



Scriptures and Doctrine :: So who were the "sons of God" spoken of in Genesis?

So who were the "sons of God" spoken of in Genesis? - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 6:21

Some here took umbrage at my last thread believing it to be of no value.

Though there is the same unspoken word to deal with I trust this thread will be viewed differently insofar as God, His Hope, was not done with man after Adam transgressed. So what further could He do to reveal Himself that man might be rectified in his thinking?

Re: So who were the "sons of God" spoken of in Genesis? - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2012/11/10 8:03

And as it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man Luk 17:26

And will we see there return?

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 8:37

Re: So who were the "sons of God" spoken of in Genesis?
by murrcolr on 2012/11/10 5:03:20

And as it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man Luk 17:26

And will we see there return?

Quote:

Are they not already in the earth ___ apostatizing as we speak? And unless He shortens the time left us. . .

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/10 8:55

Hi Murrcolr,

Quote:
-----And as it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the days of the
Son of man Luk 17:26

And will we see there return?

We have had this discussion in the past so it may be worth doing a search to get some other views of it. Here is one link to a tremendous and insightful discussion back in 2006.

https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id=7637&forum=36&start=40&viewmode=flat&order=1

Who were the sons of God?

I will only add a few thoughts. Some people contend that Luke 17:26 may not be referring to the matter of the sons of God and the Nephilim, though they believe the sons of God were fallen angels. We have this context:

Luke 17:27 They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all.

Luke 17:28 Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded;

These passages are sort of parallel in their message. Some would see it as a 'business as usual' attitude when judgment

Scriptures and Doctrine :: So who were the "sons of God" spoken of in Genesis?

It was at the door. But I would argue in addition to that, that there is a perverse element to this as well. God destroyed the world in Genesis 6 for a good reason and He destroyed Sodom for a good reason. You will notice in the story of Lot and Sodom that the people were scratching at the door to get to the angels. When Jude describes Sodom's sin he said they went after 'other' or 'another' flesh. The Greek word is heteros. We get our word heterosexual from it. Had homosexual been in view heteros would not have been used. It means 'other' flesh, as in there is a flesh of beasts and a flesh of fish, etc. It is my view that it was the hetero flesh of angels that had taken on human form. This is not a novel view, but a very very old one that dates to antiquity. Keep in mind that even after they had been blinded by the angels, they still scratched at the door. It is my view that they had already become so perverse that they were heading back to the horrific sins of Genesis 6.

Keep in mind that Zoar was spared by God though it was on the list to be destroyed. Why? Lot wanted to move there. Why? It was a 'little' city that looked like Egypt (hence, a little bit of Egypt). God wanted to nip this cancerous sin in the bud, but Lot wanted his compromise. What happened? Some 400 years later the children of Israel are spying out the land and run into what?

And there we saw the Nephilim (the sons of Anak, who come from the Nephilim), and we seemed to ourselves like grass hoppers, and so we seemed to them.” (Numbers 13:33)

Was Goliath of Gath a descendant of Nephilim born in the land (that was ready to vomit the people out) because the sin of Sodom that was also in Zoar had come to fruition and replayed the Genesis 6 events? In other words, Zoar was not as advanced in sexual sin as was Sodom when Lot arrived, but did it eventually surpass Sodom to where God had to send Israel in to clean up the land? There was no restraint on sexual activity prior to the law of Moses, except some people had a sense that certain things were wrong. If the Rabbi's are to be believed the 7 Noahide laws, one of which was a prohibition of sexual immorality would have been in play after Noah. But still we have this evidence on the table that seems pretty easy to connect the dots.

So, will we see this happen again and is this part of the question in Luke 17:26? I don't have enough confidence in fallen man to say NO. Man has consistently shown his thirst for progressive perversity. Fornication, a damnable sin, is treated as if it is normative behavior. But no one hardly wants to ask, where is all of this headed? We have pedophiles in prison trying to set up advocacy groups to try and introduce laws and rights for pedophiles. In other words, they are pressing for pedophile to be a sexual orientation. By way of analogy when I was in High School being referred to as a homosexual were fighting words and an insult of the worst kind. Today the behavior is lauded and celebrated. That has been in the last 30-35 years.

If we continue at this pace, what will 100 years look like? What will be legal and normal? The unlocked wheels of men's lusts are blazing towards Genesis 6 in my view and will be met this time with Fire and Blood. What did the Revelation say? Neither repented they of their murders, nor of their sorceries, nor of their fornication, nor of their thefts. (Revelation 9:21) Just some of my more radical thoughts on the subject. Blessings.

