

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Who are the sons, what is the devil doing there?

Who are the sons, what is the devil doing there? - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/10/17 1:18

There is this scripture in 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. Does anyone have any ideas as to what is going on here?

Who were the sons of God?
Why did Satan join them before God?

p.s. This is the KJV of this scripture, the NIV has 'angels' instead of 'sons of God'.

Re: Who are the sons, what is the devil doing there? - posted by Warrior4Jah (), on: 2005/10/17 2:38

The sons of God are angels so far I know.
That Satan came along only means that he's an angel.
I heard this at a study at a bible camp that there was a time where every angel (fallen or not) had to present themselves before God. Satan is not more powerful than God so he has to obey. :-)

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/10/17 22:42

I agree with Warrior.

Sons of God = Angels

Satan = Fallen Angel

Job 1:6 is one of the instances that shows God created Satan and all the other angels, and commands and uses them whether they are fallen or holy angels.

Other Scriptures about these fallen angels are Gen 6:2, 2 Peter 2:4, and Jude 1:6.

The assembling of the angels before God shows they are still accountable to Him, and that even though they are given the ability to try us, they still can only do what God gives them the ability to do.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/18 11:20

Quote:
-----The assembling of the angels before God shows they are still accountable to Him, and that even though they are given the ability to try us, they still can only do what God gives them the ability to do.

a valuable reminder, thanks.

Rev. 6:4 (KJVS) And there went out another horse that was red: and power was given to him that sat thereon to take peace from the earth, and that they should kill one another: and there was given unto him a great sword.
Rev. 6:8 (KJVS) And I looked, and behold a pale horse: and his name that sat on him was Death, and Hell followed with him. And power was given unto them over the fourth part of the earth, to kill with sword, and with hunger, and with death, and with the beasts of the earth.
Rev. 7:2 (KJVS) And I saw another angel ascending from the east, having the seal of the living God: and he cried with a loud voice to the four angels, to whom it was given to hurt the earth and the sea,
Rev. 9:3 (KJVS) And there came out of the smoke locusts upon the earth: and unto them was given power, as the scorpions of the earth have power. There is mystery here, but that "God is on His throne" is the core message of the Revelation.

Humble beginnings of error - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/10/22 5:40

Quote:

There is mystery here, but that "God is on His throne" is the core message of the Revelation.

Who said anything about a mystery. 8-)

In regards to the angles and the sons of God. The reason that it struck me so is because many consider the the KJV the standard for bible interpretation/translation. So if this version says 'sons of God' why would the NIV say angels if it is a less than accurate version? :-?

So maybe to rephrase the question, which is the best rendering of this verse? I can see how the mormons can use the KJV of the scripture to come up with the crazy idea that Jesus and the Devil are brothers, and all the stuff about the Nephilim.

If anyone wants any example of how far someone can go by taking parts of scripture and building a house out of it, that is it.

Re: Humble beginnings of error - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/22 10:17

Quote:

-----Who said anything about a mystery.

The mystery is that God gives creatures the empowerment to do 'wicked' things. eg. the prodigal could not have gone to the 'far country' without his father's enabling. :-)

Quote:

-----and all the stuff about the Nephilim.

I am not endorsing all that the Mormon's say as I am not sure what they do say, but many Bible students over the centuries have believed that the 'sons of God' from Gen 6 were rebellious angels. The OT uses the phrase 'sons of God' very infrequently...Gen. 6:2 (KJVS) That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.

Gen. 6:4 (KJVS) 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 (KJVS) 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 (KJVS) 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 (KJVS) When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy? There can be little doubt about who the Job references relate to. In fact, the LXX (

http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id954&forum36&post_id&refreshGo) Septuagint) translators built their answer into their translation, translating the phrase 'sons of God' as 'angels' throughout the Job references. The NIV is similarly making up your mind for you (a fairly persistent habit of that translation).

The translators are not translating here but interpreting. I would prefer to know what it says and do my 'own' interpretation! ;-)

The KJV is more literal here; 'ben elohim' = 'sons of God'.

It is a very old fashioned view and one which I dislike in many ways, but I am forced to interpret the 'sons of God' in Genesis or Nephilim (fallen ones) as rebellious angels. And consequently to interpret Gen 6 as a rebellious union between angels and human women. There you are... you always knew I was a dinosaur didn't you?

My interpretation of the early Job verses would be that God does require a 'regular account' of those that he has empowered and that their empowerment is within carefully defined parameters.

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/10/22 11:26

It's interesting to note that satan had to give account also in the Job scriptures you referenced.

Re: Who are the sons, what is the devil doing there?, on: 2005/10/24 22:10

I think I've missed something in the translation here...

What is the linguistic or otherwise basis for translating 'sons of God' to mean *angels*?

We know that Job was an Elamite

Genesis 10:22

The children of Shem; Elam, and Asshur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram.

and that God was still appearing to man in

Exodus 24

10 And they saw the God of Israel: and under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in clearness.

11 And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid not his hand: also they saw God, and did eat and drink.

12 And the LORD said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount,...

so what is the basis for assuming that the 'sons of God' were not on earth... and therefore angels? Earth, after all, is where Satan had been spending his time... Let's face it, there's no way he could have appeared in God's presence without God noticing, because of the attitude he brought with him.

And there is

Luke 3:38

Which was of Enos, which was of Seth, which was of **Adam, which was of God**.

Now that I've written this, I see " - which is not in the original. Still, my other questions stand, please.

OK. So I'm suggesting there is an underlying assumption that God was not on earth when the 'sons of God' assembled in His presence, which has led translators to believe 'sons of God' must be angels.

Can this assumption be justified?

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/10/24 22:27

'ben elohim' = 'sons of God'

In scripture that's only used for angels, the reference Ron gave was from Gen. and Job

Do you have Albert Barnes notes on the bible? or any other commentary? that might be helpful.

From what I've read 'ben elohim' is not used when it refers to human beings. When I had read what Ron had put down I had an explosion of understanding on satan having to give account or answer to God. That's what my comments were mainly of.

Re: Who are the sons, what is the devil doing there?, on: 2005/10/25 0:07

I must admit I tend to look the whole way across scripture for consistency, regardless of what commentaries say.

There is no other place where it is suggested that angels are God's 'sons' and that worries me, because the link between man being in His image, and the only begotten Son of the Father being made Flesh so irrevocably connects God with man, that I feel very resistant to the idea 'sons of God' could ever mean angels. And I want to give it a good fight before capitulating - if you know what I mean.

There is also a clear separation at the beginning of Hebrews, between angels and man and the idea that angels (fallen) and women had children is just nonsense.

To me, there is more sense in thinking the phrase is linked to Adam being breathed into by God and Eve being taken out of Adam's side, as an explanation for the separation 'sons of God' and 'daughters of men'. But, I can't justify that thought from translation - it just makes sense to my understanding.

