

THE FALLEN ANGELS  
AND  
THE HEROES OF MYTHOLOGY,  
THE SAME WITH  
"THE SONS OF GOD" AND "THE MIGHTY MEN"  
OF  
THE SIXTH CHAPTER OF THE FIRST BOOK OF MOSES.

BY THE  
REV. JOHN FLEMING, A.B.  
INCUMBENT OF VENTRY AND KILDRUM, DIOCESE OF ARDFERT; RURAL DEAN;  
AND IRISH SOCIETY'S MISSIONARY.



DUBLIN :  
HODGES, FOSTER, AND FIGGIS,  
PUBLISHERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

1879.

**Editor's note: This document was acquired from the New College Library, Edinburgh. It was scanned, edited and made available by Arthur McBryan. Please email me at the address below for any correction, advice or comment.**

[arthur@mcbryan.co.uk](mailto:arthur@mcbryan.co.uk)

This page is left intentionally blank

## PREFACE.

THE passage of Holy Scripture which the writer of the following pages endeavours to elucidate. is one on which a large amount of labour has been expended. and no inconsiderable share of learning and ingenuity employed. By Biblical interpreters. in ancient. mediaeval. and modern times, in order to ascertain and exhibit its meaning. From the commencement of our era. at least. no century has elapsed in which it has not, in some shape, been explained or commented on. Jewish and Christian theologians, in the east and in the west, have offered, in the form of commentary, or paraphrase, or translation, interpretations of the passage, according to their respective views: while writers of history, in the middle ages, have embodied, in their works, a widely received version of the brief narrative which it contains. The opinions which have been propounded on the subject, are, as might be expected, various: and the languages in which these have been expressed. are many — Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic. Greek, Latin. German, French, and English, being included in the number. The view which the present writer adopts, from a full conviction that it is the only admissible one, has been deemed not merely absurd, but impious and heretical. and is still regarded by many as, at the least, fanciful, and by some, it is

**PREFACE.**

to be believed, with a feeling of aversion so strong, that they avoid even an allusion to it, no doubt, lest they should appear to give it even a small measure of countenance.

The opinions entertained, respecting the meaning of the passage, by Jewish and Christian writers, in ancient and mediaeval times, as well as by the principal modern commentators are noticed in the following pages. The ablest treatise on the subject, and the most exhaustive of it, with which the writer is acquainted, is that by John Henry Kurtz, D.D., Professor of Theology at Dorpat, entitled, "Die Ehen der Söhne Gottes mit den Töchtern der Menschen;" Berlin, 1857. 8vo., pp. 100 — and advocating, for the most part, views similar to those here advanced. Dr. Kurtz's book was written in reply to an essay by Professor Dr. G. F. Keil, bearing a somewhat similar title,\* but assailing the opinions already propounded on the subject by the former in his History of the Old Covenant, and contending for a different interpretation of the passage. Dr. Keil's treatise appeared in the "Zeitschrift für die lutherische Theologie und Kirche," 1855, pp. 220 — 56: and of its author, Dr. Kurtz says that, "Of all the supporters of his (Keil's) view, there is not one who has treated the subject so thoroughly and comprehensively — has brought to the investigation of it so much diligence, acuteness, and learning — has so carefully arranged and exhibited the arguments which may be advanced in its favour, and has endeavoured with so much earnestness and so much appearance of success, to overthrow those which are brought forward on the opposite side." These two divines may be regarded as able representatives of

---

\* "*Die Ehen der Kinder Gottes mit den Töchtern der Menschen,*" u.s.w.

## PREFACE.

the holders of their respective views: and, indeed, had an English translation of Professor Kurtz's book appeared, there would be little pretext for the present 'publication, although differing considerably from it, as well in point of matter, as in the arrangement and treatment of the several parts of the subject. Dr. Keil has, besides, devoted to the examination of the passage a section of twelve pages (127 — 139) in his Commentary on the Pentateuch, a work which has been translated into English, and forms three volumes of that valuable and important series, the Foreign Theological Library of Messrs. T. & T. Clark.

