

Marriage of the Sons of God and the Daughters of Men. - Gen. 6:1-8
(Keil & Delitzsch)

Het Huwelijk van de Zonen van God met de Dochters van de Mensen. - Gen. 6:1-8
(Keil & Delitzsch)

The genealogies in Gen.4 and 5 , which trace the development of the human race through two fundamentally different lines, headed by Cain and Seth, are accompanied by a description of their moral development, and the statement that through marriages between the "sons of God" (Elohim) and the "daughters of men," the wickedness became so great, that God determined to destroy the men whom He had created. This description applies to the whole human race, and presupposes the intercourse or marriage of the Cainites with the Sethites.

Gen.6:1 . relates to the increase of men generally (הָאָדָם, without any restriction), i.e., of the whole human race; and whilst the moral corruption is represented as universal, the whole human race, with the exception of Noah, who found grace before God (v. 8), is described as ripe for destruction (vv. 3 and 5-8).

Bij de stambomen in Gen.4 en 5, die de ontwikkeling van het mensenras aangeven via twee fundamenteel verschillende lijnen, vanaf Kaïn en Seth, vinden we een beschrijving van hun morele ontwikkeling en de stelling dat via huwelijken tussen de “zonen van God” (Elohim) en de “dochteren van mensen” de verdorvenheid zo groot werd dat God bepaalde om de mensen uit te roeien die Hij geschapen had. Deze beschrijving heeft betrekking op het hele mensenras en vooronderstelt de geslachtsgemeenschap of huwelijk van de Kaïnieten met de Sethieten.

Gen.6:1 brengt dit in verband met de toename van het aantal mensen in het algemeen (הָאָדָם, zonder enige beperking), d.w.z. van het ganse mensenras, en terwijl de morele ontaarding als universeel voorgesteld wordt, wordt het ganse mensenras, met uitzondering van Noach die voor God genade vond (v. 8), beschreven als rijp voor vernietiging (vv. 3 en 5-8).

To understand this section, and appreciate the causes of this complete degeneracy of the race, we must first obtain a correct interpretation of the expressions "sons of God" (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים) and "daughters of men" (בָּנוֹת הָאָדָם). Om deze sectie te begrijpen en de oorzaken van deze totale ontaarding van het ras te verstaan, moeten we eerst een juiste interpretatie verkrijgen van de uitdrukkingen “zonen van God” (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים) en “dochteren van mensen” (בָּנוֹת הָאָדָם). Three different views have been entertained from the very earliest times: the "sons of God" being regarded as (a) the sons of princes, (b) angels, (c) the Sethites or godly men; and the "daughters of men," as the daughters (a) of people of the lower orders, (b) of mankind generally, (c) of the Cainites, or of the rest of mankind as contrasted with the godly or the children of God. Of these three views, the first, although it has become the traditional one in orthodox rabbinical Judaism, may be dismissed at once as not warranted by the usages of the language, and as altogether unscriptural. Vanaf de vroegste tijden hebben drie verschillende zienswijzen de mensen beziggehouden: de “zonen van God” gezien als (a) de zonen van prinses, (b) engelen, (c) de Sethieten of goddelijke mensen; en de “dochteren van mensen” als de dochters (a) van de lagere klasse, (b) van de mensheid in het algemeen, (c) van de Kaïnieten of van de rest van de mensheid in tegenstelling tot de goddelijken of kinderen van God. Van deze drie visies mag de eerste meteen geschrapt als niet gegarandeerd door het taalgebruik en als on-Schriftuurlijk in z'n geheel, ofschoon het de traditionele visie geworden is binnen het orthodoxe rabbijnse Jodaisme. The second, on the contrary, may be defended on two plausible grounds: first, the fact that the "sons of God," in Job 1:6; 2:1, and 38:7 , and in Dan.3:25 , are unquestionably angels (also אֱלִיִּם, בְּנֵי, in Ps.29:1 and 89:7); and secondly, the antithesis, "sons of God" and "daughters of men." De tweede visie daarentegen kan verdedigd worden op twee aannemelijke gronden: vooreerst het feit dat de “zonen van God” in Job 1:6; 2:1, en 38:7 , en in Dan.3:25 , ontegensprekelijk engelen zijn (alsook אֱלִיִּם, בְּנֵי, in Ps.29:1 en 89:7); en ten tweede wegens de tegenstelling “zonen van God” en “dochteren van mensen”. Apart from the context and tenor of the passage, these two points would lead us most naturally to regard the "sons of God" as angels, in distinction from men and the daughters of men. Los van de context en teneur van de passage, zouden deze twee punten ons bijna automatisch de “zonen van God” als engelen doen beschouwen, in onderscheid van mensen en de dochters van mensen. But this explanation, though the first to suggest itself, can only lay claim to be received as the correct one, provided the language itself admits of no other. Maar deze uitleg, ofschoon de eerste die zichzelf te suggereert, kan enkel claimen als de juiste ontvangen te worden in de veronderstelling dat de taal zelf geen andere uitleg bekent. Now that is not the case. For it is not to angels only that the term "sons of Elohim," or "sons of Elim," is applied; but in Ps.73:15, in an address to Elohim, the godly are called "the generation of Thy sons," i.e., sons of Elohim; in Deut.32:5 the Israelites are called His (God's) sons, and in Hos.1:10, "sons of the living God;" and in Ps.80:17, Israel is spoken of as the son, whom Elohim has made strong. Nu, dat is niet het geval. Want niet alleen voor engelen wordt de term “zonen van Elohim” of “zonen van Elim” toegepast; maar in Ps.73:15 worden de

