

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

ceivable in the case of a Roman officer, unless he had come into relations with the synagogue and been impressed with its religious teaching and principles. I cannot doubt that Luke used the term "fearing God" in x. 1, x. 22, x. 35, in its full implication.

W. M. RAMSAY.

SONS OF GOD AND DAUGHTERS OF MEN.

"And it came to pass, that when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them, that the sons of Elohim saw the daughters of Adam that they were fair; and they took them wives of all whom they chose. There were Nephelim<sup>1</sup> in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of Elohim came in unto the daughters of Adam, and they bare to them. The same were Gibborim<sup>2</sup> which were of old, men of renown." —GENESIS vi. 1, *et seq.*

THIS remarkable statement follows immediately after what may be called the new Adamic genealogy beginning in chapter v., after Abel has perished, and Cain has become a fugitive, so that it becomes necessary to the continuity of the history to begin the narrative of human descent anew in the line of Seth. It has naturally caused much discussion, and there are few expositors who seem to have very definite views respecting it, except those who regard the whole story as myth or allegory, and by whom it is placed on a level not with history, but with the amours of the Olympian gods in Greek mythology. Yet, in the view of the writer or editor of Genesis, it was evidently a historical event of much importance, as it is made the cause or occasion of that descent of the new Sethite line into evil which led to the Divine determination to destroy the children of men after a short probation of one hundred and twenty years.

<sup>1</sup> Giants, athletes, bullies, or men of violence.

<sup>2</sup> Heroes, or famous men in war and arts.

In articles on the early history of man published in the *EXPOSITOR* in 1894-95, I ventured, from the point of view of a naturalist, to give an explanation of this episode, bringing it, as I believed, into congruity with the structure of Genesis, and with what we know from other sources of the history of the primitive races of men. I have since had to answer many questions from Bible students as to this—to them new—suggestion, and have in consequence been obliged to study the subject more in detail, with results which have induced me to prepare a supplementary note on this curious question, which has much bearing on our views as to the antiquity and unity of Genesis, and also as to the use of different Divine names in different portions of it.

The current explanations of the passage may, I think, be reduced to three. (1) The sons of God were angelic beings entering into connubial relations with human maidens; and this, as the terms imply, not in the way of occasional intercourse but of actual marriage. (2) The sons of God were men of eminence and position forming matrimonial alliances with women of inferior rank. (3) They were Sethite men allying themselves with ungodly Cainite women.

The first of these explanations may be characterized as non-natural or miraculous in a bad sense; that is, as implying the action not of God, but of demons or evil angels assuming human forms. It is at variance with all the other statements of the Bible respecting angelic beings, and with our Lord's declaration that they neither marry nor are given in marriage. It has, I think, no serious advocates among educated men at present, except among those who regard the whole document in which it occurs as unhistorical. The second hypothesis appears to be trivial and insufficient to produce the effects assigned to the occurrence. The third is rational and natural, if we assume that the Cainite

race had long existed as a separate tribe from the Sethites ; and it has a parallel in the subsequent history, in the inter-marriages of Israelites with Canaanite and other foreign women. It seems to be at present the theory most favoured by orthodox commentators.

All of these explanations, however, appear to me to fail in meeting the natural and historical requirements of the case ; and more especially to be deficient in their importing into a primeval age conditions belonging to later periods, and in failing to recognise that archaic character of the Book of Genesis which is too much overlooked by most of its modern critics. If we take the terms of the record as relating to literal facts, and these facts as belonging to the ideas and doings of the most primitive times, we shall find that a very different interpretation may be given to them. It is on grounds of this kind that I have ventured to suggest that the sons of Elohim in our primitive record are really Cainites, and the daughters of Adam Sethite women, though I admit that at first sight, and without throwing ourselves back mentally into the beginnings of humanity, such a view may appear very improbable.

