

NOTES ON GENESIS 6:3–4

©

Thomas F. McDaniel, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus
Palmer Theological Seminary
Wynnewood, Pennsylvania

GENESIS 6:3

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה
לֹא יִדְוֶן רוּחִי בָאָדָם לְעֹלָם
בְּשָׁנִים הוּא בֶּשֶׁר
וְהָיוּ יָמָיו מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה

And the LORD said,
“my spirit will not always strive with man forever
for that he also *is* flesh
yet his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.”

καὶ εἶπεν κύριος ὁ θεός οὐ μὴ καταμείνη τὸ πνεῦμά μου
ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις² εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα
διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σάρκας
ἔσονται δὲ αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτῶν ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἔτη

And the Lord God said, My Spirit shall certainly not remain
among these men for ever,
because they are flesh,
but their days shall be an hundred and twenty years.

The problematic בֶּשֶׁר הוּא בְּשָׁנִים “for that he also *is* flesh”
in 6:3b needs to be read in reverse order and repointed to read
בְּשָׁר הוּא בְּשָׁנִים. Then the antecedent of הוּא “he” is the pre-
ceding בֶּשֶׁר “human” or אָדָם “man” (gender inclusive),

precluding the reading of the ם of MT בְּשִׁנֵּם as the suffix “their,” for which there is no antecedent. Because a verbless clause is unlikely to have the adverbial suffix םָ, the ם of בְּשִׁנֵּם must be either a part of the stem or the plural ם־ ending written *scriptio defectiva*.

If the stem were שג/שגם, it could be the cognate of Arabic شجن/شجن (šajin/šajin) “grief, sorrow, sadness” (Lane 1872: 1510; Wehr 1979: 533).³ If the word were שג it could be either (1) שָׁגַג “to go astray, to sin inadvertently” (BDB 992) or the cognate of Arabic شج/شجة (šaj/šajjat) “to bash in the skull, skull fracture” (Lane 1872: 1504; Wehr 1979: 532).⁴ In light of the focus in 6:5 and 6:11–13 on the increased violence on earth, the Arabic شج (šaj) “skull bashing” is more likely to be the cognate of the שג in 6:3. In this case the ם of שגם would be the suffix ם־, indicating here a *pluralis intensivus*, like the plural עוֹעִים “perverseness” in Isa 19:14 and the נֶאֱפִים “adultery” in Ezek 23: 43.

Given the well attested elision of an א, as in Exo 14:25 where וַיֵּסֶר appears for וַיֵּאֶסֶר,⁵ the stem שג/שגה/שגא “to grow, to increase” cannot be rule out as another derivation for the שג of MT בְּשִׁנֵּם. The Aramaic cognate סג/סגא “multitude/great, greatness” appears regularly without the א (BDB 960; Jastrow 954).

Thus, the MT בְּשִׁנֵּם, traditionally interpreted as “for that also” is better read as a preposition attached to a masculine plural noun with defective spelling with four possible meanings: (1) in sorrow, sadness, grief, (2) into inadvertent sin, (3) into skull bashing, and (4) in multitudes.

The בָּשָׂר הוּא בְּשָׂרִים “flesh” in the revised phrase בָּשָׂר הוּא בְּשָׂרִים, used in reference to אָדָם “earthling, mankind, humanity,” would be best understood as “physical/corporal beings” or “a human being,” like the Arabic بشر (*bašar*) “human being” (Castell 1669: 455; Lane 1863: 208), as opposed to the supra-terrestrial “sons of God,” for whom a flood would have been no threat. The mixed breed of “the sons of the daughters of man and the sons of God,” i.e., the *Nephilim*, were evidently included in the designated בָּשָׂר “flesh, human being(s).”

For purposes of English idiom the singular הוּא and בָּשָׂר may be translated as plurals and the plural שָׂרִים may be rendered as a singular. These options permit בָּשָׂר הוּא בְּשָׂרִים to mean (1) “humans are *in grief*” (שָׂרִים = שָׂרִים or שָׂרִים), (2) “humans are *in error*” (שָׂרִים = שָׂרִים), (3) “humans are *into skull bashing*” (שָׂרִים = שָׂרִים), and (4) “human beings are *in vast numbers*” (שָׂרִים = שָׂרִים).

