

# Return of the Nephilim

Revised 2/3/2017

## Principle Texts

- **Genesis 6:1** Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, <sup>2</sup> that the **sons of God** saw that the daughters of men were beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. <sup>3</sup> Then the LORD said, "My Spirit shall not strive with man forever, because he also is flesh; nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years." <sup>4</sup> The **Nephilim** were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the **sons of God** came in to the daughters of men, and they bore children to them. Those were the mighty men who were of old, men of renown.
- **Numbers 13:33** <sup>33</sup> "There also we saw the **Nephilim** (the sons of Anak are part of the Nephilim); and we became like grasshoppers in our own sight, and so we were in their sight."
- **Luke 17:26-30** <sup>26</sup> Just as it was in the days of Noah, so will it be in the days of the Son of Man. <sup>27</sup> They were eating and drinking and marrying and being given in marriage, until the day when Noah entered the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all. <sup>28</sup> Likewise, just as it was in the days of Lot—they were eating and drinking, buying and selling, planting and building, <sup>29</sup> but on the day when Lot went out from Sodom, fire and sulfur rained from heaven and destroyed them all—<sup>30</sup> so will it be on the day when the Son of Man is revealed.

## Noah

- **Jude 1:6** And angels who had not kept their own original **state [arche]**, but had abandoned their own **dwelling [oiketerion]**, he keeps in eternal chains under gloomy darkness, to the judgment of the great day (DBY, cp. WEB).
- "We grow weary in our *earthly bodies*, and we long to put on our *heavenly bodies (oiketerion)* like new clothing" (2Cor 5:2; TM)
- "And angels who did not keep their *original state and estate*, but abandoned their *proper mode and abode*, He has kept in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day" (Jude 1:6; TM)

## Lot

- **Jude 1:7** <sup>7</sup> Just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after *strange flesh*, are exhibited as an example, in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.
- Kelly (BNTC): "The angels because, spiritual beings though they were, they had coveted mortal women, and the Sodomites because, though only human beings, they had sought intercourse with angels."
- Bauckham (WBC): "As the angels fell because of their lust for women, so the Sodomites desired sexual relations with angels." "The Watchers changed the order of their nature."

## Principle Theses

- The term *Sons of God* refers exclusively to *angels* in the OT, who are called such as direct creations of God.<sup>1</sup>
- In Gen 6:1-4, a group of male angels abandoned their state and estate in order to marry earthly women and thus to procreate.
- Their offspring were called Nephilim. They are called giants (earth-born) in the LXX.
- The DNA of their offspring was a hybrid.
- These DNA-modified giants reappear after the flood.
- The legitimacy of the reference in Num 13:33 is disputed by some nephologists. Whether postflood giants were born of second sexual incursion by another group of fallen angels is affirmed by some nephologists but rejected by others. Nevertheless, other OT texts use various terms<sup>2</sup> to affirm the existence of various forms of DNA-modified giants, who can be referred to conceptually as Nephilim in the broader sense of the word.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hosea 1:10 is not considered a genuine exception by most nephologists in that phrase is (1) not identical and (2) is eschatological (cp. Rom 9:26). At the very least, it describes describing gloried humanity, when resurrected humans will be like angels. Quite possibly, it includes the misthological dimension of the dominion of rewarded humanity. Compare Heiser, *The Unseen Realm* (p. 96, n. 9).

<sup>2</sup> For example, in Gen 14:5-6 we have the Rephaim, Zuzim, Emim, Horim (Horites). In Gen 14:15, the Anakim (i.e., sons of Anak) are considered part of the Nephilim.

- Preflood Nephilim refer to DNA-modified giants who were born as a result of a preflood sexual incursion by fallen angels.
- Postflood Nephilim, if they be called that, refer to DNA-modified giants who may or may not have been born as a result of a postflood sexual incursion by fallen angels.
- Some nephologists hold to a multiple incursion theory in which they believe that there will be an eschatological incursion, alluded to by Jesus, which probably explains some of the UFO phenomena.

