

Can Demons Mate With Humans?

Introduction: the nature of demonic life

Demons are fallen, angelic, spirit beings

There is no argument here. All agree that a demon is a fallen angel. As such, the nature of demonic existence is spiritual, not corporeal. Angels were created as ministering spirits to serve God (Heb 1:14). Unlike elect angels, demons do not inhabit heaven but have been expelled and live in the atmosphere surrounding earth (known in Greek as *Tartarus*, 2 Pt 2:4), hence their leader, Satan, is called the prince of the power of the air (Eph 2:2).

Demons cannot become human

There is no Biblical evidence that demons can become human. If they could the world would be in serious trouble with their penchant for outright wickedness. Limits were put on their existence by God. Their main function is to act as spies for Satan as part of a global intelligence network, for Satan is neither omni-present or omniscient. Becoming human would, in fact, severely limit Satan's activities; there is no advantage to him. Having said that, Satan is extremely jealous of man, the crown of God's creation and the recipient of God's inheritance in Christ.

Demons cannot, therefore, mate with humans

If demons cannot become human, how can they partake of sex? It is not possible. Satanists struggle to manage this in their various rituals. There is no shortage, in these evil days, of willing partners in the occult world, yet it seems that there has been no production of demonic seed or giant offspring.

Some have made the case from Gen 18:8 that, since angels partook of food, even though they had no physical attribute to enable them to do so, likewise they could indulge in sex even though they had no physical accoutrements to procreate. Firstly, this act was a miracle wrought by God present in human form with them, as an act of grace and relationship with Abraham. It tells us nothing about what angels can do unaided by God. The very fact that these angels had been given physical appearance was unusual and miraculous. There is a huge difference here from evil angels choosing to marry human women.

Others make cases from pagan myths and the apocryphal Book of Enoch (chapter 6ff). Needless to say, this is a desperate measure since they can

find no Biblical basis for their arguments.

The nature of demonic invasion of humans

Demons can infiltrate other entities

There is clear scriptural evidence that demons can infiltrate other beings, eg: pigs (Mk 5:11-13)

Demons can infiltrate humans

Demons desire to be able to do the things that man can achieve with his senses. The nearest they can get to this is to seek to infiltrate and control humans. There are various levels of influence which demons can have over individuals, from affliction, oppression to invasion (demonisation), depending upon the level of control yielded by the person affected. The Gospels and Acts give many examples of this, however, nowhere in scripture do we see the ability of demons to mate with human women.

Scripture passages to be investigated

The mixing of races in Gen 6:1-8

The genealogies of chapters 4 and 5 trace the development of mankind through two fundamentally contrasting lines headed by Cain and Seth. The background thought is that the Cainites had been going in an evil direction (eg Lamech's violence 4:23-24) while the Sethites were developing completely differently. At this point the two tribes begin to mix with the result of the destruction of righteousness in the godly line. It may have been that the righteous were enticed by the skilful and artistic artifices created by the ingenious Cainites which improved lifestyle, but the fatal blow was the marital union of races. The Sethites were so contaminated and corrupted that the judgment of God was necessary in the flood.

v1-2 Daughters of men - There is nothing new in the mention of daughters being born throughout all mankind ('to them' refers to the collective singular 'mankind'). Neither does it follow that the term 'daughters of men' implies that the sons of God were not men any more than in Jer 32:20 where it says that God had done miracles 'in Israel, and among men'; cf also Isa 43:4; Ps 73:5; Jud 16:7. In all these passages 'men' denotes the remainder of mankind in distinction from those specifically named. The word 'daughters' finds its antecedent in the daughters of various Sethites which is the only mention so far in Genesis (5:4,7,10,13,16,19,22,26,30). So 'daughters of men' could be referring to a different class or tribe but it is not likely. The emphasis of the verses is that the 'sons of God' have no

discrimination as to which tribe these women come from. They should have married 'daughters of God', godly women.

It should be noted that warnings against marriage between believers and unbelievers is referred to throughout the Pentateuch as a very serious matter (Gen 24:3,4, 26:34,35, 29:6-8, 27:46, 28 1-3). Some have also suggested¹ that polygamy is also in view here, making the sin even worse, based upon: 'took themselves wives of all which they chose'. The similar language should be noted where the Cainite Lamech 'took two wives' (4:19).

We must take great care not to be influenced by the debauched myths of Gentile nations which describe the racy tales of the intermarrying of gods and women.

