

## ANGELS AND GENESIS SIX

### Question #1:

Virus and a plethora of micro organisms are invisible to the Unclad eye. So also are entities we find in religious scriptures such as Gods, angels, demons and other creature, ghost et cetera. This entities are referred to as spirit because they cannot be seen by the biological eyes so to speak.

### Response #1:

The Bible does not call anything spirit merely because it is invisible to humans. It calls it spirit if it is spirit. God is Spirit and "hides Himself" so that He is not seen by humans or any creature by whom He may not wish to be seen. Angels are spirits because they were created to be spirits not possessing material bodies.

### Question #2:

However this spirit beings are made of "substance" are they not? After all, the creeds of Christianity have argued that

the Godhead are of the same substance or essence.. Wether spirits or not, angel are made up of something. How this something is able to make itself visible to humans is still up for arguments.

### Response #2:

Created spirits are substances. They are just not material substances.

### Question #3:

Since a virus requires the aid of an electron microscope to be seen and studied, could we then assume that with the right equipment we should also be able to gaze upon the magnificence of the spirit entities?

**Response #3:**

What the Bible calls spirit cannot be observed by any material means. It will only become discernible to humans as God Himself wills that it should be.

**Question #4:**

once upon a time, there lived an euglena that was invisible to the Unclad eye. Give science time.

**Response #4:**

First, are you then saying that you believe that spirits exist but we don't have the technology to discern them?

Second, science could never have enough time to become able to discern or measure the spiritual.

**Question #5:**

Lets entertain ourselves with a biblical story, a very popular one.

In the bible, lot was visited by two angels whom looked humanoid. Not only where they visible to Lot but to the other people in the society who were aroused by the beauty of this angels and under spell of lust threatened to destroy lot to get a taste of the ecstasy that the anus of this male entities would provide. Lol

## **Response #5:**

The following is the Bible passage with that story. I find no suggestions in it of any beauty or arousal to make this a special case. Sodom was a depraved civilization where strangers were simply not safe because of the wickedness of the people who lived there.

*[1]Now the two angels came to Sodom in the evening as Lot was sitting in the gate of Sodom. When Lot saw them, he rose to meet them and bowed down with his face to the ground.*

*[2]And he said, "Now behold, my lords, please turn aside into your servant's house, and spend the night, and wash your feet; then you may rise early and go on your way." They said however, "No, but we shall spend the night in the square."*

*[3]Yet he urged them strongly, so they turned aside to him and entered his house; and he prepared a feast for them, and baked unleavened bread, and they ate.*

*[4]Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people from every quarter;*

*[5]and they called to Lot and said to him, "Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may have relations with them."*

*[6]But Lot went out to them at the doorway, and shut the door behind him,*

*[7]and said, "Please, my brothers, do not act wickedly.*

*[8]Now behold, I have two daughters who have not had relations with man; please let me bring them out to you, and do to them whatever you like; only do nothing to these men, inasmuch as they have come under the shelter of my roof."*

*[9]But they said, "Stand aside." Furthermore, they said, "This one came in as an alien, and already he is acting like a judge; now we will treat you worse than them." So they pressed hard against Lot and came near to break the door.*

*[10]But the men reached out their hands and brought Lot into the house with them, and shut the door.*

*[11]They struck the men who were at the doorway of the house with blindness, both small and great, so that they wearied themselves trying to find the doorway.*

Genesis 19:1-11 NASB

## **Question #6:**

the angels were sexually irresistible. Period.

**Response #6:**

I'm not taking your word for it. Period.

**Question #7:**

My point is, these entities were very much visible to the unaided eye. Could they possess some feature that enables them to reconfigure molecular structure that prevented light from being reflected by their bodies to conceal their identity?

If these entities could become visible, that means that they also must be made of a certain kind of matter. Christians never seem to trouble their brains to ask vital questions. Since they are too lazy to do so, I would take it upon myself to help question the Book of God.

**Response #7:**

Angels are part of God's creation. Their spirituality belongs to this Universe in terms of type. We don't really know how their spirituality works but what we do know is that it is not the same as materiality. It is a different kind of "matter", if we must call it that, from what is common in our experience. The Bible tells us only that and warns us to add nothing to it. When the Day comes that the Church is resurrected, we will understand and learn far more than human beings ever imagined possible.

**Question #8:**

Take a look at our friend who has been adding "stuff" from only Jehovah knows where. The Bible also told us that people who convulsed vigorously were demon possessed. Am I right?

**Response #8:**

You're wrong. It only said that someone had a demon cast out of him who suffered convulsions because of the demon's possession of his body. It does not say that wherever people are convulsing, it is because they are possessed by demons. They may or may not be. Demons drive some people mad. They give others symptoms of epilepsy. They make yet others deaf mutes. They make some diviners, that is, people who can tell you things they couldn't have known naturally. They are not the exclusive causes of most of these things.

**Question #9:**

When these angels take human form, are they subject to the forces of nature? In human form can an angel feel anger, pain, lust, depression etc? Can hot water burn their skin?

Does an angel in human form get the urge to urinate? Where does the matter upon which they take form originate from? Are they changing their own substance to that of a human? Are spirits made of substance at all?

Can we call this substance atoms? What type of cells make up the body of an angel?

**Response #9:**

What we do know is that they never take on true materiality. They do make themselves visible in a form similar to the human one but even then they do not become material. Their only way of experiencing material existence is by taking possession of material bodies owned by other spirits including man himself. But that act is highly prohibited by God and can result in an angel's getting thrown into the abyss.

**Question #10:**

is that so?? Kindly provide biblical evidence that angels need to possess an animal or human to manifest on the earthly plane.

**Response #10:**

Since you claim to have a degree from a university (as I imagine a biologist such as yourself must have), I expect that you would be better at reading and understanding what you read. I said that the only way that an angel can experience material existence, NOT manifest on the material plane, is to possess the material body of another spirit. Spirits can manifest if they want and are permitted or are willing to risk the punishment involved but to experience material reality requires a material body. They do not possess one by nature. So, they can only experience materiality by taking possession of another spirit's material body.

To experience material existence would include enjoying material sensations like eating or having relations with other material bodies. When spirits manifest, what they do when they eat, for example, is not at all the same thing that we do when we eat.

**Question #11:**

In the book of genesis, we are told that angels descended from heaven to impregnate human babes who produce viable offspring and even bore humanoid kids. Let stop here and ask some more questions.

What made angels of the most high God think of sex in the first place.? the metatron, your wisdom may be required here.

The angels in their true form could feel sexually aroused? Let's not forget that they are spirits.

To feel aroused you most have sexual cravings which are produced by intrinsic factors such as hormones, and of course the presence of a functioning reproductive organ. Since they were able to women they definitely had a reproductive organ .

Worthy of mention is the fact that the slay queen's produced babies that retained some characteristics of their angelic Bleep boy of a father. More questions arise here.

The angels took human forms but it would seem their genes didn't. For the women to be impregnated, it meant that this angels climaxed and poured forth sperm. Let stop again for some analysis.

A lion cannot impregnate a tiger because of a biological process (post zygotic isolation whereby the species may mate but gametes may not fuse, offspring is not viable or infertile) that prevents different species from interbreeding. The sperm of the lion and the egg of the tigress are not compatible.

You've probably heard of the "liger", which is the hybrid of a lion and tiger. Do note that this does have some scientific influence and will not - again - will not occur in nature.

Let's come back to the angels.

Since the copulation led to fertilisation and to production of viable offsprings (I say the offsprings are viable because they were stronger and better than the homo sapien specie. If they were not, the homo sapiens wouldn't have cried to God for intervention as said according to book of enoch) then we must

conclude that the sperm of an angel was genetically similar to that of the human male.

Simply put, the

the angelic specie and homo sapien are far more closely related than we thought. Dare I say it, that angels are in fact the advanced Homo specie or Humans.

No wonder Christians aspire to venture unto heaven and live - live like angels of the lord. Are Christians trying to evolve into a more complicated specie?

You might defend thus; that the angel took human forms hence had human sperm and dna, but from biblical accounts we are told that the offspring were nothing like the human civilisation of Noah. We are also told that the offspring called nephilim were hybrid angels and human. So the angel dna was not that of a man. An angelic sperm with angelic dna fertilised the ovum of the human babes.

That leads us to the million dollar question,

As a Biologist I am suffered to ask certain questions, and to put the biblical account under heavy scrutiny. I must also try to explain how an angelic race (which we assume are a different species)

could successfully have sexual intercourse with a human dame, and produce a viable hybrid offspring.

since the "keep the population in check" biological process to prevent breeding amongst species failed we must rule out the fact that angels are different from humans.

Lets dive into the pool of molecular Biology.

All living creatures posses genetic material, which comprises units of DeoxyriboNucliec Acid, DNA. The DNA is the blueprint of Life. It is the program code of biological existence. The DNA is the responsible directly or indirectly for all your anatomical features.

The dna which bears the genetic code is coiled up into thicker folds that end up in a form and size we call the chromosomes. Each human cell contains 23 pairs of chromosome. For healthy reproduction to take place in all organisms without scientific intervention, the number of chromosomes of the paternal gamete must be equal to that of the maternal gamete. Your mama produced 23 and your papa produced 23 to produce you. If there is a single addition or subtraction from this number, 23, it would inevitably lead to devastating consequences. For example down syndrome, kleiniphelter syndrome and lots more.

Where am I getting at?

Since the angels had successfully shot a load of cum into the puna of a female human and also successful fertilised the ovum sitting calmy in the ovary. The egg must have been surprised to see strange looking sperm cell swimming with its wings instead of tail. The chromosomal number of the angelic dna must have been very much equivalent or close to that of human females. That would be the only plausible explanation for the hybrid - nephilim to be born and grow old enough to bear its own offspring. fascinating isn't it.

Do note that there is such a term as polypoidy, whereby the offspring inherits excess number of chromosomes. However this is utterly rare in animals, and even if it occurred would have many deleterious effects on the offspring.

DO ANGELS HAVE THE ABILITY TO TRANSFER THEIR DNA THROUGH SEXUAL INTERCOURSE??

obviously the answer is YES.

DO THEY ENJOY SEX?



YES,

DID THEY EXPERIENCE ORGANMS?

YES. It's the only way they would have shot their angelic cum deep into the abyss of the vagina.

ARE ANGELS STILL CRAVING FOR SEX?

Who knows, after their rebellion driven by pussy, its probably God castrated the rest of them. If not, it means angel Micheal might be having erections as girls are going crazy of the #1mill twerk competition david0 is organising.

IS THE CHRISTIAN GOD CRUEL?

oh yeah, why would you give an angel a dick with serious libido but he won't be able to use it.? That's only something the devil can do.

Why would they fill sexual urges if they were built to serve God as their sole purpose of existence?

this is left for the Christians to answer. What are the implications of the answer to this question i threw at you?

### **Response #11:**

There is a mess of questions in here that need answering. To begin, let us see the passage in question:

[1]Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them,

[2]that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose.

[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.

Genesis 6:1-2,4 NASB

Also, consider the following passages...

[6]And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day,

[7]just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh, are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.

Jude 1:6-7 NASB

[4]For if God did not spare angels when they sinned, but cast them into hell and committed them to pits of darkness, reserved for judgment...

2 Peter 2:4 NASB

Yes, these angels went after "strange flesh" like the people of Sodom and Gomorrah later did. Since too, angels are obviously not God, the mechanism by which they produced the Nephilim through their human wives may very well have been sexual in nature.

But does this translate to a libido among angels? It might or it might not. That is of no consequence. But even if it does, there are both male and female angels (Zechariah 5:9) so that there is no lack of provision for satisfying such desires if they do exist. This is the single important issue you have raised in this matter and it is because you refuse to believe in God that you do not recognize that there is no cruelty in Him.

Note that it is the angels that give you your excuse here although you yourself are alive and well enough to complain and you do have a skill too and possibly a job and friends and a life of some consequence. None of these blessings are enough to make you think that God is good. It is just the notion that angels are sexually frustrated that exercises your anger against God.

Why did the angels which did go after human women in Genesis 6 do so? First of all, they were rebel angels who had already rebelled against God before Man was created. They desired physical bodies like the animals in the first universe that God created had. So they began to take possession of those animals and to try to create physical bodies of their own with which to experience physical life. Their activity is where the fossils that many scientists are so crazy about come from.

Living in physical bodies became an addiction for them just like hard drugs are for some of us. It destroyed them and kept them bent on a path of more self-destruction. When all the angels who wanted to toe that path had made their choice to do so and all angels who insisted on remaining loyal to God had made their choice, God summarily destroyed that first Universe with a flood that covered all of it in deep, dark ice.