goddelijken bij een zich tot Elohim richten “het geslacht van Uw zonen” genoemd, d.w.z. zonen van Elohim; in Deut.32:5 worden de Israëlieten Zijn (Gods) zonen genoemd en in Hos.1:10 “zonen van de levende God” en in Ps.80:17 wordt van Israël gesproken als de zoon die Elohim sterk gemaakt heeft. These passages show that the expression "sons of God" cannot be elucidated by philological means, but must be interpreted by theology alone. Moreover, even when it is applied to the angels, it is questionable whether it is to be understood in a physical or ethical sense. The notion that "it is employed in a physical sense as *nomen naturae*, instead of angels as *nomen officii*, and presupposes generation of a physical kind," we must reject as an unscriptural and gnostic error. Deze passages laten zien dat men de uitdrukking “zonen van God” niet met taalkundige middelen helder kan krijgen, doch enkel met theologie geïnterpreteerd moet worden. Bovendien, zelfs als het toegepast wordt op engelen, is het betwistbaar of het in fysieke dan wel ethische zin begrepen moet worden. De gedachte dat “het als *nomen naturae* in een fysieke zin gebruikt wordt, in plaats van engelen als *nomen officii*, en het voortplanting van een fysieke soort vooronderstelt,” moeten we verwerpen als een on-Schriftuurlijke en gnostische fout.

