

WHO ARE THE BIBLICAL ANGELS? – A CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE, (#10)

Clifton A. Emahiser's
Non-Universal Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830 / emahiser.christogenea.org

Since paper #'s 3, 4 & 5 of this series, I have been working under the premise that:

“... The only thing that I can imagine is, Yahweh must have given His male angels all of the abilities of His male creations, except the part of the body that produces natural opioids which stimulate the sex drive in humans. Without these, the male angels would have had no desire for sexual intercourse. Evidently, the third of the angels that rebelled against Yahweh and fell found aphrodisiac-stimuli in some type of vegetation to jump-start their sexual desires!”

Until someone reveals something more plausible, I will continue this same premise. The following is part of what I wrote in my essay *The Battle For The Priesthood*, which is important for the subject of the fallen angels fits somewhat here:

Inasmuch as we understand that Eve was the mother of both Cain and Abel, it is obvious that Cain was the firstborn of the serpent (i.e., Satan), and that Abel was the firstborn of Adam.

Because it is a subject of such great magnitude, we must prioritize our investigation of it with an eye on the subject at hand. It may come as a surprise to many of you, the symbol of the Shepherd Kings is the Sphinx, and the first Shepherd King was Adam. The priesthood was called the Order of Melchizedek. Howard B. Rand, in *Destiny* magazine, October, 1962 wrote an article “Enoch’s Mission and Shem’s Responsibility” (1962 *Destiny* yearbook pp. 201-204). Now quoting him in part:

“**Order of Melchizedek:** When Shem with his followers came out of Egypt, they founded at Jerusalem the city destined to become the City of David and also the capitol of the Kingdom of God when Jesus Christ, who is of the Order of Melchizedek, returns to rule as King of kings and Lord of lords.

“The priestly Order of Melchizedek began with Adam, and the Preachers of Righteousness from Adam to Noah were of this Order. Noah is recorded as the **eighth** Preacher of Righteousness in 2 Peter 2:5. The fifth chapter of Genesis begins, ‘This is the book of the generations of Adam’, and no one of the line of Cain is recorded there. As stated in *Primogenesis*, by Rand: [**Critical note** by Clifton A. Emahiser: the underlined sentence above is tangible evidence that Adam was **NOT** the father of Cain, which Rand recognized.] – back to Rand

“Noah was the tenth in generation. The reason he was but the **eighth** in priestly line was because Enoch was translated before his father died and did not come to the priestly office (Gen. 5:24). Methuselah, the son of Enoch, took the office directly from his grandfather Jared, the father of Enoch. Methuselah, in turn, outlived his son

Lamech, so the office passed directly to his grandson, Noah, the son of Lamech (Gen. 5:27). Noah, therefore, became the eighth Preacher of Righteousness, though the tenth in generation, because these two, Enoch and Lamech, never succeeded to the priestly office.” (*Primogenesis*, p. 44)

This would make the Melchizedek priesthood succession from Adam downward to Noah thusly: (1) Adam, (2) Seth, (3) Enos, (4) Cainan (5) Mahalaleel, (6) Jared, (7) Methuselah, and (8) Noah. Take note that Cain was never considered for the Melchizedek priesthood, inasmuch as Adam was **NOT** his father. Had Cain been Adam’s legitimate first son, we would never have heard of Abel or Seth, as second sons are not usually recorded. – Back to Rand

“In this line of Preachers of Righteousness, Shem, Noah’s son, became the ninth. As stated in *Primogenesis*:

“‘The Order of Melchizedek, in its earthly representation, began with Adam as the first Preacher of Righteousness. Noah was the eighth and Shem the ninth’ ... ‘So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee. As he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek’ (Heb. 5:5-6).

“In His ministry, He was a Prophet; in His atonement, He was a Priest. When He returns, He is to be King. Thus, in the Order of Melchizedek, He is Prophet, Priest and King’ (*Primogenesis* pp. 66-67).

“Order of Master Shepherds. The Bible also records a line of master shepherds beginning with these Preachers of Righteousness, who wore the shepherd’s garb as the insignia of office. From Abraham to John the Baptist, in each generation there were those who were members of this ancient and honorable Order. Then Jesus Christ associated Himself with the office, becoming the Grand Master of the Order of Master Shepherds: **‘I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine. As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep’** (John 10:14-15).”

!! ADAM WAS NOT CAIN’S FATHER !!