Of the works mentioned, and especially of Kurtz's "Die Ehen," &c.. much use has been made, as well as. of Maitland's Essay on "False Worship," (Lond. 1856.) and that on "The Fallen Angels" in the collection entitled *Eruvin*. (Lond.1831.) To the "Daily Bible Illustrations" of Dr. Kitto the writer is also under obligation: other writers are named below, and throughout the essay.

Should any regard the subject of this book as one of no practical value, and be disposed to ask, What profit is to be derived from its discussion? it might be sufficient perhaps to quote, in reply to the following words of a writer already named, who has anticipated and answered the question — " Some reader," says Dr. Maitland, "may say (for I often hear such language, and never without pain and pity), 'What does it matter to us which opinion is right? Of what use would it be to us to know when, and why, and how, the angels fell? Is it not a curious, speculative question, and will not one opinion do quite as well as another?' Such persons I am not anxious to answer in detail: being persuaded in my own mind. that it is an important duty to get rid of error, as much

**PREFACE.**

as we can, on all subjects, and especially of all error which has fastened on the Word of God : and that he who attempts to explain *any* verse of the Bible, which has been misunderstood, or to illustrate *any* fact of revelation, which has been misconceived, is well and usefully employed. The objector would, perhaps, see the nature of his objection in its real light, if he were to say distinctly (as he does impliedly), What was the use of revealing this or that? we could have done well enough without knowing it. In fact, we are so well without that knowledge, that when it is offered to us, we do not see it worth while to trouble ourselves about it."

It may be added to this, that if the occurrence related in this passage of Scripture were, as all are agreed, the cause which ultimately led to the most tremendous judgment with which this world has been visited, little argument is needed to show the propriety of inquiring into the real nature of such an occurrence. To this point the reader's attention will be directed. And if, while thus occupying no unimportant place in the Bible history, this passage of Scripture further serves, when rightly interpreted, and viewed in connexion with other Scriptures, to throw light upon the relations, and yet with distinction, which subsist between the angelic and human worlds — if it helps to explain a portion of the pagan mythology — if it contains a solemn warning against sins of the flesh and reminds the reader of the awful punishment with which, more than once, such sins have been visited and finally, if it tends to impress the members of one sex with a sense of the duty inculcated in Prov. vi. 25, and Matt. v. 28 — to remind those of another sex of the importance of attending to the apostolic admonition, 1 Tim. ii. 9 ; and that, to use the words of the ablest writer on the subject,

## PREFACE.

not only in the presence of man, but even where no man's eye may penetrate to enforce, in the case of both the lessons which may be learned from such portions of Holy Writ, as Genesis xxxix, 2 Samuel xi., and, it may be added, Mark vi. 17-28 — then, it is not easy to see, how an inquiry into the true meaning of the passage can be a profitless one, or how the general description of the Sacred writings given by St. Paul can be inapplicable to it, " All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."

---

It is proper to note here that the following works are generally referred to by the names of their respective authors, with page or section, viz. :- F. Delitzsch, *Commentar über Die Genesis*, Leipzig, 1872; Dr. M. Drechsler, *Die Einheit und Aechtheit der Genesis*, Hamburg, 1838; C. W. E. Nägelsbach, *Der Gottmensch*, I. Band - *Der Mensch der Natur*. Nurnberg, 1853; Dr. John Richers, *Die Schöpfungs - Paradieses- und Sündfluthgeschichte*, Leipzig, 1854; J. C. I Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung im alten und im Neuen Testamente*, Nordlingen, 1841; Havernick, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (transl. Clarks' Foreign Theological Library), 1852; Subrector E. H. Engelhardt, *Die Ehen der Kinder Gottes mit den Töchtern der Menschen*, Gen. vi. 1- 4 in the *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie, &c.*, 1856, P 401 - 412; also the treatises, *Die Ehen, &c.*, by Professors Kurtz and Keil, above referred to. References to Dr. Keil's Commentary on the Pentateuch (*Keil. Pent.*) are to Vol. 1. only.