Option one suggests that the limited human life-span, announced in 6:3b, carried its own burden of grief and sorrow, similar to the curse of *sorrow* (עֲצָבוֹן) announced to Adam and Eve in Gen 3:16–17. Moreover, the grief-stricken human victims of uninvited and unwelcomed heavenly guests, whose offspring were prone to violence, would never live to be a hundred twenty years old. Instead, panic-stricken and grief-stricken they would go prematurely to a watery grave.

Option two, that the human race was into inadvertent sin, would complement the theology of victimization introduced in Gen 6:1–2. In the Eden story of Genesis 3, sin began with the willful desire of Adam and Eve “to become like God”

(i.e., to get power). Though tempted by an earthly serpent, Adam and Eve were responsible for their choosing to eat the forbidden fruit. Efforts to project responsibility— Adam onto Eve, and Eve onto the serpent—lacked credibility, and all three were held accountable and fully responsible. By contrast Genesis 6 articulated a theology of victimization. The extra-terrestrial, super-human “sons of God” impregnated terrestrial women, creating havoc for human beings when the part-alien offspring grew to be giants. Violence became normative and the victimized humans inadvertently sinned when influenced by the their violent half-brothers fathered by the “sons of God.” A key theological difference between Genesis 3 and Genesis 6 can be recovered if the enigmatic **בשגם** meant **בשגים** “into *inadvertent* sin.”⁶

Option three, skull bashing, anticipates the violence spelled out in Gen 6:11, **וַתִּשְׁחַת הָאָרֶץ לְפָנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים וַתִּמְלֵא חָמָס הָאָרֶץ** (“now the earth was corrupt in God’s sight, and the earth was filled with violence”), in 6:12, **כִּי־הִשְׁחִית כָּל־בֶּשֶׁר אֶת־דַּרְכּוֹ עַל־הָאָרֶץ** (“for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth”), and in 6:13, **כִּי־מָלְאָה הָאָרֶץ חָמָס** (“for the earth has become full of violence”). Four words taken from 6:3–4, create the mental image of club swinging cave men: **הַגְּבֻרִים הַשְּׂגִימִים אֲשֶׁר מְעוֹלָם**, “the skull bashing giants of yore.”

According to *option four* the *singular* Adam (**אָדָם**) had become the *multitudinous* (**שְׂגִימִים = שְׂגָמִים = שָׂגָם**) human race (**אָדָם**). Any punishment of all human beings would have to be on a gigantic scale. Consequently, there was a need for

a weapon of mass destruction. Deep flood waters became God’s weapon of choice, though not a perfect weapon since there would be collateral damage in the destruction of innocent “beast, and creeping things, and birds of the heavens” (Gen 6:7; 7:23), as well as unwarranted collateral benefits for the fish and sea-creatures whose watery realm and food supply would be increased for a while.⁷ If the MT **בשגם** in Gen 6:2 referenced the multitudes of human beings, it would have provided a reason for the *gigantic* flood (**וְהַמַּיִם נִבְרְוּ מַאֲדָר**) **עַל-הָאָרֶץ**⁸ to destroy the scattered human masses and their gigantic half-brothers, as narrated in Gen 6:5–7:24.

Recognition of the **שגם** in Gen 6:3b as a possible cognate of **شجن** (*šajin*) “grief” or **شج** (*šaj*) “skull bashing” provides the clue for determining the meaning of **יָדוֹן** in Gen 6:3a. Although the Septuagint translated this verb as *καταμείνη* “dwell, remain,” this evidence was dismissed by many commentators. Skinner (1930: 143) thought that *καταμείνη* was “perhaps nothing more than a plausible guess at the meaning, though a variant text has been suspected (**יָלוֹן**, **יָדוֹר**, **יָכוֹן**, etc.).” A number of Akkadian cognates have been proposed, including (1) *danānu* “to be powerful,” (2) *dinānu* “bodily appearance,” and (3) *dinānu* “substitute, surrogate.” Speiser (1964: 44) concurred with Skinner, stating, “The traditional ‘abide in’ is a guess lacking any linguistic support.” He proposed the third Akkadian cognate above, which led him somehow to translated 6:3 as, “My spirit shall not shield man forever.”