According to the scriptural view, the heavenly spirits are creatures of God, and not begotten from the divine essence. Moreover, all the other terms applied to the angels are ethical in their character. But if the title "sons of God" cannot involve the notion of physical generation, it cannot be restricted to celestial spirits, but is applicable to all beings which bear the image of God, or by virtue of their likeness to God participate in the glory, power, and blessedness of the divine life, - to men therefore as well as angels, since God has caused man to "want but little of Elohim," or to stand but a little behind Elohim (Ps.8:5), so that even magistrates are designated "Elohim, and sons of the Most High" (Ps.82:6). Volgens de schriftuurlijke zienswijze zijn de hemelse geesten scheppingen van God en niet uit het goddelijke wezen genomen. Bovendien zijn al de andere op engelen toegepaste begrippen ethisch van aard. Maar indien de titel “zonen van God” niets met fysieke voortplanting van doen heeft, kan dit niet beperkt worden tot hemelse geesten, maar geldt dit voor alle wezens die het beeld van God dragen, of krachtens hun gelijkenis aan God deelhebben in de heerlijkheid, macht en zaligheid van het goddelijke leven, - daarom evenzeer voor mensen als engelen, aangezien God veroorzaakte dat de mens “bijna Elohim wil zijn” of slechts een weinig onder Elohim staat (Ps.8:5), zodat zelfs magistraten “Elohim en zonen van de Allerhoogste” genoemd worden (Ps.82:6). When Delitzsch objects to the application of the expression "sons of Elohim" to pious men, because, "although the idea of a child of God may indeed have pointed, even in the O.T., beyond its theocratic limitation to Israel (Ex.4:22; Deut.14:1) towards a wider ethical signification (Ps.73:15; Prov.14:26), yet this extension and expansion were not so completed, that in historical prose the terms 'sons of God' (for which 'sons of Jehovah' should have been used to prevent mistake), and 'sons (or daughters) of men,' could be used to distinguish the children of God and the children of the world," - this argument rests upon the erroneous supposition, that the expression "sons of God" was introduced by Jehovah for the first time when He selected Israel to be the covenant nation. Wanneer Delitzsch bezwaar maakt tegen het gebruik van de uitdrukking “zonen van Elohim” voor vrome mensen, omdat, “alhoewel de gedachte aan een kind van God inderdaad bedoeld kan zijn, zelfs in het O.T., verder gaand als de theocratische beperking tot Israël (Ex.4:22; Deut.14:1) naar een ruimere ethische betekenis (Ps.73:15; Spr.14:26), werden deze verbreding en uitbreiding vooralsnog niet zo aangevuld dat in historische proza de termen ‘zonen van God’ (waarvoor ‘zonen van Jehova’ zou gebruikt geweest kunnen zijn om vergissen te voorkomen) en ‘zonen (of dochters) van mensen’ zou kunnen gebruikt worden om de kinderen van God te onderscheiden en de kinderen van de wereld,” - dit argument berust op de foute veronderstelling dat de uitdrukking “zonen van God” voor het eerst door Jehovah geïntroduceerd werd toen Hij Israël verkoos om de verbondsnatie te zijn. So much is true, indeed, that before the adoption of Israel as the first-born son of Jehovah (Ex.4:22), it would have been out of place to speak of sons of Jehovah; but the notion is false, or at least incapable of proof, that there were not children of God in the olden time, long before Abraham's call, and that, if there were, they could not have been called "sons of Elohim." Zoveel is inderdaad waar dat vóór de adoptie van Israël als de eerstgeboren zoon van Jehovah (Ex.4:22), het niet op z'n plaats geweest zou zijn om te spreken van zonen van Jehovah; maar het begrip is onjuist, of op z'n minst onmogelijk te bewijzen dat er in de oude tijd, lang vóór Abraham's roeping, geen kinderen van God waren en dat, indien ze er waren, ze niet “zonen van Elohim” konden genoemd zijn. The idea was not first introduced in connection with the theocracy, and extended thence to a more universal signification. De gedachte werd niet eerst in verband met de theocratie geïntroduceerd en vervolgens tot een meer algemene betekenis uitgebreid. It had its roots in the divine image, and therefore was general in its application from the very first; and it was not till God in the character of Jehovah chose Abraham and his seed to be the vehicles of salvation, and left the heathen nations to go their own way, that the expression received the specifically theocratic signification of "son of Jehovah," to be again liberated and expanded into the more comprehensive idea of *uiogesia tou Qeou* (i.e., Elohim, not *tou kuriou* = Jehovah), at the coming of Christ, the Saviour of all nations. Zij had haar wortels in het

