

## **SUPPLEMENTAL NOTES**

### **LESSON 7: THE SECOND REBELLION**

#### **Three Other Views**

I have shown the support and implications of the view that the “sons of God” in Genesis 6 are supernatural beings that had children with human women, creating hybrid beings called Nephilim. It’s important to take a look at three alternate views and explore the strengths and weaknesses of each.

#### **View #1: The sons of God are the male line of Seth.**

The predominant interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4 that is currently taught in evangelical seminaries regarding the identity of the sons of God is that they were the godly males from the line of Seth. The sin being described in this passage would then be either polygamy or intermarriage between the godly men and the ungodly women.

#### **Strengths of the “Line of Seth” argument**

- The Biblical text does not come right out and say that the sons of God were supernatural beings.
- Humans are referred to as children of God elsewhere in the Bible, so the sons of God here could be humans.

**“You are the sons of the Lord your God. You shall not...” Deuteronomy 14:1**

**“I will say to the north, Give up, and to the south, Do not withhold; bring my sons from afar and my daughters from the end of the earth.” Isaiah 43:6**

- God seems to put the blame for the flood on the shoulders of humanity, not on the shoulders of supernatural entities.

**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**

- It is disturbing to consider that heavenly beings were procreating with humans, and sounds like mythology. It is not as difficult to believe they were from a certain line of humanity.
- Many take Luke 20:36 to mean that angels are incapable of procreation.

**[Believers] cannot die anymore, because they are equal to the angels and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection. Luke 20:36 (also Matthew 22:30; Mark 12:25)**

- The Sethite view has been taught by Old Testament professors at most of the evangelical seminaries that we might be familiar with, so there are no doubt many reputable scholars who have considered the matter and come to this conclusion.
- St. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and John Calvin are influential and respectable scholars who came to this conclusion.

### Weaknesses of the “Line of Seth” argument

- To argue that the sons of God in Genesis 6 are not supernatural beings, most other uses of the phrase in the Old Testament must be ignored.
- You also must argue that the sons of the Most High in **Psalm 82** are humans, which is hard to do when verses six and seven call them *elohim* and sentence them to death “like men.”<sup>1</sup>
- In addition, all the comparative Semitic data on the subject ever discovered must be ignored.<sup>2</sup>
- Nobody believed this view before Julius Africanus (200-275 A.D.) first tentatively considered it during a time when critics were attacking Christianity using the commonly held “angel view” as ammunition. This means that no rabbi or Christian prior to this time ever put this idea in writing, as far as we know. It was later taken up by Augustine (354-430 A.D.), who said, “By the daughters of men the Scripture designates those who sprang from the race of Cain.”<sup>3</sup> Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274 A.D.) and John Calvin (1509-1564) later took up the idea and it became the predominant opinion, but they gave no support to their views other than their own speculative commentary. Using their opinions cannot be considered to be interpreting Genesis 6 in context.<sup>4</sup>
- You can’t use the argument that “the sons of God were not angels because the text does not say they were angels” and then claim that they were from the line of Seth instead. The Bible does not ever identify the sons of God as the line of Seth. There is no link in the text to Seth or Cain at all. This means that the entire view is supported by something that is not present in the text.
- Those who hold to this view refer to Genesis 4:26, which says that “men began to call upon the name of the Lord” (ESV). The passage is listing the genealogy of Adam through Seth, so the conclusion is made that these were godly men. However, an alternate translation is, “then calling by the name of YHWH was profaned.” In other

<sup>1</sup> This is a key passage we will explore in the next lesson, so this will mean more upon later review.

<sup>2</sup> These first three points were all presented by Dr. Michael Heiser (PhD in Hebrew Bible and Ancient Semitic Languages) in a video that is no longer available on YouTube called “The Angel View Genesis 6 Giants.” He presents the same material in other teaching videos and books.

<sup>3</sup> Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*, 1274.