In the following notes, I am simply highlighting a few points of personal interest in some of the Nephilim related material I have watched or read. Some of these materials may be dealt with more exhaustively elsewhere in my writings. Some of it may not be dealt with at all. For the most part, this material will be brief supplementary comments that I have gone back and added at various points in no particular order. For example, I might thumb back through a book that I had read years before and decide to jot down a note here about something I had highlighted.

#### Videos

##### Missler—Return of the Nephilim

Chuck Missler, “Return of the Nephilim.” Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WCbFZL-bj7o>. Accessed 8/6/2016. The first hour of his presentation establishes the validity of some of the UFO phenomena. Then he discusses what the days of Noah were like, giving biblical and extrabiblical texts supporting the first multiple incursion theory. He properly refutes the lines-of-Seth theory at length. However, he seems to be of the opinion that there were no female Nephilim (1:24:15), which is a very questionable proposition. More reasonably, other nephologists would affirm the existence of female Nephilim. For disrobing angels in Jude (*oiketerion*), see 1:34:30.

##### Hoggard—UFOS: Chariots of the Beast

Pastor Mike Hoggard, “UFOS: Chariots of the Beast (Angels, UFOs and Antichrist).” Hoggard notes that a 4D object casts a 3D shadow (cp. Heb 8:5). He notes that Jack Parsons and L. Ron Hubbard were attempting to summon Babalon (aka Babylon), the false female messiah. He says that cherubim always have their wheels with them. Iron and clay not mixing in Dan 2:43 show that the attempt to merge human and angel DNA will not work and cites some movies talking about such attempts: *Taken*, *Fourth Kind*, *Fire in the Sky*, and *The Event*. He believes that the use of “your sons” being put in the king’s chariots in 1Sam 8:11-12 supports his perception that the US has reverse engineered UFO technology. The Lord will return with His own chariots (Is 66:15; Jer 4:13; Joel 2:5). Some angels are chariots (Ps 68:17).

#### Books

##### Quayle—Genesis 6 Giants

Stephen Quayle, *Genesis 6 Giants—Volume 2 Master Builders of Prehistoric and Ancient Civilizations*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Bozeman, MT: End Time Thunder Publishers, 2015). Quayle prefers to refer to the fallen angels in Gen 6:1-4 as *Nephilim* (fallen one). Although he believes the term also includes their gigantic offspring, the *Rephaim*, he will use the term Nephilim in his book to refer to fallen angels and Rephaim to their giant offspring. The Rephaim will be killed by the flood. This is consistent with the biblical narrative which does not mention Rephaim until after the flood. Rephaim will reappear through a repeat of sexual relations between Nephilim and human women and/or through DNA manipulation. He thinks that Satan may have been the cherub guarding the Garden of Eden when Adam fell (which is inconsistent with his advocacy of a pre-Adamic fall of Satan and the Gap Theory but consistent with the Chaos Theory). He believes the flood was worldwide, so all mankind now living are descendants of Noah’s sons (p. 47). He interprets Eze 28:18 as indicating that God cursed Satan with a divided mind that will lead to his defeat (p. 51). His soteriology manifests the typical inconsistency of Lordship Salvation: only those who repent of their sins and follow Christ in terms of their performance will make it to Heaven, yet salvation is a free gift not conditioned on performance (pp. 65, 451-457). He acts as those stories of postflood giants support his assumption of a race pre-Adamic giants. At least this inconsistency might be resolved, in part, by speculating that visions or angels might have confirmed this to be case. But he leaves the matter unaddressed. He notes the parallels between historic pantheons of gods with Gen 6:1-4 and lists a verity of goddesses, but he fails to reconcile the fact that the ancient pantheon had goddesses while the biblical narrative presumably only discusses gods and sons of God within the biblical pantheon (pp. 86-87). He believes that leviathan refers to Satan in his dragon form. He speculates that fallen cherubim were transformed from having ox-lion-eagle faces to lion-goat-serpent faces and may “have been shorn or their wings” (p. 93). **His attributing some pre-Adamic ruins to being 10,000 years old (p. 141) would fit well with my Young Earth Gap Theory.**

