sons of God shouted for joy?”

Though not specified as angelic or spiritual beings, the implication seems to underline this. But we must understand that the Book of Job is of a literary nature that really should not be relied upon for theological determinations.¹

In Job, there is no clear-cut statement as to who these beings are and just because they “present themselves before the Lord and Satan is with them” doesn’t necessarily mean they are in some heavenly realm at all. The phrase, “before the Lord” occurs dozens of times if not hundreds in the Bible to describe earthly happenings. Take, for example, Genesis 18:22, “Then the men turned away from there and went toward Sodom, while Abraham was still standing before the LORD.” Exodus 16:9, “Then Moses said to Aaron, "Say to all the congregation of the sons of Israel, 'Come near before the LORD, for He has heard your grumblings.'" Exodus 27:21, "In the tent of meeting, outside the veil which is before the testimony, Aaron and his sons shall keep it in order from evening to morning before the LORD; it shall be a perpetual statute throughout their generations for the sons of Israel.” (Colored italics mine) The examples are endless. On the other hand, we have 38:7, speaking of the time of creation and, “When the morning stars sang together, And, all the sons of God shouted for joy?”

One can assume the nature of these “sons,” but it cannot be done with exactitude. Job is in full poetry here and the phrase, “sons of God” may not even connect in meaning to the phrase in Genesis. In this case, it could reflect some angelic host. Considering that the word “Adam” is plural (note: Genesis 5:2 for example) it could still speak of created people.

D. Some reference Daniel 3:24-25, 24: “Then Nebuchadnezzar the king was astounded and stood up quickly; he said to his counselors, ‘Was it not three men *that* we threw bound into the middle of the fire?’ They replied to the king, ‘Absolutely, O king.’ 25: “He responded, ‘Look! I see four men untied *and* walking about in the middle of the fire unharmed, and the appearance of the fourth is like a son of *the* gods!’”

¹ For a commentary on the Book of Job and why this is proposed, please see: www.bibleclassroom.org “STUDIES”, Book studies/commentaries, Job.

This is a stretch as you can see. A Babylonian king would have no idea about the scripture references and the NASB supplies “*the*” and, “gods” is plural.

In the New Testament, II Peter 2:1-9 is viewed as referring to these beings though not specifically mentioned. In that passage we see Peter warning his readers about false prophets noting that they will be destroyed by God but His faithful saved and from verse 4 Peter wrote, (note the italics),

4: “*For if God did not spare angels when they sinned, but cast them into hell and committed them to pits of darkness, held for judgment;*² 5: and did not spare the ancient world, but protected Noah, a preacher of righteousness, with seven others, when He brought a flood upon the world of the ungodly; 6: and *if* He condemned the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah to destruction by reducing *them* to ashes, having made *them* an example of what is coming for the ungodly; 7: and *if* He rescued righteous Lot, *who was* oppressed by the perverted conduct of unscrupulous people 8: (for by what he saw and heard *that* righteous man, while living among them, felt *his* righteous soul tormented day after day by *their* lawless deeds), 9: *then* the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from a trial, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment for the day of judgment...”

Here, we have “angels” who “sinned.” The time frame is the same time frame in the narrative we are examining as verse 5 here speaks about Noah. In this and the following examples, one must draw the assumption or conclusion that the “angels” being referred to are these “sons of God” because the “sons of God” are not specifically mentioned at all.

“Hell” is “tartaros” used only this one time in the New Testament and as Peter sets the parallelism, it is “pits of darkness” where they are held for judgment. Where did he get this idea? The early Jews of Jesus’ day were exposed to a number of thoughts by apocryphal books such as The Book of Enoch³, the Assumption of Moses,⁴ The Wisdom of Solomon,⁵ and a great deal of Greek mythology about “tartaros.”

In fact, Jude, verse 14-15 also quotes from this apocryphal and apocalyptic book of Enoch,

14: “*It was* also about these people *that* Enoch, *in the seventh generation* from Adam, prophesied, saying, ‘Behold, the Lord has come with many thousands of His holy ones, 15 to execute judgment upon all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their ungodly deeds which they have done in an ungodly way, and of all the harsh things which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him.’”

This quotation in Jude is from the book of Enoch, chapter 1, verse 9,

² Underlined italics mine to emphasize the key part of the passage for our study.

