

Theological Analysis Of The Interpretation Of “Sons Of God” Based On Genesis 6:5

Ludwig Beethoven J.Noya*

Stimson Hutagalung

Milton T. Pardosi

Adventist University of Indonesia
jonesnoya@gmail.com

Abstract

In this research, the author examined the interpretation of “sons of God” based on Genesis 6:4. This research is based on three understandings of the phrase “sons of God” in Genesis 6:4 which are, sons of God as the angels, the inhabitants of a planet other than Earth and Heaven, and the posterity of Seth. These understandings are often misinterpreted by some people, and giving rise to theories that are contrary to the Biblical teachings. God wants His people to completely understand the Biblical teachings, so they cannot be misled by contradictory teachings. The results of the research on the interpretation of the “sons of God” in Genesis 6:4 found out that the intermarriage in Genesis 6 is between the “sons of God” who are the posterity of Seth with the “daughters of men” who are the posterity of Cain. This research also found that the meaning of “sons” in the Bible is an embodiment of nature, character, and disposition. Therefore, the terms and conditions to be called “sons of God” is to realize the nature, character, and disposition of God.

Keywords: Sons of God, Sons, Angelology, Intermarriage

INTRODUCTION

Genesis 6 recorded intermarriage events between the children of God and daughters of men. Preceded by verse 2, the incident was clarified in detail in verse 4 which reads, “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 bear children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown.” This verse gave rise to various interpretations from some bible experts, which established the background of this research.

The various interpretations are “children of God” as descendants of Seth, as proposed by Matthew Henry. He said that the children of God who call upon the name of God marrying the daughters of ¹ humans who live with worldly living culture and is a stranger in the eyes of God. By doing so, the descendants of Seth did not keep themselves as they should do to maintain the purity of self and hate apostasy, through intermarriage

with the descendants of Cain.¹⁷ Thus, Henry had an understanding “children of God” was descendants of Seth.

Then, the interpretation of the “sons of God” as the angels, is divided into two conditions: (1) The fallen angels, for instance, proposed by John W. Milor which states that the children of God in Genesis 6 refers to the fallen angels who held marriages with humans. They did not only had sexual relationships with women, but also beget offspring who were descendants of the giant, also called the *nephilim*, which is an indication that they had a physical

¹⁷ 1Matthew Henry *Commentary on the Whole Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1961), 32.

² John W. Milor, “Aliens in the Bible,” *The Forbidden Knowledge* [Journal On-line]; provided by <http://www.theforbiddenknowledge.com/hardtruth/aliensinbible.htm>. Accessed in November 19th, 2013.

appearance. Milor asserts that anyone who considers "sons of God" is descendants of Seth has made a big mistake with an than humans, they were not only huge, but also had an evil nature since they were not descended from pious. Thus, Milor understands the "sons of God" as angels.²

(2) All angels, both fallen and holy angels. For example put forward by David Guzik which states that "sons of God" in Genesis 6: 4 clearly refer to angels, as had been used in three other verses in the Old Testament. This view had been supported by the Septuagint translators who translates the word "Sons of God" as angels, not human descendants of Seth. Thus, Guzik's understanding of the Sons of God is all angels.¹⁸

The latter understanding were "sons of God" as the inhabitants of the planet other than Earth and Heaven, for example, proposed by Zecharia Sitchin. Sitchin argues that the Nephilim who were written in Genesis 6:4 was the result of a mixed marriage, and the word Nephilim itself means "those who fell," and in the text of ancient Sumerians recorded that there is a word "Annunaki" which have a similar meaning with the word "Nephilim" which is "peoples who come to earth. According to Sitchin and ancient Sumerian texts, "Annunaki" were extraterrestrials who came from a planet called Nibiru. Nibiru is estimated to be in the main asteroid belt between Mars and Jupiter.¹⁹²⁰²¹ Thus, Sitchin had an understanding of the "sons of God" as the inhabitants of the planet other than Earth and Heaven.

Based on the three understanding that has been reviewed above, the author feels the need to review the biblical understanding of the interpretation of the "sons of God" in

³ David Guzik, "David Guzik's Commentary on the Whole Bible," *Bible Study Light* [Commentary On-line]; provided by <http://www.studylight.org/com/guz/view.cgi?book=ge&chapter=00>.

