

Original Sin and pagan gods.

The Urth list — 8 messages, 5 voices, 09 Aug 2006

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/4684>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

b sharp — 09 Aug 2006, 11:38

James B. Jordan writes regarding the fallen angel origin of the Nephilim:

Nephilim simply means "powerful men" "great rulers,"

but isn't the word also derived from the Hebrew for "fallen"?

also he writes:

True, "son of God" means "ruler" in the Hebrew, and is used for angels once or twice, but it also >means "believer" and that is what it means here.

The beginning of Genesis 6 says:

6:1 And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, 6:2 That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.

This indicates to me that the "sons of God" were not men and their intercourse with human women was something different from the human reproduction which had already covered the face of the earth. Why would God need to cleanse the earth of "believers" with a flood, which is described immediately after?

and James says:

The sons of God who married the daughters of men because they were "good" (same word used >of the fruit Eve plucked) were the Sethites who married with the daughters of the Cainites. This >is clear from the context. In Genesis 4-5, men of the Sethite line worshipped Yahweh

So, the forbidden fruit Eve plucked was good? And "The serpent's job was to train them in wisdom". And what were these Sethite line guys doing when the rest of humanity was multiplying. Why did they only discover the daughters of men later? I have trouble understanding all this, especially with a more clear, alternate explanation available.

and lastly James B. Jordan writes:

Without interviewing him, there is really no way to know what Wolfe might be thinking about >such things, hence no way to know what his allusions might be. Moreover, Wolfe may be alluding >to fantastical readings of Genesis (e.g., Lilith) that he himself does not believe. So, be careful, and don't over-read.

Yes, but aren't you the James Jordan who did interview Wolfe and to whom he explicitly stated his belief in the reality of pagan gods? Regarding Lilith, yes, James Jordan and Roy Lackey had a discussion of Wolfe's use of this myth in regard to Copperhead about five years ago. Why would his use of Lilith in BotNS be surprising? And at the risk of sounding disrespectful and irreverent I must ask if the admonition to be careful and not over-read also applies to Bible reading ;-)?

-bsharp

James B. Jordan — 09 Aug 2006, 15:42 · in reply to b sharp

At 06:38 AM 8/9/2006, you wrote:

James B. Jordan writes regarding the fallen angel origin of the Nephilim:

Nephilim simply means "powerful men" "great rulers,"

but isn't the word also derived from the Hebrew for "fallen"?

Or, those who fall upon others.

But, for the rest, my point was that all of these things have multiple understandings. I don't want to be taken as "pulling rank" or anything, but as it happens I am the author of two books on the early parts of Genesis, so I'm aware of lots of views, very common views. I shared mine, but this is not the place to argue for my views. My point was that it's hard to know which of the various understandings of these texts are the ones Wolfe tends toward, and even if we did know, that would not tell us whether he might be employing a reading that he regards as erroneous for literary purposes. To wit, he may share the (most common) view that the sons of God are Sethites, but choose to employ the (minority) view that they are angels.

I intended only a cautionary note. @>----

Pat. Nutria

also he writes:

True, "son of God" means "ruler" in the Hebrew, and is used for angels once or twice, but it also >means "believer" and that is what it means here.

The beginning of Genesis 6 says:

6:1 And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them,

6:2 That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.

This indicates to me that the "sons of God" were not men and their intercourse with human women was something different from the human reproduction which had already covered the face of the earth. Why would God need to cleanse the earth of "believers" with a flood, which is described immediately after?

and James says:

The sons of God who married the daughters of men because they were "good" (same word used >of the fruit Eve plucked) were the Sethites who married with the daughters of the Cainites. This >is clear from the context. In Genesis 4-5, men of the Sethite line worshipped Yahweh

So, the forbidden fruit Eve plucked was good? And "The serpent's job was to train them in wisdom". And what were these Sethite line guys doing when the rest of humanity was multiplying. Why did they only discover the daughters of men later? I have trouble understanding all this, especially with a more clear, alternate explanation available.

and lastly James B. Jordan writes:

Without interviewing him, there is really no way to know what Wolfe might be thinking about >such things, hence no way to know what his allusions might be. Moreover, Wolfe may be alluding >to fantastical readings of Genesis (e.g., Lilith) that he himself does not believe. So, be careful, and don't over-read.

Yes, but aren't you the James Jordan who did interview Wolfe and to whom he explicitly stated his belief in the reality of pagan gods? Regarding

Lilith, yes, James Jordan and Roy Lackey had a discussion of Wolfe's use of this myth in regard to Copperhead about five years ago. Why would his use of Lilith in BotNS be surprising? And at the risk of sounding disrespectful and irreverent I must ask if the admonition to be careful and not over-read also applies to Bible reading ;-)?

-bsharp

Chris — 09 Aug 2006, 21:25 · in reply to b sharp

James B. Jordan writes regarding the fallen angel origin of the Nephilim:

Nephilim simply means "powerful men" "great rulers,"

but isn't the word also derived from the Hebrew for "fallen"?