³ Around 300-200 B.C. See: Enoch 10:4-7; 19:1; 54:5-10.

⁴ A first century composition.

⁵ Chapter 17. This book is thought to be composed in the mid-first century B.C.

9. “And behold, he comes with myriads of the holy to pass judgment upon them, and will destroy the impious, and will call to account all flesh for everything the sinners and the impious have done and committed against him.”⁶

These images were taught to them by the rabbis and included in their thinking and impacted their understanding. There is no canonical biblical information outside of this passage and Jude 6-7 to look to. It reads,

6: “And angels who did not keep their own domain but abandoned their proper dwelling place, *these* He has kept in eternal restraints under darkness for the judgment of the great day, 7: just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these *angels* indulged in sexual perversion and went after strange flesh, are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

This also reflects Enoch 10:1-6.

In verse 7, the word “angels” is not in the original but supplied but it does seem to be the antecedent of “angels” in verse 6.

So, this is the evidence supporting the idea that the “Sons of God” were heavenly beings or angels who had intercourse with the “daughters of men” and bore the “the mighty men of old, men of renown.” Who these are is not specified, and before the flood no candidates are suggested. However, after the flood, Genesis 10:8-9 reads,

8: “Now Cush fathered Nimrod; he became a mighty one on the earth. 9: He was a mighty hunter before the LORD; therefore, it is said, “Like Nimrod a mighty hunter before the LORD.” The word “mighty” is the same Hebrew word (*gibbor*) as in 6:4.⁷

This is speculation, of course, and not germane to the point of the narrative.

Standing in opposition to this view are Jesus’ words Himself. In answer to the question of the Sadducees in Matthew 22:23-28 regarding whose wife in the resurrection a woman (who had been married to seven men) would be, Jesus answered,

“You are mistaken, since you do not understand the Scriptures nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven.” (29-30)⁸

⁶ The Book of Enoch dates to around 200 B.C. and is excluded from both the Jewish and Western canon due to its having much mythological content and was not written by any known Old Testament author. The name of the book is spurious, though the content was interesting to the early Jews and had an obvious impact.

⁷ Also: I Chronicles 1:10. The idea of survivors after the flood is abhorrent to many, but there is biblical evidence of this as we will note. How do we handle it? That also will be dealt with in the commentary in chapters 7-9.

⁸ The sect of the Sadducees did not believe in the resurrection of the dead. So, this was a “test” question to attempt to undermine Jesus’ teachings regarding the resurrection of the dead. See also: Mark 12:25.

The word “angel” means “messenger.” “Angels” look to be unlikely to have been the “Sons of God.” Yet quotes from Enoch by Peter and Jude use the word “angel.” The Old Testament has its own word for “angel” which is “malak” and it is never used in reference to “The sons of God.” It is always used of a messenger, guard or guide. So, we are left to ponder. Could these “sons of God” be something or someone else? Outside of Enoch and quotes from him, there is no link to “angels.” Further, the references to them in both testaments are only used to teach the consequences of those who are sinful, wicked and unrighteous versus those who are righteous and virtuous in God’s sight, the point being that even these spiritual beings are not exempt from God’s judgment.

II.-III. The second and third view is that these are actually just men, either descendants of Seth or outside invaders coming into the picture.

Going back to the Genesis text in question, let's note that the “daughters of men” are introduced in verse one and in verse two we see them in conjunction with “the sons of God” - (bene Elohim).

The significance of this is that there are references to two groups of men. On the one hand we have “men” (Adam) who bore beautiful daughters, and on the other “sons of God” who took wives from among these women. These are “sons of Elohim.”

I find this significant in that as “Yahweh” (Lord) is the covenant name of God and shows relationship with those in that context (Adam). “Elohim”, God’s title or nature is not His relational “name.” So, these “sons of God” (Elohim) may not be a part of His covenant people as are the folks mentioned in chapter 5 particularly Noah and his descendants of course.

As to the descendants of Seth, we have this lineage in Genesis 5:4-7 along with the comment that he has other sons and daughters beside his son Enosh. But there is no indication of any relationship of these other sons and daughters to the “sons of God.” The entire point of this narrative is to bring us to Abraham and his descendants.⁹

Thus, the “sons of God” could be outsiders, men from outside the redemptive lineage of those we have to date in the texts prior to this chapter.