<sup>4</sup> “The writers of the New Testament knew nothing of the Sethite view, nor of any view that makes the sons of God in Genesis 6:1-4 humans.” Heiser, Michael S. *The Unseen Realm: Recovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2015. 101.

words, instead of worshipping the Creator, the line of Seth began to defile him.<sup>5</sup> This alternate rendering is supported by other ancient documents, such as the *Targum of Onkelos*, the *Targum of Jonathan*, Jerome, and Maimonides.<sup>6,7</sup> Hebrew sages understood and agreed that the apostasy against God began with Enosh, who was from the line of Seth.

- Cain named one of his sons Enoch, which means “dedicated” (the same name as Seth’s great-great-great grandson), which at least causes us to wonder if he remained godless or if his descendants were more ungodly than Seth’s line. There is no evidence that his entire line was more evil than Seth’s.
- On the flip side, you can’t argue that Seth’s line was all that godly if they were habitually taking all the ungodly women that they wanted as wives.
- If it were merely righteous men marrying unrighteous women, why would God have had to intervene with a Flood? The commandment had not yet been given for believers to remain separate from unbelievers, and God did not punish in such a drastic way even after the commandment was given and broken. (This point also applies to a modified Sethite view that suggests the term “sons of God” was limited to only the *righteous* men of Seth’s line.)
- There is no mention of righteous people remaining, even within the line of Seth. All the language in Genesis 6:5 (“every intention of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually”) and verses 11-12 (“the earth was corrupt in God’s sight...filled with violence...all flesh had corrupted their way”) indicate that this was all of humanity. There is no indication that it began as “good Seth against bad Cain” and eventually the Cainites corrupted all the Sethites. There is no mention of what happened to the righteous women of the line of Seth to cause them to be corrupted. Furthermore, there is no consideration for all the other sons and daughters of Adam and Eve that were not part either of these two lines. We are given no adequate explanation for how “all flesh” became corrupted by the mixing of God’s chosen (Seth) with God’s cursed (Cain).
- After the flood, *everyone* was a Sethite. Yet Nephilim existed after the flood. How would they have come about if there were no daughters of Cain to marry?
- Those who hold to this view must conclude that Peter and Jude got it wrong when they commented on the time period in question, or at the least they must interpret Peter’s and Jude’s words in ways that the text does not support.

<sup>5</sup> According to Brown, Driver, Briggs, the verb hukhal (הוּחַל) comes from the root חָלַל (Strong’s #2490), and one of its basic meanings is “to pollute, defile, profane.”

<sup>6</sup> “And to Sheth also was born a son, and he called his name Enosh. Then in his days the sons of men desisted [khalu] (or forebore) from praying in the name of the Lord. “ Genesis 4:26 in *Targum Onkelos* (A Targum is an Aramaic translation, so this is the way the Aramaic translates into English.)

<sup>7</sup> “And to Sheth also was born a son, and he called his name Enosh. That was the generation in whose days they began to err, and to make themselves idols, and surnamed their idols by the name of the Word of the Lord.” Genesis 4:26, *Targum Jonathan*.

- Although there is some debate about the way it is worded, Genesis 6:4 does seem to indicate that the Nephilim were the product of intercourse between the sons of God and the daughters of men. The Sethite view does nothing to explain the other Biblical references to gigantic people who once lived on the earth. Even if the case could be made that the offspring were not giants, how would it happen that the sons of these human unions would turn out to collectively be known as “mighty men” of any kind? People who hold to the Sethite view usually say that by intermarrying with the Cainites, the Sethites became morally diluted (salt loses its saltiness, etc.). What would be mighty about this?
- The actual Hebrew words used in Genesis 6:2 are quite telling. The name “Adam” simply means “man,” and this word is often used to represent all of humankind in Scripture. The Hebrew phrase used for “sons of God” in Genesis 6:2 is *bene ha elohim*. You can see the word *elohim* in there, which we know refers to God (and sometimes other immortal beings<sup>8</sup>) throughout Scripture. The Hebrew phrase for “daughters of men” is *benowt ha adam*. *Bene* (Strongs #1121) means “sons” and *benowt* (Strongs #1323) means “daughters.” Clearly, the daughters come from all of mankind (Hebrew: *adam*) and are not limited to the line of Cain, and the sons are being traced to God Himself. If this passage meant to differentiate between the godly line of Seth and the corrupt line of Cain, it would have been accurate to refer to them as *bene ha set* (Seth) and *benowt ha qayin* (Cain). Instead, *all* of the daughters are clearly being referred back to Adam, indicating that the distinction being made is that they are of humankind, not specifically Cain-kind. The very same word for men (*ha adam*) is used earlier in 6:1, so saying that it refers to only the sons of Seth in 6:2 requires one to use the same word two different ways within the same sentence.