##### Horn—Nephilim Stargates

Thomas R. Horn, *Nephilim Stargates: The Year 2012 and the Return of the Watchers* (Crane, MO: Anomalos

Publishing House, 2007). For the purpose of my research in *Monogamous Sex in Heaven* (MSIH) and its ongoing companion article “Nimrod and Semiramis,” I am most interested in his implication that the goddess Semiramis may have been brought back in 1946 by the Babylon Working (*Stargates*, 21-22), which is consistent with Horn’s taking the mythological picturing of gods and goddesses imprisoned behind gates (extradimensional portals) within the Earth as being a reality. Semiramis has been released from her imprisonment.<sup>3</sup>

#### **Johnson, *Fallen Angels***

Ken Johnson, *Fallen Angels* (USA, 2013). One of Johnson’s most provocative statements are regarding Azazel:

According to the books of *Enoch* and *Jubilees*, in the days of Enoch’s father, Jared, **the angel Azazel descended to earth**. He wanted marriage, children, and possibly to create an empire of his own. **After some years of success, a band of two hundred angels, led by an angel named Semyaza, descended on Mount Hermon intent on doing the same thing.** (p. 23)

**Semyaza and a band of two hundred angels saw what Azazel was doing and decided to do the same.** They descended on Ardis, the summit of Mount Hermon, and bound themselves by an oath to take wives, have children, and reshape the world into one of their own making. This was in the days of Jaren, Enoch’s father, about 460-622 years after Creation (p. 29)

Unfortunately, Johnson does not really defend his assessment that Azazel was the first fallen angel to mate with human females. Most would assume that Azazel was simply one of the 200 angels who came down under the leadership of Semyaza. Alternately, in well-researched book, *The Case for Lilith*, Mark Biggs poses that Azazel was the first Nephilim, being produced by a sexual union of Lilith and Semyaza.<sup>4</sup> Personally, I prefer the position by Johnson over Biggs in this regard, but I would like to see an elaboration of Johnson’s position. Although his position does provide plausible explanation as to why Azazel is given preeminence in the biblical and extrabiblical discussion, Biggs’ explanation probably has better explanatory power. Notwithstanding, it probably proves too much in that it would lead to the conclusion that Azazel is the antichrist. My leaning toward (1) Nimrod being the antichrist and (2) Lilith being a fallen angel (the sexual counterpart of Lucifer) makes me more open to Johnson’s position than that of Biggs.

Another provocative position taken by Johnson is that there was no second incursion. Instead, postflood giants are to be explained by Canaan returning to the original location of the watchers to learn from their writings how to perform genetic tampering and create warrior giants (pp. 37-40). He is not alone in such an assessment, but I do not find this explanation compelling to explain all postflood giants.

#### **Lake—The Shinar Directive**

Michael Lake, *The Shinar Directive: Preparing the Way for the Son of Perdition* (Crane, MO: Defender, 2014). Lake believes that the Illuminati plotted three world wars. Hitler was not intended to win the second. It was to set up World War III as a battle between Zionists and Muslims, resulting in a one world government (pp. 171-174). The mark of the Beast will change human DNA so that humans taking it are no longer created in the image of God but in the image of the beast. They will no longer have a conscience or be able to respond to the gospel or repent and hence be unredeemable (pp. 263-264). In MSIH I adopt and adapt this to formulate a pragmatic means of determining if those who believe that they have been genetically modified are redeemable. If they are still able to repent or believe the gospel, then they have not been genetically modified to sufficient degree to make them unredeemable. In short, if you worry that you are unredeemable, then you are not unredeemable. Those who are truly unredeemable would not be concerned about being redeemable.

#### **Horn—Zenith 2016**

Thomas Horn, *Zenith 2016: Did Something Begin in the Year 2012 that will Reach its Zenith in 2016?, The Revised & Expanded Edition of Apollyon Rising 2012* (Crane, MO: Defender Publishing, 2013). The current attempt to create a third strand of DNA to transform our double helix to a triple by adding a Peptide Nucleic Acid (PNA) hybrid (p. 254). My theoretical speculation is that DNA modification that falls short of that objective may have to be submitted to the subjective test above to determine if a sufficient degree of modification has been undergone so as to make the person unredeemable.