Though commentators are unsure about the nature of these “sons of God.” “They are. In my opinion, “men” and I would postulate descendants of those going before such as is mentioned in chapter four and five as “other sons and daughters” or, even as is mentioned in 10:8-12 about “Nimrod”, that he was “mighty” (the Hebrew “gibbor” the identical term used to describe Goliath).

⁹ It is vital to understand that the point of the entire book of Genesis is to affirm the truth of God’s redemptive plan for mankind. His provision for the creation of mankind from Genesis, chapter one, is a vital theme which sets the stage for the mercy and grace of God in the midst of a rebellious and disobedient humanity. For much more on this, see: www.bibleclassroom.org, “STUDIES” “topical studies” – “Secrets in the Genesis Account Few know About – Chapters 1-11 study.”

But once again, the point of these stories is to establish the reason for God to abolish mankind from his creation.

Second, the “Nephilim.”

“Nephilim.” This term is used in two places in the Bible as reproduced below. There are no other translations of the Hebrew word “Nephilim” in the Bible. This Hebrew word is only used in the two following references. Using the NASB as a base reference English translation,¹⁰

Genesis 6:4 reads,

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.”

Numbers 13:30-33 reads:

30: “Then Caleb quieted the people before Moses and said, ‘We should by all means go up and take possession of it, for we will surely overcome it.’ 31: But the men who had gone up with him said, ‘We are not able to go up against the people, for they are too strong for us.’ 32: So they gave out to the sons of Israel a bad report of the land which they had spied out, saying, ‘The land through which we have gone, in spying it out, is a land that devours its inhabitants; and all the people whom we saw in it are men of great size. 33: ‘There also we saw the Nephilim (the sons of Anak are part of the Nephilim); and we became like grasshoppers in our own sight, and so we were in their sight.’”¹¹

I will note here that the “Nephilim” are noted as existing before the “sons of God” took wives had offspring and after that as well. Further, it appears that they also are noted as being here before the flood and centuries later in the sons of Anak in Canaan during the time of Moses and Joshua.

Though some literalist conservatives would rise up in objection, we will see the scriptures stating this later on in this study. As far as the flood goes and any survivors who were not on the Ark, this of course could become a sticky issue and arguing over it would produce nothing of value. It is actually irrelevant in terms of the point of the book or this legend.

¹⁰ We must note that the NASB, like all translations, has problems.

¹¹ This comment is obviously “back-written” into the text from a future time, most likely during the times of David, Solomon and subsequent kings. It is likely that a lot of the book so far is compiled from many written sources, as well as from oral tradition.

There is no mention as to how this came to be, so speculation may be interesting, but confidence is unavailable. Genesis 6:4 could easily read, “The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and sometime after the flood they were also found to exist.” Can this be possible? We’ll see.

There are only a few clues as to what and who these folks are and what they were not. We will look at the etymology of the word and what it connotes. We will look at its relationship to the sons of Anak. We will also look at another Hebrew word “raphah” which is translated “giant” and see what else we can discover.

Verse 4 of Genesis, chapter 6 is both awkward and can be confusing due to the way it is phrased. In my opinion, these “Nephilim” were **not** the offspring of, “...the sons of God and the daughters of men.” Many scholars believe they were. Nevertheless, they existed before the “mighty men of old” were born and afterwards. They were not, in my opinion, those mighty men of old because there is no other comment that the Nephilim are to be identified with the “mighty men of old” even when they reappear in numbers 13.

Notice next that in translating the word “Nephilim” most translations do not use the word “giant” with the exception of the KJV and a few very old 16th century versions as well as a few other odd versions. Any translation worth its salt will leave it “Nephilim.” Here’s why. The exact identity of these people is somewhat sketchy, including their size.

