



Scriptures and Doctrine :: "In a Beginning" / Lilith

"In a Beginning" / Lilith - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/3/30 2:15

We had an interesting speaker come to our seminary class today. Her credentials were a mile long. She is a Messianic Jew, a native Israeli, works for the Israeli army, has multiple degrees, works for the RCC church as an exorcist though she is not Catholic, PhDs, etc, etc. I did not agree with many of her views, but would like to hear if anyone does. These included:

- 1) Gen 1:1 was "a beginning" not "the beginning" according to the Hebrew.
- 2) According to Jewish folklore, Lilith was Adam's first wife, who did not conceive, but his third, Eve, did (can't remember the supposed second).

Again, I don't buy into either view, curious if any of you do.

Tidbits of info I found interesting that she discussed were:

- 1) She claims she infiltrated Illuminati meetings and everything we hear about them is for real
- 2) Masonry is called "The New Builders" in Hebrew in Israel, not Free-Masons
- 3) Free-Masons dedicate their children to Lucifer at 30th degree (generational curse)
- 4) She would not comment on the Roman church

Any thoughts welcome, it was interesting, though there was much I disagreed with. It was interesting to get the Jewish view of Hell, American Christianity, politics, etc, etc.

Re: "In a Beginning" / Lilith, on: 2006/3/30 4:09

My goodness, you shur do get some "different" speakers, wherever you go to school. Must be all sorts of different spirits in the halls.

Yikes.

She sounds a bit Kabbalah-ish, which some Messianics unfortunately have gone to.

I would have asked her if she leads the folks she exorcises to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ ... etc.

She's definitely got a mixed bag there. Unfortunately, as soon as someone says they're a Saved Jew, everyone flocks to them and listens to anything. :-)

Anyways, she got #1 alright and it's sorta the same for John 1:1 in the sense that in Gen.1 that was not the "beginning" of matter.

Because the earth was "void and without form" so it wasn't the beginning for the earth, but the beginning of the earth we have now.

John 1:1 puts that "the" in there too, that shouldn't be there ... cuz Jesus had no beginning. So it's more that His beginning had no beginning. Just the "IN THE" in both of those passages are not there really ... just 'beginning' is.

#2 is extra-biblical poppy cosh. We have Eve only in The Word.

Then the illunati is real so there's a second truth mingled in with Lord knows what.

Masons do worship Lucifer in the higher degrees, so it's not unlikely that the higher degrees may do that.

Whatever Masons are called there matters little.

And being mixed with Catholicism scares me a bit if she couldn't comment on it.

I don't suppose I'd want to go to that school though.

At Bible College, we couldn't take the "Cults" class till the Senior year ... so is that what class you're in, with all these "different" speakers coming in to display their "stuff" ?

If it's a Seminary ... what's wrong with just the truth ? :-?

How are you guys supposed to learn "The Truth" if they keep parading all'a these "different" speakers through ?

Oh well, I'm a bigot.

Be careful there, will ya. ha.

Love.

Annie

Re: Cults Class - Hoy Vey !, on: 2006/3/30 4:24

<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/~humh/Topics/Lilith/>

<http://www.geocities.com/athens/forum/9991/know.html>

Re: Cults Class II, on: 2006/3/30 4:39

I can only say that this excerpt is connected to Sweet Briar College somehow, cuz I can't give the link, cuz of lots of bad pictures (I could give it to your wife though), but here's a very short excerpt from article ...

""In an effort to explain inconsistencies in the Old Testament, there developed in Jewish literature a complex interpretive system called the midrash which attempts to reconcile biblical contradictions and bring new meaning to the scriptural text.

Employing both a philological method and often an ingenious imagination, midrashic writings, which reached their height in the 2nd century CE, influenced later Christian interpretations of the Bible. Inconsistencies in the story of Genesis, especially the two separate accounts of creation, received particular attention. Later, beginning in the 13th century CE, such questions were also taken up in Jewish mystical literature known as the Kabbalah.

According to midrashic literature, Adam's first wife was not Eve but a woman named Lilith, who was created in the first Genesis account. Only when Lilith rebelled and abandoned Adam did God create Eve, in the second account, as a replacement. In an important 13th century Kabbalah text, the Sefer ha-Zohar ("The Book of Splendour") written by the Spaniard Moses de Leon (c. 1240-1305), it is explained that:

At the same time Jehovah created Adam, he created a woman, Lilith, who like Adam was taken from the earth. She was given to Adam as his wife. But there was a dispute between them about a matter that when it came before the judges had to be discussed behind closed doors. She spoke the unspeakable name of Jehovah and vanished.