However, the Septuagint's καταμείλη “remain” has good linguistic support from the Arabic *دام / دوم* (*dum / dâma*) which means “it continued, lasted, or existed, incessantly, always, endlessly, for ever . . . it became permanent, perpetual, or everlasting” (Castell 1669: 675; Lane 1867: 935–938; Wehr 1979:350). The Hebrew דִּוֵן is related to *دوم* (*dum*) in the same way that דִּשָן “fat” and *دسم* (*dasam*) “fat” are related. There is simply the well attested *ד / נ* variation, as in the case of שָׁטָן (Num 22:32) and שָׁטָם (Job 30:21), and the names Satan and Mastema (Jubilees 10:8 and 23:25), the latter being the *ʿAph^{el}* participle in the emphatic state (= מִשְׁטָמָא).

Because דִּוֵן by itself could have meant “to remain/abide for ever,” the adverbial modifier לְעֹלָם “forever” may be a later clarifying gloss for the rare דִּוֵן. While Job 12:10 affirmed בְּיָדוֹ נֶפֶשׁ כָּל־חַי וְרוּחַ כָּל־בְּשָׂר־אִישׁ, “in His hand is the *breath*⁹ of all life and the *breath* of every human being,” Gen 6:3 provided the explanation for the transition from the extended life-span of the antediluvian patriarchs to the limited life-span of Noah’s descendants. The spirit/breath from God was universal, but not perpetual. It would be measured out with a maximum fixed limit.

GENESIS 6:4

הַנְּפִלִים הָיוּ בָאָרֶץ בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם
וְגַם אַחֲרֵי־כֵן . . .
הַמָּה הַגְּבֹרִים אֲשֶׁר מֵעוֹלָם אֲנָשֵׁי הַשָּׁמַיִם . . .
the *Nephalim*¹⁰ were on the earth in those days
and also afterward . . .

Those were the mighty men¹¹ who were of old,
men of renown (NKJ)

οἱ δὲ γίγαντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις καὶ μετ’ ἐκεῖνο
... ἐκεῖνοι ἦσαν οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἀπ’ αἰῶνος
οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ὀνομαστοί

and the *giants* were on the earth in those days and after that
... those were the *giants* of old, the men of renown.

According to Num 16:2–33 Korah, accompanied by two-hundred fifty prominent Israelites, confronted Moses saying, “You have gone too far! . . . Why then do you [and Aaron] exalt yourselves above the assembly of the LORD?” These two-hundred fifty plus challengers were identified as being

- נְשִׂיֵי עֵדָה (ἀρχηγοὶ συναγωγῆς) “chiefs of the assembly”
- קְרָאֵי מוֹעֵד (σύγκλητοι βουλῆς) “chosen councillors”
- אַנְשֵׁי-רֵם (ἄνδρες ὀνομαστοί) “men of renown.”

As narrated, their challenge to Moses and Aaron was viewed as a challenge to God himself, who responded by consuming the two-hundred fifty renown gentlemen by fire and having the earth swallow up their entire households.

The modifier אַנְשֵׁי-רֵם “men of renown” used in describing Moses’ challengers has been appealed to by commentators to clarify the אַנְשֵׁי הַרֵם in Gen 6:4c, which was translated in the Septuagint as οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ὀνομαστοί and in the Targum as אַיְנְשֵׁין דְּרֵםָא, both meaning “the men of renown.” The Arabic *sumâ* (سما) “good repute, fame” (Hava 1915: 338) would be the obvious cognate of רֵם “renown.”

However, the original רֵם in 6:4c may not have been what it came to be in the MT, namely, the definite article הַ

attached to the noun שֵׁם “name,” requiring the אֲנָשֵׁי הַשֵּׁם to mean literally “the men of *the* name,” without any hint as to why “name” became definite. Another derivation of הַשֵּׁם needs to be considered.