Next, let’s look at the meaning and origin of the word used to describe the “Nephilim.” The word comes from the root “nah-phal”. This root has nuances that include: “To fall”; “falling”; “fallen”; “causing someone to fall” (depending on the stem), “throw down”; “cast down”; “lie down or prostrate” (as in prayer even) “ruin”; “overthrow”; “cause to lie down”, which transitions into “slay”; “kill”; “bring to destruction”; and so on. In the “im” ending of the word, we have a plural. Thus, the root idea in applying this to people is that they are formidable warriors. “Martin Luther gives the correct meaning, ‘tyrants:’ they were called *Nephilim* because they fell upon the people and oppressed them.”¹²

In the Numbers 13:33 reference the eight spies reported, “There also we saw the Nephilim (the sons of Anak are part of the Nephilim); and we became like grasshoppers in our own sight, and so we were in their sight.”

We have phrases like “too strong”, “devouring inhabitants”, “*great* size”. The word “*great*” is italicized in the NASB indicating it was supplied but not in the original. They cause people to be downtrodden, enslaved, dead, etc. Some think the word means that they were “fallen” people, extreme sinners etc., but this is a weak position.

They were just “men.” The Hebrew word “Nephilim” does describe “stature” or formidability”, but the word itself does not indicate “size.” But since the spies who entered the

¹² Quoted in Keil and Delitzsch, Commentary on the Old Testament, e-Sword online.

promised land (Numbers 13 – and called themselves “grasshoppers” by comparison), we can glean that these “Nephilim” (or sons of Anak) were indeed taller and bigger than average. Other passages bear that out. The average size for Israelites, or any mid-eastern or Egyptian man in those days was about five foot four to five foot six. This is a reasonably known fact.¹³ A six-footer would be quite big and both Saul and David approached that size.¹⁴

Anyway, it is quite possible, even probable that the ten spies who gave the negative report exaggerated the circumstances in Canaan to avoid being involved in conflict because they were simply cowards who did not trust in God. They said, “We are not able to go up against the people, for they are too strong for us.” So they gave out to the sons of Israel a negative report of the land which they had spied out, saying, ‘The land through which we have gone, in spying it out, is a land that devours its inhabitants; and all the people whom we saw in it are men of *great* stature.’” Again, the word “*great*” is supplied by the translators in Numbers 13:31-32. Joshua and Caleb had no such apprehensions.

We also have these peoples in Numbers, called “The sons of Anak”. Let’s get a closer look at these people and then go back to Genesis. Anak is a Canaanite word meaning “neck” or “neck chain”. These were people “of the neck”. They were also called “Emim” (“a terror”) and Rephaim” (from the same root [raphah] - “giant”) but more often, “great and tall.”

Apparently, these people “of the neck” were known for binding a chain around the necks of a prisoners and dragging them into slavery. The neck chain is a mark of slavery. Perhaps the idea of “devouring the people” comes from this. The plural is “Anakim” and also found in Deuteronomy 1:28; 2:10, 11; 21; 9:2; and Joshua 11:21-22; 14:12-15. Anak is further referenced in: Numbers 13:22, 28, 33; Joshua 15:13-14; 21:11; and Judges 1:20. You might add any references to Rephaim and Emim as well.¹⁵ All of the names for these tall people seem to be related to the “sons of Anak” who are connected to the Nephilim. Both are mentioned in Genesis 14:5 where the story of Abraham’s defeat of Chedorlaomer took place when this king kidnapped Lot.

Their habitat was primarily the Gaza strip (or territory) extending from the Mediterranean Sea east to Hebron. The Philistines (from whom we get the word “Palestine”) seemed to have come from Greece or one of the Greek islands and dwelt in Palestine by the time of Abraham (c. 2000 B.C.). The Anakim may also be related to these people as they also were in the land

¹³ From the descriptions in I Samuel of Saul and David and the recovery of buried people from that time.

¹⁴ Goliath was even larger. And, contrary to popular belief, David was a big man when he slew Goliath, probably between 26 and 30 plus years of age, bearded, arrogant and a very skilled killer already. This is quite easily demonstrated from a careful examination of the book of I Samuel, chapter 17 and onward. He also liked the idea of a monetary reward, a woman, and tax-free family land holdings. Speaking of Goliath as a descendant of these “Nephilim,” he was likely close to seven feet tall give or take. Personally, I think a tall six to mid-seven-footer. A “cubit”, though often thought of as 18”, is smaller when one takes into consideration the actual size of the people then and there. We are not talking 20th century Americans here. A cubit is more like 13-15 inches at best in ancient perspective. So, Goliath, at six cubits and a span would be roughly seven feet tall. Could he have approached eight feet? At the very outside, but I doubt it. Nine? Please. For a detailed study on this, please see my website: www.bibleclassroom.org, controversial topic XI.