With due respect to venerable translators, you can all laugh now :-P

Daryl,

Nothing I've said militates against Satan having to make an account to God. My points are simply that there was a time when God was with man without a tabernacle and that the assumption God was in heaven *above the earth*, is just that - an assumption - and this means that if the sons of God were actually human, then their having children with the daughters of men makes much more sense and doesn't interfere with any other premise in scripture.

Satan's appearance in the presence of God, in the company of *men* (sons of God), is what he has been doing from the beginning, and ties in with several other scriptures. We know he can make himself look like anything from a serpent to an angel of light, so why not a man? - but, God would have 'recognised' him.

Quote:
-----It is a very old fashioned view and one which I dislike in many ways, but I am forced to interpret the 'sons of God' in Genesis or Nephilim (fallen ones) as rebellious angels.

Ron,

Are you able to elaborate on why 'fallen ones' has to refer to *angels* and *not* Adam's descendants? Thank you.

Re: - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/10/25 0:21

Can the 'sons of God' still produce offspring or has something changed?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/25 5:57

Quote:
-----Can the 'sons of God' still produce offspring or has something changed?

ZekeO

I think it is important to remind ourselves that we are engaged in a 'best fit' exercise here. I have often made this point on SI on these themes but here it is again. Imagine two intersecting circles.. One represents the 'story of mankind' and is pretty much the subject of the Bible, the other represents the 'story of angel-kind'; this latter is not the main subject of the Bible. In fact all we really know about the second circle is from the tiny intersection where the angels' story impacts ours. Consequently we are in danger of trying to extrapolate a whole 'Angel-Bible' from that intersection and that is dangerous. God does give individual discernment of things outside the first circle but these must never become 'standard doctrines' of the church or fundamental to our whole understanding of God's ways with men; the Bible is our sufficient revelation for that. We stand in danger of being 'wiser than what has been written' as an old Quaker document put it. Having said that let me try to open out at least part of your question.

“And Jehovah said, My spirit shall not strive with man for ever, for that he also is flesh: yet shall his days be a hundred and twenty years. The Nephilim were in the earth in those days, and also after that, when the sons of God came unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them: the same were the mighty men that were of old, the men of renown.

” (Gen. 6:3-4, ASV) I've gone for the ASV here because it picks up the reference to 'Nephilim' that some using just the KJV may not have connected with this thread. Your question is 'can' it happen again? These verse certainly could be interpreted in the sense that Gen 6 was not a unique event. The phrase which gives us room to say this is "and also after that". After what? After the Nephilim were in the earth. So was there a second infestation after Gen 6? The Nephilim were in the earth in those days, and also after that, when the sons of God came unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them: the same were the mighty men that were of old, the men of renown. Gen. 6:4 (ASV)

And there we saw the Nephilim, the sons of Anak, who come of the Nephilim: and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight. Num. 13:33 (ASV) These are the only uses of the word 'Nephilim' meaning 'a fallen one' in the scriptures. (Nephilim, is the plural form)

Would this be a factor in God's determination that those who had been sexually active, as well as animals, were destroyed in the taking of Canaan. Is it possible that Goliath and his brothers were 'Nephilim'? Is this why God partly explained the Conquest of Canaan by saying 'the land is vomiting them out'?

None of this specifically answers your question although there are those who have speculated that 'as in the days of Noah' (Matt. 24:37; Luke 17:26) might include this aspect of life in the 'days of Noah'.

Would the passage from 1 Peter fit our hypothesis? “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.” (1Pet. 3:18-20, KJVS) Were these human spirits, and if so why are they singled out from all other human spirits? Personally I don't think these are human spirits and the word for 'preached' is not evangelised but proclaimed. How are we to understand this verse from Gen 6... “These are the generations of Noah: Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God. And Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. 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. 6:9-12, KJVS) Is this indicating that Noah was uniquely 'human' (and his progeny) at this time? And what are we reading of here... For if God spared not angels when they sinned, but cast them down to hell, and committed them to pits of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment; 2Pet. 2:4 (ASV)

And angels that kept not their own principality, but left their proper habitation, he hath kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. Jude 6 (ASV) This seems to be the context for another unusual Bible revelation in which the word 'Tartaros' is used... “For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment; And spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly;” (2Pet. 2:4-5, KJVS) Is this the fate of all fallen angels? or just those from the 'days of Noah'?

Was all this a particularly diabolical conspiracy to make incarnation impossible? If the whole race became demonised how would Christ have entered the race? It easy to forget that God had determined that 'man' would be his route for reclamation and restoration. Was this the reason behind Satan's implacable opposition to the human race?

So as to your specific question... could they still produce offspring? If my last paragraph is on the right lines, there would now be no purpose in such a conspiracy. Could they? Only if they were 'allowed'... and that stage of the conflict seems to be over now that we have a man in the heavens...

Re: - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/10/25 6:34

Good stuff there Ron,

What you have put here does not really answer the question as such, but place enough truth in place to filter out speculative theories, anyway thanks it was a very interesting read.

While I was thinking about the sons of God, I seem to remember that Hinduism also claims a immaculate conception of one of their deities. If you study their religion out it is almost amazing to see the parallels in the concept of the trinity and all. In speaking to some of them, they claim primacy for the concept over Christianity based on the apparent age of the religion.

As this is a very old religion I found myself wondering if this concept about angels coming to the daughters of men could be explained by this Genesis verse? No matter, its not important.

Re: - posted by Warrior4Jah (), on: 2005/10/25 7:39

Quote:
-----Is it possible that Goliath and his brothers were 'Nephilim'? Is this why God partly explained the Conquest of Canaan by saying 'the I and is vomiting them out'?

I have little to add or comment to your excellent post. But that quote grabbed my attention! A while back when I was reading through the OT I was amazed about this race of giants. Actually its not that important at all. (as its getting OT)

1Sa 17:4 *And a champion named Goliath came out of the Philistines camp; he was from Gath. His height was six cubits and a span.*

This dude was about 3 metres tall!
Still it seems that he is only one of his kind among the Philistines.
Further back we find an account of Israel battling a people of giants. (And how they relied on the Lord to beat them)

Deu 3:11 *For only Og king of Bashan remained of the rest of the giants. Behold! His bedstead was a bedstead of iron. Is it not in Rabbath of the sons of Ammon? Nine cubits was its length, and four cubits its width, according to the cubit of a man.*

The king of this people had a bedstead of iron which was more then 4 metres tall and about 1.8 metres wide! Goliath must be a (large? :-P) midget compared to the Enakites (As translated in my Dutch NBG, KJV says 'Sons of Anak')
This race of giant people existed after the great flood. Perhaps its not so important, but this did grab my attention a while back. :-)

Deu 9:1-3 has a very cool message, just like David being able to beat Goliath due to the Lord!
We often face Enakites in our lives. :-P

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/10/25 8:49

Good post

Quote:
----- So as to your specific question... could they still produce offspring? If my last paragraph is on the right lines, there would now be no purpose in such a conspiracy. Could they? Only if they were 'allowed'... and that stage of the conflict seems to be over now that we have a man in the heavens...