All one need do to verify this significant Biblical fact is to turn to Jude 14, which states: **“And Enoch also, the seventh FROM Adam, prophesied of these saying, ‘Behold Yahshua cometh with ten thousands of his saints’.”**

Then, if you will turn to both Genesis 5:1-18 and Luke 3:37-38 and count from Adam to Enoch, you can clearly see there are only six listed. Jude didn’t make a mistake when he pointed to Enoch as being the seventh **FROM** Adam, for he was including [prophet & Master Shepherd] Abel in his calculations (Hebrews 11:4). It should be noted that Jude didn’t say the seventh “generation” from Adam for Enoch was the sixth in that category. Many commentaries agree on this point, but how can this be?

If Abel is included, a proper list would then be thusly: (1) Abel, (2) Seth, (3) Enos, (4) Cainan (5) Mahalaleel, (6) Jared, and, (7) Enoch. It should be noted that both the Genesis and Luke accounts have a missing man, which can only be filled with Abel. Should one try to force Cain into Adam’s genealogy, Enoch would then be the eighth from Adam! At this juncture, one has only two choices: Cain or Abel. To exclude both

Abel and Cain is also damning, for it makes Enoch the sixth from Adam. Some will argue that one should start counting with Adam as number one, but the Greek doesn't support that idea. Choosing Cain to fill that spot is an anti-seedline, anti-christ position, for they spuriously claim Cain was Adam's authentic son. A second witness to the fact that Abel should be listed as the missing man is Genesis 4:25 which says: **“And Adam knew his wife [yet] again (not again and again, #5750 Gesenius’); and she bare a son, and called his name Seth: For Elohim, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead (in the place) of Abel, whom Cain slew.”**

If, as some claim, Cain was kicked out of the family for murdering Abel, Seth would have been a replacement for Cain, not Abel. Evidently, the anti-seedliners have a problem counting to seven, so we will clear that up!

Matt. 23:35 indicates that Abel was among the “righteous.” Abel was righteous for the same reason as Noah: he was perfect in his genealogy. At this point, it might be well to quote again the *Targum of Jonathan* on Genesis 4:1: **“And Adam knew his wife Eve, who was pregnant by the Angel Sammael, and she conceived and bare Cain; and he was like the heavenly beings, and not like earthly beings, and she said, I have acquired a man, the Angel of the Lord.”**

In verses 3 & 4, we are told that both Cain and Abel brought offerings unto Yahweh, and that there was respect for Abel's but no respect for Cain's. Now only a priest can offer a sacrifice, so both Cain and Abel were priests. Therefore, Abel was the firstborn of Adam and Cain was the firstborn of Satan. Abel's sacrifice was accepted of Yahweh, not because he was the first born of Eve, but because he was the firstborn of Eve by Adam. When we get that straightened out in our minds, we can comprehend that Enoch was the seventh priest **FROM** Adam. Abel was priest #1 **from** Adam; Seth was priest #2 **from** Adam (as a replacement for Abel); Enos was priest #3 **from** Adam; Cainan was priest #4 **from** Adam; Mahalaleel was priest #5 **from** Adam; Jared was priest #6 **from** Adam; and, Enoch was priest #7 **from** Adam. As for Cain: he was the firstborn priest of Satan birthed by Eve. Now there were many more sons born to all these patriarchs between Adam and Enoch, but only the first sons were born to the priesthood, except Seth, who was a substitute in place of Abel. Abel was not reckoned a “Preacher of Righteous” by Peter only because, like Enoch and Jared, his father also outlived him. But he was nonetheless reckoned by Jude who was counting in a different manner.

BUT JUST HOW DO THE FALLEN ANGELS FIT INTO THE EQUATION?

For this we will go to *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A New Translation* by Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr. and Edward Cook, on page 247, a translation of 1Q23, fragments 1 and 6: “¹ [...] two hundred] ² donkeys, two hundred asses, two hund[red ... rams of the] ³ flock, two hundred goats, two hundred [...] beast of the] ⁴ field from every animal, from every [bird ...] ⁵ [...] for **miscegenation** [...]”. And in the same source, 4Q531, fragment 2: “¹ [...] 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 [giants] which did not suffice for them and [...] ⁶ [...] and they were seeking to devour many [...] ⁷ [...] ⁸ the monsters attacked it.” Again, 4Q532, Col. 2 fragments 1-6: “² [...]

flesh [...] ³ al[[...] monsters [...] will be [...] ⁴ [...] they would arise [...] lacking in true knowledge [...] because [...] ⁵ [...] the earth [grew corrupt ...] mighty [...] ⁶ [...] they were considering [...] ⁷ [...] from the angels upon [...] ⁸ [...] in the end it will perish and die [...] ⁹ [...] they caused great corruption in the [earth ...] ¹⁰ [...] this did not] suffice to [...] ¹¹ they will be [...].”