**CORRIGENDA.**

---

Page 47, line 16 from above, *for* (Euty chius and Bar - Hebraeus), *read*  
(Euty chius, Syncellus, and the writers quoted by Kurtz).

Page 148, line 15 from below, *after* him, and line 16 from below, *after* he, insert (sic).

# CONTENTS

Section	INTRODUCTION	Page
I. -	The Greek Mythology – Gen vi. 1 – 4 Demigods and Heroes	1
II. -	Interpretations of the terms Bne – Elohim and Bnoth – Adam	9
CHAPTER I.		
THE FILII MAGNATUM OR JEWISH INTERPRETATION.		
III.-	Bne-Elohim=Men of Rank. Bnoth-Adam=Poor Women. Improbabilities involved in this View.	12
IV.-	Supporters of this Interpretation	25
V.-	Mendelssohn's View.	30
CHAPTER II		
THE SETHITE – INTERPRETATION		
VI.-	General View – Supporters of the Interpretation - Causes of its adoption	33
VII.-	Suppositions and Assumptions in support of this view Cainites and Sethites – Their moral and religious character	48
VIII.-	Rendering of Genesis iv. 26 (last clause)	57
IX.-	Bne-ha-Elohim, not pious men, but angels	64
X.-	The Antithesis, “Sons of God” – “Daughters of Men”	72
XI.-	Improbabilities involved in this view	77
CHAPTER III.		
THE ANGEL-INTERPRETATION.		
XII.-	Alleged Impossibility	80
XIII.-	Declaration of Christ, Matt. xxii. 30. - Objection from the supposed Immaterial Nature of Angels	86
XIV.-	The Nephilim and the Gibborim	96
XV.-	Who were the Nephilim?	100
XVI.-	Gigantic Races - Report of the Spies (Num. xiii.)	110
CHAPTER IV.		
THE ANGEL-INTERPRETATION (Continued.)		
XVII.-	Probable period of the Descent of the Angels to Earth Whence the necessity for the Deluge?	121
XVIII.-	Supporters of the Angel-Interpretation. (Ancient Jewish) .	133
XIX.-	Supporters of the Angel-Interpretation. (The Fathers, etc.)	147
XX.-	Demons	159
XXI.-	S. Peter and S. Jude	169
NOTES		179

**THE FALLEN ANGELS**  
**AND**  
**THE HEROES OF MYTHOLOGY.**

**INTRODUCTION.**

§ I. - THE GREEK MYTHOLOGY - GEN. VI. 1-4- DEMIGODS AND HEROES.

THE scientific study of mythology has engaged the attention of learned men in ancient and modern times, and, as the question of the origin of its various legends affords room for speculation, more than one theory has been advanced, and more than one method of mythical interpretation introduced, with a view to supplying a solution of it. Some distinguished scholars, in modern times, have been disposed to refer the heathen mythology to a corruption of Old Testament history and doctrine, and to find in the patriarchs the first gods of the Pagan world. Mythologists of this class, amongst whom may be named, as occupying a prominent place, Bochart (*Phaleg and Canaan*), Huetius (*Demonstratio Evangelica*), Gerard John Voss (*De Orig. ac Progr. Idol lib. 1.*), and, of English writers, the learned Jacob Bryant and G. S. Faber, have sought to connect the sacred persons and legends of the heathen with persons, events, and institutions belonging to the early ages of the world-the knowledge of these having been derived by the Gentile nations, either from intercourse with the Israelites, or from access which they may have had to the Old Testament Scriptures, or, perhaps in very many instances, from