Re: So who were the "sons of God" spoken of in Genesis?, on: 2012/11/10 8:56

Quote:
----- Some here took umbrage at my last thread believing it to be of no value.

The bible is a book of information, it's not the word of God. The word of God is not ink and paper, it's Jesus Christ. Jesus is not dead but alive. Paul calls the OT a dead book, but when the Spirit extracts the word of God from it and illuminate our spirit then it becomes alive in us.

Information alone is never going to edify the spirit. We should be looking for the revelation within what we are reading so we do not walk away with a head full of knowledge and speculation.

I am for this discussion brother.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: So who were the "sons of God" spoken of in Genesis?

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 9:29

by Approved on 2012/11/10 5:56:47

Quote:

----- Some here took umbrage at my last thread believing it to be of no value.

The bible is a book of information, it's not the word of God. The word of God is not ink and paper, it's Jesus Christ. Jesus is not dead but alive. Paul calls the OT a dead book, but when the Spirit extracts the word of God from it and illuminates our spirit then it becomes alive in us.

Information alone is never going to edify the spirit. We should be looking for the revelation within what we are reading so we do not walk away with a head full of knowledge and speculation.

I am for this discussion brother.

Lets go a step further to say the Bible is a dead book__alive to those only OF Christ? What say you, Bro.? Will that not satisfy the issue?

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 9:33

by RobertW on 2012/11/10 5:55:13

G'mornin' Robert!

Can we not say for a certainty and that it be held an absolute in our thinking that angels cannot reproduce and go from there with the rest of what we might believe when making our case?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/10 12:19

Hi CroRef,

Quote:

-----Can we not say for a certainty and that it be held an absolute in our thinking that angels cannot reproduce and go from there with the rest of what we might believe when making our case?

In the similar sense to when Satan took on the form of the Serpent, angels can take on human form. Hebrews 13:2 tells us we have entertained angels unawares. Satan can even transform himself into an angel of light. Angels are greater in power and might than man and God has already said of man, nothing shall be restrained from him that he had imagined to do. (Genesis 11:6)

We have this additional insight that I want to draw from a past conversation on this subject:

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 6)

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: By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; 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. (1 Peter 3:18-20)

The context of 1 Peter 3:19-20 is interesting. Why should Peter identify these spirits in prison; 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. (1Pe 3:19-20 KJV)? He is clearly talking about two different beings, "spirits in pris

Scriptures and Doctrine :: So who were the "sons of God" spoken of in Genesis?

on" and "souls saved by water".

This is tall corn as they say, but the story of the flood would seem to begin with the account of 'rebellious spirits'. The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. (Genesis 6:2 KJV) This brings us to Jude 6, And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation. Our word here for 'habitation' is a word that means 'house' or dwelling place. They had the power to do it, and they apparently did.

"The Old Testament only ever seems to use 'sons of God' to describe angels. It is a very apt description of angels in that they were not 'sons' to anyone else; they were created as an entire species by God Himself. Those who have received their life direct from God, without an intermediary, are justifiably described as 'sons of God'; Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God.(philologos on Luke 3:38 KJV)

Again, the letter of Jude includes an interesting verse; 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 1:6 KJV) Now who are these? and again why are they singled out from all 'fallen angels'. If it is true that demons are 'fallen angels' we know that a fair number over them are definitely not 'reserved in everlasting chains' but are wreaking destruction world wide. There seems to be a sub-set of fallen angels here who have received unique punishment; who are they? Could they be the 'rebellious 'sons of God' of Genesis 6 whose offspring are called Nephilim (fallen ones)? and if so what happened to them after the Flood?

Were they 'imprisoned' in 'everlasting chains'? Why was their sins so punished? There is a cryptic comment regarding Noah; These are the generations of Noah: Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God. (Gen 6:9 KJV) whereas God's description of the rest of humanity is; The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth. (Gen 6:11-12 KJV).

It seems as though Noah and his family may have been the last pure-bred humans on earth. If Noah and his family had become 'corrupted' in their generations there could have been no incarnation. This rebellion would have blocked the way to Christ being made flesh. Their rebellion was quashed and the wicked spirits that had instigated it were put 'in prison', 'reserved in everlasting chains'.