Just wanted to throw in there that the idea of fallen angels mating with human females to beget giant children is not really a matter of translation, it's part of Jewish myth that goes back at least as far as the written text.

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 09 Aug 2006, 22:33 · in reply to Chris

On 8/9/06, Chris <rasputin_ at hotmail.com> wrote:

Just wanted to throw in there that the idea of fallen angels mating with human females to beget giant children is not really a matter of translation, it's part of Jewish myth that goes back at least as far as the written text.

"At least?" Now, how would we know that? The earliest place such a myth is likely to be documented is in one Talmud, which dates to ... well, depends on whether you're talking about Mishnah or Gemarah, but in any case, well after the time of Christ. Figure the redaction of Genesis at the fourth or fifth century BC, and you've got between six and eight hundred years.

Mind, the stuff in the Mishnah was generally considered "ancient" at the time it was compiled, but unless you know of a reference rather older than that, I have trouble with the claim that these myths go "at least as far back as the written text."

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes, writer, trainer, bon vivant

<http://www.livejournal.com/users/sturgeonslawyer>

"Shovels are essential to the fantasy genre.

However, they are primarily used by the authors rather than the characters." -- Stephen R. Donaldson

Chris — 10 Aug 2006, 00:17 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

While it's difficult to produce references from an oral tradition, granted, there isn't much reason to believe otherwise. As you note the stories were regarded as ancient, and with a consistency that tends to indicate an origin that was not recent at the time.

Also a useful general source (I forget who it was that was raising etymological points about "nefilim"):

<http://jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=24&letter=F>

On 8/9/06, Chris <rasputin_ at hotmail.com> wrote:

Just wanted to throw in there that the idea of fallen angels mating with human females to beget giant children is not really a matter of translation, it's part of Jewish myth that goes back at least as far as the written text.

"At least?" Now, how would we know that? The earliest place such a myth is likely to be documented is in one Talmud, which dates to ... well, depends on whether you're talking about Mishnah or Gemarah, but in any case, well after the time of Christ. Figure the redaction of Genesis at the fourth or fifth century BC, and you've got between six and eight hundred years.

Mind, the stuff in the Mishnah was generally considered "ancient" at the time it was compiled, but unless you know of a reference rather older than that, I have trouble with the claim that these myths go "at least as far back as the written text."

--

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes, writer, trainer, bon vivant

<http://www.livejournal.com/users/sturgeonslawyer>

"Shovels are essential to the fantasy genre.

However, they are primarily used by the authors rather than the characters." -- Stephen R. Donaldson

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 10 Aug 2006, 00:49 · in reply to Chris

On 8/9/06, Chris <rasputin_ at hotmail.com> wrote:

As you note the stories were regarded as ancient, and with a consistency that tends to indicate an origin that was not recent at the time.

Well, that's the rub "Not recent" at the time the Mishnah was compiled could be any time before the Diaspora.

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes, writer, trainer, bon vivant

<http://www.livejournal.com/users/sturgeonslawyer>

"Shovels are essential to the fantasy genre.

However, they are primarily used by the authors rather than the characters." -- Stephen R. Donaldson

Bob Miller — 11 Aug 2006, 04:45 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

??? Sorry, The Book of Enoch is older and translated, several versions, online. Sure read to me like giants and the children of men mated.

On 8/9/06, Chris <rasputin_ at hotmail.com> wrote:

Just wanted to throw in there that the idea of fallen angels mating with human females to beget giant children is not really a matter of translation, it's part of Jewish myth that goes back at least as far as the written text.

"At least?" Now, how would we know that? The earliest place such a myth is likely to be documented is in one Talmud, which dates to ... well, depends on whether you're talking about

Mishnah or Gemarah, but in any case, well after the time of Christ. Figure the redaction of Genesis at the fourth or fifth century BC, and you've got between six and eight hundred years.

Mind, the stuff in the Mishnah was generally considered "ancient" at the time it was compiled, but unless you know of a reference rather older than that, I have trouble with the claim that these myths go "at least as far back as the written text."

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes, writer, trainer, bon vivant

<http://www.livejournal.com/users/sturgeonslawyer>

"Shovels are essential to the fantasy genre.

However, they are primarily used by the authors rather than the characters." -- Stephen R. Donaldson

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 11 Aug 2006, 05:31 · in reply to Bob Miller

On 8/10/06, Bob Miller <bob_bageera at hotmail.com> wrote:

??? Sorry, The Book of Enoch is older and translated, several versions, online. Sure read to me like giants and the children of men mated.

Okay, I'll have to check that out; I haven't read very much of the apocryphal stuff except for a few Gnostic gospels. Thanks for the pointer.

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes, writer, trainer, bon vivant

<http://www.livejournal.com/users/sturgeonslawyer>

"Shovels are essential to the fantasy genre.

However, they are primarily used by the authors rather than the characters." -- Stephen R. Donaldson