## **View #2: The sons of God are royalty and the daughters of men are commoners.**

This view is built upon the fact that royal people of the ancient Near East were often considered to be part divine. It is common in royal inscriptions to find that a king claimed to have divine heritage. The idea is that since they called themselves the “flesh of the gods,” we can interpret “sons of God” in the Biblical account to refer to these royals. Their sin was that they were taking any women they wanted for their own sexual use, regardless of whether the women were married or who they belonged to. They set a bad example, and the whole world followed their example, necessitating the Flood.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> I will give examples in the next lesson!

<sup>9</sup> “An alternate understanding may be found in a practice noted in the Gilgamesh Epic...his exercising the right of the first night with a new bride: ‘He will couple with the wife-to-be, he first of all, the bridegroom after.’” Walton, John. *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary, Volume 1*, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009. 44. In other words, the king has the right to have sex with every new bride before her husband does. The author concedes that one problem with this being understood as the great sin of Genesis 6 is that the practice is infrequently mentioned in ancient literature.

### Strengths of the “Royal” view

- Many rulers who are known to be nothing more than humans have encouraged their subjects to worship them as gods.<sup>10</sup> This began in the early Old Testament period and extended into Egypt, then all the way to Rome and beyond.
- The Hebrew word *elohim* is sometimes translated to reflect rulers or judges. (Though these instances can all be explained to be spirit beings, not humans.)<sup>11</sup>
- The word “Nephilim” is associated with the word *gibborim* in Genesis 6:4. This word means “strong, mighty, or valiant.”<sup>12</sup> *Gibborim* can most certainly be used of human men, such as the mighty men of David’s company.
- In the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, the hero is portrayed as being part god and part man. The mythologies reveal that people were creating stories that led to the common belief that the gods mixed with humans, and those who hold to this view would say the idea originated with these mythologies.
- It overcomes the linguistic problem that the Sethite view has with *bene ha elohim* and *benowt ha adam*. The men in question are not being literally considered as *bene ha elohim* (they only call themselves sons of God, they aren’t really), so it does not matter that the phrases specify different origins.
- This view does not require Christians to believe an idea that is so sensational that it appears to belong to mythology.

### Weaknesses of the “Royal” view

- Although pagans referred to royalty as gods or sons of God, Israelites did not. Nobles were never referred to as sons of God by Hebrew writers. Genesis 6 would have to be the only exception.
- “Though it is common for kings to be portrayed as having divine parentage, there is no precedent for ancient kings as a group being referred to as ‘sons of god.’ This keeps open the possibility that this title could refer to royal elites, though a reference to members of the heavenly council certainly cannot be ruled out.”<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> One example was the Egyptian Pharaoh, who called himself the “son of Re.”

<sup>11</sup> *Brown-Driver-Briggs* lists one definition for *elohim* as “rulers, judges, either as divine representatives at sacred places or as reflecting divine majesty and power.” I have studied the examples listed (Ex 21:6, 22:7, 22:8, 22:27, 1 Samuel 2:25, Judges 5:8, Psalm 82:1, Psalm 82:6, Psalm 138:1), and while some translations certainly do seem to indicate that *elohim* is referring to men, others do not (the ESV does not use *elohim* for men). Psalm 82 is the most intriguing and critical to understand, so we will look at it in detail in the next lesson to explain what I believe is going on in some of these passages. In short, I do not believe that *elohim* is ever correctly used of humans.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*.

<sup>13</sup> *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary*, 43. Note that this quote is coming from one of the main proponents of the “royal” view.