⁴ Zecharia Sitchin, "Chapter 5: The Nefilim: People of The Fiery Rockets," *The 12th Planet* (Rochester: Bear & Company,

⁵); provided by http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sitchin/sitchinbooks01_02.htm#THE

NEFILIM: PEOPLE OF THE FIERY ROCKETS. Accessed on November 18th,

⁶.

assumption that humans would not have a giant baby. Descendants of the giants of Genesis 6 indicates a very different genetics Genesis 6: 4. For Christians especially members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church (Seventhday Adventists), who are the ones that God prepared for bring souls to come closer to God, therefore, must have and teach the same understanding of the Bible and one of them is about the interpretation of the "sons of God" in Genesis 6: 4.

THE EXPERTS' VIEWS REGARDING THE IDENTITY OF SONS OF GOD IN GENESIS 6:4 SONS OF GOD AS THE ANGELS

"Sons of God" as the angels commented upon two parts, namely: (1) All angels, both the fallen and the holy. David Guzik states the following with reference to the use of the same term in the three verses in the book of Job in the Old Testament that referred to angels.²² Claus Westermann also commented through the appearance of a giant in Genesis 6: 4 which was the result of a marriage between angels and daughters of men.⁸⁹

⁷ David Guzik.

⁸ Claus Westermann, *Handbook to the Old Testament*, ed. Robert H. Boyd (Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House,

⁹), 25.

¹⁰ Henry M. Morris, "Genesis 6:2," *The Genesis Record: A Scientific and Devotional Commentary on the Book of Beginnings*, 8th printing (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), 165.

¹¹ John W. Milor.

¹² "Jubilee 5:1," translated by R.H. Charles in 1917, *Sacred Texts Online*; provided by <http://www.sacredtexts.com/bib/jub/index.htm>. Accessed on October 13th, 2013.

¹³ Zecharia Sitchin, *The 12th Planet*.

¹⁴ Immanuel Velikovsky, "Nefilim" *In The Beginning*, 1940 [Manuscript On-line]; provided by <http://www.varchive.org/itb/nefilim.htm>. Accessed on November 18th, 2013.

¹⁵ Cameron Hanly, ed., *The Intelligent Design* (Norwich: Nova Distribution, 2005),

¹⁶.

¹⁷ Adam Clarke, *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible* (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1810), 68.

¹⁸ Charles W. Carter, ed., *The Wesleyan Bible Commentary Volume One Part I*, cetakan ketiga (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1967), 45.

The latter, Henry Morris states that no human being physically descended from God except Adam.¹⁰ (2) Then commented upon as the angels sinned, who chose to follow Satan, with comments of John W. Milor stating the impossibility of a marriage between common man can produce a giant baby.¹¹ This concept also obtained through ancient writings in the book Jubilee which tells the illicit relationship that occurs between the angels who are subject to the desires of the flesh and impure love to the daughters of men.¹²

"SONS OF GOD" AS THE INHABITANTS OF THE PLANET OTHER THAN EARTH AND HEAVEN.

"Sons of God" in the sense as the inhabitants of the planet other than Earth and Heaven commented by Zecharia Sitchin who states that the expression Nephilim and people of the Shem actually means people who came from a rocket ship.¹³ It also commented by Immanuel Velikovsky stating that our existence on the age of the interplanetary travel and he claimed that Genesis was written relics associated with the visit of intelligent beings from other planets.¹⁴ And the latter, through stories personally experienced by Claude Vorilhon who are religious leaders of Raelianism. He claims that he had met a intelligent beings from other planets who claimed to be the creator of all things on this Earth.¹⁵¹⁶

SONS OF GOD AS DESCENDANTS OF SETH

"Sons of God" as descendant of Seth commented by Adam Clarke stating the doctrine of God that God's children should be born again and be under the influence of the Holy Spirit.¹⁷ Then, Charles W. Carter also commented on this matter by referring to the appointment of Set as a son by God in Genesis 4 and the history of the descendants of Seth who produce godly people.¹⁸ It is also supported by comments Matthew Henry commented on the calling of the name of the Lord who made by the descendants of Seth, but they did not keep themselves in purity and hatred towards heresy by mixing with the descendants of Cain.¹⁹

Robert Jamieson statement was in line with the comments above that mixed

marriages between the sons of God and daughters of men is the story of descendants of Seth who were religious but held mixed marriages with the apostate descendants of Cain.²³ The latter, Francis D. Nichols discloses a judgment given in verse 3 not to angels but to man, other than that in Matthew 22:30 Jesus said that angels do not marry.¹⁷ More than that, it was stated that the division of human beings at that time only in two major parts, the descendants of Seth and Cain, who generally Sethites were those who obey the Lord, and the descendants of Cain were those who lapsed and had no religion.