traditions, variously corrupted and obscured, preserved from the first amongst the nations - the true history of these persons and events having been committed to writing at a period comparatively late, and being now contained in the earlier portion of the Sacred Volume. "Idolatry," says Mr. Faber, "was a gradual corruption of Patriarchism: whence it seems necessarily to follow that, with due allowance for apostatic perversions, the great outlines of the latter were really the great outlines of the former. Such being the case, Pagan Idolatry will be Noëtic Patriarchism in grotesque masquerade; and from the distorted features of the one, we may collect, with tolerable accuracy, the genuine features of the other. In prosecuting this inquiry, Scripture will be of prime importance to us: for there only have we any authentic information respecting the nature of uncorrupted Patriarchism." To the same effect, Mr. Bryant writes in the preface (p. xiii) to his elaborate and learned *Analysis of Ancient Mythology*:- "In the prosecution of my system," he says, "I shall endeavour particularly to compare sacred history with profane, and prove the general assent of mankind to the wonderful events recorded. My purpose is to divest mythology of every foreign and unmeaning ornament, and to display the truth in its native simplicity; to show that all the rites and mysteries of the Gentiles were only so many memorials of their principal ancestors, and of the great occurrences to which they had been witnesses. Among these memorials, the chief were the ruin of mankind by a flood, and the renewal of the world in one family. They had symbolical representations by which these occurrences were commemorated, and the ancient hymns in their temples were to the same purpose. They all related to the history of the first ages, and to the same events which are recorded by Moses." The patriarch Noah is the principal personage in the mythological system of Bryant. "The history of Noah," he writes, "has been recorded by the ancients through their whole theology, but has been obscured by the many names and characters given him. He is Thoth, Hermes, Menes, Osiris, Atlas, Prometheus: his history is found in the mythology of Janus, Saturn Poseidon. All the mysteries of the Gentile world seem to have been memorials of the Deluge, and of the events which

immediately succeeded.\* The same writer adds that, although the Deluge was the grand epoch to which the nations referred the highest point to which they were able to ascend - yet that, in the rites and mysteries of the Gentiles, traces may be discerned of the antediluvian system, although these are obscure and few. Accordingly, these mythologists recognise, in the deities of the Greek or other mythologies, some of those remarkable persons who appear in the Mosaic and some other sacred writings. In Adam, and again in Noah, they see Saturn; in Jubal, Apollo; In Tubal-Cain, Vulcan; and in his sister, Naamah, Venus or Minerva. Ham is identified with Jupiter Ammon; Nimrod with Mars; Moses with Osiris and Bacchus; Joshua and Samson with Hercules. The visit of Jupiter, Neptune, and Mercury to Hyrieus, reminds them of the visit of JEHOVAH and two angels to Abraham; and that of Jupiter and Mercury to Philemon and Baucis, of the coming of the angels to Lot. They further discern in the Hindu *avatars*, or descents of the Deity, the manifestations of JEHOVAH in human form: while the sacred grove and the pillar-stone of the heathen bring to their recollection the patriarchal grove of Gen. xxi. 33, and the anointed stone of xxviii 18. In the Sacred Ark of the Pagan mysteries; in the representations of Dagon and Vishnu, under the mixed figure of man and fish: in the ox or bull of Egyptian mythology; and in the figure of the Minotaur, man and bull, they find memorials of the Ark of Noah, and of the patriarch himself, not only as saved from the waters of the Deluge, but also in his subsequent character of husbandman.

---

\* As Noah is the grand figure in the mythology of Bryant, so with Huetius, all the heathen deities are Moses - the various acts and words of the Hebrew law-giver, the events of his life, and the characters which he sustained, being ascribed to a number of deities called by different names. cc Priscos illos gentium Deos et Heroas quicunque per universum ferè orbem culti sunt : earumdem etiam conditores plerosque ac legum latores, totamque Ethnicorum theologiam, ex Mose ipso, Mosisve actis aut scriptionibus mânasse demonostrabimus. - *Dez. Ev. Prop. 4. c. 3, Ed. Stia, Paris, 1690.* Again, he says (Cap. 10, Summary of Contents) : - " Fabulares omnes Dii unus idemque sunt nempe Moses, Fabulares omnes Dii una eademque Dea sunt, atque hec Sephora est Mosis uxor. Fabularium quoque Dearum pleraeque Mariam Mosis sororem referunt. Fabularis historiae Graecorum bona pars ex Mosis libris et doctrina, atque ipsis etiam verbis profluxit."