I think it is these to whom Christ preached 'in prison'. The word 'preach' here is not 'evangelise' but 'proclaim'. The NASB has captured the sense well; in which also He went and made proclamation to the spirits now in prison, (1Pe 3:19 NASB) The purpose of the 'preaching' was not to deliver these 'spirits in prison' but to proclaim the finality of God's plan in Christ. Their wicked plan had been frustrated and Christ declared his triumph to these spirits in prison.

This can only ever be a hypothesis. We don't have enough information to settle it as a biblical doctrine but, to me, it is the best hypothesis I have been able to shape." (Excerpt taken from https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=2942&forum=36&start=40&viewmode=flat&order=0)

As an additional thought I want to suggest that God would have never destroyed the world over unequally yoked marriages. The sin nature is transmitted to all people so it is nonsense to think a pure blood line could have been maintained by marrying up the sons of Seth with the sons of Seth. Noah and his kids were of the sons of Seth and their descendants plunged the world into ruin. One of the greatest truths in the bible is that Godliness and election are not naturally hereditary but spiritually (In Christ). Blessings.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 12:33

by RobertW on 2012/11/10 9:19:09

Hi CroRef,

Quote:
-----Can we not say for a certainty and that it be held an absolute in our thinking that angels cannot reproduce and go from there with the rest of what we might believe when making our case?

Scriptures and Doctrine :: So who were the "sons of God" spoken of in Genesis?

In the similar sense to when Satan took on the form of the Serpent, angels can take on human form. Hebrews 13:2 tells us we have entertained angels unawares. Satan can even transform himself into an angel of light. Angels are greater in power and might than man and God has already said of man, nothing shall be restrained from him that he had imagined to do. (Genesis 11:6)

Angels were individually created. In addition, they are sexless__and needed only have been. OMT: Adam was also called a son of God. He, too, was but formed out of dirt.

OMT2: Kindly read this verse and try to explain it away to be speaking of angels__OK? Gen 4:26. Thanks Robert.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 12:53

Since there is little to go on in the OT for us to understand who were the sons of God mentioned in Genesis, must it necessarily leave us to conclude God was finished in the development of His creation for knowing Him as their Spiritual Father__however limited it might now be because of Adam's transgression? Must we believe that God stopped communicating with His "sons"?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/10 12:56

Hi Croref,

Quote:

-----Angels were individually created. In addition, they are sexless__and needed only have been. OMT: Adam was also called a son of God. He, too, was but formed out of dirt.

I understand. That is the modern standard objection to this ancient view. Angels neither marry or are given in marriage; however, this is the 'normal' habitation of angels that the angels that sinned apparently left in order to take to themselves wives of men. They were not procreating as angels, but as angels that had taken on human form. All of the faculties associated with human beings can be taken on by angels. We see this particularly in Genesis 19:

And there came two angels to Sodom at even; and Lot sat in the gate of Sodom: and Lot seeing them rose up to meet them; and he bowed himself with his face toward the ground; And he said, Behold now, my lords, turn in, I pray you, into your servant's house, and tarry all night, and wash your feet, and ye shall rise up early, and go on your ways. And they said, Nay; but we will abide in the street all night. And he pressed upon them greatly; and they turned in unto him, and entered into his house; and he made them a feast, and did bake unleavened bread, and they did eat. (Genesis 19:1-3)

Here are two angels that have taken on human form. They are moving in supernatural power- even smiting the vile men near the house with blindness. Yet, here they are sitting down with Lot and his family eating a meal. This agrees with our passage in Hebrews where men entertain angels unawares. The words 'they did eat' are insightful. These angels were not merely figures that looked like men, they were actually capable of eating food. This tells me that they had digestive systems. If they were able to form a digestive system, that would require the entire rest of the human physiology to function (heart, lungs, etc), what would reason would we have to think that their technology or power was insufficient to form reproductive faculties? I don't think there is any reasonable argument for saying they could form everything but a reproductive system. Just my view of it. (WKIP) Blessings.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: So who were the "sons of God" spoken of in Genesis?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/10 13:00

Hi CroRef,

Quote:

-----OMT2: Kindly read this verse and try to explain it away to be speaking of angels__OK? Gen 4:26. Thanks Robert.