I never thought that through before. That was a good point I'll need to look into further.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/25 9:30

Hi Ron,

It seems that there has been a pattern to the influence of demons upon humanity down through the centuries. I have made a connection in James 1 & 3 to some of the wiles of the devil. I wondered if you might comment:

Quote:
-----Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him. Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: (1:12 , 13)

God is not the agent of temptation, Satan or his demons are.

Quote:
-----But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death. (14, 15)

We have discussed this in other threads, so I will not here.

Quote:
-----Do not err, my beloved brethren. Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning. (16, 17)

This seems to relate to a coming passage in James 3:

Quote:
-----But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish.

So we see here that God does not tempt with evil nor does He father a malicious attitude. The 'wisdom' that is producing these things is not coming from God. So we return to 1:19, 20

Quote:
-----Wherefore, my beloved brethren, let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath: For the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.

It seems that God is revealing to us that there are some 'age old' diabolical influences in situations that produce wrath and that we ought to be swift to hear and slow to speak. In other words, we need to take some time and do some discernment of what is going on. but to do that properly we have a prerequisite:

Quote:
-----Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls.

It seems that the enemy can find in 'us' filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness and use these things as a springboard to propagate his lies. And between filthiness and an superabundance of malice- he was successful in subverting the mind of men in the old world until:

Quote:
-----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.

It seems that if afforded opportunity, this is the finality of the objective of Satan for the earth. That all flesh corrupt its way (filthiness) and be filled with violence (superfluity of naughtiness). Hence we read in the prophetic New Testament written

gs that "as it was in the days of Noah so shall it be when the Son of Man comes..." (para) etc.

We know that the violent angels that are bound in the great river Euphrates will be loosed at some point. I see these as the violent angels that God bound after the flood. But could it be possible that any of the other more sinister perverse angels as you mention could be loosed also?

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/25 11:39

Quote:
-----As this is a very old religion I found myself wondering if this concept about angels coming to the daughters of men could be explained by this Genesis verse? No matter, its not important.

These was the explanation of G H Pember. "Earth's Earliest Ages". He reckoned that these events were still in the collective memory of the race and were the source of mythologies from every culture.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/25 12:53

I believe the name, "sons of God" speaks not to whether they are angels or men but to whom their father is. Those who are obedient to God are those who obey the commands of their Father in heaven. Are not all, whether angels or man called to make a choice? Are not all, whether angels or man judged according to the choice made. Are not all who are called the sons of God enabled by God to do His work?

Here is another example similiar to the one found in Job. Who are the "companions?"

Zech. 3:1 And he shewed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the LORD, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. 2 And the LORD said unto Satan, The LORD rebuke thee, O Satan; even the LORD that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire? 3 Now Joshua was clothed with filthy garments, and stood before the angel. 4 And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment. 5 And I said, Let them set a fair mitre upon his head. So they set a fair mitre upon his head, and clothed him with garments. And the angel of the LORD stood by. 6 And the angel of the LORD protested unto Joshua, saying, 7 Thus saith the LORD of hosts; If thou wilt walk in my ways, and if thou wilt keep my charge, then thou shalt also judge my house, and shalt also keep my courts, and I will give thee places to walk among these that stand by. 8 Hear now, O Joshua the high priest, thou, and thy fellows that sit before thee: for they are men wondered at: for, behold, I will bring forth my servant the BRANCH. 9 For behold the stone that I have laid before Joshua; upon one stone shall be seven eyes: behold, I will engrave the graving thereof, saith the LORD of hosts, and I will remove the iniquity of that land in one day. 10 In that day, saith the LORD of hosts, shall ye call every man his neighbour under the vine and under the fig tree.

The precept of faith finds its' root in the spiritual world, not that which is seen but unseen.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: Who are the sons, what is the devil doing there? - posted by Rahman, on: 2005/10/25 13:18

All the questions on this thread are adressed in THE CALLED (part of the reason it's now published) ... Now available at;

XULON PRESS
<http://www.xulonpress.com/bookstore/titles/1597814644.htm>

AMAZON

http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/1597814644/103-6637566-9019013?v=glance&n=283155&_encoding=UTF8&v=glance

EUROPE

<http://www.bol.it/inglesi/scheda?action=engscheda&ean=978159781464>

FIRST 3 CHAPTERS POSTED ON SI;

http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=2289&forum=41&18

i can't wait for theologians, bible scholars and secular scientist to start ripping it apart!

Br. R

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/25 13:34

Quote:
-----I believe the name, "sons of God" speaks not to whether they are angels or men but to whom their father is. Those who are obedient to God are those who obey the commands of their Father in heaven. Are not all, whether angels or man called to make a choice? Are not all, whether angels or man judged according to the choice made. Are not all who are called the sons of God enabled by God to do His work?

There is truth here but it does not contradict what has been said so far. A 'son' is one who stands in immediate relationship to a father. ie there is no middle link of any kind between a son and a father. This is the source of the old saying that 'God has no grandchildren'.

True regeneration does effect genuine sonship. The 'new born' has no one between himself and his father. The 'life' did not pass through another but came direct from the father. In this sense Adam was a 'son of God'; the life came directly from God, but Cain and Abel were not, they came through Adam and were, consequently, Adam's sons.

This would fit with the designation 'sons of God' be given to angels who were never 'born' of other angels but who each received their 'life' direct from God.

A word of warning to those who only use the KJV... the phrase 'son(s) of God' is much less frequent in the NT than you might think. John never uses it of humans beingst! John 1:12 (KJVS) But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name:

1John 3:1 (KJVS) Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not.

1John 3:2 (KJVS) Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. Each of these references has 'children' in the original. Sorry, if that spoiled some of your best sermons! ;-)'children' has character-likeness more in mind than origin.

In the light of our discussion the correction of the KJV here is interesting. "Neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." (Luke 20:36, KJV)

"nor can they die anymore, for they are equal to the angels and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection." (Luke 20:36, NKJV) In each instance in the NKJV the word is more accurately translated as 'sons', but the context is very interesting.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/25 15:55

Brother Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----True regeneration does effect genuine sonship. The 'new born' has no one between himself and his father. The 'life' did not pass through another but came direct from the father. In this sense Adam was a 'son of God'; the life came directly from God, but Cain and Abel were not, they came through Adam and were, consequently, Adam's sons.