BIBLICAL REQUIREMENT TO BE CALLED SONS OF GOD

These terms and conditions to be called the children of God spiritually can be seen from the requirements implied in Genesis, namely:

1. Calling the name of the Lord (Genesis 4:26).
2. Walked with God (Genesis 5:24).
3. Found grace in the eyes of the Lord (Genesis 6:8).
4. A just man (Genesis 6:9).
5. Perfect (Genesis 6:9).
6. Do all that God commanded (Genesis 6:22).

Then, the terms and conditions to be called the children of God spiritually can be seen from the terms which are stated in the New Testament, namely:

1. Faith in Christ Jesus (Galatians 3:26).
2. Receive and Believe on His name (John 1:12).
3. Led by the Spirit (Romans 8:14).
4. Love enemies and do good (Luke 6:35).

¹⁹ Matthew Henry.

²⁰ Robert Jamieson, *A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical on the Old New Testaments Volume One* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978), 141.

5. Do righteousness (1 John 3:10).
6. Children of resurrection (Luke 20:36).

Strong's Hebrew and Greek Dictionaries (London: Royal Publisher, 1979). Provided by E-Sword Bible Software, version 9.9.1, by Rick Meyers, copyright 2000-2011.

¹⁹Ellen G. White, *Last Day Events* (Caloocan City: Philippines Publishing House, 1999), 290.

THE OBSERVATION IN THE THEORY OF THE SONS OF GOD AS ANGELS

¹⁷“Sons of God” (Gen. 6:4), *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* (SDABC), rev. ed., ed. Francis D. Nichols (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1976-80), 1:250.

²⁰The Greek word used for "in Heaven (in heaven)," is "ἐν οὐρ̄ νός (en Ouranos)." The word "ἐν (en)" other than to functioning as a preposition primer refers to a place, time or circumstance, can also translated as an adjective (adjectives) into "Celestial (heavenly)." Strong, “ἐν(G1722)”.

ANGELS DOES NOT HAVE AN REPRODUCTION ABILITY

Three times in the Gospels, Jesus revealed that angels do not marry. The first is : "For in the resurrection they 'do not marry nor are given in marriage,' but are like angels in heaven" (Matthew 22:30). All of the word "marry" in three of the text using the Greek original word

“(gameo)” which means "to marry a wife," or it can also be interpreted as "sexual intercourse.”¹⁸ Thereby, this verse is a clear statement that the righteous people who will be raised for the coming of Christ will not marry nor are given in marriage, because they are like the angels in Heaven. In other words, the life of the angels in heaven are not married nor given in a marriage. The writings of Ellen G. White also supports this concept by writing that the doctrine of the marriage and the birth in Heaven is not a part of prophecy that can be trusted.¹⁹

Moreover, the words "in heaven" does not merely represent a place where they can not perform marriages. The word "in Heaven" can also be interpreted as the nature of Heaven or “Heavenly.”²⁰ Thus, the nature of not married nor given in a marriage is heavenly, or the culture of Heaven. And as the angel who were holding a nature of Heaven or Heavenly, they still have these nature. Angels who have fallen into sin was not separated from these nature, because they actually originate from the same place which is

Heaven. Even they had move to another place, it does not give them the ability to mate and marry.

This is supported by Christ's statements about the human condition at the end of time similar to the situation in the days of Noah before the Flood. "For as in the days before the flood were eating and drinking, 'marrying and giving in marriage,' till the day Noah entered into the ark" (Matthew 24:38, emphasis added). Parallel this verse appeared in Luke 17: 26-27. If we compare the statement of Jesus in this verse with Matthew 22:30 will we get a comparison as follows:

Verse	Behavior	Subject
Matthew 24:38; Luke 17:26-27.	For as in the days before the flood were eating and drinking, 'marrying and giving in marriage,' till the day Noah entered into the ark.	People in the time of Noah

¹⁸James Strong, “ (G1060),”

Matthew 22:30; Mark 12:25; Luke 20:34-36	For in the resurrection they neither "marry, nor are given in marriage," but are as the angels of God in heaven.	Resurrected People, become as the angels.
Conclusion	Angels in heaven are not "those who in the days before the flood, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark."	

Through comparison of the text, it can be deduced that Jesus claimed that angels who were neither marry nor were given in marriage not included in "those in the days before the flood, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark."

Thereby, the concept of "angels do not marry" does not agree with the theory that the sons of God in Genesis 6: 4 were the angels, because angels do not have the reproductive ability, and Jesus' statement in the text above it can be concluded to be an angel are not those who in the days before the flood, married and mated.