I think this was addressed earlier:

Quote:

-----The Old Testament only ever seems to use 'sons of God' to describe angels. It is a very apt description of angels in that they were not 'sons' to anyone else; they were created as an entire species by God Himself. Those who have received their life direct from God, without an intermediary, are justifiably described as 'sons of God'; Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God.(philologos on Luke 3:38 KJV)

I'm focused on the point, "Those who have received their life direct from God, without an intermediary, are justifiably described as 'sons of God'."

Blessings.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 13:13

by RobertW on 2012/11/10 9:56:24

Hi Croref,

Quote:

-----Angels were individually created. In addition, they are sexless__and needed only have been. OMT: Adam was also called a son of God. He, too, was but formed out of dirt.

I understand. That is the modern standard objection to this ancient view. Angels neither marry or are given in marriage; however, this is the 'normal' habitation of angels that the angels that sinned apparently left in order to take to themselves wives of men. They were not procreating as angels, but as angels that had taken on human form. All of the faculties associated with human beings can be taken on by angels. We see this particularly in Genesis 19:

That is conjecture, Robert. COMMON sense says so. Human form does not mean human biology! We have no right make that assumption except from unbelief. If that was the case then Jesus went into the grave to preach to a mixed alien crowd not of Himself! NOT possible! What's more it doesn't need be that way at all if you consider that we face the same condition today that unless God shortens the time there will again be no "human flesh" left to save__a condition whereby we see Romans 1 relived by humans__the same way it as in Genesis. The human "sons of God" who no longer wished to retain God in their thinking__right down to where we see Noah__alone.

I asked you to read and comment on Genesis 4:26. Still waiting.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: So who were the "sons of God" spoken of in Genesis?

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 13:16

Hi CroRef,

Quote:

-----OMT2: Kindly read this verse and try to explain it away to be speaking of angels__OK? Gen 4:26. Thanks Robert.

I think this was addressed earlier:

I'm focused on the point, "Those who have received their life direct from God, without an intermediary, are justifiably described as 'sons of God'."

Yes ___but not in this case. Angels, called men, didn't call upon the Name of the Lord. ___Unless you are prepared to now say that men are not always men when men are spoken of when committing an act?

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 13:27

If the Sons of God are the lineage of Seth and the Daughters of Men are of the lineage of Cain, Why would that mixture create nephilim ??

Re: Gen 4:26. - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 13:39

//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.//

what I see here in this verse is that the sons of Seth are called men.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/10 13:42

Hi Croref,

Quote:

-----Yes ___but not in this case. Angels, called men, didn't call upon the Name of the Lord. ___Unless you are prepared to now say that men are not always men when men are spoken of when committing an act?

I must totally be missing the question here. Rather than me try to guess, please explain exactly what you are asking. Blessings.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 13:46

Whom are the "sons of God" in Job ch 1 v 6 ??

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 13:50

by proudpapa on 2012/11/10 10:27:02

If the Sons of God are the lineage of Seth and the Daughters of Men are of the lineage of Cain, Why would that mixture create nephilim ??

Who knows? What do we have go on but conjectured reasoning that might say that men, in this case, sons of God and because they were sons of God by obedience that opened God up to them in a some super way that released Him to the

Scriptures and Doctrine :: So who were the "sons of God" spoken of in Genesis?

m in a might way both intellectually and physically. The "daughters of men" speak of something lesser since, by custom, the male child received the attention and teachings. We must also keep in mind that women were only vessels for procreation__not intended to be the head.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 13:51

I would say angels. No reason not to.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 13:52

I would say angels. No reason not to and every reason to believe they were.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 14:02

by RobertW on 2012/11/10 10:42:30

Hi Croref,

Quote:
-----Yes ___but not in this case. Angels, called men, didn't call upon the Name of the Lord. __Unless you are prepared to now say that men are not always men when men are spoken of when committing an act?

I must totally be missing the question here. Rather than me try to guess, please explain exactly what you are asking. Blessings.

I see that Robert.

My point is to bring to the front that men functioned under the hand of God, irrespective of the fall. He communicated with them, revealing himself in the process. In that regard there would be no need to suppose angels ever coming on the scene, being introduced, for the purpose of corrupting a civilization. Man can do that on his own__as we well know and experience __and that by the process of assimilation.

The record has no point in time that says otherwise thus leaving us to needlessly conjecture our opinions.