In particular the thought, "but Cain and Abel were not, they came through Adam and were, consequently, Adam's sons" speaks to why the Scriptures speak of being "Adopted." We who become heirs with Christ are adopted into sonship. The angels who have obeyed from the beginning of time do not need to be adopted.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/25 16:10

Hi Ron,

Quote:
-----The 'new born' has no one between himself and his father. The 'life' did not pass through another but came direct from the father. In this sense Adam was a 'son of God'; the life came directly from God, but Cain and Abel were not, they came through Adam and were, consequently, Adam's sons.

So then are we talking about 'life' in terms of *breath* or *nature* or both?

In the original question we were dealing with "sons of God". In terms of the 'life' which all the angels apparently received directly from God they are "sons of God"; but in terms of their nature it at some point fell into Sinfulness they would seem to be children of the Devil, (i.e. you are of your father the Devil and the lusts of your father you will do, etc.) So Sin at some point had to have entered the angels also, yet they retained the name "sons of God." To me this almost has to lay to rest the issue of Genesis 6 as being angels. It is that or Sin enters man at his first act of disobedience.?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/25 18:19

Quote:
----- We who become heirs with Christ are adopted into sonship.

Indeed we do, but the scriptures set forth very different aspects of God's work in us through the pictures of regeneration and sonship (adoption)

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/10/25 18:24

Bro. Rahman, You're just radical :-) ! I Pray the Lord blesses you through this whole endeavor. God Bless Bro. Daryl

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/25 18:27

Quote:
----- So Sin at some point had to have entered the angels also, yet they retained the name "sons of God." To me this almost has to lay to rest the issue of Genesis 6 as being angels. It is that or Sin enters man at his first act of disobedience.?

There is something quite unique about our race. Angel's did not have sin 'enter' into them as a result of Satan's sin but as a result of their own. Each angel seems to have sinned personally and uniquely. Adam's sin spread to Eve but there is no indication of sin spreading from one angel to another; there is no generic/genetic link. (I am not talking about literal genes, but 'angelic genes'! I think we can confidently say that they is the first reference in history to 'angel genes!! :-D If it becomes popular just remember that SI had it first!)

I am just talking about sentient, intelligent life - not otherwise specified. Each angel received this life at the same moment from an initial creation. There is only one generation of angels. Just as there is only one generation of the 're-generated'. Phrases like 'the coming generation' or 'the next generation' have no meaning for 'sons of God'; there is just one generation of 'sons'.

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/10/25 20:10

Quote:

-----I think we can confidently say that they is the first reference in history to 'angel genes!!

I had to google this idea and wouldn't you know it...

(<http://www.Owned.org/~dook/angel.html>) Learn about Angelic genome

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/26 4:23

Quote:

-----I had to google this idea and wouldn't you know it...

Thanks Mike,

You've got too much free time on your hands! He's thinking of angel-genes in a slightly different way but, nevertheless, I was pipped at the post! I shall have to seek fame by some other route!

The Book of Enoch, for those who are still following this and who may have followed MC's hyperlink, was a Pseudepigraph. (ah, you say, I though it was!) Pseudepigraphy was a device used in ancient times to give credence to literary works. If you agreed with Isaiah and believed you were correctly interpreting Isaiah you might bring out a book said to be written 'by Isaiah'. In some instances it was an act of respect to a greater and earlier authority, in other instances it was plain forgery.

The Book of Enoch WAS NOT WRITTEN BY ENOCH. It comes from the period in between the OT and the NT when Judaism was going through a 'mystical' period. The myths and legends that they invented were astounding. (See (http://philologos.org/___eb-lat/appen13.htm) Jewish Angelology) The Book of Enoch is dated about 200 BC and has absolutely no link with the Enoch of the Bible.

Some say, but Jude quotes from it with apparent approval. Indeed he does, and Paul quotes from heathen poets praising Zeus with 'apparent approval' in Acts 17.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/26 10:59

Brother Robert wrote:

Quote:

-----So Sin at some point had to have entered the angels also, yet they retained the name "sons of God." To me this almost has to lay to rest the issue of Genesis 6 as being angels. It is that or Sin enters man at his first act of disobedience?

Where in Scripture does it say that those angels who chose to disobey God were still called "sons of God?"

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/26 11:16

22 And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever:

"Man has become as one of us, to **know good and evil...**"

I believe that man was given over to know evil that comes from the spiritual work of Satan. Prior to Adam's choice to disobey God's command, Adam knew only good. The Holy Spirit dwelled in him. The moment he became naked, was the moment which opened one door and shut another. Without God's Light of Life man was given over to the tempter.

In Zechariah 3 we see that Satan had once held Joshua in bondage, but Christ freed him from that bondage.

Zech. 3:1 And he shewed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the LORD, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. 2 And the LORD said unto Satan, The LORD rebuke thee, O Satan; even the LORD that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?

The angels have the same choice as was given to man. Obey God or choose the lake of fire.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/26 11:26

In terms of whether Scripture speaks of men being called "sons of God," Paul writes in Roman 8:

14 For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

I checked this verse out in the concordance and did not see the word "children" or "child" used.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/26 12:11

Hi Jeff,

Quote:

-----Where in Scripture does it say that those angels who chose to disobey God were still called "sons of God?"

I was basing the premise on the passages in Job and Genesis 6. If the "sons of God" came to present themselves and Satan with them, it would reason that all of the non-bound "sons of God" would be in that procession.

I recall once John MaCarthur listing the angels:

- 1) Elect
- 2) Fallen

Of the fallen there are:

- 1) Loosed
- 2) Bound

Of the bound there are:

- 1) Temporarily Bound

2) Permanently Bound

It would seem that all of the 'loosed' angels are accountable before God as we see the "sons of God" and Satan appearing before Him. I would think this means every one that still has their freedom. Another option I could imagine is that they were there but their specific name were not given (if it were other than "sons of God" or angels. But that's a long shot.

I cannot imagine that the so called 'Godly line of Seth' would be called "sons of God" because man had fallen and Ron pointed out other problems with it (God does not have grandchildren, etc.).

My last option being that the "sons of God" may have fallen into disobedience Genesis 6, but that still does not answer the passages in Job.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/26 12:39

Quote:

-----Where in Scripture does it say that those angels who chose to disobey God were still called "sons of God?"

Isn't this where we started? Job 1:6 (KJVS) 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 (KJVS) 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.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/26 13:01

Job 1:6 (KJVS) Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan came also among them.

I cannot assert as you that the sons of God are the fallen according to the Scriptures cited here.

Does not Scripture also teach that God sends angels to protect those that are His? Would not Job's angels be present to confront Satan?

What of the story in Daniel where the angels war against the powers and principalities in the spiritual realm.