That wiped out all the monstrosities that they had made in their lust. Today we find their bones and some preserved forms deep in the earth and exposed in some places too.

Although, God ended that rebellion, He did not stop their activities forever. He left them and their leader Satan in order to use them to test Man whom He later created to replace them among the angels. So, yes again, you are right that Man is not totally different from the angels. But man was made in a physical body and thus limited in power and knowledge unlike the angels who were created to be purely spirit without physical bodies. All believers will in the end come to possess and live in bodies so powerful that we will be greater than the angels themselves though. That is what we have been promised in the Resurrection to which we look forward.

Moving on though, we know how that test went and has gone, however. Satan has continually been working to persuade human beings to join him in rebellion. When Adam and Eve consented to, all of us automatically acquired a rebellious bent to our natures, something theologically called the sin nature. We have by nature a rebellious attitude toward God from birth although we all still possess the same ability that angels had to choose not to rebel against God if we so please.

Because Satan and his angels were left to remain in the scheme of things, they were still able to carry on with their old activities when God re-created the Universe and the earth. In fact, the very first time we encounter Satan himself after that re-creation, he was already possessing an animal: the snake in the Garden.

So, it is not strange at all that the other rebel angels would want to experience sex with human women and contrive some way to do so. This is not a problem that the elect angels have at all. Not only have their choices to be loyal to God been sealed so that they can no longer sin against God, there is also the fact that in so far as sex may be part of God's Eternal Gift or Plan for the angels, both male and female angels exist so that there is no reason that they cannot enjoy such a Gift, that is, as I said, if it has been given to them.

The rebel angels, on the other hand, have from the beginning been looking to step down from the spiritual plane into the base physical. So, of course, they sought after such a thing as we saw in Genesis 6 but at terrible cost to themselves. All the angels who were involved in that debacle at the time were thrown into the Abyss in deep, palpable darkness and bound in chains until now. They will only be released during the Tribulation after which time they and all rebel angels including their leader Satan will be thrown back in there to wait for the end of the Millennium of the Lord Jesus's Reign over the world. After that, they will be deposited in the Lake of Fire for eternity.

So, it was not a good idea at all for the rebels to mess with the perfect order of things that God had made.

As for whether angels can transfer their DNA, that assumes that they have a DNA. They are spirits. As such, what they transfer is not known to us. We don't even know how they were able to generate progeny with human beings. Clearly, they could do such a thing (in fact, the Antichrist is quite literally the devil's son), but by transferring DNA? We have no reason to think that it is necessarily so. This is not strictly biology since there is a fundamental difference of type involving one spirit partner with far greater knowledge and power than you might be able to imagine and another with a physical body, the Nephilim children notwithstanding. Biology works for physical sexual partners generating physical progeny. But when one partner is a spirit and the progeny have supernatural characteristics, then there is a true question how far biological principles can go in explaining the process.

**Question #12:**

you should address this berse to our friend. It clearly states that these angels chose to materialise and live like men. It didnt mention them possessing humans. If they possessed humans then they wouldn't have fathered nephilims. Ask me y?

**Response #12:**

I'm addressing it to you. You needed to hear it. And I am not interested in hearing your theories at this point.

**Question #13:**

then why would a castrated dog still chase a biiitch?

**Response #13:**

I am not sure what your question has to do with my comment.

**Question #14:**

what does this have to do with the argument. What about those children in somalia, syria, yemen, iraq, iran, maiduguri, etc.. Should they have the right to ridicule God?

**Response #14:**

What it has to do with the argument is that many antichristians attack the Bible and Christians ostensibly because this or that does not make sense and reasonable people should not believe it. But it always is some excuse that is covered with a veneer of intellectuality. What relationship does the sexuality of angels have to do with your own need for Salvation?.

And what are you talking about the children in Islamic regions and war-torn areas now? Are you throwing up yet another excuse?

**Question #15:**

thats why i like Christians, they know how to feel in the gaps..

let God speak for himself..

**Response #15:**

I can only imagine how you must feel at scientific conferences when someone is answering questions about discoveries they have made, especially questions that you feel they would never be able to answer. That you didn't know that certain things are in the Bible does not mean that they are not there.

The demon-possession rife in the Gospels and which were a major focus of the Ministry of the Lord Jesus were themselves a teaching about how much rebel angels love to live in material bodies and how much risk they are willing to take to have one to live in and how stubborn they can be about leaving it. The teaching in Jude about their taste for strange flesh too was a pointer to the same thing.

**Question #16:**

more fill in the blanks. Where is biblical evidence. Even the book of enoch doesn't make such claims.

**Response #16:**

See above. See also Isaiah 14, Ezekiel 28 and Genesis 1. I don't do anything outside the Bible so I don't care what the Book of Enoch says.

**Question #17:**

evidence please...

**Response #17:**

The Flood of Noah's Day was only the Universal Deluge in miniature.

**Question #18:**

@bolded, let me get this straight, so God empowered the devil whom was bold enough to challenge his creator, to torment his less advanced creature-humans. ... God must hate humanity.

**Response #18:**

In which thesaurus is "torment" a synonym for "test"? Satan and his angels were left behind to see if Man would want to join their madness. That is all I said.

**Question #19:**

but it wasnt given to them. Jesus clarified that. Why doesn't god also seal the fate of humanity to b loyal to him, he want to burn billions in hell isnt it? Do note that you sir, are also a prospective victim of hell to another Christian sect. Who hell is real and whose is a fantasy..

**Response #19:**

The Lord Jesus said that angels neither marry nor give in marriage. He never said that they are not allowed to have sexual relations with each other. The Bible is completely silent about that.

The angels have been tested. They were tested before Man was created and after all of them had chosen their allegiances, their choices were sealed. Man has 7000 years for his own testing. As each person dies, their own choice is sealed. At the end of 7000 years all mankind will have been tested and every choice will be sealed for all eternity.

It matters nothing to me who believes what. It is not my responsibility what other people want to believe. My responsibility is to find the Truth and believe it. And I did. If every religion and philosophy believes that I am going to Hell because I believe in the Lord Jesus and accept His Sacrifice for me, that is entirely their problem, not mine.

**Question #20:**

if they are still locked, then who were the 72 demons that king solomon summoned in the "keys of solomon" also do notice that both in the book of enoch and keys of solomon, the legion leader was azazel or bezelbulb respectively..

**Response #20:**

I used to be nuts about supernatural and epic fantasies. I am not so hot for them anymore. I like the Bible far more than I care for the feverish imaginations of human beings.

**Question #21:**

here you are contradicting yourself. If angels can pass down their dna which blended with human dna, doesn't that give you an idea that angels like our friend has confessed to-are humanoid. Not just humanoid but made up of the same or closely related genetic sequence.

As i explained earlier that, if the genes are dissimilar there would be no fertilization. A sheep cannot impregnate cow...

This also proves that the angel dna is composed of molecular material that is exactly the same as that of humans.



However, like i mentioned earlier also, because the angels are a better or specie they sired a more advanced offspring, the nephilim, which overpowered humanity. This is called hybrid vigour. We have seen cases like this uncountable times.... So i advice you rethink your assertions on the nature of this angels..

**Response #21:**

Just in case you didn't see it clearly the first time, I said that WE CANNOT ASSUME THAT ANGELS HAVE DNA BECAUSE THEY ARE SPIRITS AND THUS TRANSFER SOMETHING UNKNOWN TO US IN COPULATION. Hopefully, you'll see it more clearly now.

You are the one laboring in a contradiction. You suppose that spirits are merely invisible material beings. That is your own fiction. The Bible holds that spirits are not material at all. So, what you are talking about is not at all the same thing as what the Bible talks about. This is why you can talk about angel DNA. Such a thing is no different than saying "hot ice".

**Question #22:**

Angels could not have possessed humans and still produced nephilims.. After all, they possess the mind or consciousness but they of course wouldnt have altered the genetic sequence of the victim... Thank you for responding ; be advise that \_ can be aggressive, but i assure you he means no harm. He is metatron the first. If not metatron himself, who else would have know that the genesis passage referred to something other than angels. Lol.

**Response #22:**

I have no arguments including such a proposition.

**Question #23:**

Angels do not have sexual needs. Those angels in Genesis 6 were fallen angels whose true aim was to stop the promise of God. Those fallen angels (demons) probably materialized or they simply possessed the body of selected humans to pollute the world of men.

**Response #23:**

I would advise that we stay with what the Bible itself says even if we don't feel comfortable with it. As the Bible says, the actions of the rebel angels were closely connected to the beauty of the human women and their actions were similar to the actions of the people of Sodom and Gomorrah as well. So, it is hard to separate sexual desire from their actions even if they did (and they truly did) have other motives.

**Question #24:**

those angels had those desires because they were already fallen because the bible plainly stated that angels do not marry. The nature of fallen angels has ready been corrupted due to their rejection of God.

Angels do not have sexual desires does not mean they can't develop it if they are fallen.

**Response #24:**

"Do not marry" is not the same as "do not possess sexual desire" or "do not have sex". I am not willing to argue that the elect angels do possess sexual libido or have sex since the Bible does not say explicitly that they do. But it does not explicitly say that they don't either so I wouldn't argue as you do here. That is what I mean by staying with what the Bible actually says.

**Question #25:**

alright bro. Nice work

**Answer #25:**

Thank you for your kind words.

**Question #26:**

Dont you realise that, angels will first, have to be born, just like Jesus was, either as male or female, in order for them to have any chance to have sex with humans? That hasnt happened yet, has never happened, is yet to happen, so your bizarre, far-fetched theory gets shot down in flames. This applies to others like another discussant and even Odii Ariwodo, whom, I am surprised he too bought into this angels having sex bullshit

**Response #26:**

As I often say, I try to stay with what the Bible actually says. I try to do that even when it is uncomfortable or unpopular. Because the Bible is always true even when men's ideas and idiosyncrasies, however vehement, are false.

The Bible seems clear and undeniable to me in saying that sexual desire and sexual intercourse did in fact happen between the angels and the human women in Genesis 6. It is something I didn't like to think either but it doesn't seem arguable to me in the end.

And I see no reason to believe that angels need to be born in order for them to be able to have sexual intercourse with human beings. If the Bible says that they did without suggesting any kind of human birth (something I wonder at), then I certainly believe that they did without being born.

**Question #27:**

Odii, you've probably times without number, heard me say, I dont do arguments. Arguments or arguing over a matter, 110% stems from ignorance and opinions, it always is bereft of facts or factual information because of conjectures and subjectivity. This is why I dont arguments, like you are doing here exchanging ignorance for another ignorance, mainly I havent got an ignorance to trade with. If I am not sure of a subject matter, I will remain and keep mum, as opposed to exhibiting and looking to trade with my ignorance

**Response #27:**

First, just for the record, the above is what I mean by your presenting "questions" or even "comments" in an antagonistic way. It is hard to respond to the above in a friendly manner because

it is overtly insulting. Perhaps I really am exchanging ignorance for ignorance but why would I accept your judgment on that? I am presenting matters as I see them in the Bible and as I have learned from someone that is gifted and prepared as a Bible teacher too. You are not presenting matters at all, on the other hand. What you merely did is arrogate to yourself the right to call a judgment on what I have said. If you had bothered to show some Bible passage that indicates that my knowledge of this matter is either nonexistent or incomplete, that would be different. But rather you consider yourself a sufficient judge to make pronouncements to which you seem to me to think that I am responsible to yield for some reason. If I refuse to yield, you would only heap more abuse on top of the above. And how can I bear such a thing for too long without wanting to fight back?

That is why I may seem not to want to engage with you. It is only the Lord God Who knows the heart but I accepted you as a brother believer in Jesus Christ, so I would always seek peace with you even when we don't agree on some things. After all, we only know and see in part for now because of the bodies of sin that we must endure for now. If we maintain peace in love with each other, in time, the Lord will make everything plain and reconcile the incoherence in our differing understandings of all matters.

Now, I say that only because I believe that we share a fundamental belief that the Lord Jesus is God Who became Man to die for all of our sins on the Cross so that we can be saved. There are people who claim to be Christians who do not believe that at all. I do not feel any need to be at peace with them especially when they deliberately spread their lies where I have spiritual responsibility or when they feel the need to seek me out and talk to me. I avoid them unless I absolutely need to call them out to protect other believers. Then there are antichristians too who are not shy to present themselves as such. I do not treat them as brothers either.