The concept of marriage between angels and humans will find a peculiarity, if we pay attention to two elements that make up both the creature. In Genesis 2:7 stated that raw materials that forming men is dust. In Hebrews 1: 7 states that the raw material forming the angels is spirit and fire. Embodiment forms of the word "spirit" described in Psalm 104: 4, which is in the form of wind.²¹ Melihat bahan baku pembentukan yang berbeda dari kedua makhluk ini, adalah hal yang tidak mungkin untuk memiliki pemahaman keduanya dapat bersetubuh atau melakukan hubungan seksual.

Thereby, the concept of "the angels were made of fire and wind" contradict with the theory that the sons of God in Genesis 6: 4 were the angels, because men and angels

are formed from different raw materials of formation, so it can not have an intercourse.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN "TOOK THEM WIVES" AND "COME IN UNTO"

The events in Genesis 6 has two statements are used to describe the relationship between the sons of God and

²¹ "Who maketh his angels spirits; his ministers a flaming fire:" (Psalm 104:4, *TB*). The Word "wind" in this text is using a Hebrew word 'רוח(ruach)' which translated to the word "spirit" 227 times in the Old Testament. John R. Kohlenberg III, dan James

A. Swanson, *The Hebrew English Concordance* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998), 1460-1463.

daughters of men. In verse 2 says that "... the sons of God took them wives...", and verse 4 says that "... the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men ..." Each statement has a different meaning.

The statement of "took them wives"²⁴ appeared 41 (forty-one) times in the Old Testament, and all of them means a legal marriage relationship, between men and women. And sexual relationships that will happen also take place on an ongoing basis as they continue together in a marriage relationship, not a sexual relationship that occurs once or a few times, as happens in sexual relationships that are not based on a legal marriage.

The statement "come in unto" has two meanings, the first is "go to or draw near," but the statement "come in unto"²⁵ which has similarities to Genesis 6: 4 appeared 21 (twenty-one) times in the Old Testament, and all of them means both a sexual intercourse carried out lawfully in a marriage relationship between husband and wife, and also can be meaningful relationship carried out illegally in an adultery or fornication. This

²¹ In the hebrew is " ויקחו להם נשים (wayyiqhū lāhem nāšīm)," *they took them wives.*

²² In hebrew is " יבאו בני האלהים אל־בנותהאדם (yābō'ū bənē hā'elōhīm 'el bənōwṭ hā'ādām)." In *King James Version* is "the sons of God 'came in unto' the daughters of men"(Emphasis added).

relationship is not limited between men and women, but also among the same gender, and also between man and an animal. If it's standalone, this statement does not address the marriage basis of the sexual relationship, in other words an adultery. However, when juxtaposed with the word "take a waife," it means that the sexual relationship is based on the legal marriage relationship between husband and wife. By looking at this concept, it appears that the event relationship sons of God and daughters of men have the statement "taking a wife" in paragraphs 2 and "come in unto" in verse 4, which means that the sexual intercourse in that relationship was based on a legal marriage between a husband and a wife. The events in Genesis 6 is not a brutal and unlimited sexual relationship among men only, but a sexual relationship that is based on a legal marriage relationship.

JUDGMENT IN GENESIS 6: 7 ONLY ADDRESSED TO ALL FLESH.

The intermarriage event in Genesis 6 between the sons of God and daughters of men continues to Flood events in Genesis 7 which is a God's judgment on the sins of mankind which has reached its peak and can not be tolerated anymore. This judgment was not addressed to the angels, because God says "I will destroy man whom I have created²⁶ from the face of the earth; both man, and beast." This verse clearly refers to human beings that God has created, not the angel that he has created.²⁷

This concept is further clarified with the presence of the statement "All flesh". In the previous subsection has been reviewed that angels are formed from fire and wind (spirit) and not of the flesh, so they are not included in the "all flesh" in Genesis 6:13. Thereby, the concept of "judgment in Genesis 6: 7 was

²³The hebrew word that had been used is "אדם (d m)," which means 'living being (an individual or species or mankind.' Strong, "אדם(H120)."

²⁴The Hebrew word to write the words "I created" in paragraph 7 is "בָּרָא (b r)," the same word used in the creation of man in Genesis 1. As for the process of making angels in Psalm 104: 4, the Hebrew word used to write the word "make" is "עָשָׂה (' h)." Thus the judgment in Genesis 6: 7 is intended for humans that God has created (bara') in Genesis chapter 1.

only addressed to all flesh (all flesh)" does not agree with the theory that the sons of God in Genesis 6:4 were the angels, because the punishment that God gave in verse 7 and verse 13 was for the descendants of human that God had created in Genesis chapter 1, not the angels.