Again in Zech 3, we see Satan and others. The companions of which is cited in this section of Scripture do not assert that which you cite in Genesis or Job. I must therefore contend with the whole counsel of God.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/10/26 13:17

Dear Ron,

This talk of comparing the 'sons of God' to the angels is quite interesting. I must admit that I agree with you. Although, it does stir another thought that I am curious how you would address.

The Jehovah's Witnesses believe Jesus is Michael the Archangel. They do not believe Jesus is God. They believe Jesus is the first of all creation, the firstborn son of God, an angel who God has given all authority over earth and heaven. By

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Who are the sons, what is the devil doing there?

this, they believe Jesus is a God or a Lord, but not the Lord or the God. They base this on several doctrinal arguments. The most obvious argument they use is that Jesus called Himself the son of God, and at no time ever called Himself God.

By what we have been discussing, as angels being the 'sons of God,' it does lend itself to a misinterpretation of Jesus stating that He is the son of God. By this, they could say that Jesus was saying, "I am an angel." Part of this is substantiated by a misinterpretation of the book of Revelation especially chapter 22 where John is talking with an angel, and the angel was quoting God word for word saying, "I, Jesus". (Revelation 22:6-19 Also, misinterpretations in Daniel 10:13, 10:21, 11:1, 12:1 and Rev. 12:7)

As you know, I don't believe this. I believe Jesus is Lord and God. I am curious though as to what you would say to someone who was putting up that argument. How would you respond?

Thanks,

Blake

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/26 13:30

Hi Jeff,

The view that the sons of God are believed angels is a view that dates far back in antiquity. I found a quote on this:

All the versions, and indeed all the critics, are puzzled with the phrase sons of God; beney haelohim, literally, sons of the God, or sons of the gods. The Vulgate has simply filii dei, sons of God. The Septuagint, the angels of God. The Chaldee, kittey malachaiya, troops of angels. (Clarke) However, Adam Clarke does not hold to the view of Genesis 6 being 'angels'.

If the LXX has 'angels' it would have to be the understanding of the scribes of that day. This is furthered by Clarke's other notation of "troops of angels" used in the Chaldee.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/26 13:39

Quote:
-----As you know, I don't believe this. I believe Jesus is Lord and God. I am curious though as to what you would say to someone who was putting up that argument. How would you respond?

There are several levels upon which the JW theory could be addressed. The most obvious, I think, would be recourse to the epistle to the Hebrews where Christ is specifically said to have been the object of angelic worship not one of the worshippers: "And again, when he bringeth in the firstborn into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him." (Heb. 1:6, KJVS) Another helpful verse in Hebrews shows Christ's identification with the human rather than the angelic race: "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." (Heb. 2:16, KJVS)

There is another fatal problem for the JW thesis. If Michael the Angel became Christ the man, what has happened to the body of Christ the man, if (as the JW's say) Christ has now reverted to being an angel?

A very early thread here on SI discussed the 'first born of all creation' aspect. I will see if I can find it.

edit: Yes, here it is.

(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmode=flat&order0&topic_id=673&forum=36&post_id&refresh) The Father's Firstborn...

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/26 15:02

Br. Robert wrote:

Quote:

----- However, Adam Clarke does not hold to the view of Genesis 6 being 'angels'.

My understanding of Genesis 6 is that the 'sons of God' spoken of are indeed speaking of faithful men who were like Abel, Seth, Enoch, etc.

Yet my point in this discussion does not seek to establish what the sons of God are but rather what makes them 'sons of God.' Scripture teaches that there is always faithful men throughout the generations of this world. Scripture also teaches that there are always faithful angels as well.

I believe that both men and angels are 'sons of God,' that is, those who obey.

Paul teaches in Romans 8:14, who the sons of God are. It is those who submit to being led by the Spirit of God.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/26 15:35

Hi Jeff,

I understand. However, I don't believe that we can confuse the two. It is hard for me to imagine why scripture at this juncture would use "sons of God" when "sons of Seth" could have been just as easily used.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/26 16:40

Rom. 8:14 For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

Paul teaches that it is the Spirit of God that determines or identifies who are the 'sons of God.' It is very important to come to terms with this precept. This precept is laced throughout Scripture. This precept presents the choice to all His creation, obey or rebel. All will be judged according to what they did not what they thought.

Our path creates the evidence of what we hope for.

How many men in Scriptures have walk this path of life? How many men have rejected this path and are judged by the words of Jesus? How many angels have submitted to God? How many angels have rebelled against God?

How many have been led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God.

It is not my intent to argue a point, it is my intent to point to what Scriptures define as those who are the sons of God.

In Christ
Jeff

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Who are the sons, what is the devil doing there?

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/10/26 18:37

Hey Ron,

Thanks for the feedback. It is a bit ironic, but shortly after I made that post, I entered a discussion with someone who believes the trinity is false, and supports it heavily with the bible.

I read through the post about the Father's firstborn. This is helpful.

One of the things I think is interesting in all this is how it demonstrates the problems and limitations of language. In the bible, "son(s) of God" is used in conjunction with so many concepts and topics. Each time it is used, however, the connotation changes. For instance, in one part it refers to angels. In another, it refers to humans. Sometimes, it is used to show position of authority.

Words are limiting and give way to so much interpretation and meaning which is then limited by our own understanding of the words and their usage. I wonder, can God's Word really be embodied in human words?

I don't like the use of 'first born' when applied to Jesus as it is really misleading. It refers to being the first human to be resurrected. However, many people misinterpret it to mean that Jesus is the first thing God created.

Anyway, I don't think there is an adequate way to argue the position of the trinity. I believe it must be come unto by faith. Which makes a great deal of sense.

We were given free will which means we were given the choice to choose our own God, the thing that we will devote our will towards. God wants us to come unto Him in love, by our own choice, and choose to make Him our God. If Jesus, or the bible, would have just come out and said plainly, "Jesus is God," then it would have robbed us of our choice. We must believe it. We must believe in Jesus as our Lord and Savior. This revelation was hidden so that only those who Jesus chooses may have this revealed unto them.

Thanks again,

In love,
Blake

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/10/26 18:50

Dear rookie,

I hope you don't mind me adding an observation.

Quote:
-----My understanding of Genesis 6 is that the 'sons of God' spoken of are indeed speaking of faithful men who were like Abel, Seth, Enoch, etc.

I would be tempted to agree with you, unless I read further as to what it says in Genesis 6:4.

(NASB)
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.

The part that interests me is that these giants, the Nephilim, held so much influence and power that they became 'men of renown.' Myths and legends developed from them. This doesn't sound like your average man.

Just an observation.

In love,
Blake

Re: Who are the sons, what is the devil doing there?, on: 2005/10/26 22:34

I'm sorry I have not been able to read the last page of this thread, but I have three further comments, much in line with my previous post.