So, consider that your attitude may be in some need of adjustment. As much as I seek peace with you as a brother in the Faith, I am not under any law to either obey you or to respond to you when you act in such a manner as you do with comments like the above. I am willing to be corrected wherever I need it although I am not willing to be dictated to. Feel free to call my attention to anything you think I am getting wrong but only on the authority of the Bible not merely on your strong feelings about anything. I am not responsible to you after all, only to the Lord, in fact.

#### **Question #28:**

Well you are NOT adhering to this rule of yours about staying with what the bible actually says because there is no where in the bible where it states that angels have sexual appetite or sexual libido. Also no where in the bible, is it stated that angels have sexual desire. The notion hat sexual

intercourse did in fact happen between the angels and the human women is completely and utterly wrong, ill-informed and a total fallacy. How you misconstrued the nephilims in Genesis 6 and extrapolated Genesis 6:2-4 to be angels is outrageously baffling and scandalous

### **Response #28:**

In Genesis 6, the sons of God are said to have found the daughters of men so beautiful that they took wives from among them and "went in to them" so that they had children for them who were the Nephilim. This is what the Bible says. Now, we may have some mild debate about who the "sons of God" are here but not about why they took wives from among human women or whether they "went in to them" or had children by them. The language concerning those latter things is unmistakable. Those sons of God were interested in the beauty of the human women. Their choosing wives from among them had to do with sexual desire as much as with any other motive they may have had and going in to them most definitely involved relations which produced children.

Additionally, the verses from Jude clearly parallel the actions of some angels with the sexual depravity of Sodom and Gomorrah making it further impossible to debate that not only is this a sexual event but that the sons of God were unquestionably angels, rebellious ones albeit.

This is what we actually read in the Bible. The only way we can escape what is otherwise so clear is to divorce the witness of Jude and Peter from Genesis and that would leave us completely adrift with no clear understanding what the latter are referring to or to what the Flood was about. In fact, it is impossible to separate Jude from Peter or Peter from Genesis. The three are obviously the same picture.

This is not merely Odii's feverish imagination or some concoction of ignorance meant to offend anybody's sensibilities. It is what the Bible actually says.

For what it is worth, I have on this very forum argued against what I have said here too before. It did offend my sensibilities to imagine that angels had relations with human women. It continued to for a long time. Even now I am simply refusing to listen to my emotions about it since the Bible is unquestionably clear to me here. I would rather it say something different but it does not and I am insisting on believing the actual witness it makes rather than what I rather wish that it said.

As for the Nephilim, there is no question that they were important here. The Nephilim are the true backstory from which the human race developed the concept of "supermen", human beings with extraordinary abilities that astounded the world. The very teaching about the Antichrist and the witness in Genesis 3 that he will be Satan's literal seed even buttresses the fact that such people are possible. These are not mere human inventions but biblical teachings. In other words, if I just listed passages, I wouldn't need to say a single word of my own to make it clear that this is what the Bible is saying. What I do say is to help those who are untrained to see the connections which are ordinarily unmistakable but which would be hidden to those who are still learning to trust the Bible.

**Question #29:**

Sometimes, we give Satan and especially, like in this case, his angels (i.e. demons), way too much credit. Imagine fallen angels having sex with human beings. Who dash angels monkey banana? I am sorry that is a bad pun so excuse it Odii Ariwodo

**Response #29:**

That is not altogether false. It is true that very many of us give Satan and his cohorts too much credit. But it is not impossible to give him too little credit. And we are warned against both extremes in the Bible. Insisting on either will lead us to dispensing with the Bible and falling into Satan's trap in the end.

**Question #30:**

To start with, after their rebellion, Satan & his fallen angels, lost whatever abilities they might have had, to appear in physical human forms period.

**Response #30:**

I know of no place in the Bible that teaches this. Perhaps you can show me if you do know such a place and we can begin to reconcile our views from there.

**Question #31:**

Angels can ONLY appear in physical human forms and perform all permissible fleshly activities, if and/or when representing God. Anything less than being in that official capacity, automatically renders such beings, ineligible from having rights to appear as a human being to perform whatever permissible fleshly activities allowed. It just for such beings, wont happen

**Response #31:**

I do agree that it does appear that angels in general are not allowed to make themselves visible to us. The reason seems obvious judging from how such great believers as Daniel and John could not resist worshipping them when they showed themselves to them. Their power and glory is hard to ignore for us. If the rebel angels were not under a similar embargo, doubtless many believers would have been seduced away from the Faith just by seeing them.

But I think it is stretching it to say that angels ONLY appear physically when/if they are representing God. Obviously, the rebel angels can and have violated other ground rules - and undoubtedly suffered severe punishment for it - so it is not impossible for them to violate this one too even if it would be at such great risk to themselves.

**Question #32:**

Also whats important to know, is that, angels, never had, havent any mandate to procreate, that mandate was given to human beings, not and never to angels

**Response #32:**

I think that it is obvious that angels were not designed to procreate among themselves. Their number has always been fixed since they were all created at once. But the fact that angels cannot produce new generations of angels does not really have anything to do with the creation of Nephilim which while clearly different from normal human beings in important respects are truly physical half-humans at least. We don't know how the angels were able to do what they did but it is not inconceivable since angels are far more knowledgeable and far more powerful than normal human beings. Our inability to understand these things is neither a mistake on God's part nor an excuse to reject what is clearly said: namely, that angels went in to human women and produced Nephilim as a result.

**Question #33:**

Odi Ariwodo and others, you've all learned something completely worthless from whoever taught you all that nonsense, especially, in the case of the fact and truth, that they are no celestial beings (i.e. angels) involved anywhere in Genesis 6:2-4

**Response #33:**

As I have said, I have done my best to follow the Bible here. I always do that because of what I anticipate before the Judgment Seat of Christ. As much as I would rather that you and I agreed on this, I would sooner agree with the Word of Truth and be rewarded by the Lord Jesus for doing so than agree with you and be shamed and rebuked by Him for failing in Faith.

So, if you feel persuaded that the Bible says something different, I respect your feeling about it and will not debate it with you. It is between you and the Lord. But if you mean to discuss it, I would encourage you to seek out and confirm biblical reasons for holding the view that you do as I have done and endeavor to keep doing with all things.

**Question #34:**

If there are daughters of men, have you ever asked the questions:

- 1/ Who are the equivalent sons of men, as there are sons of God?
- 2/ What's the difference between the daughters of men and the daughters of God?
- 3/ Where the nephilims already on earth or not before the sons of God started going into the daughters of men?

**Response #34:**

1. I'm not sure why you expect an equivalent "sons of men" but it does occur to me that the language in that passage was deliberately forcing a contrast between the "sons of God" and the



"daughters of men". That is to say that the point was that it was "sons of God" that were in view rather than "sons of men" as might have been expected.

2. Again, I don't see why you expect a "daughters of God" here. The use of "daughters of men" coupled with the extra emphasis on increased population and human birth of these daughters appears to have been to make it unmistakable that the story was about human women rather than any other kind of female.

3. The connection of the Nephilim to the production of children from the union of the sons of God and the daughters of men seems to me to be unmistakable. It can hardly be explained why they were put together if the Nephilim were not these children themselves as you yourself went on to admit later in your post even if you still insisted that the sons of God were only male believers.

**Question #35:**

"Don't pay any attention to any of those senseless Jewish stories"

- Titus 1:14a

You are conflating multiple separate incidents here Odi, as what happened in Genesis 4:2-6 is quite different to what happened with Sodom and Gomorrah's Genesis attempted rape. It is also different to where Peter and Jude were talking about the same myth being discussed and argued upon on this thread. It is not only Peter and Jude warning against Jewish myths about angels having sex with human beings, even Paul too, warned Titus in Titus 1:14a above earlier reproduced, not to believe in them

I am so sorry to be the one saying to you that you've got hold of the wrong end of the stick here. You completely got wrong what Peter and Jude were messaging in their chapters. Peter and Jude wrote their letters combating heresies and talking exactly against the same myth being discussed and argued upon on this thread.

**Response #35:**

There are all kinds of myths, some of which truly are addressed by the Bible. But there is nothing that I see to suggest that Paul was referring to the Genesis 6 story. Nor do I see any reason to believe that Peter and Jude were speaking of anything different. How would anyone know that? Is there some other incident in the Bible that we can point to which they explain besides the Genesis Flood?

**Question #36:**

What may I ask, is it that the bible actually says? Produce what it is the bible is appeared to have said and let's with great care, thoroughness and in all its entirety examine it together.

**Response #36:**

I already did in the comments that you referred to in your response to the OP. Genesis 6:1-2, 4; 2 Peter 2:4; Jude 1:6-7.

**Question #37:**

Simply put, the nephilims are the product of when the righteous men (i.e. sons of God) had sex with daughters of the unrighteous men (i.e. daughters of men). The rest of the gist is beyond the scope of this thread

**Response #37:**

If the Nephilim are the products of human parents albeit of differing attitudes to God, why were they important to mention in that chapter?

**Question #38:**

Have you ever read of a physical appearance of satan and/or a demon to anyone in the bible ever?

**Response #38:**

I have not. Nor have I read anywhere in the Bible that they cannot physically appear to anyone since they do not represent God. [Compilation edit: The language of Matthew 4 suggests that Satan may have appeared to the Lord Jesus to tempt Him.] Do you know of any such place or might you have interpreted a silence?

**Question #39:**

Now its you learning to stretch the truth here. The bible never says the number of angels are fixed. What bible says about angels, is that they are innumerable, as in meaning, they cant be counted.

**Response #39:**

[4]He counts the number of the stars; He gives names to all of them.

Psalms 147:4 NASB

[14]"You were the anointed cherub who covers, And I placed you there. You were on the holy mountain of God; You walked in the midst of the stones of fire.

Ezekiel 28:14 NASB

In the first passage, clearly there is a fixed number of the angels.

In the second, the stones of fire were based on the same principle as Exodus 28:9-12, 17-21 and Revelation 2:17. The stones of fire were individual memorials of each angel before God. They were finite in number and they were all there at the same time that Satan was still the covering cherub.

No stretch of truth at all.

**Question #40:**

You dont know with this emboldened comment, how so close to the truth you are

**Response #40:**

What is the truth you speak of?

**Question #41:**

Angels did nothing, angels did no such thing. This is what Peter, Jude and Paul were warning against, the belief in the ridiculous, belief in myths. This is not true, and so is slander. This is slandering angels.

**Response #41:**

I expect that you will explain this in your answers to my comments and questions above.

**Question #42:**

"... Bold and self-willed, these men are unafraid to slander angelic majesties."

- 2 Peter 2:10b

I am sorry Odii, it is with a heavy heart that I posted 2 Peter 2:10b up there for you to see and it hurts me more than it will ever hurt you

Odi, I've been here, sold it, done it and have the "angels have sexual feelings" souvenir t-shirt I bought. There are quite a few many so-called truths we were raised with and forced to believe, that are not truths at all, so, yeah, I am willing to discuss, up to certain points, everything. You will have to be prepared to go the distance, because they are a lot of rot, that as we go along, needs being cleaned out. Ask me any questions or clarification on any part of this subject matter, and God help me, as I truthfully respond

Believe me Odi, I know with God's help, what I bring to the table, and trust me when I say, if need be, I am not afraid to eat alone

#### **Response #42:**

I asked you enough already and explained what my position is in the post you responded to and you still haven't answered. That Peter and Jude and Paul were referring to some unnamed myth is no answer. That the Nephilim are pure human children only raises another big question. That angels never did what I believe the Bible said that they did is still no clarification of the issue.

But I trust that you will clear things up now.

#### **Question #43:**

First thing on the list, that needs to be unlearned is thinking that the sons of God is an exclusive title reserved only for angels and further that the same sons of God in Genesis 6:2 that went into the daughters of man are not angels but are righteous men of God, in the same and similar league, just as will, Job and his sons were. Related bible verses about Job and Job's sons being called "son" and "sons of God" will be provided on request

#### **Response #43:**

I don't believe or teach that "sons of God" is an exclusive title for angels. The Lord Jesus Himself is titled the Son of God. Adam was called in Luke son of God. Believers are also later called sons of God by John. So, it is not at all my thinking that it is an exclusive title for the angels. So there is no unlearning necessary here if you meant that comment for me.

Further, my stated reason for saying that the sons of God in Genesis 6 are angels is obviously not because the title is in any way exclusive to them. It would be quite wrong of you to suggest that it is.