I stay by my opinions, not willing to conjecture the biology of angels.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/10 14:09

Hi CroRef,

Not trying to persuade anyone really. As mentioned before the best we can have in any case is a hypothesis of what may have happened. The challenge we have in dismissing the view is that it was held by the Jews long before the time of Jesus up until Josephus. He gives this historical account in Antiquities:

Antiq. 1:72 ¶ (1.3.1.72) Now this posterity of Seth continued to esteem God as the Lord of the universe, and to have an entire regard to virtue, for seven generations; but in process of time they were perverted, and forsook the practices of their forefathers, and did neither pay those honors to God which were appointed them, nor had they any concern to do justice towards men. But for what degree of zeal they had formerly shown for virtue, they now showed by their actions a double degree of wickedness; whereby they made God to be their enemy,
Antiq. 1:73 (1.3.1.73) for many angels of God accompanied with women, and begat sons that proved unjust, and despisers of all that was good, on account of the confidence they had in their own strength; for the tradition is, That these men did what resembled the acts of those whom the Grecians call giants.

For the record, I am not trying to establish a doctrine here. I just want to show that the view is ancient and give an accurate account of how it plays out for those interested. Blessings.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: So who were the "sons of God" spoken of in Genesis?

Re: , on: 2012/11/10 14:26

Quote:
----- That is conjecture, Robert. COMMON sense says so. Human form does not mean human biology! We have no right make that assumption except from unbelief.

When it comes to the missing pieces in creation and the Old World before Noah, it's all conjecture, unless you have any ancient writings that predate Noah that can shed some light on the subject, we'll keep on remaining in the dark.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 14:41

by RobertW on 2012/11/10 11:09:20

Hi CroRef,

Not trying to persuade anyone really. As mentioned before the best we can have in any case is a hypothesis of what may have happened. The challenge we have in dismissing the view is that it was held by the Jews long before the time of Jesus up until Josephus. He gives this historical account in Antiquities:

Antiq. 1:72 ¶ (1.3.1.72) Now this posterity of Seth continued to esteem God as the Lord of the universe, and to have an entire regard to virtue, for seven generations; but in process of time they were perverted, and forsook the practices of their forefathers, and did neither pay those honors to God which were appointed them, nor had they any concern to do justice towards men. But for what degree of zeal they had formerly shown for virtue, they now showed by their actions a double degree of wickedness; whereby they made God to be their enemy,

Antiq. 1:73 (1.3.1.73) for many angels of God accompanied with women, and begat sons that proved unjust, and despisers of all that was good, on account of the confidence they had in their own strength; for the tradition is, That these men did what resembled the acts of those whom the Grecians call giants.

Given the account of the Jews, even up to Josephus, I will still stay with my thinking. Not only that but it would seem they are held in reverence on issues that cannot be explained by their reasoning__too many things to support their unbelief in Jesus Christ.

Re: , on: 2012/11/10 14:50

Quote:
----- too many things to support their unbelief in Jesus Christ.

How so?

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 14:56

I'll let you answer that.

Re: Croref - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 15:01

hi Croref
interesting subject.

Croref wrote ///I would say angels. No reason not to.///

Does the old testament use the phrase "sons of God" ever in reference to men ??

as such knew either by knowledge or experience that his guests were angelic and therefore something to be earnestly desired even above the flesh of men. I want to say that this is occult thinking and even were it true has no place in the thoughts of those who are seeking to serve God in truth. Regardless of what happened in Genesis chapter six there is no such connection between those events and Genesis chapter nineteen.

Further in the passage from Luke chapter seventeen concerning the days of Noah and the days of Lot the sum of the activities mentioned all relate to reasonable and natural activities. There is no reference to immorality let alone men desiring the flesh of angels. The overwhelming purpose of this passage is to draw attention to the suddenness as well as the foolishness of disobedience to God's laws. That their were angels who left their dwellings and took company with men in order to participate in marriage is clear enough but that these angels, which in Peter's letter are said to be in chains of darkness awaiting judgment, are not said to have desired the flesh of men, but in seeing the beauty of the daughters of men, desired to be married, a thing not permitted to them.

As a matter of certain knowledge I tell you plainly that in drawing this link as I have presented it simply above amounts to a pure satanic fantasy. Apart from this it is a misrepresentation of the facts of Genesis nineteen where it is clearly stated that the young men and the old men from every quarter of the city of Sodom surrounded Lot's house and demanded to have familiar relations with the two men whom Lot was seeking to preserve. That Lot held these two men in high regard is obvious from the passage where he calls them "lords", but to infer from the descriptor "angels" that the men of the city knew this and therefore strongly desired it, being somehow of a more desirable familiarity is again occult and attends to pure satanic knowledge.