In the Alphabet of Ben Sira (Alphabetum Siracidis, or Sefer Ben Sira), an anonymous collection of midrashic proverbs probably compiled in the 11th century C.E., it is explained more explicitly that the conflict arose because Adam, as a way of asserting his authority over Lilith, (23 A-B). Lilith, however, considering herself to be Adam's equal, refused, and after pronouncing the Ineffable Name (i.e. the magic name of God) flew off into the air.

Adam, distraught and no doubt also angered by her insolent behaviour, wanted her back. On Adam's request, God sent three angels, named Senoy, Sansenoy, and Semangelof, who found her in the Red Sea. Despite the threat from the three angels that if she didn't return to Adam one hundred of her sons would die every day, she refused, claiming that she would

as created expressly to harm newborn infants. However, she did swear that she would not harm any infant wearing an amulet with the images and/or names of the three angels on it.

At this point, the legend of Lilith as the "first Eve" merges with the earlier legend of Sumero-Babylonian origin, dating from around 3,500 BCE, of Lilith as a winged female demon who kills infants and endangers women in childbirth. In this role, she was one of several mazakim or "harmful spirits" known from incantation formulas preserved in Assyrian, Hebrew, and Canaanite inscriptions intended to protect against them. As a female demon, she is closely related to Lamashtu whose evilness ..."

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/3/30 10:40

I was thinking Kabbalah while she was speaking.

Our parent school is in Israel, Holy Lands University. Our professor tells us ahead of time when non-believers or people with strange doctrine are going to be speaking. He brings them in for their expertise in particular fields. They also realize when they are speaking that there are many in the room whom may disagree with what they bring up.

Many in our class are already ordained. When these speakers come in, we end up asking them about all their doctrines. While we don't agree with them, we get to dialogue with people to look into the world view they bring in. We are studying ancient Israel, so everyone we are bringing in is from Israel or works there, studying the area. So these are people who handle the Dead Sea Scrolls, dig up the artifacts, have been in the Qumran caves, etc, etc.

We are not learning doctrine to replace what we have, but why not dialogue with these people to know what people on the other side of the world believe.

I am a KJV-reading, young earth creationist, sold out fundamentalist, hook-line-and-sinker Jesus guy. These people are not changing our doctrine, but rather showing us where they get theirs.

Yes, the lady did say she leads people to Christ.

Our professor is fundamentalist Christian, and I think everyone in the class would either label themselves fundamentalist or evangelical. Our professor has explained that there are few conservative fundamentalist or evangelical Christians that also carry the credentials to speak on archaeology, Dead Sea Scrolls, land/nature/society, etc, that have true 'hands on' knowledge of Israel. That's why these people are brought in.

Re:, on: 2006/3/30 12:04

Wasn't questioning you bro, but you asked for "any thoughts" ... so I figured it was open discussion ... that's all.

Love you LGB.
Annie

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/3/30 13:44

All your thoughts are welcome. I just wanted to reassure you that we were not learning foundational doctrine out of this class, but rather getting a true feel of Israel then and now.

Feel free to post any other thoughts.

Re: Sympathy for the devil.... - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2006/4/3 11:15

Quote:

MeAgain wrote:

Masons do worship Lucifer in the higher degrees, so it's not unlikely that the higher degrees may do that.

Actually, this isn't entirely correct. To my knowledge there is only one type of freemasonry that entertains the Luciferian Doctrine in any way, and that is the Southern Jurisdiction's Scottish Rite in the United States. The accusation comes from a five sentence statement made in Albert Pike's "Morals and Dogma" (which incidently is a veritable "telephone book" in size) which deals with worldviews and philosophies of various epochs and cultures, and how they relate to what he considers to be the fundamental principles of civilised society, which are liberty, equality and fraternity. Pike sought to deny the existence of the devil by claiming that the Hebrews changing the "accuser (satan)" into an author of evil, after returning from Persian captivity and it's dualist belief in a "good deity" and an "evil deity".