'Sons of God' - There are three possible interpretations suggested for this group: princes, angels or Sethites. The first is the traditional Jewish view i.e. royal men marrying commoners; but the usage of the language preclude it and there is no evidence that the line of Cain had established monarchical rulers. Scripture is against the idea that Kings are gods and princes are sons of a god. This idea is entirely pagan. The second would seem logical in connection with other passages if there were not a better interpretation more suited to the language used.

There is such a better understanding. These people are the Sethites, the ones just described in chapter 5. Men like Enoch (v22), Lamech (v29). They lived lives that deserved the title 'sons of God' (*benê 'elohîm*) and Seth's mother regarded him as a son from God (Gen 4:25). The Sethites had also begun to call on the name of Yahweh at this time (Gen 4:26). This title is applied to godly men and nations elsewhere in the OT (Ps 73:15, 80:17; Deut 14:1, 32:5; Hos 1:10) albeit in slightly different forms (*i.e. thy children, son of man, sons of the living God*) and in the NT (Lk 3:38, 20:34-36). In one place, godly magistrates are even called 'Elohim and sons of the Most High' (Ps 82:6); in another, men are said to be 'a little short of Elohim (Ps 8:5). The righteous line of men is given the title 'sons of God', this applies to the tribe of Seth and later to Israel and the church.

Is this phrase not used of angels? Yes it is in Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7; Ps 29:1, 89:6; (the term in Dan 3:25 refers to a theophany); but it is not *only* used of angels! In addition, even when applied to angels, it is questionable whether the phrase should be understood in a physical or ethical sense. All the other

¹ E.g. Robert Jamieson

terms applied to angels are ethical. Is it not also important that Moses, the writer of Genesis, uses the term elsewhere for godly people (e.g. Deut 14:1), and never for angels?

The context must decide which interpretation is chosen. Angels have not been mentioned thus far in Genesis, nor even their creation alluded to, but other human sons of God have been identified and 4:25-5:32 has been devoted to them; although Moses waits until now to use this specific title to make his point about degeneration of the line. A greater problem in my eyes is that those who favour angels here all agree that it is fallen angels in view, demons, but how can these evil demons be described as sons of God?² This clearly points to the godly line of Seth being designated by this phrase. If the writer wanted to introduce the concept of angels at this point, why did he not simply call them *angels* instead of causing all this trouble?

There is also a theological problem if these people are demons. Fallen angels are condemned, they have no possibility of salvation. What happens to the hybrid children of a mixed demonic/human race? Can they be saved? Furthermore, why did the demons stop mating? There is no record of this occurring later. Even if you consider the later mention of Nephilim to be 'serpent seed', why is there no mention after the conquest of Canaan? If it was so pleasurable to demons, why did they stop?

v3 Punishment

Another pointer to correct interpretation is that this verse shows that God restricts the life of man for what occurred. Why would he do that if it was angels, not men, who had sinned? God is not unjust. The women seem to be similarly innocent since v2 indicates that they were taken wilfully (lit: 'whichever they liked best they took'). Also, for all mankind to suffer, these angelic actions must have not only been common, but universal. No one wants to admit this as it goes too far. If it was this widespread, and if the union produced giants, the world would have been populated with giants. The whole scenario is preposterous.

As a result of the mixing of races, man also became flesh (*basar*), i.e. not just sinful, but totally abandoned to a base life of sin and selfishness, consumed by bodily appetites (see *flesh* in 6:12,13, Job 10:4). Consequently, God put a limit on the time for repentance, i.e. 120 years. God's Spirit would not judge³ or rule in men forever. God's word had been

² The references in Job are related to elect angels in array before God. The sudden appearance of Satan is obviously unusual as implied by the phrase, 'Satan also came among them', and the Lord asking Satan, 'whence have you come'.

³ From the verb *dîn*, to judge. *Rûah* is therefore God's Spirit convicting the world of sin,

handed down from Adam onwards and the Spirit had operated on the basis of it, instructing and judging (reproving) in the conscience and in preaching of godly men like Enoch and Noah.⁴

Despite this, man had ignored God and gone his own way to the point where even once godly men now took any woman as the fancy took him. Man became given over to the base instincts of life incapable of being ruled by the Spirit of God. At this base level of sin, man forfeited all further hope of grace. 'Therefore his days shall be 120 years'.⁵ There remained only 120 years before judgment. God patiently waited until the ark was built (1 Pt 3:20). It is not a reference to shortened life spans. Many after the flood lived longer 11:11,13,15,17,19,21,23,25; 25:7; 35:28; 47:9; and the pronoun 'his' refers to the generation living at the time.

v4 The Nephilim

First note that there is no conjunction (and/but) at the beginning of this verse. There is no strong link to verse 2. The Nephilim are not connected to the offspring of the women mentioned. There is no need to describe these children. If men cease to fear God, follow their passions and chose women from an evil race, their children are not likely to be reared in the fear of God. Here in v4, the writer is mentioning a new class of ungodly men. The name 'Nephilim' being mentioned first to make this emphasis clear and to indicate a time period: 'at that time'.