godelijk beeld en was daarom vanaf het begin algemeen in haar toepassing; en niet totdat God, in het karakter van Jehovah, Abraham en zijn zaad koos om de uitdragers van het heil te zijn en de heidense naties hun eigen weg liet gaan, dat de uitdrukking de bijzondere theocratische betekenis van “zoon van Jehovah” kreeg, om weerom losgelaten en uitgebreid te worden naar het meer uitgebreide begrip van uioqesia tou QeouÚ (d.w.z. Elohim, niet tou kuriou = Jehovah), bij de komst van Christus, de Redder van alle naties. If in the olden time there were pious men who, like Enoch and Noah, walked with Elohim, or who, even if they did not stand in this close priestly relation to God, made the divine image a reality through their piety and fear of God, then there were sons (children) of God, for whom the only correct appellation was "sons of Elohim," since sonship to Jehovah was introduced with the call of Israel, so that it could only have been proleptically that the children of God in the old world could be called "sons of Jehovah." Indien er in vroegere dagen godvruchtige mensen waren die, zoals Henoch en Noach met Elohim wandelden of zelfs als ze niet in deze innige priesterlijke relatie met God stonden, door hun godsvrucht en vreze des Heren het goddelijk beeld een realiteit maakten, waren er toen zonen (kinderen) van God voor wie “zonen van Elohim” de enige juiste benoeming was aangezien zoonschap tot God ingeleid werd met de roeping van Israël, zodat het enkel vooruitlopend kon geweest zijn dat de kinderen van God in de oude wereld “zonen van Jehovah” genoemd konden zijn. But if it be still argued, that in mere prose the term "sons of God" could not have been applied to children of God, or pious men, this would be equally applicable to "sons of Jehovah." On the other hand, there is this objection to our applying it to angels, that the pious, who walked with God and called upon the name of the Lord, had been mentioned just before, whereas no allusion had been made to angels, not even to their creation. Maar als het nog steeds betwist wordt, met dat in louter proza de term “zonen van God” niet kan gebruikt geweest zijn voor kinderen van God of voor godvruchtige mensen, zou dit evenzeer gelden voor “zonen van Jehovah”. Anderzijds is er dit bezwaar tegen ons laten gelden van deze term op engelen dat de godvruchtigen, die met God wandelden en de naam van de Here aanriepen, net tevoren vermeld werden terwijl er geen zinspeling gemaakt werd naar engelen, zelfs niet naar hun schepping.

Again, the antithesis "sons of God" and "daughters of men" does not prove that the former were angels. It by no means follows, that because in v. 1 האדם denotes man as a genus, i.e., the whole human race, it must do the same in v. 2, where the expression "daughters of men" is determined by the antithesis "sons of God." And with reasons existing for understanding by the sons of God and the daughters of men two species of the genus האדם, mentioned in v. 1, no valid objection can be offered to the restriction of האדם, through the antithesis Elohim, to all men with the exception of the sons of God; since this mode of expression is by no means unusual in Hebrew. "From the expression 'daughters of men,' " as Dettinger observes, "it by no means follows that the sons of God were not men; any more than it follows from Jer.32:20, where it is said that God had done miracles 'in Israel, and among men,' or from Isa.43:4, where God says He will give men for the Israelites, or from Judg.16:7, where Samson says, that if he is bound with seven green withs he shall be as weak as a man, for from Ps.73:5, where it is said of the ungodly they are not in trouble as men, that the Israelites, or Samson, or the ungodly, were not men at all. In all these passages אדם, (men) denotes the remainder of mankind in distinction from those who are especially named." Cases occur, too, even in simple prose, in which the same term is used, first in a general, and then directly afterwards in a more restricted sense. We need cite only one, which occurs in Judg.19-21. In Gen.19:30 reference is made to the coming of the children of Israel (i.e., of the twelve tribes) out of Egypt; and directly afterwards (Gen.20:1,2) it is related that "all the children of Israel," "all the tribes of Israel," assembled together (to make war, as we learn from vv. 3 ff., upon Benjamin); and in the whole account of the war, Gen.20 and 21, the tribes of Israel are distinguished from the tribe of Benjamin: so that the expression "tribes of Israel" really means the rest of the tribes with the exception of Benjamin. And yet the Benjamites were Israelites. Why then should the fact that the sons of God are distinguished from the daughters of men prove that the former could not be men? There is not force enough in these two objections to compel us to adopt the conclusion that the sons of God were angels.