<sup>3</sup> See “Nimrod and Semiramis.” Available at <http://mishology.org/pdf/articles/Nimrod-and-Semiramis.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> See “Azazel as the Seed of Lilith.” Available at [http://bitterwaters.com/Evidence\\_Azazel\\_1Enoch.html](http://bitterwaters.com/Evidence_Azazel_1Enoch.html). Accessed 10/15/2016.

### Fortson—Beyond Flesh and Blood

Minister Dante Fortson, *Beyond Flesh and Blood: The Ultimate Guide to Angels and Demons* (USA: Impact Agenda Media, 2012). Fortson's book is a great introductory text briefly touching on many areas. He even excels where most books fail in explicitly acknowledging the existence of female angels (pp. 22-28). He believes that the description *unclean*, when used of *spirits*, denotes their hybrid mixture (p. 134).

### Horn and Putnam—On the Path of the Immortals

Thomas Horn and Chris Putnam, *On the Path of the Immortals* (Crane, MO: Defender Publishing Co., 2015). Putnam correctly insists that the winged women in Zech 5:9 are female angels (p. 7). Prudently, he believes that Satan "falls *three* times in Scripture" (emphasis his, 27). Horn and Putnam believe some Nephilim survived the flood (p. 124). Another possibility is that giants returned through Nimrod's gate (p. 178). Some legends say that the giants from the stars had "four fingers and no thumb" (p. 120). DMT allows us to see dark matter and parallel universes (pp. 141-142). Horn cites Chuck Mossler's belief that before the fall Adam and Eve had "access to as many as ten dimensions" (p. 153). Ps 24:7 may be referring to "a dimensional gateway that Jesus Christ passes through to access...the earthly realm" (p. 157). The whirlwind through which God spoke to Job was a bidirectional portal (Job 38:1). Nimrod was a giant (p. 178). The reason for Desert Shield was to obtain Nimrod's body to clone it (pp. 204-206). The chapters on multiverse and portals are particularly interesting.

### Horn and Putnam—Exo-Vaticana

Cris Putnam and Thomas Horn, *Exo-Vaticana* (Crane, MO: Defender Publishing, 2013). This book starts off with discussion of the *Watchers* and proceeds to link them to UFOs and ETs, which are more likely really EDs. However, Lewis is noted to allow ETs on other planets who are guaranteed from us (p. 217). Chalmers allowed the possibility of genuine ETs (p. 284). Chapter 11 discusses this exotheology at length. They acknowledge that angels may have built cities on other planets, and Rahab may have been such a planet (pp. 471-480). Their discussion of the Nephilim would lead to the conclusion that Semiramis was a fallen female angel, as I point out in my article, "Nimrod and Semiramis." And their discussion of multiverse is very good. See my *Misthological Models: Part 2* for interaction. Their anticipation that Saturn's Iapetus is a synthetic moon that serves as the bottomless pit is intriguing (pp. 361-363).

### Skiba—Babylon Rising

Rob Skiba, *Babylon Rising: And The First Shall Be Last* (updated and expanded), Kindle Edition (King's Gate Media, 2013). Skiba does well to affirm that Semiramis was the wife of Nimrod and to quote Horn to the effect that she may have returned to the Earth as a spirit in 1946 because of the Babylon Working. He poses "that Semiramis may have been a daughter of Cush. Through incest with her father, she produced Nimrod. Thus, she became both his half-sister" (KL 5563-5564). Whereas Skiba believes that Semiramis was a Nephilim, I believe she was a fallen angel who married Cush, became the mother of Nimrod, and then his wife.

