

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: OT Texts Regarding Satan's Origin****OT Texts Regarding Satan's Origin - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/7/10 21:02**

There are a couple of OT passages that are commonly used to explain Satan's origin.

From Ezekiel 28:

"11 Moreover the word of the Lord came to me, saying, 12 "Son of man, take up a lamentation for the king of Tyre, and say to him, "Thus says the Lord God:

"You were the seal of perfection,
Full of wisdom and perfect in beauty.
13 You were in Eden, the garden of God;
Every precious stone was your covering:
The sardius, topaz, and diamond,
Beryl, onyx, and jasper,
Sapphire, turquoise, and emerald with gold.
The workmanship of your timbrels and pipes
Was prepared for you on the day you were created.

14 "You were the anointed cherub who covers;
I established you;
You were on the holy mountain of God;
You walked back and forth in the midst of fiery stones.
15 You were perfect in your ways from the day you were created,
Till iniquity was found in you.

16 "By the abundance of your trading
You became filled with violence within,
And you sinned;

Therefore I cast you as a profane thing
Out of the mountain of God;
And I destroyed you, O covering cherub,
From the midst of the fiery stones.

17 "Your heart was lifted up because of your beauty;
You corrupted your wisdom for the sake of your splendor;
I cast you to the ground,
I laid you before kings,
That they might gaze at you.

18 "You defiled your sanctuaries
By the multitude of your iniquities,
By the iniquity of your trading;
Therefore I brought fire from your midst;
It devoured you,
And I turned you to ashes upon the earth
In the sight of all who saw you.
19 All who knew you among the peoples are astonished at you;
You have become a horror,
And shall be no more forever."

From Isaiah 14:

12 "How you are fallen from heaven,

O Lucifer, son of the morning!
How you are cut down to the ground,
You who weakened the nations!
13 For you have said in your heart:
‘I will ascend into heaven,
I will exalt my throne above the stars of God;
I will also sit on the mount of the congregation
On the farthest sides of the north;
14 I will ascend above the heights of the clouds,
I will be like the Most High.’
15 Yet you shall be brought down to Sheol,
To the lowest depths of the Pit.

16 ‘Those who see you will gaze at you,
And consider you, saying:
‘Is this the man who made the earth tremble,
Who shook kingdoms,
17 Who made the world as a wilderness
And destroyed its cities,
Who did not open the house of his prisoners?’

In the Ezekiel passage, the specific language indicates a judgment on the "king of Tyre" and in the Isaiah passage the king of Babylon is specifically in view. Both texts are surrounded by various pronouncements of judgments against different literal kingdoms.

Does anyone know how these scriptures came to be understood to be talking about Satan's origin? I am not sure that simply reading the texts without presuppositions gives that impression. Remember "Lucifer" simply means "morning star" or "shining one."

Re: OT Texts Regarding Satan's Origin - posted by EverestoSama, on: 2012/7/10 22:54

Midrashically (the Hebrew way of looking at Scripture and prophecy) all of the ungodly kings in one way or another paint a picture of Satan and the Anti-Christ (long but quite rewarding study).

Also, interestingly the part in Ezekiel 14 references the king as the "cherub who covers" which was a reference to one of the angels on the ark of the covenant, showing his position before the fall (as a reflection of the earthly things representing a pattern of things in heaven, as shown in Hebrews 8:5). Also verse 15 could hardly be talking about a normal fleshly man. "Perfect in your ways" would not apply to a man in this time, especially living outside of the covenant of God, or any man who ever lived save Adam (until the fall) and Christ.

This event of the casting out was also referenced by Jesus in Luke 10.

Like all Hebrew prophecy it contained a double meaning. It was literally against Tyre (the peshat midrash) and also about Satan (the pesher midrash), as we see elements in the prophecy that could not have been about a physical mortal.

All of the evil and worldly kings in the Bible paint this picture in one way or another.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/7/11 13:06

Everest wrote:

"Like all Hebrew prophecy it contained a double meaning. It was literally against Tyre (the peshat midrash) and also about Satan (the peshet midrash), as we see elements in the prophecy that could not have been about a physical mortal."

But how do we know the double meaning was about Satan? There is a lot of apocalyptic language in the prophetic writings that can't be taken literally-- e.g. they are hyperbole. For example, in Isaiah's pronouncement against Edom in Is. 34, it says:

"Its streams shall be turned into pitch,
And its dust into brimstone;
Its land shall become burning pitch.
It shall not be quenched night or day;
Its smoke shall ascend forever."

I don't believe smoke is still ascending in that part of the world.

So I am just trying to determine how we are CERTAIN that the passages in the OP refer to Satan, and are not just hyperbolic images of judgment, or rather hyperbolic images of why judgment was necessary (i.e. the pride of the kings in question). Just like there is very disturbing imagery in Ezek. 23 that cannot be taken literally.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2012/7/11 13:20

These are important insights by Jesus that help to explain your scriptures.

We know Satan fell from heaven.

Luk_10:18 And he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven.

2Co 11:3 But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.

These two verses pull together that Satan was the Serpent and is the Devil.

Rev_12:9 And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him.

Rev_20:2 And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years,

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/7/11 19:41

Here is a summary of the available biblical data on this topic:

1. Jesus and John inform us that Satan was evil "from the beginning" (John 8:44/1 John 3:8)
2. Proverbs states that God made everything for Himself...even the wicked for the day of doom (16:4)
3. These verses may or may not be addressing the origin of Satan, but if they are, they suggest that God may have created Satan as a divinely-appointed "tester" (the literal meaning of "tempter"), to test His people's loyalty (as He tested Israel with false prophets--Deut.13:1-4).
4. That God has tolerated the presence of Satan until now demonstrates at least one irrefutable fact: God has use for him, or else He would have tossed him into the lake of fire before now. If God has use for a devil, would He not be entitled to create one for His purpose?