The Greek tradition of the division of the universe between the three sons of Saturn, evidently points to the division of the earth between the three sons of Noah: and, to mention only one other instance, it is in the highest degree probable, as supposed by Mr. Faber that the several theologies, Hindu, Chinese, Pythagorean, Orphic and Platonic, respecting a Divine Triad, presided over by a Monad, have relation to Adam, the father of the human race, and his triple offspring, transmigrating into, and reappearing in, Noah, the second father, and his, in like manner, triple offspring.\*

That the whole of the pagan, or even of the Greek, mythology may be explained in accordance with this method of interpretation is an opinion which can hardly be maintained, as it appears to be certain that mythological systems arose not from any one source, but from several. † At the same time, it is very evident that, in many of the legends, not only of the Greek, but of the Hindu and other mythologies, the Gentile nations have embodied their remembrances of events, the true record of which is found in the Mosaic Scriptures. We are thus enabled to throw light on the origin of some traditions or the heathen, for which it might otherwise be impossible to account. Comparison of the Various traditions which have existed, both in East and West, with reference to the Golden Age or Paradisiacal state, the Temptation, the Serpent, the Fall, the Flood, or the building of Babel, with the Biblical record or these, must carry with it a conviction of the truth of our remark - these traditions being evidently nothing else than distorted versions of the Mosaic accounts, the main circumstances in each case, as related by Moses, being readily recognizable in them.

An attentive consideration of the subject with which the following pages are occupied, must produce, we think, a like conviction in the minds of those who are acquainted with the Grecian

---

\* See Bryant's *Analysis*, vol. 3, pp. 15, 560, &c.. 2nd Ed., 1775. - Faber's *Pag. Idol.*, vol. 3, pp. 16, 604. 610, &c.- Lond., 1816.- Huet. *Dem. Ev. Prop.* 4. Bochart *Phaleg.*, I., 1, 2, and II., 13. *Canaan*, I., 18, &c. Cadomi, 1651. Vossius, *De Orig.*, &c., lib. I., cc. 5, 15 - 18, 25, 26, &c.- Amst. 1641.

† See Keightley's *Mythology of Greece and Italy*. Lond. 1838, pp. 11-13.

mythology; for, although the object which we propose to ourselves' in this treatise is, not to explain the origin of sacred legends of the heathen, but to give an exposition or a remarkable passage of Scripture, yet the exposition which we hope to present to the reader - the only one, as it appears to us, which meets the requirements of the case, and which it is possible to defend on exegetical grounds - can hardly fail to impress him with the belief that at least one distinguished legend of the mythology of Greece must have had for its foundation a singular occurrence recorded in the Inspired Book - an extraordinary event, of which those who survived the Deluge had personal knowledge, and with reference to which their descendants carried with them traditions when they began to migrate westward after the Dispersion, These traditions, preserved amongst some of the families of Noah's descendants for a thousand years or more-subject, of course, to the various influences which more or less affect all tradition-at length assumed the forms in which they appear in some of the earliest Grecian poetry, relating the birth of the Titans and giants, and their wars with the gods, and in which the real facts which constituted the basis of these traditions are not only, in great measure, disguised and altered, but also very highly embellished.