In *Genesis Rabbah* 26, Rabbi Aha offered a twofold challenge to the interpretation that the אֲנָשֵׁי הַשֵּׁם was the same as אֲנָשֵׁי שֵׁם. He associated the נְבָלִים with נָבָל “foolish,” citing Job 30:8, בְּנֵי-נָבָל גַּם-בְּנֵי בְלִי-שֵׁם, “they are the children of churls, yea, children of ignoble men,” and pondered, “Yet you say that they were ‘men of renown!’” Rabbi Aha interpreted the אֲנָשֵׁי הַשֵּׁם to mean “they laid desolate (הַשְׁיִמוּ) the world, were driven in desolation (הוֹשְׁמִנוּ) from the world, and caused the world to be made desolate (יִשׁוּם).” He obviously associated הַשֵּׁם with הַשֵּׁם/הַשֵּׁם, the *Hiph^{il}* of שָׁמַם “to ravage, to terrify” (Jastrow 1597; Ben-Yehuda 73). But it is difficult to accommodate the ה of the *Hiph^{il}* in a noun form.

The Hebrew הַשֵּׁם in this context is more likely to be the cognate of Arabic هشم (*hašama*) “to destroy, smash, shatter” and its adjective هشيم (*hašîm*) “broken, crushed” (Castell 1669: 891 [*fractus, confractus*]; Lane 1893: 3043; Hava 1915: 828; Wehr 1979: 1206), so that הַשֵּׁם/הַשֵּׁם is a synonym of הַכּוֹס “to treat violently.”¹² If so, the phrase needs to be re-pointed as אֲנָשֵׁי הַשֵּׁם “men of violence.” The following texts addressed the violence initiated by the gigantic *Nephalim*.¹³

- *Enoch* 7:2 “and they [the daughters of men impregnated by the angels] bare great *giants* whose height was 300 ells, who consumed all the acquisitions of men . . . and devoured mankind.”
- *Enoch* 9:10, “and the women have born *giants*, and the

whole earth has thereby been filled with blood and unrighteousness.”

- *Enoch 15:8–11*, “An now, the giants, who are produced from the spirits and flesh, shall be called evil spirits upon the earth And the spirits of the giants afflict, oppress, destroy, attack, do battle, and work destruction on the earth and cause trouble.”
- *Jubilees 5:1–2*, “the angels of God saw them [the daughters of men] . . . and they bare unto them sons and they were *giants*. . . . and they began to devour each other.”
- *Jubilees 7:22–23*, “. . . and the *giants* slew the *Nâphîl* and the *Nâphîl* slew the *Eljô*, and the *Eljô* mankind, and one man another.”
- *I Bar 3:26*, “How vast the territory that [God] possesses! . . . the *giants* were born there who were famous of old, great in stature, expert in war. God did not choose them, nor give them the way to knowledge; so they perished because they had no wisdom; they perished through their own folly.”¹⁴
- *III Maccabees 2:4*, “You destroyed men for their wicked deeds in the past, among them *giants* relying on their own strength and self-confidence.”
- *1Q23 Frag. 9 + 14 + 15*, “2[. . .] they knew the secrets of [. . .] 3[. . . si]n was great in the earth [. . .] 4[. . .] and they killed many [. . .] 5[. . . they begat] giants [. . .].”¹⁵
- *Sirach 16:7*, “he was not propitiated for the ancient *giants* who revolted in their might.”
- *Wisdom of Solomon 14:6*, “for even in the beginning, when arrogant *giants* were perishing, the hope of the world took refuge on a raft.”

- *Ezekiel 32:27*, “and they do not lie with the fallen mighty (גִּבּוֹרִים נְפִלִים) men of old . . . because they were the terror of the mighty in the land of the living.”¹⁶
- *Numbers 13:33*, there we saw the *giants* (הַנְּפִילִים) who were the sons of Anaq from the *giants* (הַנְּפִילִים), and we seemed to ourselves like grasshoppers.”¹⁷
- *Genesis Rabbah 26*, “*Awim* [the seventh name of the *Nephilim*] denotes that they cast the world into ruins, were themselves driven from the world in ruin, and caused the world to be ruined, as you read, עֲנָה עֲנָה עֲנָה ‘A ruin, a ruin, a ruin’ will I make it” (Ezek 21:27, MT 21:32).