¹⁵ Reading these references will begin to give you a better idea about these people. Please do so at your convenience.

by then. They are mentioned as enemies of Egypt in the general Abrahamic era.

(Note: Numbers 13:22) Othniel, the son of Caleb (and the first judge) drove these people out of the land. They retreated to Gaza, Gath and Ashdod. Goliath was from Gath (a “Gittite”). His whole family was big. But it seems that everyone who battled them won. The Bible describes them as “great, numerous, and tall” repeatedly.

Returning to Genesis 6, there exists a reference to the “Nephilim” prior to the flood, and then it says, “and afterwards”, referring to the time before and after “the sons of God took the daughters of men as wives, but possibly before and after the flood as we see them referred to in the time of Moses and Joshua as extant in Canaan. There are references to the “Anakim” during the time of Abraham onward, and even several hundreds of years during and after Israel conquered Palestine as we saw.¹⁶ The point is that the author of Genesis 6 referred to the “Nephilim” as being “on the earth in those days” suggesting that he knew of their existence in more recent history and placed an editorial comment in the text.

So, aligning the “Nephilim” with “Anak” is a probable conclusion especially given Numbers 13:33. Interestingly, there is a tie in the names given to these two peoples. The Anakim were also called “Rephaim” as we saw above. The root of this word is the same as for “giant” and the word “Nephilim” is used to describe the “Anakim” in Numbers 13. The actual word for “giant” or “giants” is the word “raphah”. It is translated “giant” only in II Samuel 21:16,18,20,22; and “giants” only in I Chronicles 20:4,6,8. These references are worth reading! Note the relationship to the past and to Goliath. Both accounts relate the same events, but the references are interesting as they differ, one referencing “the giant” - Goliath and the other the “giants”.

Now, back to the Genesis reference. 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.” I reproduced the Hebrew of Genesis 6:4 below for a reference.

הנפילים היו בארץ בימים ההם וגם אחרי־כן אשר יבאו בני האלהים אל־בנות האדם וילדו להם המה
הגברים אשר מעולם אנשי השם:

The sentence is indeed awkward. What it does not say is that these “Nephilim” had anything to do with the “sons of God” or the “daughters of men” or the offspring of these two groups. Why mention them? To lay the foundation for the conflict between peoples, namely the “Nephilim” and the children of the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men” who became the “mighty men of old, men of renown” and the subsequent total depravity of mankind prompting God to eradicate the wicked from His creation – except for Noah and his family.

¹⁶ Note: Deuteronomy 1:23-31; 2:9-11; 2:14-22; 9:1-3; Joshua 11:21-23; 14:6-15; Judges 1:20.

There seems to be some need to explain the origin of these “Nephilim.” But there is none. They are noted as just being in existence at that time and “afterwards.”

In a related thought, research draws the conclusion that the Torah and subsequent books were actually formalized and compiled into written documents (complete scrolls) during the time of the kings of Judah after David, i.e., during the first temple era. Within these documents is ample evidence of this (not necessarily the time frame - which take more work to establish - but later editorializing) easily spotted if one simply begins to look up phrases in Genesis and other books such as “to this day” and the like. Quick examples – Genesis 19:37-38; 22:14 etc. These are dozens of these types of phrases in the O.T.

In fact, the note in Genesis 4:22, “As for Zillah, she also gave birth to Tubal-cain, *the forger of all implements of bronze and iron*; and the sister of Tubal-cain was Naamah” places the writing after 1,200 B.C.E. the beginning of the iron age, and so concurrent with the time frame mentioned.

Just spotting this alone can help in pinning down dates of Biblical events such as the Exodus, conquest of Canaan and so on. So, these editorial “intrusions” were to help the current reader understand the “what’s” of the past. So, if one accepts the “Temple” era as the “compiling scenario,” our text (6:4) makes a whole lot of sense.