As for the sons of God being righteous men of God, I can only see you saying that that is the case with only the reason that "sons of God" has more than one meaning. But the fact that it does means that it is no more necessarily "righteous men of God" than it is necessarily "angels". You are only rejecting one possibility in favor of one you prefer for no stated reason yet.

#### **Question #44:**

Oh, to the untrained and unsuspecting eye, that is what would appear to be the case

Most importantly, I don't know why and how you can't see the disparity in the phrase "sons of God" and "daughters of man"

In Genesis 6:1, you see it stated that "daughters" were born to human beings when same human beings began to multiply. Fast forward a bit, there suddenly is a departure from using the former "daughters" phrase, switching to using a different "daughters of man" phrase that enhanced the previously used "daughters" phrase.

Now, if there were "sons of God", there equally will be "daughters of God", just as, if there were "daughters of man", there equally also will be "sons of man". Obviously, the bible is clearly separating "daughters of man" from "daughters" and making different "daughters of man" from "daughters"

After all, the bible, in John 1:12, says:

"But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God,  
(i.e. she, daughters of God, as well) even to them that believe on his name"

Aside John 1:12 above, now the question is, what is it about being "the sons/daughters of God"?

The major & key thing in the "the sons/daughters of God" expression, really, is about dependence

Dependence upon what? Dependence upon who? you'll ask

Well, whoever or whatever your dependence is upon, gives away, whether you're part of, or not part of "the sons/daughters of God"

As, any, whether angels or human beings, living in full dependence on God, are called "the sons/daughters of God"

Any, whether angel or human being, fully relying upon God, of own free will and so in glad submission, is called a "son/daughter of God"

Now, looking at Genesis 6:2, the bible made a statement of fact and reference to when sons of God saw the daughters of man that they were fair and they took them wives of all which they chose

Genesis 6:2, retold, in a simplified way, says, some sons of God, saw the daughters of man that they might be fair like the daughters of man are; but these sons of God, didnt take to, these daughters of God, as wives material, to chose from, rather these other sons of God, preferred the daughters of man, as wife material

When one, fast forwards to Genesis 6:8-9, moving on, away from Genesis 6:2, then a proper understanding of the situation in Genesis 6:2, unravels. Noah, as a son of God, had grace and with this grace/favour, he had the sense, to avoid "daughters of man" & stick to a "daughter of God" is what Genesis 6:8 is saying.

Genesis 6:9 corroborates Genesis 6:8, saying, Noah did the right thing (i.e. he was righteous) and that among the people of his time, he had sound, unblemished & without defect judgement (i.e. he was blameless). Also, that he didnt depart from walking habitually with God

Noah, was the only one, found in his generation, who was not keeping company with, not socialising with, getting into the pants of "daughters of man" As a son of God, he was the only one found not mixing with "unbelievers"

You do notice in the bible passage, that nephilims were already in the land, before the sons of God stating going into the daughters of man, hence increasing the numbers of Nephilim, dont you?

You also do realise Odii, that even after the flood, the Nephilim gene did survive, dont you?

#### **Response #45:**

I think that it is a weird type of eye that would actually see things any different than that. This is the passage in question:

[1]Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them,

[2]that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose.

Genesis 6:1-2 NASB

It is not possible to make that statement any clearer than it is. Men began to multiply and daughters were born to them and these daughters were found to be beautiful by "the sons of God".

As to a disparity between sons of God and daughters of men, in my previous post, I pointed out that this was an important thing to notice in the passage because of how weird it was that "sons of God" is used in a context where human beings were being talked about. The sons of God would need to be qualified in order for the passage to make sense if they were also human beings. Otherwise, its use only surprises the reader and confuses him.

It seems obvious to me that any distinctions of daughters of MEN (the word was "men" too, not "man") from daughters of God is really forced. The passage does not offer any real reason to infer such distinctions here. All it says is that men multiplied and had daughters born to them who were beautiful. There was no switching around of terms. Men had daughters. Those daughters were later referred to as "daughters of men". That is very natural language. They could hardly be called anything else. The only weird thing here is "sons of God". The term would ordinarily surprise a reader because we were talking about human beings until now. Why suddenly say "sons of God" when the passage had been speaking of human beings multiplying and having female children?



Such a question would be legitimate. And that is why I said in the beginning that a mild debate about the term is not unreasonable. It is queer language to use there.

Regarding that, I said above that the term is clearly not exclusive to angels. But it does, in fact, apply to angels sometimes. Therefore, it is not reasonable to rule them out just because of the term itself. Perhaps the term refers to righteous men, or perhaps it refers to angels. Either is a possibility if the term is the only consideration. Thankfully, it isn't. If it was, it would be impossible to understand this part of the Bible.

As to what the term means, the definition you gave is quite obviously uncredited. Adam was also a son of God but he sinned. We believers today are sons of God but we all sin and the vast majority of us are lukewarm in the Faith. By your definition of full dependence on God, however, neither Adam nor we are sons of God since sin is necessarily a failure to depend fully on God. There is another definition that may be gleaned from the Bible. "Sons of God" would be "deputies" of God, that is, agents of God's Authority in His Creation. Clearly, Adam was one. Clearly, we are too by our position in THE Son of God Jesus Christ Who is God's Chosen Ruler over all Creation and we will become actualized in that position in the Resurrection. Angels too are God's Agents today. That was what they were created to be and they still function that way. Even the rebels among them necessarily answer to God for the domains that they usurp. This is seen in Satan's role in the assembly in Job 1, 2. Even though he did not show up as a friendly, he did have to tell God what he had been up to on earth which he usurped from Adam. So, when the Bible uses the term, it is not wrong to expect that it may be referring to even rebel angels.

As to "daughters of God", while the term is not theologically wrong since, at least, all female believers are in the same position as male ones, it is not warranted in this passage. That there are daughters of God as counterparts to sons of God and sons of men as counterparts to daughters of men is neither here nor there. It has no place in the passage.

Thus your "simple" and self-admitted retelling of that part of the Bible is neither warranted nor accurate. The distinctions on which it is based are foreign to the passage and the definition you worked with is foreign to the Bible itself.

Two words about the Nephilim and Noah whom you also talked about:

1. About Noah, this is what the Bible says:

[8]But Noah found grace in the eyes of the LORD.

[9]These are the generations of Noah: Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God.

Genesis 6:8-9 KJV

I see nothing in there about marrying a daughter of God as opposed to marrying a daughter of man. But I do see that his "generations", that is, his biological pedigree appears to matter here. In fact, this is connected to the issue of the Nephilim. Noah was a pure blood, a full human. He was not a Nephilim at all. Nor was his wife, nor were their children. They were the only humans left alive who still insisted on following God. In fact, they may have been the only fully human creatures still alive at the time [compilation edit: Methuselah died in the year of the Flood so there is some indication that there were other human beings alive at the time]. The craze to have children like the Nephilim as great as they were had led the vast majority to breed with them and fatally contaminate the human species with an evil bent of nature. The Nephilim were exactly like the rebel angels in character. They were unrepentantly evil but physically powerful, able to do things that were humanly impossible and very very resilient. These things were what occasioned the Flood. They weren't easy to kill and they could not be converted. See below.

[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.

[5]Then the Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and that every intent of the thoughts of his heart was **only evil continually**.

Genesis 6:4-5 NASB

2. About the Nephilim, yes, you are right that the Nephilim had been in the earth for some time but not that the marriage of the sons of God only added to them or that they survived the Flood. Regarding the last, Goliath and the descendants of Anak were no Nephilim. It was the fear of unbelieving Israelites that made them qualify them that way to justify their cowardice. They were only abnormally sized humans. The Nephilim were not giants. They were "men of renown" or "great men". That is, they did things that made them greatly admired among men. The Rephaim too were not Nephilim. They were also men of great stature and number, but still ordinary humans (Deuteronomy 2:20; 3:11). The Nephilim were normal-sized but exceptionally strong and very resilient physically but also they were abnormally intelligent (compare the passages about

Antichrist who is himself prophesied to be Nephilim: Genesis 3:15). But let us see the passage again before we continue.

[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.

Genesis 6:4 NASB

To begin, this verse is actually addressing the timeline. The genealogy in the previous chapter ended with Noah and later in this chapter we see that the story picks up with Noah again. What Moses did here was explain that this situation pre-existed the current point at which the story was (at the beginning of the 120 years of grace before the Flood: see verse 3). The marriage [compilation edit: the Hebrew does not call it a marriage, so "cohabitation" is a better word here] of the sons of God to daughters of men occurred before this time and thus the Nephilim had already been around for a while by the time Noah was born. And they remained until the Flood. That was the gist.

That is, it is error to say that the Nephilim existed prior to those marriages or after the Flood since that is not what that verse says. What it does say is that the Nephilim were already existing from when the human women bore them until after this point in the story when God set about bringing on the Flood to destroy them and end their activities on the earth.

#### **Question #46:**

1When man began to multiply on the face of the land and daughters were born to them,

2the sons of God saw that the daughters of man were attractive. And they took as their wives any they chose.

3Then the Lord said, "My Spirit shall not abide in a man forever, for he is flesh: his days shall be 120 years."

4The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of man and they bore children to them. These were the mighty men who were of old, the men of renown.

- Genesis 6:1-4

Please carefully watch Genesis 6:4 closely to notice that the Nephilim, who happened to be giants, were already on earth before the sons of God started mingling with the daughters of man. The Nephilim, were on earth before and continued to be after, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of man

**Response #46:**

Please see above.

**Question #47:**

I am sorry Odi, there is too much knowledge gap to patch or fill in here for you, so I am going to attempt to gauge the extent of what you know by asking a few questions, like:

1/ What do you know about the source(s) of Paul, Peter and Jude letters that got them concerned to write about myths and heresies?

2/ Do you know that Jude references and quotes from Peter when he writes?

3/ Do you know that Peter and Jude make references to or should I say quoted from non apocrypha and/or pseudepigrapha books, that rightfully are rejected to be in the bible?

4/ Do you know that what Peter and Jude quoted in that book is exactly what is being discussed and argued on this thread?

5/ How many apocrypha, non apocrypha and/or pseudepigrapha books have you so far read, that you are cocksure Paul wasnt referring to the Genesis 6 story and the heresies surrounding it?

6/ Can you give me a list and names of such books in #5 above that you've so far read, would you?

**Response #47:**

To begin with, I am quite confident that what I have said about everything here is what the Bible actually teaches. Your attribution of ignorance to me is your business. I know what I know.

1. Jude was the same as John concerned about Gnostic heresies. Peter also addressed them. Paul was not as concerned with them as far as I know [compilation edit: Paul was at least as concerned judging by the attention he gave to angelic matters in Ephesians and Colossians]. But if you mean something else by "sources", I don't know what you are asking.

2. Jude wrote under the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit same as Peter did.

3. I am confident that they made no such references. The Book of Enoch to which I think you refer is a recent hoax.

4. I said in both my response to the thread and to you that the identity of the sons of God as angels was confirmed by Jude and Peter. You insisted that they were speaking of myths.

5. Have you yourself read all the books in the world that you should be sure of anything at all?

6. If you have, produce the list of all the books in the world as well.

**Question #48:**

With this forthcoming comment, you have confirmed you have misunderstood what is going on with Genesis 6:1-2 and the heresy about it, that Peter had to comment on. Also Jude is parroting Peter and continuing on from it. Did you notice what Jude said at Jude 1:8? After Jude 1:6-7? Do you see his writing similarities with Peter? Or you never took any notice of his similarities with Peter?

**Response #48:**

Please see above.

**Question #49:**

Brawn and brains. Nephilim represents brawn, sons of God represent brains. The Nephilim's physical strength in contrast to intelligence was important to mention and as them being well known for some bad quality or deed. Case in point Goliath etcetera.

**Response #49:**

Please see above.

**Question #50:**

I haven't yet read anywhere in the bible of a celestial popping out and physically appearing looking like a human being on its own accord and without been sent on an errand by God or not in an official capacity. Celestial beings are law abiding, bad celestial know their limits

**Response #50:**

So you interpreted a silence. That is always bad theology.

**Question #51:**

"But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels,"

- Hebrews 12:22

"And I looked, and I heard the voice of many angels around the throne, and of the living creatures, and of the elders;

and their number was myriads of myriads and thousands of thousands,"

- Revelation 5:11

I'll let you have it though the bible says, angels are myriads, countless or innumerable just as seen above

**Response #51:**

The Greek word translated "myriad" is an actual number.