If the שֵׁן of MT בְּשֵׁנָם in 6:3 is related to the Arabic شج / شجة (*šaj/šajjat*) “skull bashing, breaking someone’s head,” as suggested above, there is additional support from Arabic that the הַשֵּׁם of 6:4 is related to هشم (*hašama*) “to destroy.” Lane (1872: 1505) cited ten different epithets for the different levels of “skull bashing,” the first five of which are not serious enough to require retaliation. But the seventh epithet, which requires a mulch of ten camels, is هاشمة (*hâšimat*) “a broken bone, a fracture of the skull.” Therefore, when in Hebrew the enigmatic שֵׁן/שָׁן (used in reference to בְּשָׂר “human being”) and the problematic הַשֵּׁם (used in reference to אִנְשׁ “human being”) appear in adjoining verses in a text which rails against human violence, they are likely to be related to each other as the Arabic شج (*šaj*) and هشم (*hašama*) would be in a similar text.

CONCLUSION

Plaut (1974:58) acknowledged that Gen 6:1–6 was “the one mythological fragment retained in Genesis,” and then demythologize it with the following interpretation:

Men became giants, achieved renown in their time, and were heroes by their own values. When God evaluated human development, He looked neither at man’s size nor at his reputation, but at his heart, and he found its devices evil. Hence, God resolved to make a new start with Noah.

But quite to the contrary, for the narrative theologian who penned Genesis 6, the *Nephilim* were neither אָדָם “men” nor אֲנֹשִׁי־יָשָׁר “men of renown.” They were infamous, not famous. Contrary to Enoch 15:8, which states “the giants . . . shall be called evil spirits,” in Gen 6:3–4 the giants were fictional corporal beings (בְּשָׂר), a mixed breed from supra-terrestrial fathers and terrestrial mothers. Scholarly conjectures about lost legends of beloved human heroes of yore—seemingly hinted at in the epithet אֲנֹשִׁי־הַיָּשָׁר—have been misdirected because the epithet originally was probably אֲנֹשִׁי־הַשָּׂדֶה “men of destruction,” i.e., those who were gifted in *skull bashing* (שָׂדֶה = שָׂגִים) and *skulldugery* (Enoch 9:6).

Genesis 6:1–6, as narrative theology, used mythology to offer an alternative explanation on the origin of evil other than the one given in Genesis 1–3. The creation story affirmed that evil did not come from God because everything God created was good or very good. The Eden story affirmed that evil was earthly in its origin and the responsibility of earth’s preeminent creatures: Adam and Eve, who were in the image of God, and the serpent which was the “wisest of the beasts of the field.”

Genesis 6 marks the beginning of a theology of victimization which eventually ended up with the affirmation “the devil made me do it.” To be sure, there is no devil in Genesis 2–3 nor in Genesis 6—only a renegade reptile in the former story and some horny angels in the latter text. But the brief account in Gen 6:1–6 became the catalyst for expanded narratives (like Enoch 6–11) about fallen angels (נְפִלִים) which were ultimately responsible for human violence, sin, and sorrow.

The four definitions cited above for the בְּשָׂגִים of שָׂגָם (namely, שְׂגִיאוֹת “multitudes,” שָׂגָם “grief,” שְׂגִיָּים “error,” and שְׂגִיָּים “skull bashing”), suggest an author’s well intentioned multiple layers of meaning and permit the following paraphrase of several phrases in Gen 6:3–4.

My spirit will not abide in men and women forever.

*Multitudinous
human beings are
into skull bashing, in grief, in sin.*

So their days will be one hundred twenty years.

*The Nephalim . . .
were the giants of yore,
the men of violence.*

NOTES

1. Reading the MT בְּשָׂגִים as a compound of the preposition בְּ, the relative particle שֶׁ, and the adverb מְאֵד, a combination which occurs only in this verse (BDB 993; GKC 67^p; Skinner 1910: 143–244; von Rad 1961: 111). Skinner provided a list of objections to this derivation. The Septuagint’s διὰ τὸ “because” does not reflect the מְאֵד “moreover.”

2. Given the graphic similarity of נ and ז and the occasional confusion of מ and ה, the נם of the MT בְּשֵׁנִים may have been misread as זה by the Septuagint translators. Delitzsch (1920: 116) cited seven examples of the מ/ה confusion, including (1) Psa 35:5 where the MT דוּחָה “driving away” became ἐκθλίβων αὐτούς “afflicting *them*” (= דוּחָה) in the Septuagint, and (2) Ezek 45:1 where the MT עֶשְׂרֵה אֲלֵף “10,000” became εἴκοσι χιλιάδας “20,000” (= עֶשְׂרֵה אֲלֵף).