However, let’s make a further observation. Genesis 6:1-4 could be totally left out of the narrative and there would be no interruption in the narrative. The chapter could simply pick up in verse 5 and go on and we would be none the wiser. The reason for this inclusion seems to be for laying the foundation for the necessity of the flood by pointing out that the wickedness of men was aided by the descriptions in verses 1-2 and 4-5. Looking at the entire immediate context we read,

Genesis 6:1-8,

1: “Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, 2: that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. 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.’ 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. 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. 6: The LORD was sorry that He had made man on the earth, and He was grieved in His heart. 7: The LORD said, ‘I will blot out man whom I have created from

the face of the land, from man to animals to creeping things and to birds of the sky; for I am sorry that I have made them.’ 8: But Noah found favor in the eyes of the LORD.”

Does the inclusion of this explanation (verses 1-2; 4-5) add any reason for the decision for the flood? It could be argued both ways effectively. The key comment is found in verses 5 and 6. The word “then” is not a good translation (in fact it is not even close) as it suggests that this verse is based on the previous passages. The Hebrew is, “The Lord (Yahweh) “saw” the wickedness...” “Wickedness” had been developing and increasing and threatened to derail God’s plan of redemption for all mankind. This was something He did not permit until His plan was fulfilled in Jesus the Messiah.

It seems fair to state that man’s (Adam’s – man’s) wickedness caused the Lord great sorrow and He realized that a redemptive work could not be completed through the existing population - man, whose life is sustained by God’s breath - (“ruah” or spirit – Genesis 2:7) - but of the flesh, nevertheless, must be destroyed. The 120 years is not the span of a man’s life, but the amount of time God will give man until the destruction of the flood, presumably to repent.¹⁷

In conclusion, the point of the book of Genesis so far is to present the true God, the creator, who made man in His own image giving man dominion over the creation God prepared for us. Knowing in advance what would occur, God had prepared a plan of redemption to any and all who would call upon His name in faith and trust.

A major theme is that God has prepared the way for people in advance of their arrival. This theme is repeated from Genesis, chapter 1 to Revelation, chapter 22. His grace and mercy, as well as reaching out to and calling to mankind is evident all through the scriptures. But few call out to Him. From the beginning of Genesis chapter 1 to the end of chapter 4 not one person called out to the Lord. Yet he showed His mercy, gave instructions of life and humanity disregarded His voice and word.

This story is still the same this very day, and His judgment will fall one day just as Jesus said,

“But about that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father alone. For the coming of the Son of Man will be just like the days of Noah. For as in those days before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered the ark, and they did not understand until the flood came and took them all away; so will the coming of the Son of Man be.” Matthew 24:36-39

¹⁷ Frankly, this passage, the longer I study and read it, looks to be the blending of at least two documents or traditions. There is no question that this happened in the Book of Genesis, in fact in much of the Pentateuch, as Genesis 1:1-2:3 to 2:4 ff. demonstrates clearly in the Hebrew. You might not like this idea, but there it is anyway.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

Scripture passages reproduced in this study are from the New American Standard Bible unless otherwise noted. The NASB, Zondervan Corporation, 1999, The Lockman Foundation. (Note: The asterisk normally indicating the historical present tense has been eliminated to avoid confusion in terms of footnotes).

The Anchor Bible, Volume 1, “Genesis”, E.A. Speiser, Doubleday & Co. Garden city, N. Y., 1972

Biblia Hebraica, Rudolph Kittle, Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, Germany, 1962

The Expositor’s Greek Testament – Volume 5, II Peter, R. H. Strachan, Jude, J. B. Mayor, Eerdmans, 1961

The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible, Volume 12, II Peter, Jude, Albert E. Barnett, – Abingdon, 1962

Lecture on line: “Were the ‘sons of God’ fallen angels, who are the Nephilim?” Dr. Peter Gentry, Professor of Old Testament interpretation, Southern Seminary.

The NASB, Zondervan Corporation, 1999, The Lockman Foundation, Genesis comments by: Ronald Youngblood, II Peter and Jude by: Donald W. Burdick.

Word Biblical Commentary, volume 1, Gordon J. Wenham, Word Books, 1987

E-sword.net: Smith’s Bible Dictionary; Jamieson, Fausset and Brown Commentary; Albert Barnes notes on the Bible; Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the Bible; Vincent’s Word Studies; Keil & Delitzsch Commentary on the Old Testament.