In the Grecian mythology an important place is occupied by certain powerful beings, described as being of mingled heavenly and earthly, or divine and human origin, and variously designated by the names of giants, Titans, demigods, heroes. (See NOTE A.) With the history of these classical scholars are familiar; but of the many who, in youth or after-life, may have become acquainted with the giants and heroes of mythology, only a few, perhaps, have regarded them otherwise than as imaginary beings, or the legends respecting them as aught else than poetic fictions, intended either to amuse, or, at best, to represent certain changes and appearances of external nature. Few, comparatively; have believed that in these legends were preserved the memorials of a real race - a race of beings of superhuman origin - who, by whatever names they may have been called in after times, or however extraordinary the sources to which heathen tradition ascribed their origin, or however monstrous the forms or extravagant the exploits which have been attributed to them,

were living in the world at a remote period of its history-a period,

-“When the earth  
Saw men and spirits walking side by side” -

and have left behind them a name which has endured for four thousand years. There are those, however, who believe that the pagan traditions were not pure inventions - not wholly without foundation - and who are able to see in those famous legends of the Greeks which tell of the more than earthly origin of the giants and Titans, of their wars with Saturn and Jupiter, and of the marvellous feats which they performed, an unmistakable reference to real events, the brief narrative of which forms a portion of the Old Testament Scripture, and may be read, in the words of the Authorized English Version, in the sixth chapter of the Book of Genesis, verses 1-4, as follows :

" And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the  
"face of the earth, and daughters were borne unto them, that  
"the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were  
"fair: and they took them wives of all which they chose.  
"And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with  
"man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hun  
"dred and twenty years. 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.\*

What were the two classes whose union produced the powerful and mighty race which acquired such bad eminence in the primeval world? Such is the question which naturally presents itself to the mind of the reader of this passage of Holy Scripture.

---

\*In Note B will be found Etheridge's English version of the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan on Gen. vi. 1 – 4. It has not been thought necessary to insert at length the original passage, the Greek of the Septuagint, or the Chaldee of the Targums, as the important terms in each are noticed in the course of the exposition: and any who may wish further to examine the Hebrew or these versions will either be possessed of copies, or can have access to them.

Dr. Kitto, in whose words we have stated it, says in reply, "The first impression of many readers will, perhaps, be that the 'sons of God' were angels, and the 'daughters of men' human females ;" and he adds - although not coinciding in opinion with those who adopt it - that this view of the subject has been entertained by many, both in ancient and modern times.\*

We are not sure that, to a person reading the passage for the first time, and unacquainted with any of the interpretations which have been assigned to it, the idea would at once suggest itself that the "sons of God," whom it represents as having taken to themselves wives from amongst the daughters of men, were angels, so very remote is such an occurrence from the ordinary range of our conceptions. Not more likely, however, would he be to conceive of them as descendants of the patriarch Seth. Calling to mind, were he acquainted with it, the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament, he might probably suppose that these "sons of God" were certain pious men - men regenerated by the Spirit of God; but observing the very intimate connection evidently implied in the narrative as having subsisted between the marriages of the sons of God with the daughters of men and the judgment of the Deluge - for why, otherwise, has any mention of these alliances been made-he would naturally be at a loss to conceive in what way the marriages of godly men could have contributed to the bringing about of a catastrophe so terrible. But, were this person to be informed that the original expression, translated in our version "sons of God," is universally admitted to designate angels in the only other places in the Hebrew Scriptures in which it occurs, he would feel himself called upon to take it in the same signification in Genesis vi.; and not only so, but in the fact of a union of this nature-the confounding of two distinct orders of creatures - and the consequent production of a mixed race, partly angelic, partly human-in this derangement of the divine plan he would probably discern a solution of the difficulty which had presented itself to his mind - a sufficient explanation of the cause which necessitated the almost total extermination of those who were then upon the earth. Were he

---

\* *Daily Bible Illustrations*. By John Kitto, D.D. Antediluvians and Patriarchs. Tenth Edition, 1866, p. 136.

further to be informed, that no other view of the subject was prevalent generally-at least, amongst Christian theologians until some three or four centuries had elapsed from the commencement of the Christian era, when it was exchanged for one which seemed to be more in harmony with certain erroneous practices and opinions then beginning widely to spread themselves in Christendom, he would have little doubt that "the sons of God" of Gen. vi. were inhabitants originally of another world than this, beings of a nature diverse from that of mankind.