- Pagan kings have been bad examples and have taken whatever women they wanted countless times throughout history, yet God never judged this practice so severely and definitively as he did with the flood.
- Even the women who were being forcibly taken were wiped out in the Flood. Furthermore, the linguistics of Genesis 6:2 indicate that the marriages were consensual, which does not fit the “royal man takes advantage of another man’s bride” paradigm.
- This position shares many of the same weaknesses as the Sethite view; namely, it ignores all other uses of the phrase in the Old Testament, it argues that the sons of God in Psalm 82 are human, it is highly selective in the Semitic documents used and the interpretations thereof, it wrongly interprets the commentary of Peter and Jude, and it fails to explain how giants came to be upon the earth.
- Frankly, I am baffled by the usage of the *Epic of Gilgamesh* to support the Royal View. I believe this story to be a twisted version of Noah’s flood account that makes Yahweh out to be the evil one. The fact that Gilgamesh is part human and part divine argues to me that these kinds of hybrid beings existed and people were writing legends about them, rather than being any kind of proof that this type of story was the originator of the belief. Not only that, but Gilgamesh sets out to destroy the evil being who had been responsible for sending the Great Flood—none other than the creator god, Huwawa. (It is easy to see how *Huwawa* is similar to *Yahweh*, especially since the vowel sounds are uncertain.) There are many parallels in place names and events between the *Epic of Gilgamesh* and the Genesis account of the Flood. It is my strong opinion that the Genesis account gives the straightforward, unadulterated facts while the enemies of God simultaneously inspired their people to invent stories that contain elements of truth but twist the outcome to vilify the Creator. Although we can’t be sure, the “part-god” (or supernatural) status of Gilgamesh could very well be one of the seed facts that the story was built upon. The plot will thicken as we make possible connections between the fictional Gilgamesh and the historical person of Nimrod (and the Babylonian Mystery Religion that sprang from him).

### **View #3: The sons of God were demons who possessed humans**

This is the idea that the sons of God were demons that inhabited and controlled human men to do their bidding. The offspring of these unions with human women would then, of course, have been fully human. It is attractive to those who understand that the Hebrew words are clearly pointing to immortal beings and humans, yet cannot go so far as to acknowledge that these beings can procreate directly with humans and produce hybrid offspring. I believe there are a few observations that make this impossible.

- Again, it does not account for the archaeological and Biblical evidence for what the Nephilim really were.
- Like the others, it ignores the Semitic literature that speaks of hybrids.

- It fails to take into account the oldest and most prevalent rabbinical understanding of the origin of demons and uses the term interchangeably with sinful supernatural beings.
- If demons had to work through willing human hosts to accomplish the physical activity of reproduction, then we would have to say that “good angels” somehow inhabited the bodies of human hosts to be able to eat with Abraham or interact materially with humanity in any other way (**Genesis 18**). The Bible gives no evidence whatsoever that angels (fallen or unfallen) ever co-opt human bodies like demons do. It seems that they take on their own physical bodies when present in the physical realm.
- It’s hard to imagine how demons could ever be called “sons of God.”
- There would still be Nephilim on the earth today because we know that demons continue to possess human men. These possessed men presumably have intercourse with human women and produce offspring that are fully human. If this is all Genesis 6 is describing, then it’s so common that it’s not even worth mentioning.

## **Nephilim After the Flood**

### **How did the Nephilim come back after the Flood?**

- Some believe that certain giants survived the Flood, either by hiding in deep places within the earth, in submersible technology, or because they were off-planet at the time. While I consider it possible that technology before the Flood was much more developed than commonly believed,<sup>14</sup> it quickly takes us to a whole different place to claim that they were elsewhere in the solar system in spaceships!
- Others think the Flood was localized, not global. Even if this were the case (a view that I can’t quite get my head around), God promised Noah afterwards in Genesis 9:11 that “never again shall all flesh be cut off by the waters of the flood...” so it seems that in this case all flesh *was* cut off by the waters of the flood! That would include the flesh of Nephilim, in my opinion.
- The angels who sinned in Genesis 6 were chained up until the Judgment Day, so they could not have come back and married different women and had new Nephilim children with them. Some suggest that other rebellious angels committed the same sin. I find this unlikely, given that the extreme punishment of being chained up in the abyss would have served as a deterrent. It’s not impossible, though.
- One possibility is that one or two of Noah’s sons’ wives had some Nephilim DNA. I didn’t previously prefer this option because it seemed that it would produce huge numbers of Nephilim (one or two thirds of humanity), but then I considered the possibility that the Nephilim DNA was recessive. If that were the case, it is possible