The question whether the "sons of Elohim" were celestial or terrestrial sons of God (angels or pious men of the family of Seth) can only be determined from the context, and from the substance of the passage itself, that is to say, from what is related respecting the conduct of the sons of God and its results. That the connection does not favour the idea of their being angels, is acknowledged even by those who adopt this view. "It cannot be denied," says Delitzsch, "that the connection of Gen.6:1-8 with Gen.4 necessitates the assumption, that such intermarriages (of the Sethite and Cainite families) did take place about the time of the flood (cf. Matt.24:38; Luke17:27); and the prohibition of mixed marriages under the law (Ex.34:16; cf. Gen.27:46; 28:1ff.) also favours the same idea." But this "assumption" is placed beyond all doubt, by what is here related of the sons of God. In v. 2 it is stated that "the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose," i.e., of any with whose beauty they were charmed; and these wives bare children to them (v. 4). Now לקח-אשה (to take a wife) is a standing expression throughout the

whole of the Old Testament for the marriage relation established by God at the creation, and is never applied to porneia, or the simple act of physical connection. This is quite sufficient of itself to exclude any reference to angels. For Christ Himself distinctly states that the angels cannot marry (Matt.22:30 ; Mark 12:25 ; cf. Luke 20:34ff.). And when Kurtz endeavours to weaken the force of these words of Christ, by arguing that they do not prove that it is impossible for angels so to fall from their original holiness as to sink into an unnatural state; this phrase has no meaning, unless by conclusive analogies, or the clear testimony of Scripture,(footnote: We cannot admit that there is any force in Hofmann's argument in his Schriftbeweis 1, p. 426, that "the begetting of children on the part of angels is not more irreconcilable with a nature that is not organized, like that of man, on the basis of sexual distinctions, than partaking of food is with a nature that is altogether spiritual; and yet food was eaten by the angels who visited Abraham." For, in the first place, the eating in this case was a miracle wrought through the condescending grace of the omnipotent God, and furnishes no standard for judging what angels can do by their own power in rebellion against God. And in the second place, there is a considerable difference between the act of eating on the part of the angels of God who appeared in human shape, and the taking of wives and begetting of children on the part of sinning angels. We are quite unable also to accept as historical testimony, the myths of the heathen respecting demigods, sons of gods, and the begetting of children on the part of their gods, or the fables of the book of Enoch (Gen. 6 ff.) about the 200 angels, with their leaders, who lusted after the beautiful and delicate daughters of men, and who came down from heaven and took to themselves wives, with whom they begat giants of 3000 (or according to one MS 300) cubits in height.

Nor do 2 Pet.2:4 and Jude 6 furnish any evidence of angel marriages. Peter is merely speaking of sinning angels in general (aggelwn amarthsantwn) whom God did not spare, and not of any particular sin on the part of a small number of angels; and Jude describes these angels as tou" mh thrhsanta" angels as tou" mh thrhsanta" thn -- eautwn archn alla apoliponta" to idion oikhthrion, those who kept not their principedom, their position as rulers, but left their own habitation. There is nothing here about marriages with the daughters of men or the begetting of children, even if we refer the word toutoi" in the clause ton omoion toutoi" tropon ekporneusasai in v. 7 to the angels mentioned in v. 6 ; for ekporneuein, the commission of fornication, would be altogether different from marriage, that is to say, from a conjugal bond that was permanent even though unnatural. But it is neither certain nor probable that this is the connection of toutoi" . Huther, the latest commentator upon this Epistle, who gives the preference to this explanation of toutoi" , and therefore cannot be accused of being biased by doctrinal prejudices, says distinctly in the 2nd Ed. of his commentary, " toutoi" may be grammatically construed as referring to Sodom and Gomorrah, or per synesin to the inhabitants of these cities; but in that case the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah would only be mentioned indirectly."