THE RESULT OF THE MARRIAGE IN GENESIS 6 IS NOT SEMI-DIVINE BEINGS OR SEMI-ANGELS

Another concept that does not agree with the theory of the sons of God in Genesis 6: 4 as the angels, is the result of a descendant of the marriage is not mentioned as semi-divine creatures or semi-angelic beings. In the verse states that "...they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown." The woman gave birth to the mighty "men"²⁸ in other words is a human, not supernatural beings, semidivine or semi-angels. While the phrase "At that time the giatns (*nephilim*)²⁹ were on Earth..." In Hebrew does not say that it is the offspring of the marriage of sons of God with the daughters of men. This sentence seems to appear as a parenthetical statement, which is clauses or phrases used in sentences that contain secondary

²⁵Using Hebrew word "גִּבּוֹר (gibb r)," and "אִישׁ (ysh)." "gibb r" means (1) a strong, great, mighty; (2) the powerful, the great, the mighty. Brown, Driver dan Briggs, 14. " ysh" has a meaning, a human; man; husband; mankind; winner; great people. Ibid, 35. Dalam *King James Version* disebut "great men" dan "men of renown." Both the Hebrew word used in verse 4 refers to a human, not supernatural beings, semi-divine, as well as semi-angel.

²⁶"נְפִילִים (neph yl)," only appeared two times in the bible (Kej. 6:4; Bilangan 13:33). Means Giants; those who fall; bully; the cruel. Strong, "נְפִילִים(H5303)." Ancient Nephilim was destroyed by the Flood, but in Numbers 13:33 the same expression is used to describe people who have high, body size, and cruelty are the same as the ancient Nephilim. In other words, the word "Nephilim" is an adjective, not a noun or personal pronoun.

²⁷ "Parenthetical Statement," *Compopedia Wiki*, Provided by [http://compopedia.wikia.com/wiki/Parenthetic al_Statement](http://compopedia.wikia.com/wiki/Parenthetic_al_Statement). Accessed on March 18th, 2014.

information that is not required to complete an independent clause or main clause.²⁷

Through the review above, the concept of "the offsprings of marriage in Genesis 6 is not semi-divine beings or semi-angel" does not agree with the theory of the "sons of God" in Genesis 6: 4 were the angels, because the offspring produced by the intermarriage events were human, and were not supernatural beings, semidivine creatures, or even semi-angels.

THE OBSERVATION IN THE THEORY OF THE SONS OF GOD AS INHABITANTS OF PLANET OTHER THAN HEAVEN AND EARTH

Some things that become an outcome of the author's reviews to the theory of sons of God are the inhabitants of the planet other than Earth and Heaven, are:

1. Nephilim in Genesis 6 is the embodiment of nature, not a physical manifestation. As reviewed above. And the word *shem*, in all the bible-related dictionaries and commentaries that author had researched, never translated or interpreted as a rocket ship, as Zecharia Sitchin said.
2. Genesis 6 did not discuss the existence of the inhabitants of planet Earth received the arrival of the inhabitants of other planets. It is supported by many concepts as reviewed above that Genesis 6 clearly tell the story between man and man, not by angels, and inhabitants of other planets like Immanuel Velikovsky said.
3. The Book of Genesis told clearly that the Earth was created by God, not by scientists from another planet. Meeting events between Claude Vorilhon with these creatures do not get a clear reinforcement of other experts, so it is very hard to believe, because it does not have a strong and clear reference.

THE OBSERVATION IN THE THEORY OF THE SONS OF GOD AS DESCENDANTS OF SETH DIVISION OF

HUMAN IN TWO MAJOR PARTS

Genesis 6 appeared in the Bible after Genesis 4 and 5. In Genesis 5:4 says that Adam was still begetting boys and girls, after begat Cain and Seth. However, in Genesis, only listed the genealogy of Cain and the genealogy of Seth, the genealogy of the other children of Adam did not mentioned. Genesis 4:17-24 tells the lineage of Cain, in other words, a family of Cain. While Genesis 4:25-5: 32, tells the lineage of Adam, not through Cain, but through a Set. In other words, a family of Seth.

With this concept, we find that humans at that time divided into two major parts, namely: (1) The descendants of Cain, and (2) The descendants of Seth. Thereby, this concept does not agree with the theory that the sons of God in Genesis 6: 4 were the angels, because two large groups at times it is not supernatural and human beings, but human beings human descendant of Cain and Seth.