---

<sup>14</sup> Longer lifespans to develop ideas and intelligence that was uncorrupted by decaying DNA could certainly lead to greater ingenuity and creativity, the evidence of which would have been destroyed by the Flood.

that Nephilim characteristics wouldn't show up for several generations (when recessive gene happened to meet recessive gene) and that there wouldn't be as many Nephilim offspring produced.

- Another possibility is that humans performed genetic experiments after the Flood and produced a form of Nephilim by modifying the human genome. Genesis 10:8 may hint at something of this nature when it says that Nimrod "began to be" a *gibbor*, which the Septuagint translates as "giant."

Personally, I do not find any of these suggestions to be without its problems, but some are worse than others. Since the Bible does not specify, I do not think we should limit ourselves to these suggestions or be overly concerned about figuring this one out.

## Ancient Sources Supporting the Supernatural View of Genesis 6

### Josephus:

Now this posterity of Seth continued to esteem God as the Lord of the universe, and to have an entire regard to virtue, for seven generations; but in process of time they were perverted, and forsook the practices of their forefathers, and did neither pay those honors to God which were appointed to them, nor had they any concern to do justice towards men. But for what degree of zeal they had formerly shown for virtue, they now showed by their actions a double degree of wickedness; whereby they made God to be their enemy, for many angels\* of God accompanied with women and begat sons that proved unjust, and despisers of all that was good, on account of the confidence they had in their own strength; for the tradition is, that these men did what resembled the acts of those whom the Grecians called giants. But Noah was very uneasy at what they did; and, being displeased at their conduct, persuaded them to change their dispositions and their acts for the better; but, seeing that they did not yield to him, but were slaves to their wicked pleasures, he was afraid they would kill him, together with his wife and children, and those they had married; so he departed out of that land.<sup>15</sup>

### Book of Giants

Fragments of the *Book of Giants* were found with Dead Sea Scrolls and are dated between the third and second centuries BC. The *Book of Giants* parallels *1 Enoch* in some ways and acts as an additional commentary on Genesis 6. It asserts that there were giants and that people were mixing animal species before the Flood.

The brackets with dots in the quotation indicate that part of the manuscript is missing:

<sup>15</sup> *The Antiquities of the Jews*, translated by William Whitson (1667-1752), p. 32, bk. 1, ch. 3, §§72-74. The asterisk by "angels" directs the reader to Whitson's footnote: "This notion, that the fallen angels were, in some sense, the fathers of the old giants, was the constant opinion of antiquity."



2 [...] they defiled [...] 2[...they begot] giants and monsters [...] 3[...] they begot, and, behold, all [the earth was corrupted...] 4[...] with its blood and by the hand of [...] 5[giant's] which did not suffice for them and [...] 6[...] and they were seeking to devour many [...] 7[...] 8[...] the monsters attacked it.<sup>16</sup>

[...two hundred] 2donkeys, two hundred asses, two hundred...rams of the] 3flock, two hundred goats, two hundred [... beast of the] 4 field from every animal, from every [bird...] 5[...] for miscegenation [...] <sup>17</sup>

“Miscegenation” is a word generally used to describe reproduction by parents of different races, but is referring to the mixing of different species of animals in this context.

Another interesting feature of *The Book of the Giants* is that several of the giants are named, with one of the names being “Gilgamesh.”