[Trouwens, de Here Yeshua zei eertijds dat in d eopstanding de mens zal zijn als de engelen en niet huwen; dus geen seksuele relaties kennen! Het valt dus zeer te betwijfelen of het in gen.6 engelen zouden betreffen. \(Marcel Achten\)](#)

There is nothing in the rules of syntax, therefore, to prevent our connecting the word with Sodom and Gomorrah; and it is not a fact, that "grammaticae et logicae praecepta compel us to refer this word to the angels," as G. v. Zeschwitz says. But the very same reason which Huther assigns for not connecting it with Sodom and Gomorrah, may be also assigned for not connecting it with the angels, namely, that in that case the sin of the angels would only be mentioned indirectly. We regard Philippi's explanation (in his Glaubenslehre iii. p. 303) as a possible one, viz., that the word toutoi" refers back to the anqrwpoi aselgei" mentioned in v. 4 , and as by no means set aside by De Wette's objection, that the thought of v. 8 would be anticipated in that case; for this objection is fully met by the circumstance, that not only does the word outoi, which is repeated five times from v. 8 onwards, refer back to these men, but even the word toutoi" in v. 14 also. On the other hand, the reference of toutoi" to the angels is altogether precluded by the clause kai apelqousai opisw sarko" etera" , which follows the word ekporneusasai . For fornication on the part of the angels could only consist in their going after flesh, or, as Hofmann expresses it, "having to do with flesh, for which they were not created," but not in their going after other, or foreign flesh. There would be no sense in the word etera" unless those who were ek porneusante" were themselves possessed of sarx ; so that this is the only alternative, either we must attribute to the angels a sarx or fleshly body, or the idea of referring toutoi" to the angels must be given up. When Kurtz replies to this by saying that "to angels human bodies are quite as much a etera sarx , i.e., a means of sensual gratification opposed to their nature and calling, as man can be to human man," he hides the difficulty, but does not remove it, by the ambiguous expression "opposed to their nature and calling." The etera sarx must necessarily presuppose an idia sarx.

But it is thought by some, that even if toutoi" in v. 7 do not refer to the angels in v. 6, the words of Jude agree so thoroughly with the tradition of the book of Enoch respecting the fall of the angels, that we must admit the allusion to the Enoch legend, and so indirectly to Gen. 6, since Jude could not have expressed himself more clearly to persons who possessed the book of Enoch, or were acquainted with the tradition it contained. Now this conclusion would certainly be irresistible, if the only sin of the angels mentioned in the book of Enoch, as that for which they were kept in chains of darkness still the judgment-day, had been their intercourse with human wives. For the fact that Jude was acquainted with the legend of Enoch, and took for granted that the readers of his Epistle were so too, is evident from his introducing a prediction of Enoch in vv. 14, 15, which is to be found in ch. i. 9 of Dillmann's edition of the book of Enoch. But it is admitted by all critical writers upon this book, that in the book of Enoch which has been edited by Dillmann, and is only to be found in an Ethiopic version, there are contradictory legends concerning the fall and judgment of the angels; that the book itself is composed of earlier and later materials; and that those very sections (Ch. 6-16:106, etc.) in which the legend of the angel marriages is given without ambiguity, belong to the so-called book of Noah, i.e., to a later portion of the Enoch legend, which is opposed in many passages to the earlier legend. The fall of the angels is certainly often referred to in the earlier portions of the work; but among all the passages adduced by Dillmann in proof of this, there is only one (ch. 19:1) which mentions the angels who had taken wives. In the others, the only thing mentioned as the sin of the angels or of the hosts of Azazel, is the fact that they were subject to Satan, and seduced those who dwelt on the earth (ch. 54:3-6), or that they came down from heaven to earth, and revealed to the children of men what was hidden from them, and then led them astray to the commission of sin (ch. 64:2). There is nothing at all here about their taking wives. Moreover, in the earlier portions of the book, besides the fall of the angels, there is frequent reference made to a fall, i.e., an act of sin, on the part of the stars of heaven and the army of heaven, which transgressed the commandment of God before they rose, by not appearing at their appointed time (vid., ch. 18:14, 15; 21:3; 90:21, 24, etc.); and their punishment and place of punishment are described, in just the same manner as in the case of the wicked angels, as a prison, a lofty and horrible place in which the seven stars of heaven lie bound like great mountains and flaming with fire (ch. 21:2, 3), as an abyss, narrow and deep, dreadful and dark, in which the star which fell first from heaven is lying, bound hand and foot (ch. 88:1, cf. 90:24). From these passages it is quite evident, that the legend concerning the fall of the angels and stars sprang out of Isa.24:21,22 ("And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall visit the host of the height [צבא המרום , the host of heaven, by which stars and angels are to be understood] on high [i.e., the spiritual powers of the heavens] and the kings of the earth upon the earth, and they shall be gathered together, bound in the dungeon, and shut up in prison, and after many days they shall be punished"), along with Isa.14:12("How art thou fallen from heaven, thou beautiful morning star!"), and that the account of the sons of God in Gen. 6, as interpreted by those who refer it to the angels, was afterwards combined and amalgamated with it.