### Skiba—Archon Invasion

Rob Skiba, *Archon Invasion: The Rise, Fall and Return of the Nephilim* (Kindle edition, 2012). Since Skiba finds no evidence in Scripture for female angels, he assumes that goddesses "were in fact giants, Nephilim, and/or Elioud [i.e., offspring of Nephilim]" (p. 167). He tries to dismiss Zech 5:9 as providing scriptural evidence for female angels, posing that it refers to female Nephilim instead. I find the proposition that it is referring to female angels much more likely and in harmony with our being created in the image of male and female *elohim*. See MSIH and my article "Nimrod and Semiramis." I would pose that the reason some postflood giants were as tall as cedars (Amos 2:9) was because they were the result of a second incursion. Based on 1En 10:10, Skiba believes all the Nephilim killed themselves before the flood. He has much more confidence in this secondary text than I do.

From 1En 68:15, Skiba concludes: "Michael is prophesying that *no other angel* will ever be judged for that act again," that is, the act of "mating with human women" (p. 35). Yet, in a note, he acknowledges that Satan will do so in the end times. One must ask, though, if Skiba's confidence in or interpretation of this Enochian passage are fully justified. For one thing, even if the passage is true, Michael may have been simply expressing an opinion rather than a divinely communicated prophesy. Angels can make errors in judgment without sinning. See MSIH. On the other hand, if the intent of the Enochian text is truly to rule out all future sexual mating by fallen angels, then even Skiba acknowledges that it breaks down regarding Satan. Many would attest that it breaks down on other occasions as well.

He interprets Dan 2:43 to mean that fallen angels mingle human DNA by scientifically extracting and implanting sexual fluids though surgical rather than sexual means: "They shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another" (p. 60). That is, they will not have sex with one another, a fallen angel with a human, and thus not become one flesh (cp. Gen 2:24; 1Cor 6:16). Schnoebelen, on the other hand, even from firsthand experience, affirms that this very thing is going on and that humans are becoming one flesh with fallen angels. Either Skiba has overstated his case, or Schnoebelen, and many like him, are lying about their experiences. I do not believe that

Schnoebelen is lying. Therefore, I suspect that Skiba may have jumped over fifty-two verses a little too hastily to run back to Gen 2:24 to conclude that, when the context is dealing with sex, *to cleave* necessarily means *to copulate*. We are to cleave to the Lord (Dt 10:20; 11:22; 13:4; 30:20; Josh 22:5; 23:8). Does this mean that we are to have sex with the Lord?!? Ruth cleaved to Naomi (Ruth 1:14). Does this mean that she had sex with her?!? Was Ruth telling Naomi that Boaz told her to have sex with all his servants (Ruth 2:21)?!? Granted these contexts are not talking about sex, but they, among others, do illustrate the fact that cleave does not necessarily imply sex. Furthermore, the ESV allows sexual intimacy without cleaving: “As you saw the iron mixed with soft clay, so they will mix with one another in marriage, but they will not hold together, just as iron does not mix with clay.” Copulation is not ruled out in this understanding. Furthermore, even if Skiba is correct about the verse, he may have overstated its implication. Daniel may simply be saying that copulation is not the only way that they will mix themselves humanity sexually. Scientific methods may be an additional means or even primary means.

Supposedly, per Gen 6:4, he assumes that the gods who mated with human women were Nephilim, not fallen angels (p. 63). This is a strange assessment. The more reasonable interpretation is that the sons of God who mated with human women in this passage were fallen angels who produced Nephilim. These fallen angels were the gods who produced the Nephilim offspring. According to Skiba, “the problem is, the Bible makes no mention of female angels and boldly proclaims that angels do not participate in marriages in heaven” (p. 63). However, these fallen angels are no longer in Heaven! The fact that angels do not marry in Heaven does not prove that fallen angels do not marry on Earth. As an aside, my thesis in MSIH is that male and female angels have sexual soulmates in Heaven. Thus, I find his argument in this regard completely unpersuasive. On the other hand, his argument that since Zeus was born, he was not an angel is a much better argument, if one is willing to concede that the legends are always accurate in that regard, which I am not. Yet, after appealing to the legends and again claiming that all angels are apparently male, he continues: “Zeus was the offspring of the Titans. Where did the Titans end up? Tartarus” (p. 64). He acknowledges that the myths affirm male Titans and female Titanesses (p. 70). But if Titans are fallen male angels, then Titanesses would be fallen female angels.