### Book of Jubilees

This historical work parallels the Genesis account (with much more detail) and was well known to the Early Church. Extensive fragments were found among the Dead Sea Scrolls (more than the number found for most of the other books of the Old Testament). The oldest copies date to about 100 BC, but many believe the original source is older. It seems that the author was aware of *1 Enoch*. It was held in high regard, since many Early Church Fathers quoted it, yet it was not considered to be Scripture.

And it came to pass when the children of men began to multiply on the face of the earth and daughters were born unto them, that the angels of God saw them on a certain year of this jubilee, that they were beautiful to look upon; and they took themselves wives of all whom they chose, and they bare unto them sons and they were giants. And lawlessness increased on the earth and all flesh corrupted its way, alike men and cattle and beasts and birds and everything that walks on the earth – all of them corrupted their ways and their orders, and they began to devour each other, and lawlessness increased on the earth and every imagination of the thoughts of all men (was) thus evil continually . . . (Jubilees 5:1-2)

### Qumran Fragment

An additional unnamed fragment found with the Dead Sea Scrolls (dated to the first century AD) contains the following matter-of-fact assumption about the origin of the gibborim:

“[And] the interpretation concerning Azazel and the angels to whom were born gibborim...”<sup>18</sup>

<sup>16</sup> 4Q531 Frag. Copied from Hamp. *Corrupting the Image*, 123. The brackets with ellipses in this and other quotations [...] indicate a missing part of the line.

<sup>17</sup> IQ23 Frag. 1+6. Copied from Hamp, *Corrupting the Image*, 122.

<sup>18</sup> Qumran fragment 4Q180, lines 7-8

## Genesis Aprocryphon

Another of the texts uncovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls contains references to the angels interbreeding with human women. In this text, a conversation between Lamech, the father of Noah, and his wife (Bitenosh) is detailed. Lamech questions his wife because he thinks that the conception of Noah was due to either an angel or a Nephilim. Again, we're not looking to these sources for the true account, but to see what the people of the time believed to be true about the identity of the sons of God and their offspring in Genesis 6.

I thought, in my heart, that the conception was the work of the Watchers the pregnancy of the Holy Ones and that it belonged to the Giants... and my heart was upset by this... I, Lamech, turned to my wife Bitenosh and said... Swear to me by the most High, Great Lord [...] I swear to you by the Great Holy One, the King of the heavens... That this seed, pregnancy, and planting of fruit comes from you and not a stranger, Watcher, or son of the heaven...<sup>19</sup>

## Archaeological Evidence for Giants

Archaeologists have unearthed figurines of *apkallus*, which are the Mesopotamian counterparts to the Biblical sons of God. They were built into the foundations of walls of buildings to ward off evil powers. The Mesopotamians called them *mats-tsarey*, which means "watchers."<sup>20</sup>

I have never seen the bone of a giant. If I did, I would be skeptical about whether it was a fake. We live in a Photoshop age in which people seem to make a sport out of producing elaborate hoaxes. However, if we're going to make the claim that giants actually existed on the earth, there should be at least some evidence that can be trusted to prove such a thing, shouldn't there? Josephus claimed such evidence.

For which reason they removed their camp to Hebron; and when they had taken it, they slew all the inhabitants. There were till then left the race of giants, who had bodies so large, and countenances so entirely different from other men, that they were surprising to the sight, and terrible to the hearing. The bones of these men are still shown to this very day, unlike to any credible relations of other men.<sup>21</sup>

More recently, Colonel William F. Cody (Buffalo Bill) reported in his autobiography that in 1871 the Pawnee Indians had given him a huge thigh bone that the expedition's surgeon determined was from a human. It was so large that they had to leave it behind, as they had no wagon.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Col. 2. (1). Copied from Hamp, *Corrupting the Image*. 121.

<sup>20</sup> Heiser, *Unseen Realm*, 104-105.

<sup>21</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book 5:2:3

<sup>22</sup> Cody, William F. *The Life of Honorable William F. Cody*, 1879.

Apparently, the evidence for Cody's story was so convincing that a Yale paleontology professor (Othniel Charles Marsh) later led fossil expeditions to that area to search for giant remains.