Who were they? Firstly, they were fearsome warriors and men of stature as the only other reference (Num 13:33) shows. The Hebrew root verb *naphal* means: 'to attack', 'fall upon' or just 'fall' (Jer 48:32; Jos 11:7) and could produce the nouns: robber, attacker or bandit (Luther translated the term as 'tyrants'). Some translate it as 'fallen ones' referring to their moral depravity. These people are said to be on the earth already at the time when the

restraining sin and using the testimony of the righteous (Heb 11:7; 1 Pt 3:9).

⁴ An alternative translation is that *yadôn* means abide from the root *dnn*, to abide; i.e. 'My Spirit will not abide in man forever'. *Rûah* here must mean the breath of life in man; i.e. the removal = death, e.g. Keil. 'Spirit' here refers to the divine spirit or animating power of life given to man, the principle of 'physical and ethical, natural and spiritual life' (p135). This is what God will take from man. Could this then be a reference to a higher quality of life enjoyed by ante-diluvian mankind? Certainly they lived longer and appear to have engineered the many building feats that have left us with mysteries. For a similar view, see also Wenham 'breath of life' (p141), Aalders (p154-155) and the LXX, Vulgate and Peshito translations. Aalders prefers to translate 'for' as 'to err' (as the Masoretes) giving the rendering: 'My Spirit will not remain in man forever, now that he has erred'. Or also Keil: 'in their erring he (man as a race) is flesh'. Jamieson translates it as: 'My Spirit shall not be made low in man' i.e. the higher nature of man will not be allowed to remain humiliated in a lower, base life (p88).

⁵ At this point Noah was 480 years old.

mixing of races took place and could not, therefore, be the progeny of the union. The reputation these men developed for violence⁶ was so substantial that they stand out as a major catastrophe by which time was reckoned ('in those days' or 'at that time' plus 'when the sons of God went in'). A characteristic of that ante-diluvian time was the presence of Nephilim, violent men. In fact in 6:11-13, it is said twice that the earth was filled with violence and required judgment.

Were they giants? This term originated from the Septuagint translation. There is no reason to translate the word that way, even if the attackers were giants. 'Sons of Anak' means 'sons of the long-necked one' which *may* refer to tall stature.⁷ The key problem is that this red-herring diverts attention from the main issue: the moral point (wicked attackers). There is no reason whatsoever in the text to see a race of giants emerging from an unholy union of angels and women. Even if they were giants, it has nothing to do with the demonic issue. The writer would then be indicating that in those days giants were common before the fall at the same time that the sons of God went with women.⁸

The result of all of this is that the Sethites had lost their godly heritage and the Cainites had produced violent bandits to such a degree that God only sees 'great wickedness' (v5) and decides to judge the world with a flood. The outward actions of mankind is the result of continual evil in the heart without restraint.

Angels do not marry Matt 22:30; Mk 12:25; cf Lk 20:34ff

It is not good enough to say that Matt 22:30 mentions marriage but doesn't prohibit sex. Firstly, the normal reading would obviously include sex within marriage, therefore, angels do not have sex. Secondly, Gen 6:2 specifically says that the sons of God took themselves wives. The term - *wayyiqechû nashîm* is the standing expression for marriage in the OT and is never applied to the physical act of sex (Greek: *porneia*) outside the marital union.

⁶ 'Heroes' is better translated as 'violent men', probably with an association of warrior prowess.

⁷ Num 13:32-33 does not support the *giant* idea either. Only a portion of the Nephilim are described as sons of Anak who may have been tall (not giants). The spies also only mention them in comparison with the inhabitants of the land. It was *these inhabitants* who were of great stature. In any case Num 13 is of no use in explaining Gen 6 as the flood killed off all traces of the Nephilim in the pre-flood peoples. Out of interest, several giants are mentioned after the flood: Og (Deut 3:11); Goliath was over 9 feet tall / 6 cubits and a span (1 Sam 17:4); other Philistine giants (2 Sam 21:16-22; 1 Chron 20:4-8); and an Egyptian (1 Chron 11:23), only 7 1/2 feet tall.