THE WORDS OF EVE REGARDING THE BIRTH OF CAIN AND SETH

Both Cain and Set were born from the same womb, from the womb of a mother named Eve. However, Genesis recorded a different response from the same mother. Eve's response when giving birth to Seth, was different than when she gave birth to Cain. After Eve gave birth to Cain, she said, "I have gotten a man From the Lord." This paragraph should read as follows: "I have gotten a man, the LORD." These words show confidence Eve on Cain regarded as the embodiment of an offspring that God had promised which is written will crush the head of the devil who bruise his heel in Genesis 3:15. However, this assumption is shattered when Cain condemned for his action to Abel.

After the birth of Seth, Eve said, "God has given me another child instead of Abel; because Cain killed him. "The word "grant" should be translated as "appointed,"³⁰ because

²⁸ Kejadian 4:25. Hebrew word that had been used for the word "appointed" is "שׂית (sh yth)," which means: appointed, determined, prepared, and set. In *King James Version* states: "For God, said she, hath 'appointed' me another seed instead of Abel"(emphasis added). And the name of Seth had been taken from this word.'

through this statement, it seems that Eve no longer have a personal thought or assumed, but he stated that it is God who establishes Seth as the entry way of salvation for mankind, through Christ. Based on this concept, the authors support the theory of the sons of God in Genesis 6: 4 is a descendant of Seth, because after the birth of Seth, Eve statement stating that the Seth is appointed by God.

IN HIS OWN LIKENESS AND IMAGE

There is one same word that written in the Bible when God was about to create Adam, the word that written when Seth was born. In Genesis 5: 3 says, "And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth." The phrase "image" and "likeness" appears in Genesis 1:26 when God wants to create human.³¹ Set to follow the image of Adam, and Adam followed the image and likeness of God. So if we use syllogistic logic, we find a correlation as follows:

Major Premise	"Adam" follow the image and likeness of God
Minor Premise	Seth follow the image and likeness of "Adam."
Conclusion	Seth follow the image and likeness of God

By the logic above can be deduced that Seth follows the image and likeness of God. Spirit of Prophecy writings in the books of the Patriarch and the Propehts is supporting this concept, by writing that body shape of Seth is greater than Cain and Abel, and compared

²⁹ "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness..."(Genesis 1:26, *KJV*).

³⁰Ellen G. White, *Sejarah Para Nabi*, jilid 1 (Bandung: Indonesia Publishing House, 2011), 82.

³¹ *Ibid.*,

with both, Seth is the one who looked more like Adam.³⁰ So it's really in an accordance to what the Bible says that Seth is in the image of Adam, not Cain and Abel. The reason that author have found why Genesis 5: 3 did not directly record that Seth followed the image and likeness of God, instead noting that Seth in the image of Adam is the purpose of the author of Genesis, who is Moses, to provide a comparison that contrasts with the other descendants of Adam which does not reflect the image and likeness of God, Cain. Genesis 4:1 recorded the story of the birth of Cain, but there is no record that Cain reflects the image of Adam, as was the case with Abel.

Embodiments of the image and likeness of God who is present in Seth, and are not present in Cain, not merely the physical aspect, because physically, Seth and Cain are the same human being. The differences that appear is on the inner aspect or character. Although just like Cain, inherited human condition that has fallen into the sin of his parents, Seth is still following instructions of truth, serve and honor God.³¹

THE BIBLE ACCOUNT ABOUT THE LIFE OF DESCENDANTS OF CAIN AND SETH

Another concept that gives a fundamental difference between Seth and the descendants of Cain is the biblical accounts of the lives of some of the descendants of Cain and Seth. Both families are descendants of Adam, but in between they have a fundamental difference. In Genesis 4 and 5, the Bible only recorded testimony of the lives of two generations of Adam's descendants, which is the family of Cain and the family of Seth, which have significant differences. First, is the second generation of descendants of Adam. The secondgeneration of Adam from the descendants of Cain is Enoch. The life records of Enoch of the Bible is initiating the establishment of the first city in the world (Gen. 4:17) Most likely the reason of family built a city is a place of refuge. In other words, Cain rely on the protection of the town they founded. It is directly in contrast with the second-generation of Adam from the family of Seth, who is Enos. The life record of Enos in the Bible is to begin calling the name of God (Gen. 4:26). In other words, the descendants of Seth, through the life records of Enos showed us that they depends on God, by calling his name.