**Question #52:**

The fact that you spoke off, that angels cannot produce new generations of angels and that the creation of Nephilim which while clearly different from normal human beings in important respects are truly physical half-humans at least is the truth. Or are you now going to withdraw, retract and distance yourself from the statement because I interjected a remark that it is the truth?

**Response #52:**

You said that I was close to the truth, not that I had spoken the truth.

**Question #53:**

Read both Peter and Jude, you will see, they both were talking about those slandering celestial beings. Peter, even using a hypothetical "if" in his letter, should have made you realise this

**Response #53:**

I see now what you meant. Well, I would only be slandering angels if I was accusing them of doing something that the Bible did not say that they did. So far, I see no reason to believe that I am. So I don't believe either that I am slandering them.

**Question #54:**

Why you are hellbent on believing what the bible never said or never intended to say, is anyone's guess. I have said just about enough for you to give yourself permission to have a reset and rethink. Again, I offer, ask me any questions or clarification on any part of this subject matter, and God help me, as I truthfully respond

**Response #54:**

As I said before, your feelings about this are of no consequence to me. I seek to follow the Bible. That means that I do my best to read it and interpret it as it is without adding a thing or taking a thing away from it. That is what I strive to do. That you feel strongly that I am misrepresenting the Bible does not mean that I am. I am certain that you are but it is something that I would leave you to figure out as you strive to follow God since I am equally certain that you will not listen to me.

**Question #55:**

I wish I was as sanguine as you are because you make it sound, like it is that easy to put right 16 years of PDP misrule within less than 4 years of APC governance. You seem to have forgotten, I said: "there are a lot of rot, that as we go along, needs being cleaned out."

**Response #55:**

Anyone who wishes to know the Truth will yield to it when they hear it. It all depends on how much they want it. Some want it bad enough to take it faster than others. As for me, I keep pushing forward as the Lord helps me to learn what He teaches me and apply it to my life and help others as He strengthens me to. It is a duty that I owe to Him, my friend, not to you.



**Question #56:**

Please, without erroneously giving me Genesis 6:2, 6:4, Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7 and Luke 20:36, state your reason(s) for saying that the sons of God in Genesis 6 are angels

**Response #56:**

If you believe that those are the wrong passages for proving that, then I have nothing more to add.

**Question #57:**

I was just being civil and unnecessarily generous because actually there is nowhere angels are in a clear and detailed manner, leaving no room for confusion or doubt called sons of God. If you know of any verse that in a clear and detailed manner, leaving no room for confusion or doubt, calls angels sons of God, please as soon as possible, share this with me

Without erroneously giving me Genesis 6:2, 6:4, Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7 and Luke 20:36, please show me where in the bible, angels are called the "sons of God"? None. Nowhere.

**Response #57:**

I neither asked for nor care for your generosity. Civility was all I asked for. As for the passages, you obviously know them already. You only appear to have a completely different take on them than one would warrant.

**Question #58:**

It is uplifting and heart-warming to see that you underlined men and daughters to show the contrast in the storyline's change in tone and it switching to using sons of God and daughters of men instead of the previous ordinary men and daughters

**Response #58:**

Suffice to say that I have no clue what you mean here.

**Question #59:**

Read further on, to see where I've dealt with this remark

It doesn't surprise the reader and confuses the reader, if the reader is conversant with the theme of the story and reading with the eyes peeled

If I haven't already asked you, please can I ask you then, what is the theme of Genesis chapter 6 Odi?

**Response #59:**

I have to say that while I was never particularly enthusiastic about this conversation, I am rapidly losing all interest in it. You keep suggesting that you possess some great exclusive knowledge here that you wish to be begged for. I already told you that I know what I know and have already willingly shared it elsewhere and in this conversation with you too. If you have something that you wish to say, feel free to say it. If you have no wish to say it, please let me be. You were the one who seemed to want to talk. I did not seek you out here.

**Question #60:**

Please ignore wherever I've typed "daughters of man" instead of typing "daughters of men" I actually meant in the first place intended typing "daughters of men"

**Response #60:**

Okay.

**Question #61:**

A smart man only believes half of what he reads, a wise man know which half to believe, so I am pleased that you are up for discussing this

Now, when you say: "The passage does not offer any real reason to infer such distinctions here.", can I ask you, what is the theme of Genesis chapter 6 Odiid?

If you answer that question correctly enough, it becomes easier to see the build up, the switching terms making distinctions between men generally and a certain set or different types of men, referred to as "the sons of God". See the switching terms making distinctions between the general women and a different or certain set of the womenfolk, referred to as "daughters of men" It will be inconsistent of the bible not to stick with it's original style but it changed the style because it is making distinctions has the theme of the narrative unfolds

Dont be so quick to be thankful, remember, I asked you above, that without erroneously giving me Genesis 6:2, 6:4, Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7 and Luke 20:36, please show me where in the bible, angels, in a clear and detailed manner, leaving no room for confusion or doubt, are called the "sons of God" Have you been able to oblige me?

"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:"

- John 1:12

I gave you John 1:12, as a bible guide about what sons of God is before mentioning dependence, now tell me if dependence is uncredited in being called a son of God

I already said, I was just being civil and unnecessarily generous when playing along and permitting you ascribing "sons of God" to angels. I am sorry, but that is the only means, I could think of to try to understand you, to know where and what position you are coming from

My question if yet not answered, still stands Odi. So again and without erroneously giving me Genesis 6:2, 6:4, Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7 and Luke 20:36, please show me where in the bible, angels, in a clear and detailed manner, leaving no room for confusion or doubt, are called the "sons of God"?

**Response #61:**

Unless you actually wish to say something, as I said above, I am not interested in answering any more questions. This conversation is happening because of your choice to mention me in your comment on the thread. I am not your student and do not consider your position here to be biblically correct. So, if you actually want to demonstrate its correctness, by all means, do so. If you do not, then let me move on to other conversations.

**Question #62:**

You are absolutely right, it has no place in the passage. In fact, the "daughters of God" phrase is not warranted in the narrative because it is not party to the theme of discussion in Genesis Chapter 6 Odi. The existing and unfolding problem, got exacerbated when the "sons of God" went into "daughters of men" The bible is always careful and deliberate with its choice of words and wordings, hence the conscious switch of tone from using the word "daughters" to moving on to the more distinctive "daughters of men" The "daughters of men" are complicit, even if by accident or as willing partners, they are and so the reason why the "daughters of men" are mentioned and the "daughters of God" are not

**Response #62:**

You're exactly right that what the Bible says is very deliberately said. That is why I reject speculations about what it does not say. I cannot credit your "daughters of God" teaching because I see nothing in the passage itself - or, in fact, anywhere in the Bible - to suggest that it is right.

**Question #63:**

The most perplexing and head scratching situations usually have simple retelling answers. If you can't explain it simply, it means you don't understand it well enough then.

**Response #63:**

I did not say that simplicity was a problem. I said that your retelling was not biblically accurate. In fact, it was false.

**Question #64:**

You say you see nothing in there about marrying a daughter of God as opposed to marrying a daughter of men, but then go on to say, but you do see that it was his "generations", that is, his biological pedigree that appears to matter here. I hope you see how you've contradicted yourself there.

**Response #64:**

There was no contradiction since his biological pedigree had to do with his parentage, not with his marriage. That is what pedigree means.

Also note that I edited that part of my post for greater accuracy.

**Question #65:**

Anyway, we know why in Genesis 6, God was planning to wipe the whole earth of human beings, however, God finds something in Noah, that is exemplary. It said, Noah is "perfect in his generations", and that is exactly how you too put it, when you said "he was not a Nephilim at all.

Nor was his wife, nor were their children" and that him his wife and children were the only full human beings left about on earth

**Response #65:**

First, I apologize for the earlier mistakes but I edited that part of my post before you responded. I believe that the Bible does not teach that they were the only full humans left but the human race was truly getting wiped out and replaced by the Nephilim strain.

Still, I am at a loss what you are saying here. Are you then admitting that the Nephilim were not fully human? Wasn't that what you were arguing against? Or is it your position that a marriage of righteous men to unrighteous women would produce half-humans?

**Question #66:**

The evidence is there, black and white in the bible, look at Genesis 6:4a, saying "The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward,". They already existed but increasingly became more with the interest of the "sons of God" bar Noah, going into "daughters of men"

**Response #66:**

I don't think I have a better answer to this than what I said before.

**Question #67:**

"We even saw the Nephilim there—the descendants of Anak that come from the Nephilim!

We seemed like grasshoppers in our own sight, and we must have seemed the same to them!"

- Numbers 13:33

Goliath, the giant killed by David, wasnt the only descendant of the Nephilim. Giants, when man fell, originally came about from the Nephilim. Giants population increased and got aggravated to becoming a menace to society when the sons of God suddenly found the daughters of men's beauty powerfully and mysteriously attractive to.

**Response #67:**

The KJV translated wrong in Genesis 6:4 [compilation edit: the translation was not wrong, only misleading for contemporary times]. The Nephilim were not giants.

**Question #68:**

This entire remark is laughable and if I should comment on it, kkins25 and others will say I am doing a metatron again.

**Response #68:**

Okay.

**Question #69:**

Odi, did you just type that the Nephilim were not giants? kkins25, come see, see me, see confusion and wahala ooo

Odi, the word Nephilim in Hebrew means giants. If you want me to elaborate, and go into the etymology details and literal meaning of Nephilim, I will, but only if you ask me to, so suffice to say, the Nephilim were giants, human beings initially with incredible stature and strength before brains met brawn. The beauty of the "daughters of men" was the catalyst.

**Response #69:**

I am not asking you a thing. I did not come to you for a conversation. You, on the other hand, thought to scold me for holding a point of view that you disagree with and I simply explained to you that I was duty-bound to be true to the Bible even if you didn't agree with me. If you feel the need to correct me, then do so. Or else leave well enough alone.

As for the Nephilim, as I said, the KJV translated wrong [compilation edit: the translation was not wrong, just misleading for contemporary times]. They were not giants. And even if they were, why would a marriage of righteous men to unrighteous women produce giants? And why would it be considered in any way related to the disparate spiritual loyalties of the spouses? Or, as it seems to me that you might be suggesting, why would there be a connection between a race of giants and human sons of God in the latter's marrying unrighteous women?

**Question #70:**

"18After this, there was another battle against the Philistines at Gob. As they fought, Sibbecai from Hushah killed Saph, another descendant of the giants.

19During another battle at Gob, Elhanan son of Jairf from Bethlehem killed the brother of Goliath of Gath. The handle of his spear was as thick as a weaver's beam!

20In another battle with the Philistines at Gath, they encountered a huge man with six fingers on each hand and six toes on each foot, twenty-four in all, who was also a descendant of the giants.

21But when he defied and taunted Israel, he was killed by Jonathan, the son of David's brother Shimea

22These four Philistines were descendants of the giants of Gath, but David and his warriors killed them"

- 2 Samuel 21:18-22

Odi, I repeat, brawn and brains. Nephilim represents brawn, sons of God represent brains. The Nephilim were able to be "men of renown" or "great men" and did things that made them greatly admired among men, not just only because of their stature and physical strength but importantly because they became endowed with intelligence from the association of the "sons of God" going into the "daughters of men" Beauty, Brawn and Brains. Bullies will always be a bully, no matter how much brains they have, that is why the giants in the bible were well known for some bad quality or deed. Case in point Goliath etcetera.



**Response #70:**

The word Nephilim is not in that passage you posted. If you reread my post, you will see that in my edit, I explained how the Nephilim were not Rephaim and certainly not the same as any giants that followed.

**Question #71:**

I am sure of the bible verse you are referring the Antichrist to being prophesied to be Nephilim but would like you to post here your reference that the Antichrist himself is prophesied to be Nephilim please.

**Response #71:**

It was in my edit. The post has the reference.

**Question #72:**

Being a bully that Nephilims are, is it surprising, that the physical strength and intelligence qualities be found in the Antichrist?

**Response #72:**

I don't see anything in the Bible to suggest that they were bullies. They may have been or they may not have been. But the whole idea of "bullying" is extrabiblical.

**Question #73:**

See my comment below

To an ill-informed and unprejudiced mind, the words, as they stand in Genesis 6:4, states, as clear as day, that the Nephilim, who were on the earth in those days, as existing, before the sons of God began to go into the daughters of men. It didnt even say marry or know them, as Adam and others knew their wives, but says: "the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men" Bluntly put, the "sons of God" fairked the "daughters of men" literally.

**Response #73:**

You have suggested that you know the Hebrew here. What does the Hebrew original of that verse say?