To press into the true meaning of the passage is not so difficult if it is read in simplicity without the attendant occult knowledge that is implicit in this thread.

Verse four of chapter nineteen makes the matter straightforward and clear. This verse tells us who are present at Lot's door "men of Sodom surrounded the house both young and old, and all the people from every quarter." The saying "all the people" must include women as well as biblically "people" are always both men and women. This fact gives a proper meaning to what homosexuality really is. Today this abomination is itself being changed in meaning to become a psychological equivalence of natural sexual desire between a man and a woman in marriage. In Lot's day perverse women were just as complicit in the activities of men and were given over to the same lusts and perverse inclinations. Homosexuality is not a psychological phenomena it is primarily sexual degeneracy and the fulfilling of lusts that are gender neutral. Male and female alike with mutual admiration and complicity therefore seek homosexual gratification from both male and female. Lot understood this because he offered the men his daughters in a desperate need to preserve the two men in his house. It is for this reason that Lot is called righteous. If the possibility that Lot's two virgin daughters were likely to have been refused he would not have thought to offer them in the first place.

It is only in the last fifty years or so that homosexuality has been systematically presented as a biologically discreet reality attended by appropriate psychological self-identity. This presentation is a construct of wicked imaginations and has to do with the breakdown of discreet gender identities for the purpose of once again pressing societies into open sexual degeneracy. Biblically when women press into this exchange of the natural for the unnatural it is considered more abominable than men and hence why the Greek expression of heterosexual desire is used in Jude in describing those women who desired what to them were biological males. This does nothing to detract from the principle sin of Sodom that of homosexuality of both men and women. The apostle Paul made this point clear enough (Romans 1:25).

On a careful reading of Genesis chapter six it is possible to see that the Nephilim mentioned there is both a reality at that time and a future reality as well. Yet the imprisonment of the angels in chains of eternal darkness in Peter is singular in its account. That is to say there is just one such prison. It may well be that the first time the angels left their abodes and took wives from amongst the daughters of men; the consequence was not as severe as it was the second time it happened. Either way it is clear that the consequence for some angels was singular and final. It is also clear from the passage in Genesis chapter six that this was not a homosexual ambition, but rather an ambition to be like men, having wives. It is also clear that God didn't judge this activity with regards to judging the whole earth until the establishment of the Nephilim in physical reality. This was not just an ambition it became a physical reality. Yet it is not until Numbers 13:33 that the future activity of disobedient angels is seen to have a genealogical identity in the lineage of Anak, who himself was of th

Scriptures and Doctrine :: So who were the "sons of God" spoken of in Genesis?

e Nephilim and therefore in obedience to God's law "flesh begets flesh", Anak gave issue to son's who are also called Nephilim. The issue of Anak is not an issue of angels and women, but an issue of Anak himself and his wife or else wives. In short the giants in the land were at least 2nd generation offspring of a disobedient union between an angel and a woman in the first instance. The judgement of the angels who abandoned their heavenly estate to take wives was so severe and so complete it would serve as a terrible and fearful reminder that all such unions would be dealt with swiftly and decisively. It stands to reason therefore that to attribute this knowledge and ambition on the part of the Sodomites would be a truly exceptional thing to both desire and to provoke. If it were true then it would amount to a wickedness of almost incomprehensible proportions. It would amount to men and women setting themselves in the way of angels in heaven to tempt them. It is for this reason that I have said that this idea is occult and could only have its final root in Satan seeking to draw the angels away for an end time activity or effect. To my own knowledge such cooperation would amount to directly serving Satan. It could not be entered into without certain knowledge. Whatever it is however, it is a dangerous well of knowledge to be drinking of.

Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2012/11/11 1:33

hi, i think a more important question that makes more sense to ask is "where are the sons that are in the statement "the whole earth groaneth for the manifestations of the sons of God" that is a now question and you could be the answer.jimp

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/11 8:22

Since most here believe God gave man a freewill and that freewill was never taken away due to Adam's transgression, why not strongly consider that the men who called upon the Name of Lord were declared by God to be His sons, by Him ? 1. They recognized His presence 2.They prayed to Him 3.They obeyed Him__and He answered them with prosperity of all sorts. __and then we read Romans 1.