In the first chapter of Genesis the name of God is Elohim ; in the second it becomes Jahveh-Elohim. The first use of the term Jahveh by human lips is, however, attributed to Eve when on the birth of Cain she says "I have gotten a man, the Jahveh," not "*from* Jahveh," as in our translation. The meaning of this exclamation of the first mother is plain from the immediately preceding statements. After the Fall a Saviour had been promised, who is to be the seed or progeny of the woman, and Eve most naturally supposes that the child to whom she has given birth is this "coming one." Like many interpreters of prophecy in later times, she antedates its fulfilment. From the time of this utterance of Eve we may assume that the name Jahveh becomes that of the coming Redeemer,

and is associated with that of Elohim, who has promised the Redeemer. Thus the name Elohim represents God as Creator; the name Jahveh, God as the promised Redeemer. The foundation is thus laid in our primitive record for that idea of a Redeemer or Mediator which pervades the whole Bible, and which under the corruptions of heathenism became multiplied into "gods many and lords many." The point, however, which we now note is that this distinction existed from the time of Eve, though only in the days of her grandson Enos did men formally invoke Jahveh as God.<sup>1</sup> This is the testimony of the record, and we are bound to receive it in that sense whether we believe it or not.

In Genesis iv. 3, Cain and Abel are represented as presenting offerings or gifts to Jahveh. Yet Cain's offering was rather one to God in the aspect of the God of nature, than as the promised Redeemer. The context implies that it was purposely so, and the subsequent "talking" or dispute with Abel may not improbably have referred to this. In any case it is Jahveh who remonstrates with Cain, and after the murder of Abel denounces his conduct, apparently without effect; and henceforth Cain may be said to have broken with Jahveh as the redeeming God, though he seems to be aware that as a murderer he may ultimately suffer from the vengeance of his fellow-men.

Cain is next said to have gone out from the face of Jahveh, which implies much more in the way of religious separation than mere departure from a local shrine; and at the same time he leaves his paternal home and goes forth to found a new tribe of men distinct from that of Adam. In a primitive state of society, when there are no prisons or penal colonies, a murderer must either be slain or banished from his tribe into the wilderness without; and this involves a social and religious excommuni-

<sup>1</sup> Chapter iv. 26.

cation and isolation, leading often in ancient times to the foundation of a new tribe and race.

Thus we have presented to us the formation of two distinct clans destined to diverge greatly from each other in a few generations. We have not obscure indications of this divergence even in the brief record of Genesis. In a religious point of view the Cainites are not represented as cultivating the worship of the Redeemer-Jahveh. They probably, however, still retained the nature-worship of Elohim, and so might be termed "sons of Elohim." They built cities and cultivated the arts of civilization, while some of them perpetuated the vagabondism of Cain by entering on a nomadic and probably hunting life, and falling into a rude and barbarous condition, in which their arts and implement-making were made subsidiary to aggressive warfare. Of the Sethites, on the other hand, we have mainly the record of their invoking Jahveh while walking with Elohim, and of their retaining a hope of a redemption from the Fall, though it seems certain that toward the end of the antediluvian period they also degenerated in a religious point of view, probably in consequence of the intermixture with Cainites mentioned in the passage before us. This intermixture, however, is stated to have originated in the aggressions of the nephelim among the Cainites, who captured wives from the feebler Sethites. This, I think, is implied in the expression "took to them wives of all whom they chose," that is, at their own will and pleasure and without regard to the primitive law of marriage, which provided that a man should leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife, implying friendly social relations with his wife's relatives.<sup>1</sup> The issue of such marriages would necessarily be Gibborim, or men of greater power and energy than either of the pure races, which would eventually be overcome and dominated

<sup>1</sup> Gen. ii. 24. See also our Lord's reference to this in Matt. xix. 5.

by them. Thus we have a natural explanation given to us of the violence and misrule which raged in the antediluvian world, and which threatened to quench all its higher moral and spiritual life.