**Question #74:**

Where, what is there above for me to see?

Are you saying the Nephilim werent already existing before the sons of God started fairking the daughters of men?

Is that your position and how you understand Genesis 6:4?

**Response #74:**

I made one single post but it was too long so I had to break it at that point. That was why I said "see above". My answer was in the preceding post.

As I said in that post, yes, that is how I understand Genesis 6. The Nephilim were the product of the union of the angels and the human women.

**Question #75:**

Because you are ignoring the obvious, but I am so pleased you answered those 6 questions. You dont know how much it means to me you answering them. It permits me to better understand you, better understand yor station(s), better know why and how you come to be in the position(s) you reveal about yourself, topic and whatnot. That is the objective, they arent trick questions, and there are never nothing malicious intents with my questionings. Thank you.

**Response #75:**

To be clear, I don't consider them trick questions. I find them condescending and annoying. I would be happy to answer questions to clarify what I believe for others. But your questions are designed ostensibly to demonstrate the errors in a position that you do not agree with. That is not something that I ordinarily have a problem with. The problem is that with such a design, when you get answers you don't expect, you may be sorely tempted to accuse your opposite of some kind of malpractice. That is why I would rather you just made your case and if we can agree, we do. If we cannot, we would at least know why we cannot and have a chance of disagreeing amicably.

**Question #76:**

Well, I know you cant deny that part of Jude is very similar to 2 Peter, hence my "what do you know about the source(s) of Paul, Peter and Jude letters that got them concerned to write about myths and heresies"

First, I am going to show you here next, evidence of Jude quoting Peter, before talking of other sources, or "sources" as you put it, Jude and Peter quoted from. There are more of Jude quoting Peter, but this just one, as it is, is enough and factual. More can be provided upon request

17But you, beloved, remember what was foretold by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ

18when they said to you, "In the last times there will be scoffers who will follow after their own ungodly desires"

- Jude 1:17-18

"Most importantly, you must understand that in the last days scoffers will come, scoffing and following their own evil desires."

- 2 Peter 3:3

**Response #76:**

There is no doubt - and I have not expressed any such in this regard - that Jude is similar to 2 Peter. But it is a leap of logic to go from that to concluding that either copied from the other. That is also why many antichristians pretend that Matthew copied Mark and so on. As I said, both Jude and Peter wrote under inspiration. There is absolutely no need to claim that there was any copying going on at all since they were both writing under the same influence. This is itself yet another proof of the whole Bible's consistency. All over the Bible, even though there are multiple human authors, the theme is one and the proof is in how each agrees with the other.

**Question #77:**

You at times can be so predictably suspicious of my questioning, that it makes you go on a defensive and tangent

My question was: "Do you know that Jude references and quotes from Peter when he writes?", which required at most a Yes or No binary answer, at worst I dont know. Anyway I never doubted the inspiration under which Jude wrote, but I have shown with the above that Jude references and quotes from Peter when he writes, which was the question asked.

**Response #77:**

First, that it sounds defensive to you does not mean that it is.

Second, there was no tangent at all. As I explained above, there was no necessity to assume that either copied from the other. If, in fact, any copying happened, why do you assume that it was Jude

who did it and not Peter? There is no reason to infer that any copying happened. Both of them were writing under the same spiritual influence so it is not unexpected that they should say similar things.

Third, I have told you before that there are such things as false dichotomies. If I have no reason to assume what you assume, I cannot be reasonably expected to give you the answers you expect. I cannot tell you that "yes, I know that Jude copied Peter" or "no, I don't know that/if Jude copied Peter" or whatever the third option might be in your thinking when I know that Jude and Peter wrote under the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit and thus did not need to copy each other.

**Question #78:**

Well, I am sorry to be the one bursting the bubble and letting you know that they both made references to non apocrypha and/or pseudepigrapha books, that rightfully are rejected to be in the bible, case in point The Book of Enoch

"See the Lord is coming with thousands upon thousands of his holy ones to judge everyone and to convict the ungodly of all the ungodly acts they have done"

- 1 Enoch 1:9

14Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied about them:

"See, the Lord is coming with thousands upon thousands of his holy ones

15to judge everyone, and to convict all of them of all the ungodly acts they have committed in their ungodliness, and of all the defiant words ungodly sinners have spoken against him."

- Jude 1:14-15

How can you, in light of the above, say The Book of Enoch is a recent hoax, where it is clear as day shows Jude 1:14-15 echoing 1 Enoch 1:9?

**Response #78:**

I can say so if I know that someone who read Jude decided to create a book of Enoch after the fact containing those quotes so that with it he can sell other lies.

**Question #79:**

Absolutely and backed with scripture

**Response #79:**

I'm afraid I don't know any such Scriptures.

**Question #80:**

You are, sometimes, like just here, too quick to protect yourself from a harmless and innocent question. All I merely asked was

"how many apocrypha, non apocrypha and/or pseudepigrapha books have you so far read, that you are cocksure Paul wasnt referring to the Genesis 6 story and the heresies surrounding it". The question had nothing to do asking about reading all the books in the world

I dont need to have read all the books in the world that I should be sure of anything at, but if you read like I do, you would have read the book of Enoch, as a non apocrypha and/or pseudepigrapha book, or read any of the apocrypha books

**Response #80:**

Your question was not innocent. But I won't argue with you if you insist that it was. The second paragraph in your response is why I answered you the way I did. I don't need to know anything from the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books to be sure what to believe. That is not to say that I am not familiar with some of them. But there are far more pseudepigraphical books than one can

read in one lifetime. If our understanding of the Bible depended on knowing what these false books say, then we are hopeless to ever be sure what the Truth is.

But it doesn't. To understand the Bible, we need only the Holy Spirit, the Bible itself and gifted and prepared Bible teachers.

**Question #81:**

I only stop reading when I am six foot under but for sake of this thread, I can tell you I have read the book of Enoch along with some other good, bad and ugly books.

**Response #81:**

That is your choice and I have no part in making it for you. For myself, I would rather spend my time reading and rereading my Bible, listening to a gifted and prepared Bible teacher and studying what material I need to prepare myself to teach others properly. The last may include some of these books you speak of if my gift for apologetics required knowledge of them. So far I haven't seen that it does, so I am not much concerned with them.

**Question #82:**

On the contrary. It is just that, I haven't yet read anywhere in the bible of a celestial popping out and physically appearing looking like a human being on its own accord and without been sent on an errand by God or not in an official capacity and so that it a precedent that shows and can be used as a reason whywe dont see celestial beings popping out and physically appearing looking like a human being on their own accord and without been sent on an errand by God or not in an official capacity

**Response #82:**

[1]Then Jesus was led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil.

[2]And after He had fasted forty days and forty nights, He then became hungry.

[3]And the tempter came and said to Him, "If You are the Son of God, command that these stones become bread."

[4]But He answered and said, "It is written, 'Man shall not live on bread alone, but on every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God.'"

[5]Then the devil took Him into the holy city and had Him stand on the pinnacle of the temple,

[6]and said to Him, "If You are the Son of God, throw Yourself down; for it is written, 'He will command His angels concerning You'; and 'On their hands they will bear You up, So that You will not strike Your foot against a stone.'"

[7]Jesus said to him, "On the other hand, it is written, 'You shall not put the Lord your God to the test.'"

[8]Again, the devil took Him to a very high mountain and showed Him all the kingdoms of the world and their glory;

[9]and he said to Him, "All these things I will give You, if You fall down and worship me."

[10]Then Jesus said to him, "Go, Satan! For it is written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and serve Him only.'"

[11]Then the devil left Him; and behold, angels came and began to minister to Him.

Matthew 4:1-11 NASB

Now, even without any Bible passage offering such an example as the above, it is still a very bad idea to assume that if the Bible does not say something, then it must mean something else by its silence. We don't know everything about the affairs of the spiritual. We barely even know what the ground rules are here. We can glean enough from the Bible to be able to walk in total confidence in God but far much more is happening spiritually than God is pleased to tell us in the Bible. The right attitude to have then is one of humility. What we are not told we ought not to assume recklessly.

### **Question #83:**

C'mon now Odii, it's me, please stop pulling my leg.

"Myriad" used in those bible context is not used as an actual or fixed number. "Myriad" means a unit of ten thousand, but the bible says they are myriads, effectively a countless or extremely great number of celestial beings or angels



10,000

**Response #83:**

Ten thousand times ten thousand is an actual number. A thousand thousands is an actual number. Still, my position is that it is impossible for the number of creatures that God made to be infinite. They are not God Who is truly infinite. We may be unable to count as high as the number of all the angels but there is a finite number of them. But what the Bible does say is not that their number is infinite but that they were "tens of thousands of tens of thousands and thousands of thousands" or "myriads of myriads and thousands of thousands". That is finite, not infinite.

**Question #84:**

This is a quiet truth, that is not a version of anything widely known, as it is an original knowing. Some people fall victim to dogma and ill-informed teaching. There is nothing more damaging to a discovered truth than attachment to an old error and closeness to the truth, because the thing about the truth is, not a lot of people can handle it. You can be standing right in front of the truth and not necessarily see it, and people only see and get it when they're ready to see and get it. The only people who are and are going to be mad at you for speaking the truth are those people who have been believing a lie

**Response #84:**

That is neither here nor there. You gave the impression that there was something more. Still, let it be.

I will only add that the Truth is not meant to be hidden - except from those who do not want it - and it certainly does not present a badge of arrogance for learning it. Those who know the Truth are under obligation to help others who are willing to learn it (Matthew 10:27). We don't present ourselves as some kind of elite because of what we know. That is knowledge puffing us up or making us arrogant (1 Corinthians 8:1). Love teaches us to help others with what we know.

**Question #85:**

"Again the Lord said to Raphael, Bind Azazyel hand and foot; cast him into darkness; and opening the desert which is in Dudael, cast him in there."

- Book of Enoch 10:6

"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;"

- 2 Peter 2:4

I always any day, will take Peter and Jude's words on any matter first before taking yours on board Odi, no disrespect or insult intended.

When Peter in 2 Peter 2:4 above, used that hypothetical "if" in his letter, he was quoting from the Book of Enoch 10:6 shown above and talking about how out of place as to be amusing, it is to believe in all that fantasy of angels humping human beings and further on, in 2 Peter 2:11, he denies that angels were accusing other angels, saying they (i.e. meaning angels Michael, Uriel, Raphael, and Gabriel) wouldnt bring such a slanderous accusation against these supposedly angels having sex with human beings before God

**Response #85:**

I wouldn't have it any other way, I assure you.

As for your quote, I believe I have already addressed it. The Book of Enoch is a worthless waste of time and a dangerous one too for those who will not follow the biblical method for growing in the Truth.

**Question #86:**

Your best is not good enough

**Response #86:**

I would worry if you were the Lord Jesus.

**Question #87:**

Brilliant deduction, however, the thing about the truth is, not a lot of people can handle it because the greater the ignorance, the greater is the dogmatism, but there certainly are different paths of learning and growth anyway, so I say may you continue to abound in His grace

I will asap reply to your other post with the comment about "The KJV translated wrong in Genesis 6:4. The Nephilim were not giants".

**Response #87:**

There is only one way to grow in the Truth, that is, to come to know and understand the whole teaching of the Bible: we must submit to the authority of a pastor-teacher whose teaching is approved by the Bible and stick with his ministry until we have learned everything that the Bible teaches as a whole (Ephesians 4:11-14). There is no other way.

**Question #88:**

Of course you wouldnt have anything more to add because you and I know that, there is nowhere it is in a clear and detailed manner, leaving no room for confusion or doubt, stated that angels are called sons of God. Nowhere in the bible, is it forcibly and clearly expressed that angels are sons of God. What is so difficult, in admitting this truthful fact Odii?

**Response #88:**

I don't know any such thing. If these passages, as clear as they are, are not clear enough in your judgment, why should I expect you to receive any other witness? I doubt that you would accept even one that says unequivocally that "angels are sons of God". You have your own agenda which has nothing to do with what the Bible actually says in this regard, so it is not surprising that you reject its witness.

**Question #89:**

Of course, I know Genesis 6:2, 6:4, Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7 and Luke 20:36 and that they aren't talking of angels as sons of God, but I wanted to be sure you are not hinging your conjectures on any other bible verses, I am not aware of

I can't believe you're bold enough to say "You only appear to have a completely different take on them than one would warrant." but nothing spoils, I am not fretting, because I know the penny will drop sooner or later

**Response #89:**

What you believe in this is between you and the Lord. You do not accept my authority as a teacher so I can hardly be held responsible for you here. As for my conjectures, what else would you call something you are hell-bent on rejecting? Are you saying anything different from what atheists say when they call the Gospel and the Bible a fiction? Suffice to say that just like your "simple" retelling of the Genesis 6 passage, your explanation of these passages you reject are bound to be just as convoluted and just as based on foreign intrusions into the Bible.