Second, is the seventh generation of Adam. The seventh-generation of Adam from the family of Cain was Lamech, a record of his life in the Bible was the first time in the world practice polygamy, and vindictive to those who hurt him as much as 77-fold (Gen. 4: 19,24). In other words, Lamech walked following his will or his desires as a human being. It is directly in contrast with the seventh generation of Adam from the family of Seth. The Bible record that Enoch walked with God, and he was ascended by God (Gen. 5:24). In other words, Enoch walked to follow the will of God, so that he was appointed by God.

Thereby, the concept of "The Bible account about the life of descendants of Cain and Seth" is agree and in harmony with the theory of the sons of God in Genesis 6:4 is human descendants of Seth, because there are significant differences between the descendants of Seth who rely on God, with the descendants of Cain who rely on themselves as a human being. In other words, there is a correlation between the expression of their dependence that represent the identity of the two breeds, the "sons of God" and the "daughters of men".

INTERMARRIAGE BETWEEN THE BELIEVERS AND UNBELIEVERS IS NOT PLEASING IN THE EYES OF GOD

The next concept that agree and in harmony with the theory of the sons of God in Genesis 6:4 as human descendants of Seth is the appearance of some of the records in the book of Genesis tells us that marriage between believers and unbelievers are not pleasing in the eyes of God. Here is the data:

Table 1.1. Genesis Account About the Marriage Between The Believers and Unbelievers

Text	Events
24:3-4	Abraham asked Eliezer to take an oath that He will not take a women from Canaan to be a wife for Isaac
26:34-35; 28:6-	When Esau take a Hittite to be his wife, it became a

8	grief of mind unto Isaac and Rebecca
28:1	Isaac told Jacob not to take Canaan woman to be his wife.
34:14	Dina was raped by Shechem. Married to the uncircumcised are a disgrace to Israel.

In the other Old Testament books, this concept emerged. Both in the book of the Pentateuch (Leviticus 18: 1-30; 19:19; Numbers 12: 1; Deuteronomy 7: 1-4; 23: 2), and in books other than the Pentateuch (Ezra 9: 1-15; Nehemiah 13 : 23-30; judges 14: 1-3). The same concept also appears in the Epistles of Paul in the New Testament (2 Corinthians 6:14).

Thus, we can found another concept in Pentateuch which states that "intemarrriage between the believers and unbelievers is not pleasing in the eyes of God" and the concept agree and in harmony with the theory of the sons of God in Genesis 6: 4 is human descendants of Seth, since the emergence of the concept of intermarriage between the believers and unbelievers in the book of Genesis and the other books of the Old Testament. Thereby, the theory that the sins of mankind in Genesis 6 which are mixed marriages between godly descendants of Seth and apostate descendants of Cain is not an impossible thing.

THE OBSERVATION IN THE BIBLICAL REQUIREMENTS TO BE CALLED SONS OF GOD

THE APPEARANCE OF THE WORD "SON" IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

In the Old Testament, the word "son" was written with the Hebrew word "בן (Ben)," and "יָלַד (yeled)." The word "בן (Ben)," appears 4902 times in the Bible.³²

³² Wigram, *The New Englishman's Hebrew Concordance* (Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1984), 232-258.

³³ According to Strong, "son" means: children; in the broadest sense is a granddaughter;

Most of the words “בן(ben)” in the King James Version translated the word associated with offspring, child, or children. However, it translated as well as residents, nation, or people of a particular region or nation. In addition, translated also together with adjectives attached, such as a powerful, alien, valiant, and others. While the word “יָלֵד(yeled),” appears 90 times in the Bible, and the translation can be classified into three parts, namely: (1) 74 times as a child / children [both men and women]; (2) 6 times as sons / boys; and (3) 10 times as young men [youth]. The word “יָלֵד(yeled)” more likely to be understood as the descendant, just a few record in the Bible that used the word to describe an adjective, it’s often used for the word "youth" or "young people."

Thereby, the word “בן(ben)” not only used to describe the offspring of parents, but also represents the origin or residence, and also the nature he has. While the word “יָלֵד(yeled)” tend to be translated only from the aspect of the descendants of a parent.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WORD “SON” IN THE BIBLE

Based on the previous sub-sections, the authors obtain the data occurrence of the word "son" in Hebrew in the Old Testament and the Greek New Testament. The author also get some translation and understanding of the emergence of these words in both the Old Testament and the New Testament. Therefore, by looking at the above data, the author get a conclusion that the word "Sons" in the Bible is not only to be understood as the offspring of parents, both men and women, but also have an understanding as the embodiment of nature, characterization or disposition.³³

And specifically in Genesis 6: 4, the Hebrew word that had been used i. “בן(ben),” which in addition can be interpreted as a descendant, but also can be interpreted as a manifestation of nature, characterization, or disposition. Some occurrences of the word

citizens; nation; quality or nature; and conditions. Strong, “בן(H1121).” According to Brown, “son” can also be interpreted characterization; nature or disposition. Francis Brown, *The New BrownDriver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Massachussets: Hendrickson, 1979), 119-120.