I will next cite a brief passage from *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Hershel Shanks, under the subtitle, “When the Sons of God Cavorted with the Daughters of Men”, written by Ronald S. Hendel, (both Edomite-Jews) pp. 172-173, slightly edited:

“... The Canaanite root[words] of the Sons of God allow us a glimpse into the antiquity of these figures and make it clear that these are indeed divine beings. The Israelite use of the term derives from the body of traditional lore inherited from the Canaanites. The concept of the Sons of God as well as the stories about them doubtless goes back to Canaanite time ... In Israelite tradition the Sons of God are the lesser deities who accompany Yahweh in his heavenly assembly. Their sphere of activity is restricted in comparison to that of their Canaanite forebears; this, of course, is due to the fact that in Israelite worship Yahweh had subsumed [*i.e., included*] the essential functions of the other gods. Only in a few passages are the activities of the Sons of God prominent. These passages, especially Gen. 6:1-4 and Deut. 32:8, reflect traditions that are quite early. Indeed, these two passages would be quite at home among the Ugaritic mythological texts, except that the chief god is Yahweh rather than El! Let us turn now from the Sons of God to the offspring produced when they united with the daughters of men, as described in Gen. 6:1-4. Although the language of the text is a bit choppy, it nevertheless seems clear that the offspring are referred to as the Nephilim. These Nephilim are described as the ‘heroes of old, the men of renown.’ Who are the Nephilim? ... Nephilim literally means ‘the fallen ones.’ In Hebrew the word is a common euphemism for ‘the dead.’ (For example, Jer. 6:15 tell us, ‘They will fall among the fallen [Hebrew, *nopelim*].’) ... In Eze. 32:27, we read of the Nephilim as warriors who have fallen.: ‘They lie with the warriors; The Nephilim of old; who descended to Sheol; with their weapons of war’ ... Elsewhere in biblical tradition the Nephilim are described as the giants who were native inhabitants of Canaan. In the report Moses’ advance scouts give of their foray into Canaan (Numbers 13:33), they advise Moses: ‘All the people whom we saw in its midst were people of great size; there we saw the Nephilim – the Anakims are part of the Nephilim – and we seemed in our own eyes like grasshoppers, and so we must have seemed in their eyes.’ ... In Deut. 2:11 the giant Anakims – part of the Nephilim – are also called Rephaim, a more general term for the giant native inhabitants of Canaan. Two of the most famous of the Rephaim are King Og of Bashan, whose huge iron bed could still be seen on display in Rabbah of Ammon (Deut. 3:11), and the giant warrior Goliath, who is described as descended from the Raphah in Gath (2 Sam. 21:19 ff) ... The Nephilim thus appear to be a race of heroes who lived both before the Flood and in Canaan before the Israelites conquered the Promised Land. In these eras, the Nephilim end up, as their name suggests, as ‘the dead ones.’ The Rephaim and Anakims are said to have been wiped out by Joshua, Moses, and Caleb, though some stragglers remained to be slain by David and his men. In Joshua 11:22, we are told that ‘No Anakims remained in the land of Israel, but some remained in Gaza, Gath, and Ashdod.’”

Therefore, the subtitle “When the Sons of God Cavorted with the Daughters of Men” seems quite interesting, as “cavort” means: “1. To bound or prance about in a

sprightly manner; to caper. **2.** To make merry; to sport; frolic [Perhaps variant of CURVET.], *The American Heritage Dictionary*; Ibid. “sprightly ... Buoyant or animated; full of life. See Synonyms at nimble. -adv. With briskness; gaily.”

At least this is the premise of Ronald S. Hendel! Hence, we should reexamine Gen. 6:4:

“There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in^{H935} unto^{H413} the daughters of men, and they bare *children* to them, the same *became* mighty men which *were* of old, men of renown.” [The Charles Thomson *Septuagint* has “**went in unto**”; nevertheless both of the words “**in**” and “**unto**” are two separate words in both the Hebrew and the English! Probably the Septuagint is the more correct, as the fallen angels were the aggressors.