But, in the minds of very many, even of those who receive, with humble and unhesitating faith, Whatever information they believe to be set before them in the Bible, and who have no desire to explain away the supernatural or extraordinary occurrences which it relates, or to interpret the mention of an angelic visit to mankind as a figurative mode of speaking - in the minds of many such there exists a strong prejudice against the idea of such intercourse between the visible and invisible worlds as that which the old interpretation of our passage implies - a prejudice so decided, that they are ready, as has been remarked by a writer on the subject, to swallow almost any absurdity, or catch at anything, however ridiculous, provided they can thus get rid of whatever might seem to give countenance to such a notion.

It will be our aim, in the following pages, to prove that the fact of such unnatural connection between beings of two orders widely different from each other is asserted in our passage, however inconceivable or inexplicable by us such a fact may be. or however deeply the minds of the many may be prejudiced against the reception of it. We will endeavour to show that the only admissible interpretation of Gen. vi 1-4 is that in which the expression Bne-ha-Elohim (sons of God) is regarded as designating angels, and the term Nephilim (giants) the superhuman progeny to which the lawless desires of these angels gave birth - an interpretation which, as it appears to have been the earliest, was also that most generally received in the ancient synagogue and early Christian Church - one which is neither at variance with the usage of the Hebrew language, nor supported by arbitrary and irrational assumptions, but which meets at once the requirements of the language and the necessities of the case, and which, while it brings before us things that are mysterious and beyond

our power to explain, does not, nevertheless, present anything that can be pronounced to be contrary to the dictates of reason. Our exposition of the passage will set before the reader those facts which, we feel assured, it was the intention of the sacred writer to record. It will show that the occurrence which I relates involved the renouncing by a portion of God's creatures of their original divinely-appointed station and destination - the voluntary descent to a lower sphere, for the purpose of forming with beings inferior to themselves alliances unbefitting their own higher nature, and inconsistent with the ordination of God-an as the result of this, the forcing into the creation of a new and monstrous race, whose existence had not been intended by the Creator. In thus ascertaining the fact which the Holy Spirit has in this place recorded - the unlawful commingling of different classes of creatures - the adulteration, as we may term it, of the race on earth, which was now no longer purely Adam's - the disturbance of the order of creation, and displacing of limits which God had assigned - our interpretation furnishes (see §17) an answer to the question, Whence the necessity for a judgment so fearful, and so universally destructive, as that of the Deluge? - a question to which no satisfactory answer is afforded by a of those other interpretations of the passage which have be proposed.

## § II. - INTERPRETATIONS OF THE TERMS BNE-ELOHIM AN BNOTH-ADAM.

There are, in our passage, four principal terms, viz.,

**בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים** (Bne-Ha-Elohim), rendered "sons of God"- and **בְּנוֹת הָאָדָם** (Bnoth-Ha-Adam), "daughters of men" - in verse 2: and **הַנְּפִלִים** (Han-Nephilim), the "giants," and **הַגִּבּוֹרִים** (Hag-Gibborim) the, mighty men" - in verse 4. On the right interpretation, especially of the first, of these terms, the tr exposition of the passage depends. The terms in verse 4. hereafter come under notice: of the other two the following interpretations have been proposed ;

I. – BNE-HA-ELOHIM = *fili magnatum* or *magnates*, sons of princes, judges, rulers – men of authority and rank – who married

BNOTH-HA-ADAM = women of inferior station. "*Filii judicum vel potentum filias hominum, i.e., plebeiorum, uxores duxerunt*" - Poli Synopsis, *in loc.* From the time, at least, of the publication of the Targum of Onkelos, this was the favourite explanation of these terms by Jewish writers, a few of the later excepted (See Chapter I.)

2.-BNE-HA-ELOHIM = *Pious Men*, descendants of Seth, who styled themselves, or were styled, on account of their godly and virtuous character, Sons of God, and who chose for wives BNOTH-HA-ADAM = women of profligate or godless life belonging to the race of Cain, or other branches of the human family outside their own. This view was maintained by all Christian writers from the fourth to the close of the eighteenth century, and by many from that to the present time. (See Chapter 11.)