1) Matthew 22:30

For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.

The fall of angels cannot have conferred on them the power of procreation. Why would God do that?

2) We still have giants on the earth. They may be rare, but they have to be held in context with the smallness of some others. Before the Flood, the coldness on earth which (later) helped to make people smaller, did not exist. This would have supported 'largeness'.

Historically, some completely perfect humans were only 3 - 4 feet tall - and still are today. This makes a person who is over 7'6" or even over 8 feet tall, very much a giant. (The 'definition' nowadays is 6'3" or over).

People are still being born with 6 fingers and toes. I was at school with someone like this. These days tho, to avoid their future embarrassment by such a variation, at an early age, the 6th digit on each hand and foot which most readily offers itself as 'odd' is removed, so the rest of the developmental years take up the space and minimise the visible scarring from the surgery.

My point is, then (Gen 6) and now, these are genetic rather than spiritual variations in normality, which could easily have been passed down through Noah.

3) The spirits referred to in Peter's writings, could be those whom Jesus led captive after His victory on the cross, particularly those capable of holding people in bondage all their lives through fear of death. (Heb 2:14 - 16)

Psalms 68:18

Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the LORD God might dwell . {for men: Heb. in the man}

Ephesians 4:8

Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.

It may be this is why demon possession may seem to be quite muted in our societies now, especially the Christianised ones, where love in a measure militates against fear.

I believe we are in denial if we imagine that the sort of extreme violence which caused God to send the Flood, does not go on in a measure where it can unchecked, even today.

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/10/27 9:25

Dear dorcas,

Quote:
-----My point is, then (Gen 6) and now, these are genetic rather than spiritual variations in normality, which could easily have been passed down through Noah.

What you say could be valid, except for the fact that we are not talking about a few genetic variations. We are not talking about a few giants popping up here and there. The scriptures do not give any indication of this. Rather, it seems to present it as such that all the children of the 'sons of God' and 'daughters of men' produced giants, 'men of renown.'

In today's time, we don't call giants, 'men of renown.' We think of them as being odd or strange, but not mighty and powerful. Why would people at that time be any different?

Not to mention that the genetic makeup of people during this time was closer to that of Adam, a perfect man. People before the time of Noah lived to be 1000 years. That was normal. And so, at that time in history, the likelihood there was any genetic irregularities is small. I would be more inclined to say the people living during that time were near perfect.

These Nephilim had might and strength that caused people to revere them and call them heroes. These are men with power.

This is just my observation. I do realize this is all speculation. We don't know the truth of the matter, and if God wanted us to know, then He would tell us.

What we do know is Christ, and that is who we should know.

God Bless,
Blake

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/27 13:01

Brother Ron,

What is the equivalent word for Nephilim in the Septuagint?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/28 13:53

Quote:
-----What is the equivalent word for Nephilim in the Septuagint?

The Gen 6 passage has 'gigantes' which is our word gigantic and the Greek for 'giant'. However many Hebrew teachers did believe that these Nephilim were 'fallen ones' first and 'giants' second. ie they were gigantic because they were 'fallen ones'.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/28 14:54

In the Septuagint the greek word 05303 for Nephilim is different. In the Greek the word is "Husterema" which means, "deficiency, that which is lacking, of those things which are to be filled up."

So there seems to be more to this idea of giants for the Hebrew scholars of the 3rd century BC chose to translate into Greek "husterema" as a means to convey what the Nephilim were, or were not.

Now with this, what really might be going on here in Genesis 6? If the Nephilim are lacking something, or there is a lack of them, what does that say as to fulfilling the need of the daughters of men?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/28 15:31

Quote:
-----In the Septuagint the greek word 05303 for Nephilim is different. In the Greek the word is "Husterema" which means, "deficiency, th at which is lacking, of those things which are to be filled up."

I don't understand this paragraph. The Hebrew word, Strongs 05303 is nephilim, The Septuagint translations chose the Greek word 'gigantes'; this word is never used in the New Testament so there is no equivalent Strongs number for it.

Oh wait, I see what you have done. You have used your 'Accordance Software' to find the Strongs Number for the word Nephilim, but you have looked up the word in the Greek list, when you ought to have been looking in the Hebrew list. Th e Greek word husterema (Strongs: Greek! 5303) means 'poverty' but this Greek Strongs Number has nothing to do with the word Nephilim.

Nephilim, the Hebrew word, Strongs Hebrew 5303, is used only in Gen. 6:4; Num. 13:33.

husterema, the Greek word, Strongs Greek 5303 is used in Luke 21:4; 1Cor. 16:17; 2Cor. 8:14; 9:12; 11:9; Phil. 2:30; C ol. 1:24; 1Th. 3:10.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/28 16:27

Br. Ron,

You are right, I made the mistake that you pointed out here. I was using the Blue Letter Bible site for the info.

However, once seeing where I went wrong, I also noticed where you spoke of the idea of "fallen."

The root word in Hebrew is Strongs number 05307. The word is "Naphal." The meaning of this word connotes, the idea of fallen, or fail. So again, there seems to be something more to be gleaned.

Also I thought that the Nephilim were the result of the sons of God going into the daughters of men. But now looking at t he verse more carefully, that doesn't seem to support that notion.

4 There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown.

The nephilim existed before the sons of God came into the daughters of men.

What do you think?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2006/5/17 9:26

Quote:

rookie wrote:
Also I thought that the Nephilim were the result of the sons of God going into the daughters of men. But now looking at the verse more carefully, that d oesn't seem to support that notion.

4 There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown.

The nephilim existed before the sons of God came into the daughters of men.

In my early walk, I naively thought that "sons of God" referred to the descendants of Seth, and "daughters of men" referred to the descendants of Cain. With the latter knowledge that "sons of God" is translated from "ben elohim", I can see two possible paths.

Psalm 8:5 has been a verse that in the past I used to claim that the KJV was fallible. The reason being what KJV translates as "lower than the angels", some modern paraphrases translate "lower than God". The word "angel/God" is translated from "elohim". Because Elohim is mostly translated "God" it seemed to make more sense this way, for how can man, which is in the image of God, be created "lower than the angels"?

However, there is one problem with this logic, in that Hebrews 2, where the importance of man is established to be higher than that of angels, the writer quotes the psalmist and translates "elohim" as "angelo" (v7). Therefore, either "elohim" can be justifiably translated as "angels", or Hebrews is an "epistle of straw" (which obviously it is not). If this is the case, the term "sons of God" could also be translated "sons of angels", which would seem to support the notion of an "angelic union" with man that produced offspring. Behold "path one".

The other possible scenario is found in Numbers and Deuteronomy, where God reveals the reason why Israel was to totally annihilate the seven nations in the promised land (namely, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites), while leaving others (Deut 20:10-18).