But it may be asked: If the Cainites are called sons of Elohim, why are not the Sethites termed sons of Jahveh? The answer is—(1) That if named in that way at all, they should be called sons of Jahveh-Elohim, because they worshipped God in both capacities. (2) That as Jahveh was a future Redeemer, they could scarcely be called His sons. (3) That they were *par excellence* sons of Adam, since Cain had been disinherited and banished; and we learn in chapter fifth that a new genealogy was in consequence commenced in the line of Seth—a circumstance which the purely mechanical critics unreasonably represent as the beginning of a new and distinct document.

The Sethites were thus sons and daughters of Adam by special right, just as the Israelites were children of Abraham in a different sense from the Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, Ishmaelites, and others, who had diverged from the ancestral faith. Besides this, it is well known that many ancient peoples have been in the habit of regarding themselves as men in the true sense as distinguished from other peoples. The distinctions of Jew and Gentile, Greek and Barbarian, Egyptian and vile foreigner, are cases in point. In rude tribes in America the same feeling prevails. Hence the Chippewyans and Esquimaux in Northern America each claim for themselves exclusively the title of men, refusing it to each other.

Looking then at the narrative in Genesis as consisting of the annals of a very primitive time, we are led by its own terms to regard the sons of Elohim as Cainites, the daughters of Adam as Sethites.

We can thus account for the new beginning of the genealogy of Adam in chapter v., without the violent sup-

position of a separate document forced into the work. Nor do we need to have recourse to such suppositions to account for the use of the terms Elohim and Jahveh which come in as the primitive evidence of the beginnings of religion among early men. It may be well to add here some confirmatory facts from special notices in the record.

In the end of chapter iv., closing the Cainite genealogy, we have a remarkable statement respecting the Cainite Lamech, which at once becomes intelligible on the supposition that he is an example of the Cainite heroes who captured Sethite wives, while his sons, Tubal-Cain, Jabal, and Jubal, present excellent types of the men of renown who sprang from such mixed marriages. In his recorded song he refers to his having, probably in the capture of his wives, slain a man who had wounded him, and holds that this homicide in self-defence was more excusable than Cain's act of murder, and that any one injuring him on account of it would incur a heavier penalty. He addresses the poem to his wives, probably because he apprehends blood-revenge, and perhaps that his wives might betray him to their injured relatives. Thus this story of Lamech naturally closes the genealogy of Cain, and connects it with the account of the mixed marriages immediately following. The converse of this is presented by the peaceful and hopeful words of the Sethite Lamech, at the close of the genealogy of the true sons of Adam. It is impossible to doubt that the author intended to weave together these two genealogies as introductory to the wider historical statement respecting the mixed marriages which introduces us to the deluge.

In the deluge narrative itself, we find the distinction between Jahveh and Elohim preserved in all its integrity, as parts of one and the same history, in which the two capacities of the Redeemer and Creator must be duly recognised. It is as Elohim that God produces the deluge

and instructs Noah as to the ark, and finally remembers him and delivers him from the receding waters. But it is Jahveh whose spirit strives with men, and is grieved at heart with their wickedness, who grants the respite of 120 years, who instructs Noah as to clean beasts for sacrifice, who shuts in Noah into the ark, who accepts Noah's sacrifice and promises that there shall no more be a deluge, and also some alleviation of the curse on the ground. After this acceptance and promise Elohim intervenes to confirm the promise, adding His blessing and covenant, and enacting new laws for Noah and his family. Thus the distinction of the two names is consistently kept up, quite independently of any supposition of Elohistic and Jahvistic documents. It reminds one indeed of the distinction in the Gospels in the use of the names God, Father, Son, and Lord, by Christ and the evangelists.<sup>1</sup>

We thus find that the right understanding of this remarkable passage unites, as by the keystone of an arch, the previously separate and apparently conflicting Jahvistic and Elohistic elements of the early part of Genesis, and the seemingly fragmentary genealogies of Cain and of Seth, and brings out clearly the plan of the author in his history of early man. It furnishes also another link of connection with the Chaldean account of the deluge, for there is a certain parallelism between the *rôle* of Jahveh and Elohim in Genesis and that assigned to different members of the pantheon, as Bel and Hea, by the Chaldean writer. It may be asked, however, Why did the author of Genesis use a form of expression so enigmatical to his commentators, and so peculiar even with reference to later Biblical books? The answer is, Because he is so archaic a writer, and writes not for modern scholars, but for primitive folk who were familiar with facts and with modes of thought and expression which have long ago passed away. Besides,