3.-BNE-HA-ELOHIM = Angels, till then unfallen, as Lactantius, in ancient time, and Maitland, Kurtz, and others, in our day, believe; or, angels already fallen with Satan - the *daemones incubi* of the middle ages. The latter is stated to have been the view of the Cabbalistic Jews, as well as of some Christian writers, named by Drs. Kurtz and Keil. From the intercourse of the angels with *women*, = BNOTH-HA-ADAM, sprang the Nephilim, called in the English version, giants and mighty men, a superhuman race. The oldest explanation of the passage. (See Chapters III. and IV.)

4.-BNE-HA-ELOHIM = *the earlier descendants* of Adam and Eve, as distinguished from the later, with whose daughters, = BNOTH-HA-ADAM, they intermarried; the men of the former race excelling those of the latter in physical and intellectual qualities, as well as in moral and religious character, were thence styled Sons of God. Mendelssohn's view. (See § 5.)

5.-BNE-HA-ELOHIM = *the Patriarchs named in Gen. v.*, supposed to have been so called on account of the vast duration of their lives, in virtue of which they might be regarded as resembling; in some degree, the real Sons of God, the angels. R. Isaac Abarbanel (a Spanish Jew of the 16th century), in a Dissertation on the Longevity of these Patriarchs (translated into Latin by the younger Buxtorf-Basil, 1662), refers, page 417, to Bereschith Rabba, a rabbinical commentary on Genesis, to show that this opinion was propounded by certain rabbins who are there named.

6.-BNE-HA-ELOHIM = Giants, persons or things distinguished

by their greatness, power, strength, or other remarkable qualities, being sometimes designated, in Hebrew, by the addition of *Elohim* to their names (see below, p. 13); hence, *fili Dei –homines proceri*, or *magni*. These gigantic men are supposed to have chosen wives of like physical proportions with themselves, **טוב** being taken to mean tall or large, rather than *fair* - a signification thought to be warranted by its use in 1 Sam. ix. 2. From these unions sprang the powerful race mentioned in verse 4. This is the view of Oleaster (Jerome Olivier, or De Oleastro) a learned Portuguese Dominican monk, author of a comment on the Pentateuch (Lisbon, 1556) - and, although we may not adopt it, is at least a more rational one than either the first or second above mentioned. - Poole's *Synopsis*, Gen. vi. 2.

The following, in addition to the three principal interpretation: of *magnates*, *pious Sethites*, and *angels*, are noticed in Dr. Smith's: *Dictionary of the Bible*, Article *Giants*.

7.-BNE-HA-ELOHIM = *men*, with great gifts, in the image of God" - (Ritter, Schumann).

8.-BNE-HA-ELOHIM = *Cainites* arrogantly assuming the title of sons of God. (Paulus.) Gesenius (Thes.) refers to this interpretation. Some of the moderns, he says, as Ilgen, understand by this term the posterity of Cain, who prided themselves on their inventions and skill in arts.

9.-BNE-HA-ELOHIM = *worshippers of false gods* - **παιδες' των**, Aqu., making *Bne* = "servants." (Comp. Deut. xiv. I; Prov. xiv. 26; Ex. xxxii I; Deut. iv. 28, *etc.*) This view, the writer in *Smith* says, is ably supported in "*Genesis of the Earth and Man*," pp. 39, sq. Dr. E. Harold Browne, Bishop of Ely (in the Speaker's Commentary), mentions this interpretation. He says:- "The author of "*Genesis of the Earth and Man*" suggests that '*the sons of the gods*' (so he would render it) may mean the worshippers of false gods. These he looks on as a pre-Adamite-race, and would render, not 'daughters of men,' but 'daughters of Adam.' The pre-Adamite worshippers of the false gods intermarried with the daughters of Adam." We have not seen this book. The interpretation appears to be partly founded on the rendering of Aquila (who, however, has **υιοι των Θεων**), but what that translator really understood by the expression in the original is uncertain.