

## The mystery of the 'sons of God' Part 1

The Bible mentions a mysterious race of beings identified only as 'the sons of God' in the book of [Genesis](#) and in the book of Job. These **'sons of God'** mated with the **'daughters of men'** (the children of Adam) who produced offspring that ruled the antediluvian world; they were the power brokers, the elite of that day, heroes, men of renown, men of fame and came to be looked upon as 'gods' not just mere mortals. Who were these mysterious creatures that seem to have been superhuman yet were motivated by very human desires and lusts. The identity of these **'sons of God'** mentioned in the Bible has been a source of much controversy for the past three millennia. There are two main hypotheses that are forwarded to try and identify them.

- The **'sons of God'** were men who had descended from Adam's son Seth. According to this theory the daughters of men with whom the **'sons of God'** mated were the daughters of Cain (Adam's first son) and the **'sons of God'** were the male descendants of Seth, who was Cain's younger brother. However the Bible makes no distinction at all between Seth's descendants and Cain's; it would appear that they were all equally wicked with the sole exception of Enoch and Noah in the days before the flood. So the argument that Seth's sons were righteous and Cain's daughters evil does not hold any water.
- The more widely accepted view these days is that the **'sons of God'** were fallen angels. This interpretation is based on equating the prophet Isaiah's account of the fall of Lucifer as detailed in the book of [Isaiah, chapter 14](#) with the sins of Sodom as described in the New Testament book of [Jude](#). This would mean that angels are capable of procreation, that angels are called 'sons' in the Bible, and that angels can be tempted in much the same way as humans. This too is a fallacious argument and will be proven as such.

There is a third possibility that I have never heard presented and I am baffled as to the reason why. According to my understanding of the Bible, the **'sons of God'** were flesh and blood humans but they were not descended from Adam. They were a race of humans that were genetically compatible with the race of man or the race of Adam on Earth. They came to Earth from other planets, almost certainly from within our own solar system, in the days before the flood, and perhaps after the flood as well. In all likelihood they were created in Heaven at the time of the beginning of creation, and from Heaven they were transplanted to Earth, and from Earth they spread across the galaxies. They are not angels, fallen or otherwise or ethereal spirit beings of any kind, they are very much flesh and blood beings, genetically compatible with Adam and his children, even though they are not descended from him. My extensive studies on this controversial subject have led me to draw the following conclusions:

- **'Sons of God'** are not angels or ethereal spirit beings.
- In the Bible the title **'SON'** has never been given to any angel. Biblically speaking the title 'SON' may only be applied to corporeal flesh and body creatures not spirits.
- **'Sons of God'** of Genesis and Job are humans not descended from Adam, they are not Adamkind; they are not the descendants of Adam and Eve. The Bible also indentifies them as 'man' or mankind and 'sons of men' not just **'sons of God'**.
- **'Sons of God'** or non Earthly humans have inhabited, and may continue to inhabit untold number of planets throughout the galaxy and possibly our own solar system (the Martians **may be** human after all rather than little green men.)

The term **'sons of God'** is used in the Old Testament a total number of 5 times, twice in chapter of [Genesis](#) and thrice in the book of Job. What these scriptures make evident is that the **'sons of God'** had some characteristics that were common with man, meaning Adam and his children, and some that would seem to be common with angelic or ethereal beings. The [Genesis](#) account of the **'sons of God'** would seem to indicate that they were flesh and blood corporeal beings. The Job account on the other hand would seem to suggest that they were ethereal heavenly beings. I refer to them in the past tense in the context of the references to them in [Genesis](#) and [Job](#) but this does not mean that they are

now extinct; I believe they are to be found in the Universe in numbers greater than we can comprehend. The following scriptures from the book of [Genesis](#) and Job refer to the **'sons of God'**.

[Genesis 6:2](#) And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, <sup>2</sup>That the **'sons of God'** saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. <sup>3</sup>And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years. <sup>4</sup>There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the **'sons of God'** came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown.

[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 2:1](#) Again there was a day when the **'sons of God'** came to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan came also among them to present himself before the LORD.

[Job 38:7](#) When the morning stars sang together, and all the **'sons of God'** shouted for joy?

These few references to the **'sons of God'** in the Bible nevertheless give us valuable clues as to their origin, their desires, their motivations and also the nature of their being, whether they were corporeal creatures or spirit beings. When comparing the book of [Genesis](#) account to the book of Job account, we notice some obvious differences.