His odd interpretation of Gen 6:4 seems to be at odds with his own translation: “*The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, because the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore children to them. Those were the mighty men who were of old, men of renown.*” (Genesis 6:4 Rob’s Revised NASB Version)” (emphasis his, 48). His translating the verse with *because* does not prove his point. To the contrary, even by this reading, *because* makes sexual mating between *the reason* for the Nephilim both before and afterwards: *because = the reason*. *The reason* Nephilim were on the Earth both before and afterward was *because* fallen angels (i.e., “sons of God”) sexually mated (i.e., “came into”) human women. His translation destroys his interpretation. The text is attributing Nephilim to sexual mating, not scientific experimentation both before and afterward. This reading also nullifies his interpretation that *afterward* refers to a period after Nephilim supposedly had killed themselves off. Not only were Nephilim still present, their presences is attributed to sexual mating between fallen angels and human women even afterward, just as it was before. Even anything, his translation is a slam dunk for the multiple incursion theory.

Based on the 3000 ells of 1En 7:2, Skiba believes that they were 450 feet tall. Presumably, postflood Nephilim would not be that large. However, even Johnson, who like Skiba believes that the giants completely annihilated themselves before the flood, believes that that 1En 7:2 is probably a textual corruption so that the Titans were only “forty to forty-five feet tall.”<sup>5</sup> That is within the realm of postflood possibilities (Amos 2:9). In any event, he believes the first-generation giants were the Titans, who brought forth the Nephilim, who brought forth the Elioud (pp. 66-67).<sup>6</sup>

Skiba rightly reasons that the injunctions to kill the men, women, and children in texts such as Dt 3:5-7 indicates that the women were Nephilim. Where we differ is that he believes that the goddesses were Nephilim, while I believe that they were likely fallen angels. For example, he believes that the goddess Diana in Acts 19:35 was “in reality Nimrod’s sister Semiramis, who was known as Ishtar to the Mesopotamians, Isis to the Egyptians, Astarte in the Northwestern Semetic regions, and Inanna to the Sumerians” (p. 164). He further states that she was Baal’s consort, known as Ashtoreth in the land of Canaan, and worshipped by Solomon (1Kgs 11:4-5). In my assessment, however, Baal was a part of the divine council, and thus a fallen angel, so his consort would likewise be a fallen angel.

His extended discussion of Nephilim genetics is certainly a strong point of his book. Like myself, he concludes that full-blown Nephilim cannot be saved, neither, would they desire to be. So if you desire to be saved, you are savable (p. 190).

<sup>5</sup> Ken Johnson, *The Ancient Book of Enoch* (USA, 2012), 19, n. H. Like Skiba, he believes that there were three groups of pre-flood giants annihilating themselves before the flood (pp. 22-23).

<sup>6</sup> Similarly, “and they [the Watchers] begat sons the Naphidim, and they were all unlike, and they devoured one another: and the Giants slew the Naphil, and the Naphil slew the Eljo, and the Eljo mankind, and one man another” (Jubilees 7:22). Skiba: Watchers—Naphidim/Titans—Naphil/Nephilim/Anunnaki—Eljo/Elioud/Igigi. The Sumerian Anunnaki and Igigi would have been part of the first-generation giants who killed themselves off within 500 years (p. 71).

### Mardis—What Dwells Beyond

Jeffery W. Mardis, *What Dwells Beyond: The Bible Believer's Handbook to Understanding Life in the Universe*, third edition, Kindle edition (Crane, MO: Defender Publishing Co., 2015). Mardis gives the historical backdrop to the belief in life on other planets, basically finding its start in the first extraterrestrial invasion which was by fallen angels in Gen 6:4. He poses that God's spreading out the heavens like a curtain to dwell in (Is 40:22) alludes to the space-time fabric of the universe. Yet he seeks to limit biological life to this one planet, which seems rather odd. Would you not expect life throughout the tent? Supposedly, "the deadly void of outer space" (KL 6085) is intended to keep us trapped in one corner of the tent until the tent is done away with when all things become new.