Doug Hamp acknowledges the problems we face when seeing is not always believing. He very carefully selected photos and reports from actual newspapers that were printed before the computer age to verify that giants existed. At least with these older stories we know that the photos themselves were not tampered with, although there is always the question of whether the objects in the photos or the eyewitness reports themselves are real.

- In *Traces of the Elder Faiths of Ireland: A Folklore Sketch* (Volume 1) by W.G. Wood-Martin, Mr. Wood-Martin provides descriptions of huge skull pieces and teeth. A photo is included of a twelve-foot fossilized Irish giant, with the description of its discovery and storage place.
- The *Chillicothe Weekly Constitution* published a story in 1917 about a petrified foot that was found in a coal mine in Iowa that was more than 24 inches long. The owner would have been about thirteen feet tall.
- A report in the *New York Tribune* on February 3, 1909, claimed that a fifteen-foot prehistoric skeleton was found at Ixtapalapa (ten miles southeast of Mexico City). The article explained that this discovery had revived the old Aztec legend about a prehistoric race of giants.
- According to the *Oelwein Register*, on November 8, 1894, scientists confirmed that the skeletons of a race of giants between ten and fifteen feet tall had been found in a cemetery at Montpellier, France.<sup>23</sup>

As mentioned in the lecture, these things are all very interesting, but I do not believe we should make much of either the presence or absence of reports of giant skeletons. Many such reports have proven to be hoaxes and make the whole idea of giants appear ludicrous. Unless bones were preserved under particularly favorable conditions, none of them would have survived from pre-Flood or pre-Davidic times until today.

---

<sup>23</sup> These examples are summarized from Hamp, pages 160-164. His endnotes give web links to view text and photos.

## Further Investigation/Resources

**Know Your Enemy Series** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HDDGI79x4Pc&list=PLCED9C361662866BD>

I'm hoping you will watch all the way through this 77-part series by the time we're done with this course. The longest ones are about 15 minutes, but some are just 3 or 4. For this week, just watch Parts 1-3 (if you can stop!). There are many details Mark Fairly presents that I would change if I could, but I still like the overview of history that he gives.

I have come to greatly respect the work of Michael Heiser. His Amazon.com bio reads, "Michael Heiser is a scholar in the fields of biblical studies and the ancient Near East, and he is a Scholar-in-Residence at Faithlife, the makers of Logos Bible Software. Michael has an MA in Ancient History from the University of Pennsylvania, and he has an MA in Hebrew Studies and a PhD in Hebrew Bible and Semitic Languages from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He has published widely in scholarly journals and popular periodicals such as Bible Study Magazine, and he teaches ancient languages online at MEMRA." So he has the credentials, but more importantly, he is committed to attaining the perspective that a person would have had in the ancient Near East when the Old Testament was codified. He is able to make the linguistic minutia both comprehensible and fascinatingly readable. I think it all comes together in his 2015 book:

Heiser, Michael. *The Unseen Realm: Recovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2015.

Heiser, Dr. Michael S. *A Companion to the Book of Enoch, Vol 1 (1 Enoch 1:36)*. Defender Publishing, 2020.

Another of Heiser's books is more particular to the subject of Watchers and Nephilim. He goes on to explain a fair number of New Testament passages in light of the fact that the people of that period would have had the Genesis 6 incident "in their heads:"

Heiser, Michael. *Reversing Hermon*. Defender Publishing, 2017

The internet is rife with articles about the Nephilim, with many head-spinning claims that vary in their plausibility. There is a very narrow window of sources that I have personally encountered that I can recommend as sound in both claims and methods. In general, I need to see an insistence on the inerrancy and authority of Scripture with Biblical support for the conclusions made if I am even going to consider what the person is saying. Doug Hamp is another author that holds to these values and helps to tie the Biblical account of Genesis 6 to its modern-day implications:

Hamp, Douglas. *Corrupting the Image*, Crane, MO: Defender Publishing, 2006.

The books I have cited are readable and accessible to those of us who are not linguistic experts and Ancient Near East scholars. The footnotes within them provide a gateway to the wealth of serious scholarly work that has been done on this topic.