People who mention "Lucifer" to freemasons, leave them thinking that they will find out that they are really "devil worshippers" at a certain degree, but technically, this isn't the case. The only common theme in freemasonry (bearing in mind that there are so many different branches of freemasonry, without even considering Illuminism, Rosacruscionism, etc, which Freemasons tend to distance themselves from) is their requirement of belief in a "supreme being" without requiring that he be known as a specific identity (eg, Y-HW-H, Jesus, Allah, etc). This implies a deification of man, due to his ability to choose his own god. Granted that this is the core theme of LaVeyan Satanism and Alistair Crowley's philosophy, "Do as thou wilt, that is the whole law", but when people hear "devil worshipper" in the meaning of "Luciferian", they expect that they'll find out that they are worshipping some guy named "the devil", or "satan". The reality is that true Satanists worship themselves, not some "demonic deity".

Luciferian Doctrine merely highlights that Isaiah wasn't referring to Satan as Lucifer, but that Lucifer is the latin word for "light bearer" and is being used to describe Nebuchadnezzar claiming to be divine. The same word is used in Messianic prophecy, which means that it could be used to refer to Jesus. To the Luciferian, it isn't a matter of "deifying Satan" but referring to their understanding of the "Holy Spirit" as the "light bearer (Lucifer)". What they miss is that Nebuchadnezzar's actions parallel those of Satan, claiming the right to direct man away from God's will in the garden, thereby claiming to be God and being a "false light to the world".

Before I had researched this, I used to tell Freemasons that the higher degrees worship the devil, which their Worshipful Masters could truthfully deny. In Australia particularly, there is only York Rite Freemasonry, which carries Christian overtones (in spite of the whole "supreme being" thing), which would leave me looking stupid for making such claims. But when you tell a freemason that their claim that all the gods are the same, they quickly change the subject to things like, "If God is a God of love, then why is there human suffering in the world?" A sure sign that you've hit a nerve.

We may only get one chance to plead our case with a man, be careful that you don't try to build that case on erroneous ground, as double jeopardy can apply when it comes to a man's soul.

In His service.

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/4/3 22:50

Good comments. Thanks.

Re:, on: 2006/4/3 23:52

<http://www.saintsalive.com/freemasonry.html>

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2006/4/5 10:23

Quote:

MeAgain wrote:

<http://www.saintsalive.com/freemasonry.html>

May I recommend this site, but only if you are prepared to spit out bones: (<http://www.masonicinfo.com/lucifer.htm>) <http://www.masonicinfo.com/lucifer.htm> and (<http://www.masonicinfo.com/pike.htm>) <http://www.masonicinfo.com/pike.htm>. This site is a Freemason rebuttal site, and where I got some of the previous info that I posted. One thing that is a little misleading, is that Lucifer is mentioned in "Morals and Dogma" a few times outside the famous three sentences, and references to the Devil, which water down his influence in the world, and comes very close to flatly rejecting can be found by running a search over the document.

This gives an example of a Freemason come back to accusations of Devil Worship. Be careful of "Christian" anti-masonic sites, as some are over zealous in blowing minor issues into major ones.

One good site that I would recommend is (<http://www.ephesians5-11.org/>) www.ephesians5-11.org.

Want to find a smoking gun of Freemasonry, look into (<http://www.ephesians5-11.org/hiram.htm>) Hiram Abiff.

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/4/26 16:19

Quote:
-----Anyways, she got #1 alright and it's sorta the same for John 1:1 in the sense that in Gen.1 that was not the "beginning" of matter.

Genesis 1:1 is unquestionably referring to "The Beginning. It says, "in the Beginning God created the heavens and the earth." To create is to form out of nothing, That is to bring into being.

But Genesis 2 shows us the earth in a different condition from the original as the Hebrew "Was" should be translated "became" as it is the same word used as "And Adam "became" a living soul."

And according to subsequent scripture, it is greatly supported that the great rebellion of Lucifer and a third of the heavenly hosts took place between vs. 1 and vs. 2 showing that the 6 days following are literal days, but not the original creation. That is, they are a restoration of the universe, brought into judgment because of the rebellion of the ruler of the world, that is Lucifer.

How long this interval was there is no record, But when the Spirit of God began to brood upon the surface of the waters, it was to recover and to remake the world.

The six days are a recovery of the world and a remaking of it.

This both accounts for the fossil record as well as supports the scriptures which assert the present world was formed out of water.

And that, "God did not create the world a waste place but created it to be inhabited"

Many of the most used believers and servants of Christ have seen this is the record and hold this view.

This view was first brought to light by G. H. Pember in his book, "Earth's Earliest Ages" and subsequently embraced and held by many such as Jessie Penn Lewis, Watchman Nee, A. A. Pink, and many others.

Graftedbranch