Yet his assumption is refuted by the very passage he cites: "It is He who *sits* above the vault of the earth, and its inhabitants are like grasshoppers, who *stretches* out the heavens like a curtain and *spreads* them out like a tent **to dwell in**" (Is 40:22). Note that the timing of these three action verbs is not limited to the past or future but encompass the present. Even now, in the present time period, the universe is spread out like a tent for man's habitation. The present tense shows that the universe is spread out to be inhabited in the present time. The implication of this verse is that not only are there other inhabitable planets in this universe but that they are inhabited. This conclusion even flows from his own analogy: "One Man to Populate a Planet—When God created mankind, He did not create groups and pockets of men and women all over the world. He began, instead, with the creation of only one man. And if you'll remember, the woman was created from the man (Gen. 2: 22). So, in essence, the entire human race started with the direct creation of **ONLY ONE MAN**" (KL 1873-1875). True. All humanoid life originated with this one human pair. But do you think that God only made one pair of rabbits and told them to populate the rest of the planet? Hardly! Many rabbits were created all over the world. The analogy would suggest that if a singular pair of humans being created and limited to a singular location indicates that all humanoid life was limited to this one planet in the beginning, then the creation of animals and plants being created contrastively in abundance and not limited to a singular location suggests that they are located on other planets as well. Mardis wants to treat Earth as a microcosm of the universe so that the creation of a singular human couple indicates that human life was only created on one planet in the universe. He is probably correct. For the same reason, he is probably wrong to limit all biological life to this one planet. The corresponding typology would indicate that animal and plant being created throughout the planet points to animal and plant life being created throughout the universe.

As I stated in *The Outer Darkness*: "If Adam and Eve had not sinned, then during the course of time they eventually would have populated this planet to such an extent that it would have been necessary for most of their offspring to be moved to other planets and populate those planets." Man was created to rule all things, but he has not yet fulfilled that mandate (Heb 2:7-8). The most intuitive conclusion is that God created life on other planets throughout the universe, and man was created to rule those planets as well. Does biological life exist on other planets? Yes. Does biological humanoid life exist on other planets? Probably not. But even if God did create biological humanoid life on other planets, even in His own image, then the humanoid life created on this planet was apparently created to rule over the humanoid life on those planets as well, even if they are His image bearers on those planets. Mankind created on Earth was created to rule over all of God's creation, even over angels who likewise are created in the image of God. Therefore, one would conclude that even if God did create other biological image bearers in other planets, they will be subservient to the humanity composing the Bride of Christ on Earth. Much more likely, however, God's creation of humanoid life was limited to this one planet. Typology and soteriology both suggest so. However, it may be that fallen angels have been tinkering with the animal life on other planets to create counterfeit life forms on those planets, and some of those life forms might even be humanoid in appearance because fallen angels have mixed their own DNA with those animals to produce angel-animal hybrids. These fallen hybrids might even build and fly UFOs. So, unlike Mardis, I would not rule out the possibility of extraterrestrial life visiting this planet from other planets. Even so, my explanation for that life would be very much like that of Mardis.

In any event, Mardis is correct that the universe, like a tent, is not infinite. Further, as he notes, God does create darkness (Is 45:7), but the darkness is not called good in the Genesis account nor anywhere else in the Bible. Darkness is associated with God's judgment. Mardis associates sackcloth with darkness but makes a leap to concluded that a personal deliverance from sackcloth Ps 30:11 shows that the universe will have darkness removed. More likely, night will not be experienced in Heavenly Jerusalem but will be experienced elsewhere in the universe in the eternal state (Rev 21:25). Day and night are biblically presumed to go on forever (Rev 20:10). Such darkness, if not good, is at least amoral.

He asserts: "If an organism has no spirit, it is technically (and scripturally) **NOT ALIVE** (trees, plants, micro-organisms, etc.)" (KL 2834-2835). Hence, if plants are not alive, they cannot die. His statement, if true, would weaken my argument that forms of death existed before Adam's fall (see my book, *Rewards are Eternal*). But his statement is false. Plants can *perish* (*abad*, Jon 4:10). This same Hebrew word is used frequently to describe the death of humans. My argument for certain forms of death before the Adamic fall stands.