#### **Book of [Genesis](#) suggests that the **'sons of God'** were corporeal beings, flesh and blood humans**

- Men, flesh and blood mortal men, were multiplying on the face of the earth. It would appear that only when mankind had increased in sufficient numbers and started building a civilization that they caught the attention of the **'sons of God'**. It also appears that the **'sons of God'** came to Earth because they were attracted to the beauty of the 'daughters of men', earthly women, so all the interaction between the **'sons of God'** and Adam's descendants seems to have taken place on the earth not in the heavens. As an aside the fact that the **'sons of God'** found the daughters of men to be fair or strikingly beautiful should not come as a surprise because they were the children of Adam and Eve, who were both formed by God's own hands. Eve was probably the most beautiful women ever on Earth and her daughters must have been gorgeous, so no wonder that the **'sons of God'** found them irresistibly attractive.
- The **'sons of God'** saw the daughters of men on earth and found them to be fair, meaning beautiful; this would indicate that their passions were very human; they were moved by the sight of what they saw. ([1 John 2:16](#) For all that is in the world, 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.)
- They took wives, which would again indicate that they desire the same things that humans desire, to marry, and to have children and families. It does not appear that they came merely to have relations with these beautiful women and then leave to go back to wherever they came from; they seem to have made homes and settled right here on earth. Though this seems to have been the rule, mythological accounts would also suggest that the children of Adam have had interaction with other humans, not of their race that did not necessarily dwell on Earth all the time but traveled back and forth through the heavens.
- In [verse 3 of chapter 6 of the book of Genesis](#), there is a cryptic observation that the LORD God made stating that **man also is flesh** indicating that there was a creature other than man that was flesh present on earth at that time. In context, that verse of scripture can only be referring to the **"sons of God"**. [Genesis 6:3](#) And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, **for that he also is flesh**: ...

- The **'sons of God'** and daughters of men had children together; very much as countless couples do today, there is no indication that this was somehow a supernatural or cross species act; it seems to have been a result of two creatures of the same species mating very naturally as genetically compatible species do, and having offspring. [Genesis 6:4](#) ...when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men...this is a very straightforward description of an act described many times in the Bible as occurring between a male and female of the same species.
- The offspring of this union are identified in the Bible as **'men'** not as giants, hybrids, angels or any other creature, simply as men, even though they became famous men, these children were still men or mankind, not any other kind. [Genesis 6:4](#)...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.

So for these reasons it would seem that these creatures were very much like mankind, they were genetically compatible and seem to have had a relationship with ordinary women as easily as an Caucasian man would be able to have a relationship with an oriental woman although they are two different races. Thus the Genesis account seems very much to prove that the **'sons of God'** were humans not angels or any other species. They seem to have been a race of humans other than the race of Adam but seem to be human nonetheless.

### **Book of Job suggests that the 'sons of God' were ethereal beings, angelic spirits**

In [Job chapter 1](#) and [2](#) the **'sons of God'** had access to the LORD God, and though the Bible does not specify the exact location, it would seem that their appearance before the LORD was in God's dwelling place, the Heaven of heavens. So they had the means to travel up to the heavens, were capable of space travel, and this would suggest that they were ethereal beings. The Genesis account too would tend to suggest that the **'sons of God'** did not originate on Earth, so they must have arrived from somewhere out there, and therefore they had the means to travel through space, whether they were humans or angelic beings.

The [Job 38:7](#) reference to **'sons of God'** depicts them as being in Heaven, shouting for joy at the time of the laying of the foundation of the earth. This would prove that the **'sons of God'** were created even before the earth was created, and therefore they could not have been the children of Adam who came much later. The fact that their origin predated evens that of the Earth and the fact that they were in Heaven with God witnessing the formation of the planet would imply that they were angelic ethereal creatures, assuming that all the inhabitants of the heavens are angelic spirit beings. This assumption implies that the only place with corporeal life in the Universe is the Earth; an assumption I believe is not supported by the Bible.

Therefore comparing the Genesis and Job accounts would prove one fact beyond doubt; the **'sons of God'** were both in Heaven and on the Earth; they had the means and the technology to travel through space. While the Genesis account strongly suggests that they were humans, it is unclear from the Job account whether they were angels or humans. As previously mentioned, the interpretation that they were angels is based on the assumption that corporeal life is to be found just on the Earth, and in none of the other countless planets out there. It would seem that we need some more evidence to determine whether the **'sons of God'** were angels or humans.

### **Does the term 'sons of God' refer to celestial angelic beings or to terrestrial flesh and blood humans?**

In the Bible the terms 'son of God' or **'sons of God'** seem very much to refer to corporeal creatures rather than **angels** or other divine beings such as the **'watchers'** mentioned by the prophet Daniel in Daniel 4:17. Job 38:7 is frequently quoted to try and prove that the Bible actually equates the term **'sons of God'** with angels. In the King James Version of the Bible [Job 38:7](#) is written as follows: 'When the morning stars sang **together, and** all the **'sons of God'** shouted for joy?' However, in most instances where the interpretation is desired that the **'sons of God'** were angels, this scripture

is quoted as follows: 'When the morning stars sang **together (NO COMMA) and** all the **'sons of God'** shouted for joy?' At a glance there seems to be no difference between the King James rendering of this verse, and these other versions of the same except for a simple **comma (,)** placed by the KJV translators between the two groups identified in this verse, **THE MORNING STARS, and THE 'SONS OF GOD'** . What this little simple comma does is to separate the **'morning stars'** singing together and all the **'sons of God'** shouting for joy as independent clauses, and therefore referring to two different groups of beings not the same group with different names.