Now if these different legends, describing the judgment upon the stars that fell from heaven, and the angels that followed Satan in seducing man, in just the same manner as the judgment upon the angels who begot giants from women, were in circulation at the time when the Epistle of Jude was written; we must not interpret the sin of the angels, referred to by Peter and Jude, in a one-sided manner, and arbitrarily connect it with only such passages of the book of Enoch as speak of angel marriages, to the entire disregard of all the other passages, which mention totally different sins as committed by the angels, that are punished with bands of darkness; but we must interpret it from what Jude himself has said concerning this sin, as Peter gives no further explanation of what he means by amarthasai. Now the only sins that Jude mentions are mh thrhsai thn-- eautwn archn and apolipein to idion oikhthrion. The two are closely connected. Through not keeping the arch (i.e., the position as rulers in heaven) which belonged to them, and was assigned them at their creation, the angels left "their own habitation" (idion oikhthrion); just as man, when he broke the commandment of God and failed to keep his position as ruler on earth, also lost "his own habitation" (idion oikhthrion), that is to say, not paradise alone, but the holy body of innocence also, so that he needed a covering for his nakedness, and will continue to need it, until we are "clothed upon with our hose which is from heaven" (oikhthrion hmwn -- ex ouranou). In this description of the angels' sin, there is not the slightest allusion to their leaving heaven to woo the beautiful daughters of men. The words may be very well interpreted, as they were by the earlier Christian theologians, as relating to the fall of Satan and his angels, to whom all that is said concerning their punishment fully applies. If Jude had had the porneia of the angels, mentioned in the Enoch legends, in his mind, he would have stated this distinctly, just as he does in v. 9 in the case of the legend concerning Michael and the devil, and in v. 11 in that of Enoch's prophecy. There was all the more reason for his doing this, because not only to contradictory accounts of the sin of the angels occur in the Enoch legends, but a comparison of the parallels cited from the book of Enoch proves that he deviated from the Enoch legend in points of no little importance. Thus, for example, according to Enoch 54:3, "iron

chains of immense weight" are prepared for the hosts of Azazel, to put them into the lowest hell, and cast them on that great day into the furnace with flaming fire. Now Jude and Peter say nothing about iron chains, and merely mention "everlasting chains under darkness" and "chains of darkness." Again, according to Enoch 10:12, the angel sinners are "bound fast under the earth for seventy generations, till the day of judgment and their completion, till the last judgment shall be held for all eternity." Peter and Jude make no allusion to this point of time, and the supporters of the angel marriages, therefore, have thought well to leave it out when quoting this parallel to Jude 6.

Under these circumstances, the silence of the apostles as to either marriages or fornication on the part of the sinful angels, is a sure sign that they gave no credence to these fables of a Jewish gnosticizing tradition.) it can be proved that the angels either possess by nature a material corporeality adequate to the contraction of a human marriage, or that by rebellion against their Creator they can acquire it, or that there are some creatures in heaven and on earth which, through sinful degeneracy, or by sinking into an unnatural state, can become possessed of the power, which they have not by nature, of generating and propagating their species. As man could indeed destroy by sin the nature which he had received from his Creator, but could not by his own power restore it when destroyed, to say nothing of implanting an organ or a power that was wanting before; so we cannot believe that angels, through apostasy from God, could acquire sexual power of which they had previously been destitute.