<sup>1</sup> See Green on the Unity of Genesis.

he may have desired to show that the grosser forms of idolatry and of polytheism did not exist in antediluvian times, and to emphasize the fact that in religion mere theism without the idea of redemption is imperfect and misleading in the case of fallen men. It is really the archaic and simple character of the early part of Genesis that has misled modern critics. It is a book for babes, for mere children of nature, rather than for scholars, and perhaps the best commentaries on it will eventually come from the more backward and antique races of men, when they become students of the Bible, rather than from German literary workshops. To understand it we must return in imagination to the conditions to which it relates. I may mention that Jesus Christ, in His few references to early man in the Gospels, seems to enter into this antique character of Genesis; but this is a subject too wide to be taken up here.

We know a little from geological and archæological research as to primitive man, and it may be well to compare this with the record in Genesis. We must bear in mind, however, that the comparison of ancient remains with written records is always difficult, and is necessarily imperfect in its results, and that, as I have elsewhere explained, much of the land occupied by antediluvian men still remains under the sea, or is buried under alluvial deposits, so that we may never have access to the remains of the denser and more advanced communities of the period.<sup>1</sup> We know, however, at least three races of antediluvian men by their osseous remains, and to some extent by their works of art. They are the so-called Canstadt, Truchère, and Cro-Magnon races. The two former are respectively the lowest and highest in physical organization. The third has many of the characteristics of a half-blood between the two others. I have suspected this ever since I

<sup>1</sup> *The Meeting-place of Geology and History*, 1894.

knew anything of the osseous remains of this race; but it has been clearly brought out by the researches of Dr. Franz Boaz, of the United States department of ethnology, who has carefully inquired into the results of the intermixture of European and aboriginal races in America.<sup>1</sup> He shows that the half-bloods exhibit a marked increase in stature and physical power, especially in the men, and that they are also more variable than the pure races. Other peculiarities are also noticed, more especially a diminution in the height of the face in comparison with the brain-case. These indications are distinctly visible in the gigantic race of Cro-Magnon and Mentone. Hence we may infer that the tribes who in Europe, where the facts are best known, were cut off by the post-glacial subsidence—the geological equivalent of the Biblical deluge—consisted of a rude and a more refined race of pure blood, and a third race of gigantic hybrids, which may, when better known and traced more widely over the world, realize the old account of the antediluvian giants. I would not, however, insist too strongly on this in the present imperfect state of our knowledge. Should further discoveries confirm the present indications, the coincidence would be very striking, and would also come into harmony with prevalent traditions of gigantic primitive men.

One other question deserves a passing notice. How could so circumstantial account of the antediluvian world be transmitted to subsequent ages? The answer is that modern research has ascertained the existence of certain forms of writing among early men as far back as the deluge itself; and if the date of the early chapters of Genesis is that of the generations immediately succeeding that event, there is now no reason to doubt that the testimony of witnesses of the flood may have been recorded from their own lips. The Chaldean tablets even represent Noah as pro-

<sup>1</sup> *Popular Science Monthly*, October, 1894.

viding for the safety of written records before the flood began, and the earliest inscriptions of Chaldea and Egypt carry us back long before the time of Abraham, and therefore to a period when the oral testimony of survivors of the deluge might still be available.

If, like the ancient Chaldean histories and poems, their statements were inscribed on clay tablets, originals or very early copies may yet be discovered. In the meantime the version preserved, under the good providence of God, in Genesis bears internal evidence of veracity, of primitive age, and of Divine guidance in its preparation as a basis for the religious system which culminates in the advent of the Messiah as the long-delayed fulfilment of the promise originally made to our first parents, and passed on to later times by holy men inspired of God.

J. WM. DAWSON.