However by removing the comma and writing this scripture as follows, the meaning can be changed: 'When the morning stars sang together and all the **'sons of God'** shouted for joy?' Without the comma (,) between the morning stars and the **'sons of God'**, it could mean that the morning stars and the **'sons of God'** are one and the same. This is how most scholars arrive at the conclusion that *the 'sons of God' who shout for joy are also identified as "morning stars" who "sang together."* No, the Bible does not identify the **'sons of God'** as the morning stars. 'Stars' in the Bible are identified with angels but not the **'sons of God'**. [Revelation 1:20](#) The mystery of the seven stars which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks. **The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches...** So if the reference in Job 38 to 'morning stars' means angels does it then mean that the **'sons of God'** are also angels?

The word **'SON'** is never applied to angels in the Bible. As a matter of fact [Hebrews 1:5](#) tells us that no angel has ever been identified in the Bible as a son! "For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?" God chose to incarnate in the form of man, and His family of begotten sons have all arisen from mankind, beginning with Jesus after his resurrection, therefore it stands to reason that the angels are not called his sons because though they are his creatures, they are not His offspring, they are not born of His Seed. [Hebrews 1:7](#) calls angels his ministers, meaning servants. "And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire." The writer of Hebrews made a distinction between Moses and Jesus, expounding that Moses as a servant did not have the same position or inheritance as Jesus; this same distinction is very much applicable to angels and Jesus, they are servants, not heirs of God. They may be higher in the hierarchy of creation than flesh and blood man but they are not going to be inheriting God's Kingdom and therefore cannot be his sons. These are doctrinal issues that people do not consider when they insist upon identifying the **'sons of God'** as angels.

There are yet more problems with identifying the **'sons of God'** as angels. It is commonly taught that the cause of the fall of the angels was their lust for human women with whom they wished to cohabit rather than in the heavenly realms. The Bible teaches that temptations are specific to individual species.

- [1 Corinthians 10:13](#): There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man... *So there are temptations that are common to man but does this mean that they are the same temptations that are common to angels?*
- [Psalm 8:5](#): For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels...*man has been made lower than the angels.*
- [2 Peter 2:11](#): Whereas angels, which are greater in power and might...according to the apostle Peter angels are greater in power and might than man. *Therefore it is not reasonable that the temptations of man and angels would be the same. We know that the 'sons of God' were easily tempted by the sight of beautiful women, and lust of the eyes is very much a human temptation, but is it necessarily an angelic temptation?*
- [1 John 2:16](#) For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the **lust of the eyes...lust of the flesh, lust of the eyes we are told are in this world, which is a world of corporeal flesh and blood world creatures. Do the lusts of this world also entice angels who are not of this world but belong to a higher domain?**

It has often been taught that the book of [Jude](#) tells us that the sin of the angels was the same as the sin of Sodom, that it was a sexual sin. If angels are like humans, then it is believable that their sin could have been of a sexual nature but if they are far greater in power and might than mankind, would they really have left their **'First Estate'** merely for the sake of having sex with women? It is not difficult to believe that a man would risk everything for a beautiful woman as Samson did for Delilah, as David did for Bathsheba, but would angels do the same? Let me quote [Jude verses 6 and 7](#) and show how disingenuous it is to equate the 'angels leaving their first estate' with the Sodomites going 'after strange flesh'.

[Jude: 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. [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.

First of all these are two different sentences and what is common between them is the doctrine of judgment not of the particular sin which brought judgment upon these two groups. [Jude](#) is telling us that no matter what the sin, judgment will come, whether it is angels that sin or human beings. **'Everlasting chains'** and **'eternal fire'**, both of which are judgments is what is common between these two verses. Yet I have heard numerous so – called scholars claim time and time again that what is common between these verses is the type of sin, not the judgment. They say that the sin of the angels, leaving their first estate, and the sin of Sodom, giving themselves over to fornication and going after strange flesh are the same.

Neither Jude nor Peter claimed that the sin of the angels and that of the Sodomite humans was the same, merely that judgment always results from sin, regardless of the type of sin. The angels kept not their first estate; they did not go after strange flesh. **The word 'Estate' in Jude means 'Principality', it means 'Rule'**; these angels were princes and rulers not just over small territories, they ruled planets and star systems and galaxies. We know that the **'sons of God'** acted very much like humans, they saw beautiful women, they lusted after them, they married them, they had children with them, their desires and ambitions seem to be very mundane compared to that of the angels who were of a much higher order, of greater power and might. So does the Bible really teach that the angels sinned the same way in which humans do, in the way that the **'sons of God'** did? So what were the sins of the angels for which they were willing to give up their First Estate, their own principalities, give up their own thrones? Was it for a creature lower than they were or did they set their sights much higher?

To be continued in part 2