To review our grade- and high school English training, I will quote from the *World Scope Encyclopedia*, under the topic “Preposition” for a concise definition:

“Preposition ... in grammar, a part of speech which shows the relation between its object and some other word. In English the preposition generally precedes the noun which it governs. Grammarians usually agree that prepositions were originally either verbs or nouns, and generally class them with relational words. About 40 prepositions are used in English, besides a number of participles that are employed as inseparable prepositions, such as *be-stir* and *be-speak*. In Greek there are 18 prepositions and in Latin there are about 50.”

To refresh our understanding of Prepositions, I will cite the 2-volume *Carreer Institute Course In Practical English*, vol. 1, pp. 11-12:

“PREPOSITIONS; Words That Show a Relationship:

“Another important part of speech is the **preposition**. A preposition is not a modifier. The only parts of speech that are modifiers are adjectives and adverbs. The preposition has a different function to perform in the sentence. *A preposition shows the relationship that exists between certain words in a sentence* ... You should become acquainted with the words that are commonly used as prepositions. A list of these prepositions is given here for your reference. Refer to this list repeatedly until you are able to identify the prepositions that are in common use. The fact that a word is in this list does not mean that it is always used as a preposition. Some of these words often function as other parts of speech. The test of its use as a preposition is to determine whether it shows the *relationship* between its object and some other word in the sentence.

“A List of Commonly Used Prepositions:

“above, about, across, after, against, along, among, around, at, before, behind, below, beneath, beside, between, beyond, by, down, during, except, for, from, in, inside, into, like, near, of, off, on, since, to, toward, through, under, until, unto, up, upon, within.” ... Of course, this citation does not include Prepositional phrases, or compound Prepositional phrases!

Interestingly enough, at Gen. 6:4 we have two prepositions in succession, (1) “**in**”, and (2) “**unto**”, suggesting two separate actions, rather than a single action. In other words, (1) “**in**” suggests the action of penetration, while (2) “**unto**” suggests full penetration. The 2nd definition of “**unto**” in English is, “**until, till**”, and the 3rd definition of “**until**”, as a preposition, is: “onward to or till (a specified time or occurrence) ...”

Don't get mad at me! I didn't write the Bible. Not only are these two different words in English, but they are two different prepositions in the Hebrew, as follows:

Strong's **H935** בוא **bôw'**, *bo*; a primitive root; to go or come (in a wide variety of applications):– KJV renderings: abide, apply, attain, X be, befall, + besiege, bring (forth, in, into, to pass), call, carry, X certainly, (cause, let, thing for) to come (against, in, out, upon, to pass), depart, X doubtless again, + eat, + employ, (cause to) enter (in, into, -tering, -trance, -try), be fallen, fetch, + follow, get, give, go (down, in, to war), grant, + have, X indeed, [in-]vade, lead, lift [up], mention, pull in, put, resort, run (down), send, set, X (well) stricken [in age], X surely, take (in), way." Gesenius' *Lexicon* has: "(a) ... 'to enter unto a woman ... Gen. 6:4' ...", and with ב, "to enter into (one's body).", plus "to have intercourse with anyone", plus "...to put in, to insert ..."

Strong's **H413** אל **'el** *ale*; (but used only in the shortened constructive form אל **'el** *el*; (a second form) a primitive particle, properly denoting motion towards, but occasionally used of a quiescent position, that is, near, with or among; often in general, to:– KJV renderings: about, according to, after, against, among, as for, at, because (-fore, -side), both ... and, by, concerning, for, from, X hath, in (-to), near, (out) of, over, through, to (-ward), under, unto, upon, whether, with(-in)." Gesenius' *Lexicon* has in part: "(A) Preposition, signifying in general, to tend to anything, to verge to or towards any place" The English word "verge" means: "Be almost on the point of happening or doing something; edge, threshold." Thus, we are compelled to determine that the fallen angels went far beyond the sexual threshold [*i.e.*, the point of no return].

The RSV translates Gen. 6:4 thusly: "**The Nephilim [*i.e.*, fallen ones] were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men^{H120}, and they bore children to them. These were the mighty men that were of old, the men of renown.**"

Not being satisfied with phrase order of Gen. 6:2 & 4, I rearranged the content to read thusly: "² **That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose** ⁴ **"In those days the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare *children* to them, after that there were giants [*i.e.*, *Nephilim*] in the earth, the same *became* mighty men which were of old, men of renown."**

The progression of sin is clearly spelled out at James 1:14-15: "¹⁴ **But every man [*or angel*] is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed.** ¹⁵ **Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death."**

I believe I have properly identified who did what, and when they did it!