Quote:

-----Deuteronomy 2:9-12 (KJV)

9 And the LORD said unto me, Distress not the Moabites, neither contend with them in battle: for I will not give thee of their land for a possession; because **I have given Ar unto the children of Lot for a possession.**

10 The **Emims dwelt therein in times past, a people great, and many, and tall, as the Anakims;**

11 Which also were **accounted giants, as the Anakims; but the Moabites call them Emims.**

12 The Horims also dwelt in Seir beforetime; but the children of Esau succeeded them, when they had destroyed them from before them, and dwelt in their stead; as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which the LORD gave unto them.

Here we have a division. The nations that Israel were to destroy were descended from "giants" (here Anakim, descendant of Anak - Num 13:33) and the unmolested ones had already defeated the giants in their land. The further exhortation is that Israel was forbidden to marry the women of these "Anakim nations", due to the strong temptation to be drawn to worship their gods. The only basis that an Israelite could marry outside of their own nation, was when the women were from "cities which are very far off from thee, which are not of the cities of these nations" (Deut 20:15), and women from the "Anakim nations" who were "women children, that have not known a man by lying with him" (Num 31:18 - obviously once they were old enough to marry).

Why would God do that? Because these nations worshipped their gods sexually. Their sexuality was corrupted and could not be separated from their "pagan" worship. For the Israelite to join with these women was to inevitably lead to their devotion to the foreign Gods, due to the "expertise" of these women in the delivery of sexual gratification. They would have been taught how to do it well, as a prostitute is taught in order to have their clients return for more. Just as the seductive techniques that have infiltrated western culture (such as Tantric Sex for example), which lead to ignorant worship of the "god of this world" due to the benefits of increased pleasure and promise everything from deepening of relationship to decrease of stress and physical ailments, so too would the Israelites end up preferring this kind of "worship" to that which was prescribed by Yahweh (on a side note, the restoration of the sexual worship of the "sacred goddess" is one of the purposes behind the the DaVinci Code).

Note also that this sexual worship was often associated with fertility, with the deity (such as Astarte) promising increased "fruit of the womb" to those who submitted to her techniques. Before long, the Baals would be sacrificed to in order to "procure things", and the Molochs would be sacrificed to in order to attain "ascendancy over one's fellows" (for more on this listen to Paris Reidhead's (<http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid38>) Dangers of Third Generation Religion). Also note that these "false gods" would actually deliver on their promises, as all they would ask is that the "ways of this world" be obeyed (1 John 2:15-16).

Now considering that the "false gods" promised prosperity as a result of following the principles of this world, that the inhabitants of Canaan worshipped these gods, and the inhabitants were giants who were highly successful at cultivation and horticulture, and considering that the "sons of Israel" were forbidden to marry the "daughters of Anak" because that

would lead to these successful idolators to seducing Israel into like practice with promises of prosperity that they actually "could deliver on", then perhaps there is similarity to be noted when looking at the "sons of God (via Seth)" and the "daughters of men (ie, the 'ideal-giant-man', the Nephilim, via Cain)?"

In other words, the reason why there were giants was that the people of the land (both the 'pre-flood' Nephilim and the 'pre-promised-land-conquest' Anakim) had such a handle on the 'principles of this world' (much like our modern day scientists) that they could manipulate things in such a way that prosperity was assured. Now considering also that God had already told Abraham that "the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full" and that his descendants would have to wait until that happened before he would give them the land (Gen 15:13-16). Now consider that if you had had some 440 years to perfect your idolatrous worship to the point that prosperity and success was assured, why would you want to stop this to obey a God who says that what you have been doing all these years is an "abomination in His sight", and that you now had to follow a course that would lead through suffering before the realisation of glory?

To me it makes sense that God would choose to flood the world, of whom He said, "My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh..." (Gen 6:3) and that logic also makes the total annihilation of the people in the promised land make sense. Perhaps this can help us to understand Jesus words "Resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also" (Mat 5:39) when considering the issue of wars. It seems that God was "genocidally (is that a word :-)) racist" toward the inhabitants of His promised land. The judgement against the world by flooding would never be repeated, sealed with the sign of the rainbow (Gen 9:12-16). Perhaps his judgement against the world by ordering the sword point of His people, will not be repeated (now that would shed some light on the origin of the "crusades" and "jihad" alike), with the confirming sign of the presence of the "salt of the earth" and the "light of the world" (Mat 5:13-16). That can be taken as a mixed message, by the modern day "giants in the land", as it would appear that there are no more obvious "warning shots". God is now about "giving over" the unrepentant to their sin and chastening of the righteous (See Rom 1 and Psalm 73).

So the choice is simple, either they repent of their trust in the "principles of the world" or they'll have to endure the final judgement when God's Spirit will finally cease to strive with men for ever....

Re: Eastons 1897 Bible Dictionary, on: 2006/5/17 22:48

We have so much confusion today on this issue. Who are the Sons of God?

Adam was referred to as the Son of God in the New Testament.

The 1897 Eastons Bible Dictionary has this to say about the issue.

Topics: Son of God

Text: The plural, "sons of God," is used (Gen. 6:2, 4) to denote the pious descendants of Seth. In Job 1:6; 38:7 this name is applied to the angels. Hosea uses the phrase (1:10) to designate the gracious relation in which men stand to God.

In the New Testament this phrase frequently denotes the relation into which we (Christian believers) are brought to God by adoption (Rom. 8:14, 19; 2 Cor. 6:18; Gal. 4:5, 6; Phil. 2:15; 1 John 3:1, 2). It occurs thirty-seven times in the New Testament as the distinctive title of our Saviour. He does not bear this title in consequence of his miraculous birth, nor of his incarnation, his resurrection, and exaltation to the Father's right hand.

This is a title of nature and not of office. The sonship of Christ denotes his equality with the Father. To call Christ the Son of God is to assert his true and proper divinity. The second Person of the Trinity, because of his eternal relation to the first Person, is the Son of God. He is the Son of God as to his divine nature, while as to his human nature he is the Son of David (Rom. 1:3, 4. Comp. Gal. 4:4; John 1:1-14; 5:18-25; 10:30-38, which prove that Christ was the Son of God before his incarnation, and that his claim to this title is a claim of equality with God).

When used with reference to creatures, whether men or angels, this word is always in the plural. In the singular it is always used of the second Person of the Trinity, with the single exception of Luke 3:38, where it is used of Adam.

xxxxx

In Hosea Chapter 1:10 The Jews, God's chosen people, are referred to as ***God's sons (sons of the living God)***:

10. Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, YE ARE THE **SONS OF THE LIVING GOD**

New Testament

John 1:12 " 12. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the **sons of God**, even to them that believe on his name:"

Romans 8:14

14. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the **sons of God**.