3. Although one might expect the Hebrew cognate to be שָׁנָן rather than שָׁנָם, the interchange of a מ and נ is well attested. The Arabic ان (ʾin) “if” and the Hebrew אם “if” is one example of the מ and נ variation. The נָגַר/מָגַר variant in Ezek 21:17 and 35:5 is another, for 21:17 reads מְגֹרֵי אֶל־חֶרֶב הֵיוּ אֶת־עַמִּי “they are *delivered over* (מָגַר) to the sword with my people,” whereas 35:5 reads וַתִּגַּר אֶת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל־יְדֵי־חֶרֶב “you *delivered* (נָגַר) the Israelites *over* to the power of the sword.” See also note 4.

4. Ordinarily the Arabic ش (š) would be a ש in Hebrew, but there are a number of cognates where a ש matches the Arabic ش (š), including: (1) שָׁבִיב “flame” and شب (šabba) “to kindle a fire, to blaze, to flame” and شبة (šabbat) “a blazing, flaming fire”; (2) תִּשְׁוֹקָה “desire, longing” and شوق (šawq) “desire, yearning, longing of the soul” and ذو شوق (dū šawqin) “an admiring lover”; and (3) חֲשָׂרָה “collection” and حشر (ḥašara) “to collect.” If the MT ש of שָׁנָם is retained rather than repointed as a ש, the שָׁנָן which is the cognate of شج (šaj) could be another example of exceptions to the general pattern of ش (š) = ש and س (s) = ש.

5. On the elision of the ש, note Delitzsch, 1920: 21–22, §14^{a-c} and GKC 23^f and 68^{h,k}. Other noteworthy elisions include: וַתִּשְׂרַחֲנִי

and ותזרני in the parallel texts of Ps 18:40 and 2 Sam 22:40; האסורים and הסורים in Ecc 4:14; יהל for יאהל in Isa 13:20; חמתיכם and תבו for חמאתיכם and תאבו in Lev 26:18 and 26:21 in 11QpaleoLev.

6. The theme of inadvertent sin becomes very dominant in the post-diluvian Noah narrative when (1) Noah *innocently* drinks stale grape juice, (2) became *unintentionally* intoxicated, (3) *unknowingly* exposed himself while asleep, (4) whereupon Ham *accidentally* saw his nakedness—which led Noah in his stupor to *incoherently* cursed his grandson, Canaan, because of what Ham *inadvertently* did. The only intentional acts in the entire episode were those of Ham who alerted his brothers who were then careful to cover their father without looking at him.

7. Jubilees 5:2–3 reads in part, “. . . all flesh corrupted its ways, alike men and cattle and beasts and birds and everything that walks on earth—all of them corrupted their ways and their orders.”

8. Note the use of the verb נָבַר in Gen 7:18–20, 24 and the noun גְּבֵרִים in 6:4. There would be enough flood waters to drown the “giants,” i.e. the גְּבֵרִים who were also known as the נְפִלִים.

9. Note the Arabic cognates *نفس* (*nafs*) “soul, spirit, vital principle” and *نفس* (*nafas*) “breath,” the latter of which suggest that נָפֶשׁ here may be the synonym of רוּחַ “breath.” Lane (1893: 2827) provided an extended citation dealing with the differences between the *نفس* (*nafs*) and the *روح* (*ruh*), i.e., נָפֶשׁ and רוּחַ, noting that God takes away *نفس* when one sleeps and the *روح* is taken away when one dies.

10. The transliteration of נְפִלִים as *Nephilim* appears in the ASV, NAB, NAS, NAU, NIB, NIV, NJB, NRS, and RSV, in disagreement with the Septuagint, Vulgate, Targum, KJV, and NKJ which understood נְפִלִים to mean “giants.”

11. The Greek γίγαντες for the Hebrew גִּבּוֹרִים reflects a definition of גִּבּוֹר which corresponds to the Arabic cognate جبار (*gab-bâr*) “huge, tall, and strong, a giant, one who is tyrannical, who is extravagant in acts of disobedience and in wrong doing” (Lane 1865: 375) and the Aramaic גִּבּוֹרָא “strong, hero, giant” (Jastrow 234).