Mardis does not believe that there are any female angels and, therefore, takes the winged women in Zech 5:9 to

be counterfeit life forms, genetically produced hybrids (KL 3100-3101). His opinion is strained by his subsequent assessment:

The Bible shows that Satan is a fallen cherub and not a fallen angel. Satan has the ability to TRANSFORM HIMSELF into the appearance of an angel. The only difference between a true angel and the Devil's counterfeit angelic appearance is that Satan's "angel" would have wings. If you compare Revelation 4:7 & 8 you'll see that cherubim can appear as MEN WITH WINGS....

Cherubim have the ability to transform their physical appearance. Now it may be that each cherub can only change into one of the four faces, or it could be that each cherub has the ability to change into any four of the faces. The Bible's not clear on this detail. In the end, however, the theory of "cherubic transformation" remains sound. (KL 3299-3309).

If his assessment is correct, that *winged men are fallen male angels*, then the most logical deduction would be that *winged women are fallen female angels*. Specifically, winged women would be fallen cherubim who have changed into the form of their female human face. If his theory of cherubic transformation is as sound as he proposes, then he should have concluded that the winged women in Zech 5:9 are fallen female cherubim who have changed into the form associated with their human face. His argument against female angels leads to some strained conclusions: "Because angels appear identical to human men (Heb. 13: 2), and because there are no female angels, certain 'angels that sinned' became physically attracted to Earth women and sired illicit children by them" (KL 3019-3021; emphasis his). According to this perspective, God created angels as male and with sexual desires but no legitimate means to fulfill those sexual desires. So they will live in eternal sexual frustration. This makes God a very poor designer. Mardis makes an unwarranted assumption when he goes on to say, "Genesis 6 shows there were no 'daughters of God' taking the 'sons of men', because there are NO FEMALE ANGELS. This means that there was ONLY ONE PLACE where the carnal lust of these supernatural creatures could be satisfied—planet Earth" (KL 3997-4000). False. Sexual desires could be fulfilled in Heaven with female angels but procreative sex could only be fulfilled on Earth.

He believes that Heaven is in this universe: "Heaven is not in an alternate 'dimension' or on another 'plane of reality'. Heaven is real. And although it may be located far, far, above the heavens (over 14 billion lightyears or more away from Earth, on the other side of the darkness— see chapter 10), the Lord Jesus Christ arrived there by first ascending off the surface of planet Earth. Think about it. If Heaven is not located above the Earth (and above outer space), what would be the point in ascending up into the sky to get there?" (KL 3703-3706). "Third Heaven' can be reached by literally departing the surface of the earth and traveling northward through space. The Lord Jesus Christ demonstrated this truth when he ascended into heaven bodily" (KL 6051-6052). I can sympathize with this perspective since I entertained it in *The Outer Darkness*. However, I have now adopted a multiverse perspective and would place Heaven in another dimension (see my fourth coming series, *Misthological Models*).

For the most part, Mardis concludes: "Aliens are neither men, nor animal, nor angel, but in general, appear to be an amalgam of all three in one way or another" (KL 5639-5640). He poses an interesting theory: "Aliens are either man-made, angel-made or both (i.e. forces working in collusion). In some cases, these life forms may be part of an elaborate plot which attempts to help man bypass the deadly effects of outer space by engineering experimental man-animal hybrids designed for deep space travel—an ability which God has denied to man" (KL 5976-5980). Using Rev 9:1-11 for support, he states that aliens are intraterrestrial, counterfeit life forms from physically cavernous regions inside the Earth. Although I do not agree with Mardis on some of the particulars, I am in general agreement with his most basic conclusion: Aliens are counterfeit life forms produced by fallen angels. Despite such differences in our models, I would recommend his book as good read. His treatment of worms is particularly interesting. I certainly appreciate his FG soteriology.