**Question #90:**

You underlined men and daughters to show the contrast in the storyline's change in tone and it switching to using sons of God and daughters of men instead of the previous ordinary use of men and daughters words, for a reason, didn't you? I am glad you did that because that was a Freudian slip on your side

**Response #90:**

I can't help what you choose to see. I underlined men and daughters because both words were present in the phrase "daughters of men" which I also underlined. As I explained later, there is nothing else that you can call daughters who are born to men which would be clearer than "daughters of men". You thought to insist that there was some sort of switching happening all on your own. Clearly, no such thing happened. Men had daughters and those daughters were referred to as daughters of men since that is what they were. There is nothing better that they could have been called.

**Question #91:**

Don't be reluctant to give information when I pose questions at you but be worried when you decline to answer them

Please find the courage to answer the questions, anytime I ask that you're cagey to answer

Why? because from your replies, is the only way you'll know which direction your truth lies

Of course, I know and understand why you particularly wouldnt want to be enthusiastic about this conversation, and its cool, as my work is just the seed. For me, sometimes it's enough just to plant the seed, and walk away. Let someone else water the seed, seed germinate and the flower grow on its own.

**Response #91:**

This is precisely why discussing with you is a grand waste of time and a terrible test of patience. I answered a thread without making any reference to you. Someone made a challenge to the Bible and I answered it. You came and scolded me for "[buying] into this angels having sex [\_\_\_]" as you put it, and for "blindly and poorly arguing that angels have sexual desire". I said nothing to you prior. I was only answering a thread that someone else made and I was doing so from my understanding of the Bible. That understanding did not derive from you. I have never been your student so that you should feel the need to correct me when I misrepresent what you have taught me. Nor was it the first time that you had tried to have a fight with me over what I teach.

I have often found what you teach objectionable. But I don't comment on it. I let you teach as you please trusting that if your heart is really seeking to honor God in what you do, you will soon come round to the correct doctrine on all things that you teach. It is not my job to correct you especially since I have seen how you can be in conversations. In fact, I only expressed a disassociation from an erroneous doctrine you put forth once for you to bristle and try to start a cantankerous debate. I wasn't even trying to correct you. I only said that you were wrong in associating me with what you taught since I didn't hold the same views. That was all. But you cannot stand having anyone hold different views from you, can you? That is why you keep starting fights and then you turn around and claim that your questions are harmless and innocent. If they are, why are they seeds that you are doing? What kind of seeds are they?

I told you that I know what I know. I told you that I do not accept your teachings here as biblical. Why then has this conversation continued? Only because you are hell-bent on correcting me. Was that my concern with you? Did I try to have a conversation with you? Peace is alien to you. You cannot have it unless you have beaten everybody into subjection to you and your errors. You "re-tell" a Bible passage on the basis of the witness of a pseudepigraphical book which you yourself admit has no place in the Bible and I am the one in need of correcting? You are far more arrogant than you know. Your own desire to be top dog in teaching has blinded you to the Truth. You are ending up not only misleading weak believers but opposing the Truth of the Bible for nothing more than your own false sense of superiority because of your lack of fear of God. If you feared the Lord, you would not even permit the thought of adding anything to what He has said in the Bible into your heart.

I have continued the conversation so far because I hope to bear witness to the Truth wherever it is possible through it. Your work here will have its reward with the Lord. My concern was not so much to correct you or to give back the same abuse that you had meted to me. It was to make sure that anyone who seeks the Truth is not turned aside by the lies you have not been ashamed to tell here. So, it is you who should be concerned that I am not answering your questions. I try to answer all questions and arguments even with antichristians, how much more with a fellow believer. My refusal now is to demonstrate that you are doing worse than even antichristians who are clearly antagonists have done. Your own antagonism is the kind that sneaks up behind the unsuspecting and harms them when they least expect it.

#### **Question #92:**

What comes easy, fast and furious won't last, what lasts won't come easy, fast and furious. You should know that much Odii. Reiterating, 16 years of PDP misrule of the country, isnt going to be miracuouly fixed by less than 4 years of ACP governance

The light of the truth can be harsh to those that have been in the dark. In my last post, I said a prayer for you, to be abounding in His grace (i.e. so I say may you continue to abound in His grace) Do you really understand the meaning of that prayer? It's a prayer to open your eyes, to let you see this matter in a new way. It's a gift that can only be felt when your eyes are open to see and you're open enough to accept the truth.

Even if not now, someday, you'll have the epiphany, look back and know exactly what we've discussed on this thread

### **Response #92:**

My journey with God started when I was so little that I have no memory of it. I grew up to stories about my weird childhood. I have always loved the Lord and sought to know Him. So when I went to church from childhood until now, I was not merely trying to do as I was told. I went enthusiastically. That was how I came to know what is actually taught in churches. I was born and raised in the Methodist Church. My grandma took me to Roman sacraments because my mother's side of the family was Roman Catholic through and through. This is why I caught a taste for extrabiblical material. I read volumes on Catholic saints and the Apocrypha growing up. By my late teens I had explored Roman, Protestant and Pentecostal traditions. Because of the incoherence and bad practices I gave up on churches and pastors and started trying to make my own way.

That was how I remained until late 2017. The Lord was merciful to me and brought me then to a teaching ministry and to a teacher who is both exceptionally gifted and better prepared than anybody else I have met in my thirty odd years on earth. Until that time, I found the Bible very difficult - and, in far more cases than I would have admitted before, impossible in fact - to understand. It was in many of these years that I took on and held to many very bad interpretations like this one that you are selling on the strength of a pseudepigraphical book and on interpretive gymnastics that only those who refuse to follow the Bible humbly would ever fail to see. I was my own teacher and was as arrogant as you are now. If there was a difference between how I was and how you are, it would probably only be in my willingness to submit to someone qualified later.

So, it is not that I have much error accumulated over the years or that I am hardened in error from long exposure since the interpretation that I am putting forth is what I only learned within the past 17 months. It may be you who from long years of independent or private interpretation are now hardened in error. And it certainly is not that I have any problem with the light of truth. I have

changed positions and made adjustments that I have held which were either wrong or imperfectly right as the light shines brighter in my own heart. But is that true of you? You are the one who hold that the Book of Enoch is rightly excluded from the Bible thereby admitting that it is not inspired and yet it is this book that informs your interpretation of a Bible passage which is itself inspired. This is notwithstanding the fact that the book is a recent hoax and the fact that the Bible always interprets itself.

**Question #93:**

Of course, you wouldnt see nothing in the passage itself - or, in fact, anywhere in the Bible - to suggest that it is right and thats simply because whether you want to admit it or not, it's a man's world and the bible was written by men, a patriarchal society Odii

**Response #93:**

You admit then that it is not in the Bible, that it is only an invention of your own?

**Question #94:**

"Thus your "simple" and self-admitted retelling of that part of the Bible is neither warranted nor accurate."

- by Odii: 12:01am On Feb 11

**Response #94:**

The quotes were there to say that your retelling was not simple at all. Rather it is convoluted and overwrought.

**Question #95:**



C'mon Odi, did you read the bible giving credit to Noah's ancestors or that the credit was given directly to him or not?

I dont know where out from you pulled "pedigree" I am suspecting you are confusing "pedigree" with "generation". You do know and accept that "generation" means all of the people born and living at about the same time, as Noah and has nothing to do with genealogy and/or "biological pedigree", dont you?

Do you accept and agree that it is Noah who is given credit for remaining pure by not marrying and/or going into any of the daughters of men?

**Response #95:**

"Generations" is a word used quite a bit in Genesis in old translations like KJV and it is not a bad translation (this is also true of the word "giants" used to translate Nephilim). But because of the way we use the word today, its use in Genesis can be misleading. Consider the following:

These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens...

Genesis 2:4 NIV

The word is used in a literal sense in those translations. It refers to the "generating" of the object in view. This is what also happens with Noah. In NIV1984 and NASB, the word used is "account" which emphasizes the recounting of the origins rather than the origins themselves. The word refers to his origins, or, in other words, his parentage. He was a pure human being, not a Nephilim. He and his family were possibly the last pure humans left although we cannot say that definitively.

**Question #96:**

Thank you for the belated heads up. You wrote: "Noah was a pure blood, a full human. He was not a Nephilim at all. Nor was his wife, nor were their children. They were the only humans left alive." to which I completely concur without demur, however have you ever given thought to the daughters-in-laws?

**Response #96:**

The edit was made before you responded so I didn't think I needed to warn you about it earlier.

Again I wonder why you concur when you are arguing that the Nephilim were not the product of angels and human women.

About the daughters-in-law, they were purely human too.

**Question #97:**

I am not going to hold it against you because you're just as human as I am Odi. We all make mistakes

Everything you wrote in your edit is completely true, bar the "rebel angels" bit. That is a figment of imagination. It is old wives' tale, a widely held but utterly false belief

**Response #97:**

The rebel angels bit is the point of the whole passage because it explains the Flood.

**Question #98:**

"43Why is my language not clear to you?

Because you are unable to hear what I say.

44You belong to your father, the devil, and you want to carry out your father's desires.

He was a murderer from the beginning, not holding to the truth, for there is no truth in him."

- John 8:43-44

It's you doing the arguing here, not me. I'll be the first to tell you, if I am arguing but I am not. If I am not sure of something, I won't talk about it, talkless argue over it.

Now Odi, you and I know from the bible that, Cain, the woman's firstborn turned out to be a seed of Satan and a killer of Abel, the seed of the woman, rather than a killer of the seed of Satan. The Nephilim were already existing via Cain's lineage. Reiterating, the giants, when man fell, originally came about as Nephilim. Giants population increased and got aggravated to becoming a menace to society when the sons of God suddenly found the daughters of men's beauty powerfully and mysteriously sexually attractive to

### **Response #98:**

About arguing, you have said that plenty times already and I ignored it each time because it was obviously false. If you consider yourself to not be arguing, you are welcome to your own self-delusion. Every time that we provide a discussion describing what we believe to be true along with reasons why we believe it to be true, we make an argument. But it is only consistent with arrogance to think that you are making decrees rather than arguments. The Truth can be stated and argued for: in fact, that is what we do unless it is being communicated between a teacher and a student.

As to your submission about Cain's lineage, this is one more example of your taking liberties with the Bible. Nowhere is it stated in the Bible that Cain's lineage produced giants. Furthermore, Cain was very clearly, as you yourself also admitted, the woman's seed as much as Abel himself was. Nowhere is he called Satan's seed. The sense in which he may have been Satan's seed is no different than the sense in which all unbelievers are as well. But what we see in Genesis 3:15 is a match of opposites: the woman's Seed against the Serpent's seed. We know from later in the Bible that the Lord Jesus was the woman's literal Seed since He had no biological father and that the Serpent was Satan. It is only right to expect that this is not just a metaphorical or merely spiritual relationship at all but one just as literal as the Lord Jesus's to the woman.

Finally, this is an evasion of the question I asked.

**Question #99:**

"There were giants in the earth in those days, yea, and after that the sons of God came unto the daughters of men, and they had born them children, these were mighty men, which in old time were men of renown. "

- Genesis 6:4 Geneva Bible printed before KJV

"There were giants in the earth in those days, yea, and after that the sons of God came unto the daughters of men, and they had born them children, these were mighty men, which in old time were men of renown. "

- Genesis 6:4 Geneva Bible printed before KJV

"Soothly giants were on the earth in those days, forsooth after that the sons of God entered [in] to the daughters of men, and those daughters begat; these were mighty of the world and famous men (these were the mighty and famous men of the world)."