Romans 8:19

9. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the **sons of God**.

Phil 2:13-15

13. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.

14. Do all things without murmurings and disputings:

15. That ye may be blameless and harmless, the **sons of God**, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world;

1 John 3:1-2 Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the **sons of God**: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not.

2. Beloved, now are we the **sons of God**, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

It seems from the examples found in Scripture that the term "Sons of God" in the Book of Job actually refers to Angels (the good ones). A distinction is actually made between them, and Satan, who is a fallen Angel and would be hardly considered a Son of God anymore:

Job 1:6-7

6. Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them.

7. And the Lord said unto Satan, Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it.

What this Scripture teaches me is that Satan still has access to Heaven, and is still subservient to his maker, God Almighty.

God bless,

Stever :-)

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2006/5/18 7:43

Quote:

Stever wrote:
Job 1:6-7
6. Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them.
7. And the Lord said unto Satan, Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it.

What this Scripture teaches me is that Satan still has access to Heaven, and is still subservient to his maker, God Almighty.

What if this refers to the "sons of ", is a reference to a day in which the people of like nature to Seth (ie, they "call upon the name of the LORD (Yahweh)" - Gen 4:26)? This would create a scenario where Satan is coming to God, as His people are "calling upon Him" and God points Satan's attention to one amongst these who please Him, namely Job. This is in contrast to the people that Satan encountered as he was "going to and fro in the earth". This presents the silent possibility of a contrast between people who are dependant on God's participation in their life and those who pridefully think that they need not "call upon the name of the Lord".

In other words, this could be a situation where Satan is bragging about how many people there are who are subject to his kingdom, compared to the tiny remnant of God's "sons".

Note that this protects the integrity of the KJV translation (ie, rightly choosing to translate 'elohim' as 'God' rather than 'angels' as it is in Psalm 8:5). To my knowledge this verse is not actually quoted in the NT, and every verse that was mentioned in Stever's post, "sons of God" translates "theos" as "God", where Heb 2:7 translates "elohim", from Psalm 8:5, as "angelos" which in English is rendered "angels". Obviously all the NT references to "sons of God" are referring to "mortal beings" and not "angels", so this would further support the notion that "sons of God" in Job also refers to "mortal beings" with a disposition that is "like unto" or even a "consequence of union with and dependence on" God.

I concur with Stever who said, "This is a title of nature and not of office." I would perhaps go a step further to say that it is a "description of character and not a title of office". I believe it was Norman Grubb who made mention to God's ultimate goal of "bringing many sons to Glory" (Heb 2:10), comparing it to Henry Ford setting up an "English Ford Motors", a "Dutch Ford Motors", an "Australian Ford Motors", etc... by effectively "replicating himself" by raising up staff that hold to his values and methods, and then sending them out to replicate his "American Ford Motors". Perhaps Job also presents a "pre-NT" illustration of "sonship" in limited form, just as "OT-Levitical-sacrificial atonement" is a limited expression of "NT-Messianic-sacrificial atonement", where the former merely "covers sin" while the latter "removes sin".

So we have it again, the never ending allusion to the "Tale of Two Kingdoms". I guess it makes more sense than a disjointed "staff meeting of angels" in the Book of Job, that has no relevancy to the rest of the story. But as anyone who has followed any of my posts in the past, I am capable of being wrong (no...seriously :-P) so anyone who can close this theory out, would be very welcome to this "seeker of truth"... but you've got to admit, it makes sense.

Re: Sons of God, on: 2006/5/18 10:12

CJaKfOrEsT posted:

this refers to the "sons of ", is a reference to a day in which the people of like nature to Seth (ie, they "call upon the name of the LORD (Yahweh)" - Gen 4:26)? This would/COULD create a scenario where Satan is coming to God, as His people are "calling upon Him" and God points Satan's attention to one amongst these who please Him, namely Job.

xxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

It seems to me that the Sons of God, as mentioned in Genesis refers to all believers in God, going all of the way back to Adam, and carried forward through Abel, and finally Noah, and then carried forward past the flood by the line of Seth. Th

ese were all believers in the "Seed of the Woman" that presented blood sacrifices to the Lord to cover their sin, until the final sacrifice, Christ Jesus, paid the ultimate price for all believers, going back to the beginning of time, to the end of time.

I am in a rush right now, but will try to post this over the weekend.

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/5/18 15:52

A son is either a son by creation or a son by birthing, that is why in the Old Testament nobody called God Father. Only after birthing can a son call the Seed giver Father. The son's of God in Hosea are yet future son's that will be birthed by the Seed of Christ in them making them son's of the Living God and are able to call the Life Giver Father.

In the place where it was said - (or where it shall be said, i. e., at the first) unto them, ye are not My people, there it shall, in after-time, this after time is after the Cross then by the birthing it may be said unto them, ye are the sons of the living God Both the times here spoken of by the prophet were yet future, for Israel, although they had apostatised from God, had not yet been disowned by God, who was still sending to them prophets, to reclaim them. They ceased to be owned as God's people, when, being dispersed abroad, they had no share in the sacrifices, no temple-worship, no prophets, no typical reconciliation for sin. God took no more notice of them than the pagan. Acts 28:27-28 For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them. Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and that they will hear it. The prophet spoke of two futures; one, when it shall be said to them, "ye are not My people;" and a yet further future, in which it should be said, "ye are the sons of the living God." The place of both was to be the same. The place of their rejection, the dispersion, was to be the place of their restoration. And so Peter says that this Scripture was fulfilled in them, while still "scattered abroad through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." The place, then, where they shall be called the "sons of the living God," is, wheresoever they should believe in Christ. Although separated in body, they were united by faith. And so it shall be unto the end. "Nothing now constraineth to go up to Jerusalem, and still to seek for the temple of stones, for neither will they worship God, as aforetime, by sacrifices of sheep or oxen; but their worship will be faith in Christ and in His commandments, and the sanctification in the Spirit, and the regeneration through Holy Baptism into Christ by the Holy Spirit and Christ baptizing By the Father into the Holy Spirit making the glory of sonship their's that believe, who are worthy thereof and are called thereto son's of the Living God by the Lord"

All son's in the old testament are created son's, such as Adam, Angels and Satan all son's of God who of flesh on earth and son's of God who are spirit in heaven. Job 1:6-7 Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan came also among them. And the LORD said unto Satan, Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the LORD, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it. Notice I N the earth, not on the earth, which is created Flesh beings, and in the earth created spiritual beings.

Satan was defeated at the Cross and no longer has access to the Father's Throne, for The Head of Christ Is still bruising the Head of Satan His footstool, which will become complete when all is put under the rule and authority of Christ, when He sits on David's Throne in the New Jerusalem.

In Christ: Phillip