12. It is most unlikely that the הַשָּׂם in Gen 6:2 is related to the Arabic هاشم (*haššama*) “to honor anyone,” هاشم (*hašim*) “generous, bountiful,” هشام (*hišâm*) “generosity, bounty,” or تهشم (*tahaššama*) “to conciliate anyone, to show kindness” (Castell 1669: 891; Wehr 1979: 1206; Hava 1915: 828). Note the name הַשָּׂם in I Chron 11:34 and the modern day Hashemite kingdom in Jordan. See above, note 4, for ש (š) being a ש or ש in a Hebrew cognate.

13. Enoch 6:4–5 reads as follows, “Let us all swear an oath and all bind ourselves by mutual imprecations not to abandon this plan but to do this thing [to choose wives from among the children of men].’ Then swear they all together and bound themselves by mutual imprecations upon it. There were in all two hundred . . .” The *Nephilim* in this tradition became “ones who swore oaths,” as though the נַפְלִים of נַפְלִים were the cognate of Arabic نفل (*nafala*) “to swear, to take an oath” and *naffala* “to give an oath to” (Hava 1915: 789–790).

14. In this tradition the enigmatic נַפְלִים was taken to be a variant form of נְבִלִים “foolish ones” (BDB 614). The ב/פ variation is found elsewhere, like בָּזַר and פָּזַר “to scatter.” For the confusion of ב and פ, see Delitzsch 1920: 115.

15. Other parts of the “Book of Giants” found at Qumran are found in 4Q203, 2Q26, 4Q530–532, 6Q8, available online at <http://www.piney.com/DSSBkGiants.html>, or in *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A New Translation*, by Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, Jr., and Edward Cook (San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishing) 1996.

16. For the MT **וְלֹא יִשְׁכְּבוּ אֶת־גְּבוּרִים נְפִלִים מֵעֲרָלִים**, the Septuagint reads *καὶ ἐκοιμήθησαν μετὰ τῶν γιγάντων τῶν πεπτωκότων ἀπὸ αἰῶνος*, “and they are laid with the giants that fell of old.” The significant differences in the Septuagint are (1) the absence of any negative for the MT **וְלֹא**, and (2) reading **מֵעוֹלָם** “from of old” for the MT **מֵעֲרָלִים** “from the uncircumcised.” The *πεπτωκότων* “fallen ones” supports the MT **נְפִלִים**, although it is very tempting to repoint **נְפִלִים** to **נְפִלִים** or to assume a haplography of what was originally **נְפִלִים נְפִלִים**.

Rather than ignoring the MT **וְלֹא** in Ezek 32:27, as did R. S. Hendel (“Of Demigods and the Deluge,” *JBL* 106 [1987]: 22), it should be repointed as **וְלֹא־**, i.e., the conjunction followed by the emphatic **לֵ/לֹא־** “surely, actually, indeed.” This emphatic particle appears also in Ezek 20:25, “I gave them statutes that were *indeed* good,” in agreement with 20:11, “I gave them my statutes . . . by whose observance man shall live.” Once the emphatic particle is restored in 20:25, most of 20:26 should be restored to follow 20:27, reading,

It is again your fathers blasphemed me, by dealing treacherously with me, (saying) that I defiled them through their very gifts in making them offer by fire all their first-born, that I might horrify them.

This restoration has the support of 20:31, where Ezekiel quotes God as saying, “when you offer your gifts and sacrifice your sons by fire, you defile yourselves with all your idols to this day.”

The point being made in Ezek 32:27 is that whereas (1) the king of Meshech-Tubal, along with all his hordes, was *actually* (= **לֵ/לֹא־**) buried alongside the fallen giants of yore, and (2) was adorned in death with his sword as a pillow and his body-shield as a blanket, but (3) the Pharaoh of Egypt shall be slain by the sword and buried simply with uncircumcised and unadorned rival warlords.

17. This identification of the *Anakim* with the *Nephilim* assumes that some of the *Nephilim* survived the flood. But the Wisdom of

Solomon 14:6, “for even in the beginning, when arrogant giants were perishing, the hope of the world took refuge on a raft,” suggests otherwise.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

<http://tmcdaniel.palmerseminary.edu/cbbp-bibliography11pt.pdf>