"sons/child" as the embodiment of nature, characterization or disposition, among others are: children of the kingdom (Matt. 13:38), children of resurrection (Lk. 20:34), children of light (Jn. 12 : 36), the children of disobedience (Eph. 2: 2), children of the day (1 Thess. 5: 5), sons of thunder (Mark. 3:17), the children of hell (Matt. 23: 15). 7 (seven) occurrences of the word "son/child" in the above expression does not describe the word "son/child" as a descendant, but describe the word "son/child" as the embodiment of nature, characterization or disposition. Based on this concept, the authors have an understanding that the phrase "sons of God" does not merely describe the "child" who is offspring of God, but described the expression "children" who embodies the nature and characterization or disposition similar to God. Human beings as children of God should reflect the nature or character of God, so it is become a idea of the word "child" which is a manifestation of nature. Some attributes of God that should be realized by man as His children are already displayed in the biblical requirement to be called the sons/children of God.

Thus, the concept gave us an understanding that to be called "children of God," the man must be a manifestation of the nature, disposition, and the character of God in this world.

CONCLUSION

The intermarriage that occurred in Genesis 6: 4 was between the "sons of God" who were descendants of Seth, and the "daughters of men" who were the descendants of Cain. All the understanding that emerged aside from it, would be contrary to the concepts which have been reviewed above. Moreover, it can be concluded that the human being as the "sons of God" is not merely in terms of the physical aspect, but from the inner aspect. The phrase "sons" is not a descendant of someone, but the embodiment of the nature, character, or disposition of a person. Thus, as "sons/children of God," human beings should reflect the nature of God in all aspects of life on this earth.

REFERENCES

Henry, Matthew. *Matthew Henry’s Commentary on the Whole Bible*.

- Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1961.
- Milor, John W. "Aliens in the Bible." *The Forbidden Knowledge*. Journal online. Provided by <http://www.theForbiddenKnowledge.com/hardtruth/aliensinbible.htm>. Accessed on November 19th, 2013.
- Guzik, David. "David Guzik's Commentary on the Whole Bible." *Bible Study Light*. Commentary online. Provided by <http://www.studyLight.org/com/guz/view.cgi?book=ge&chapter=006>. Accessed on November 15th, 2013.
- Sitchin, Zecharia. *The 12th Planet*. Rochester: Bear & Company, 1976. E-book Online. Provided by [http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sitchin/Sitchinbooks01_02.htm#THE NEFILIM: PEOPLE OF THE FIERY ROCKETS/](http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sitchin/Sitchinbooks01_02.htm#THE%20NEFILIM%3A%20PEOPLE%20OF%20THE%20FIERY%20ROCKETS/) Accessed on November 18th, 2013.
- Westermann, Claus. *Handbook to the Old Testament*. Edited by Robert H. Boyd. Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976.
- Morris, Henry M. *The Genesis Record: A Scientific and Devotional Commentary on the Book of Beginnings*. 8th Printing. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Velikovsky, Immanuel. *In The Beginning*. 1940. Manuscript Online. Provided by <http://www.varchive.org/itb/nefilim.htm>. Accessed on November 18th, 2013.
- Hanly, Cameron, Ed. *The Intelligent Design*. Norwich: Nova Distribution, 2005.
- Clarke, Adam. *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible*. New York: The Methodist Books Concern, 1810.
- Carter, Charles W, Ed. *The Wesleyan Bible Commentary Volume One Part I*. 3rd Printing. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1967.
- Jamieson, Robert. *A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical on the Old New Testaments Volume One*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978.
- Nichol, Francis D., *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*. Washington: Review and Herald Publishing Association. 1978.
- Strong, James. *Strong's Hebrew and Greek Dictionaries*. London: Royal Publisher. 1979.
- White, Ellen G. *Last Day Events*. Caloocan City: Philippines Publishing House, 1999.
- _____. *Sejarah Para Nabi*. 1st Volume. Bandung: Indonesia Publishing House, 1999.
- Compedia Wiki. "Parenthetical Statement." Provided by http://compopedia.wikia.com/wiki/Parenthetical_Statement. Accessed on March 14th, 2013.
- Wigram. *The New Englishman's Hebrew Concordance*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers. 1984.
- Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver, dan Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1955