- Genesis 6:4 Wycliffe Bible printed before KJV

Almost all exegesis and/or expository commentaries, say the Nephilim were already existed contemporaneously with the sons of God, that the Nephilim were on 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 and so in line with my viewpoint

**Response #99:**

I checked again. The translation was not outright wrong although it is certainly misleading for our time. It is true that translations from that time in history used the concept of giants to translate the word but the translators used a mythological creature to which their audience could relate to explain what the Nephilim is. See below:

As to "giants", this term occurs in the KJV as the result of an unfortunate translation choice. The Greek version of the Hebrew Old Testament (i.e., the Septuagint or LXX), in order to make the Hebrew term nephilim (lit., "fallen ones") understandable to an audience versed in classical culture, translated the word as gigantes (finding a rough parallel to the nephilim in the Greek myth of the giants). KJV picked that up, but now people are misled by the translation since 1) what we think of as a "giant" today is quite different from the Greek idea and 2) people today tend to see the KJV as almost inspired, little realizing that the translators expected an educated audience to understand that this was just a translation (one which was accommodating a difficult Hebrew term to a more familiar mythological one). In short, "giants" in the KJV are actually nephilim – these creatures were not necessarily larger than other people nor different in appearance (whereas the Greek giants were monstrously large and grotesque, having a hundred hands each!). It was their origin that made the nephilim so different: as half-human half-angels, there were exceptionally powerful and gifted individuals (although hostile to God and horrific from the divine point of view), "mighty men which were of old, men of renown" (giboriym asher meol'am anshey hashem).

- <https://ichthys.com/mail-Giants-and-Nephilim.htm>

As for commentaries et al, this is not necessarily a helpful recourse for your position since commentaries are only as good as their makers and biblical interpretation is not a democratic business. Just like very many people miss the narrow road and constricted gate but find the wide boulevard and broad gate, many exegetes - especially in our lukewarm age of Laodicean - miss the Truth in their exegesis especially when there is a very popular position which could cost them in sales to contradict. They don't always get it wrong and agreement in the majority can be very helpful in understanding what the Truth is but numbers do not define the Truth.

#### **Question #100:**

I am not scolding you, did not scold you Odii. What do you think it has been happening so far with my stick laid down besides yours?

#### **Response #100:**

You don't argue, according to you. You don't abuse, according to you. You don't insult, according to you. You also did not scold me, according to you. You have a completely different comprehension of these words than I am familiar with. Whatever you may call your words referring to me in your posts, they were a scolding, they were abusive, and they were insulting.

**Question #101:**

I think you havent cop on to my Brawn and Brain scenario

**Response #101:**

As my final question in that quote showed, I haven't. Your scenario is outlandish, biblically speaking.

**Question #102:**

"You also do realise Odii, that even after the flood, the Nephilim gene did survive, dont you?"

- by : 4:30am On Feb 10

I am quite sure you recollect me previously saying the aove inverted commas

**Response #102:**

I do, hence the comment. There were no Nephilim after the Flood. That too is a fiction you are laboring under. Or else what was the Flood for? Did God miss His target?

**Question #103:**

" (compare the passages about Antichrist who is himself prophesied to be Nephilim: Genesis 3:15)"

- by Odii: 12:01am On Feb 11

Is Genesis 3:15, the passages about Antichrist who is himself prophesied to be Nephilim then?

**Response #103:**

As you will have seen earlier in this post, it is the passage indeed.

**Question #104:**

"The LORD saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every intention of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually."

- Genesis 6:5

**Response #104:**

Nothing about bullying there. In fact, I have used that very passage in this conversation to demonstrate the inveterate evil of the Nephilim that required the Flood to destroy them.

**Question #105:**

"See my comment below

To an ill-informed and unprejudiced mind, the words, as they stand in Genesis 6:4, states, as clear as day, that the Nephilim, who were on the earth in those days, as existing, before the sons of God began to go into the daughters of men. It didnt even say marry or know them, as Adam and others knew their wives, but says: "the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men" Bluntly put, the "sons of God" fairked the "daughters of men" literally."

- by : 8:38am On Feb 12

The above inverted commas is what you're asking a Hebrew explanation from. Are you sure I mentioned anything about Hebrew in my comment there, hmm?

**Response #105:**

This is the comment I meant:

Odi, the word Nephilim in Hebrew means giants. If you want me to elaborate, and go into the etymology details and literal meaning of Nephilim, I will, but only if you ask me to, so suffice to say, the Nephilim were giants, human beings initially with incredible stature and strength before brains met brawn. The beauty of the "daughters of men" was the catalyst.

- (<https://www.nairaland.com/5011271/said-angels-dont-sexual-feelings/1#75647915>)

**Question #106:**

I applaud your honesty in saying you do not know of such thing.

If you were able to show me where it is forcibly and clearly expressed that angels are sons of God, of course, I will gladly eat the humble pie, ask for your forgiveness, admit I got it all wrong and accept on the face of the unequivocal proof you give

My agenda is not to suffer ignorance gladly, and please stop, at every moment being defensive and anxious to avoid opposing views

I remember I previously warned and told you that you are responsible for what you teach

I am in good company of Paul, Peter and Jude who call what you believe in to be myths and teaching heresy. Please, don't even go there, we are not talking about the Gospel and the Bible being fiction,



but rather this is about believing in celestial beings otherwise known as angels impregnated human beings

It's OK, I am not sweating it

My hands are up in the air, and I am guilty as charged. Yes it does make one become infuriated at times when a well-known respected teacher knows not these things

You dont like tables you're standing on being shaking, it seems, isnt it Odii?

Some of the differences between you and I are, I love and can take criticism. I dont shy from saying things bluntly as they are. I dont call a spade a fork. It is my work to correct anybaga, I will bring any baga to the water trough, and from there the onus to drink is on you and not me. No one, including not you, a heavyweight, even not me typing, is a sacred cow. I dont mind whose ox is gored, I will say it as it is and there's nothing personal to it. I fear no one, as a clear and innocent conscience fears nothing.

So my brother, I dont start fights and then you turn around and claim that my questions are harmless and innocent Odii, but rather I engage people by laying down my stick alongside their stick on the ground and throw in questions because he who is afraid to ask questions, is ashamed of learning. I dont like making assumptions, so that's why I try asking questions Odii.

It is better to answer a question even without settling the matter than to try settling the matter without any attempt to answer the question. Asking questions is as important as answering them. He who asks a question is a fool for a minute but he who does not, remains unknowing and a fool forever, so can you see there is a reason and method in the questioning madness?

Now about what and when you say "... a disassociation from an erroneous doctrine you put forth once for you to bristle and try to start a cantankerous debate. I wasn't even trying to correct you. I only said that you were wrong in associating me with what you taught since I didn't hold the same views. That was all. But you cannot stand having anyone hold different views from you, can you? ...". Well I am quite sure Odii, you are a father and not just an ordinary father, but you are a loving, fair, evenhanded and just father. I like to believe you are fair and impartial in treatment or judgement, well if you, an earthly father have all this admirable qualities when dealing with human beings, how

much more than that, do you think God, our Heavenly Father has? You really believe, circumstances of every action we took whilst on earth would not be considered by God isn't it? You really think that people wouldn't be offered a free legal representative in the person of Jesus an Advocate, to defend them and put a defence to the Judge. Did you not notice, that after a length, I didn't drag the matter with you anymore? I understand, some of us, at times entertain elements of parochialism in matters such as that one you wouldn't agree with or accept.

Phew. Are you done talking? You are taking this personal and to heart now Odi. You are becoming over sensitive. Where did this thought of "... far more arrogant than you know... desire to be top dog... false sense of superiority... lack of fear of God.... " and others emanate from? Don't mix bad words with the bad mood you're in please.

I've always learned a great deal from questioning as in when I ask questions, more than as opposed to ordinary straight talking or discussions. I think it's Albert Einstein, one of the finest brains about who said: "The important thing is not to stop questioning. Curiosity has its own reason for existing." but my curiosity questions rubs you the wrong way, it apparently seems, as you don't like me questioning your answers and/or comments.

Odi do you know what I find remarkable about intelligence? Intelligence, is not that you know everything without questioning, but rather, is, you question everything you think you know.

I am humbled by the testimony you've just shared here, and so again I pray may you abound in His grace to know that angels do not have gender, there is no male or female angels and that angels weren't given the ability to procreate human beings. Now if you agree and accept these facts, how do you explain away, how angels supposedly managed to obtain the ability to conceive and bear children with daughters of men?

Not so fast Odi, come back here. You are getting it twisted up with your "You are the one who hold that the Book of Enoch is rightly excluded from the Bible thereby admitting that it is not inspired and yet it is this book that informs your interpretation of a Bible passage which is itself inspired. This is notwithstanding the fact that the book is a recent hoax and the fact that the Bible always interprets itself." comment. I never anywhere suggested that the book of Enoch is an inspired book. I had advanced the point that the book is an old hoax from the first/second century that the contents of it, Peter Jude and Paul were familiar with because of its existence in their times alive and so tackled the angels having sex with human beings myths circulated and aided by the books just like that one. If Tertullian, an early Christian father figure, wrote in c. 200 that the Book of Enoch had been rejected by the Jews because it contained prophecies pertaining to Christ then it

wouldnt be a recent hoax as such, dont you think Odii?. It is an old hoax that, recently was, in batches, unearthed, rediscovered and found again.

Despite the difference(s), I highly appreciate you though , so I tell you what Odii, if you are hellbent on insisting that, it is angels being referred to in Genesis 6:4 and elsewhere other places, then I cannot help thinking, so be it my dear beloved brother.

PS: I am sorry Odii were you banned and your post hidden because of responding to me? I have sent you a message to the personal e-mail shown on your Profile signature anyway

### **Response #106:**

As I always do, I am offering you formal notice that I am quitting this discussion. I have considered reasons to continue and do not find them compelling enough to proceed. A particularly compelling reason is your misrepresentation of things that I have said but I think that any honest person reading the exchange will see where you have. Clarifying would only prolong a pointless conversation.

However, for the purposes of clarity, I will summarize what I consider the most important things to me in this discussion:

Touching the subject exclusively:

1. Judging only by what the Bible itself actually says, Genesis 6 documents a monumental event in human history which was about God's Love for the Human Race, namely, the global flood that made sure that the Savior would still be born to save humanity.

2. That is, the event we have been discussing was a deliberate attempt by Satan to prevent the birth of the Savior and the deliverance of the human race. His cohorts, who had already demonstrated their taste for physical existence and experience, took for themselves women from among human beings with whom they produced the Nephilim.

3. The Nephilim were hybrids who possessed physical durability and intellectual ability as well as superhuman ability that made them desirable as relatives. This is natural. Women (and certainly men) have always had a desire to produce children or be related to people of exceptional qualities. So, in time, the Nephilim strain came to pretty much overrun the human species.

4. By the time Noah was born, there were very few humans left. At the time that God intervened, "all flesh [had] corrupted its way upon the earth". Pure humanity was a seriously endangered species by that time.

5. Now, because of the incredible durability and abilities of the Nephilim, even if there were a group of human beings who were willing to fight, the Nephilim are very hard to kill even if you could outsmart them in a fight. For this reason, only God's intervention would be able to eliminate them from the picture and guarantee the perpetuity of the human line so that His Promise of a Savior would be fulfilled.

6. Hence, a global flood which covered the earth long enough to make sure that the Nephilim all died.

7. This was really all that Genesis 6 was about: the preservation of the human race, not merely the punishment of evil since evil is always present in human beings.

8. It is merely tangential that rebel angels demonstrated sexual desire there.

Having said that,

1. You obviously have less respect than a believer ought to have for the Bible. This puts you in far greater danger than you appear to have any concept of.

2. You also are too arrogant to appreciate that everyone has a God-given right to believe and teach whatever they please. They will answer to God for how they use their free will, not to you.

3. You are quick to deny all sorts of things including that you offer yourself as a teacher of the Bible, but you actually do offer yourself as one. So, let me warn you: be very careful what you tell other people that God says. You will not get away with misleading anybody at all about God's words. In fact, you will have greater condemnation from Him than anybody else can have if you do.

4. It is in your best interest to never add anything to what the Bible says or to take anything away from it. This is related to #1 and #3 above. Leave the Bible as it is. If you do not understand it, be diligent in seeking and praying for a gifted and prepared teacher to explain it to you. Do not seek anything outside the Bible to explain the Bible.

**Question #107:**

Where in the text does it say that the antichrist is the devil's son?

**Response #107:**

[15]And I will put enmity Between you and the woman, And between your seed and her seed; He shall bruise you on the head, And you shall bruise him on the heel."

Genesis 3:15 NASB

**Question #108:**

So you are implying the devil has many sons?

**Response #108:**

I was answering definitively that the Antichrist is Satan's literal son, not implying anything further.

He has only one such offspring according to the Bible and it is the Antichrist. All other children of his are necessarily people of the same spiritual bent as he since he champions all evil. That is, the sense in which all unbelievers are his children is that they are all rebels like him and he is the chief rebel against God.