⁸ It should be said that several commentators who see that the 'sons of God' are Sethites still maintain that the Nephilim were physical giants e.g.: Morris, Aalders, Jamieson. A reasonable case can be made for unusual conditions prevailing in the ante-diluvian period based upon archaeological evidence, dinosaurs, ancient myths which possibly led to giantism being common in those climatic conditions; but the scriptural case is not strong at this point.

This verse alone destroys the idea that demons took wives in Gen 6.

2 Pt 2:4, Jude 6

Both these passages refer to the original fall of the angels, if it did not, there would have to be two falls of the angelic order. There is no direct correlation with Gen 6. Peter is referring to evil angels in general, not of a particular sin of a small group of angels. Jude talks of angels who left their principdom⁹, their authority as rulers. There is nothing about angelic marriages. Neither is there a syntactical connection with verse 7, which, in any case, talks about fornication (*porneia*) not marriage and raising children.

As the days of Noah Matt 24:37

Some, believing that Gen 6 is talking of angels marrying women, feel that the verse in Matt 24 shows that at the end, fallen angels will again mate with humans producing fantastic offspring. It is now becoming popular to suggest that, Extra Terrestrial beings are, in fact, this offspring of demons and women, able to produce amazing technology (UFO's) in co-operation with government departments (like the US Armed Forces).

The clear lessons of Noah's time is what we should focus on. These are:

- The multiplication of mankind.
- God's patience with a wicked world.
- Pre-occupation with physical appetites.
- Rapid advances in technology.
- Increased proficiency in art, especially that which diverts attention from God and his requirements.
- Materialistic attitudes.
- Hedonism.
- Prominence of female influence.
- Disregard for marriage.
- Pollution of marriage and fascination with sex.
- Violence.
- Ignorance of the things of God.
- Alliance between the nominal church and the world.
- God sending messengers to warn of coming judgment.
- God's Spirit judging men (cf 2 Thess 2).
- The rejection of God's message.
- Increase of evil (demonic?) activity.
- God's judgment.

⁹ 'First estate' is literally *principality*.

- The salvation of the family of God and a new world.¹⁰

Does this sound familiar?

Conclusion

Having looked at all the scripture passages which are usually marshalled to make the case, we can see that there is no direct evidence that demons can mate with human women. In fact, there is not even the slightest hint that such a thing could occur. If a demon is a non-physical, spiritual entity, it is impossible for it to be able to indulge in sex.

This being the case, the emerging idea that ET's are demons or demonic children has to be thrown out. The whole UFO/ET phenomena is no doubt part of a global, Satanic conspiracy, but the physical expression of it (UFO machines, ET lifeforms etc., if ever discovered) must be the work of men. Demonic activity is surely responsible for most of the paranormal occurrences, but any real, material machines or activity (black triangles / UFO's / strange lights / radar sightings etc) must be man made and part of a 'black finance' budget operation developing new technology. If there is going to be a public announcement confirming a governmental cover up about the existence of ET's (particularly in the USA) and coming clean about the whole UFO phenomenon, then we should look even more carefully for the Satanic purpose behind it.

¹⁰ I am indebted here to: Pink, Pember and Morris.

Bibliography

Favouring the Sethite theory

- G Ch Alders** Genesis; Bible Students Comm.; Zondervan
R S Candlish Studies in Genesis; Kregel
M Henry Comm. on the whole Bible; Hendricksen
Jamieson, Faussett and Brown Comm. on the Bible; Eerdmans
H C Leupold Exposition of Genesis; Evangelical Press
C F Keil & F Delitzsch Comm. on the OT; Eerdmans
M Poole Comm. on the Holy Bible; Banner of Truth
T Whitelaw The Pulpit Comm. Kegan Paul, Trench & Trubner

R F Youngblood

The Book of Genesis; Baker

Historically: Conservative Jewish, Protestant and Catholic expositors (inc. Luther & Calvin) and the later church fathers after Chrysostom, Cyril, Jerome and Augustine.

Favouring the fallen angel theory

- D Kidner** Genesis; Tyndale OT Comm.
H H Morris The Genesis Record; Baker
G H Pember Earth's earliest ages; Pickering & Inglis
A W Pink Gleanings in Genesis
G Wenham Genesis 1-15; Word Biblical Comm.
Historically: Early Jewish Rabbis, Josephus, Philo, early church fathers (e.g. Justin, Athenagoras, Clement, Tertullian), Brethren expositors.

Ambivalent

- J J Davis** Paradise to Prison; Baker
V P Hamilton Handbook on the Pentateuch; Baker

Copyright © Paul Fahy 1997

Understanding Ministries