5. Though scripture affirms that some angels have fallen (2 Pet.2:4/Jude 6), no scripture anywhere ever states that Satan is or was himself an angel.
6. In the poetic language of Ezekiel (which never mentions Satan), the king of Tyre is said to have been a cherub in the garden of Eden (28:13-14). But later, in the poetic language of the same prophet, the Assyrian is said to have been a tree in the garden of Eden (31:3, 9)! Why should one passage be taken more literally than the other?
7. A few verses earlier than the disputed Ezekiel passage (v.2), the ruler of Tyre is specifically said to be a "man" (not an angel). The statements that the king of Tyre is "full of wisdom," "perfect in beauty" and "perfect in all thy ways" are clear hyperboles, which were used earlier in the book about the city of Tyre itself (27:3, 28:3). This "king of Tyre" was corrupted by "trading" or "merchandise" (v.16), a distinctive of the city of Tyre, but hardly fitting any scenario of the activities of an un-fallen angel in heaven.
8. Likewise, "Lucifer" (Isaiah 14:12) is clearly identified as the "king of Babylon" (Isa.14:4) and as a "man" (v.16). The lofty aspirations of "Lucifer" are exactly those of the builders of the Tower of Babel (the origins of Babylon). Lucifer is nowhere identified with Satan in the Bible.
9. The fact that Satan was seen by Christ falling "like lightning from heaven" (Luke 10:18) does not tell us anything about Satan's origin. Jesus did not state a time frame for what He saw, and might have been seeing prophetically the downfall of Satan which He later describes in John 12:31, and which John describes in Revelation 12:9---both of which seemingly were fulfilled at the cross (cf. Col.2:15/Heb.2:14).
10. None can doubt the devil's ability to "be transformed into an angel of light" (2 Cor.11:14), but this does not tell us any more about his actual nature than we can learn about the true character of his ministers from the fact that they "are transformed into ministers of righteousness" (v.15)

Re: - posted by EverestoSama, on: 2012/7/12 0:01

Quote:
-----I don't believe smoke is still ascending in that part of the world.

That's because the fullness of that prophecy has not come to fruition yet. It will happen though. Again, if you understand midrash, all the verses you quoted and everything you've questioned here will make perfect sense, as you'll be much more adept and knowledgeable about Jewish metaphor, prophecy, and pattern.

The topic is extensive, but I can provide resources if you'd like to get a good running start. Email me.

- posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/7/12 0:10

interesting thread.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2012/7/12 0:22

Satan was known as Lucifer.

No one knows the mystery of "Theodicy", which is the origin of evil, whom Christians know as Satan.

God obviously gave Lucifer freedom of choice, but how he exercised it is a mystery. Adam and Eve needed a "Tempter", and they decided to hearken to Satan's voice.

But, whose voice did Lucifer hearken to? Who tempted him?

Who did he derive his evil nature from? Adam and Eve had a model of evil in which to derive their lawlessness (disobedience) from.

This is the mystery of Theodicy and no one has ever been able to answer it to my knowledge.

It is enough to know that Satan exists and is God's adversary and thus our adversary. The Bible teaches much about who he is and how he operates, just not how he became. We know it was through pride, but again, since Lucifer was not totally self-independent and self-existent, how did he come by this pride? Where did he get the idea? We know where Adam and Eve got their idea to rebel, but what about Lucifer?

Food for thought?

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/7/12 6:59

Pilgrim wrote: "Food for thought?" Very much so, and here is some more:

- Since sin presupposes temptation, who tempted a holy angel to sin? (If Satan was an angel)
- If an angel could sin without a devil to tempt him, may we not sin without a devil to tempt us?
- If a holy angel was tempted to sin by surrounding evil, is heaven a holy place?
- If an angel was tempted by his own evil passions, could he have been holy?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/7/12 7:06

Everest wrote:

"Again, if you understand midrash, all the verses you quoted and everything you've questioned here will make perfect sense, as you'll be much more adept and knowledgeable about Jewish metaphor, prophecy, and pattern.

The topic is extensive,"

In "The Pursuit of God," AW Tozer talked about reading scripture as "an intelligent plain man" and commended this approach. He said the intelligent plain man "approaches the Bible without any previous knowledge of what it contains. He is wholly without prejudice; he has nothing to prove and nothing to defend."

Frankly, at this point in my life this is the only way I want to approach scripture. I have heard enough of everyone else's theories. If I have to know "midresh" or whatever to understand the scriptures, then I am hurtin' for certain. Of course, I don't believe a person has to know midresh to understand the scriptures.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2012/7/12 9:41

The philosophical issue is that a benevolent God would want to prevent or overcome as much evil and suffering as possible. An all-powerful God would be able to overcome evil and suffering. But since there is a lot of evil and suffering in the world, it would appear that either God cannot or will not prevent it or overcome it. If God cannot, that impugns omnipotence. If God will not, that impugns divine love.

This is usually what non-Christians say and they don't think it is a proper answer when Christians just say, "His ways are higher than our ways."

I have been in discussions where Christians are derided because they seem to know so much about God, the meaning of life, sin, grace, salvation, the nature of the Trinity, the divine and human natures of Jesus, and so on. But when it comes to theodicy, they suddenly get ignorant.

Maybe evil is not a problem to be solved but a challenge to be met. We know Jesus Christ has solved the issue of sin and now the issue of suffering is to be endured, conquered, and otherwise dealt with in ways that deepen trust in the God of grace who has a purpose in all things. Although, I do believe in Divine healing, it seems very few people get healed.

Then, there is the Calvinistic notion that God created and then condemned to eternal damnation a good portion of the human race.

So, this is a very big subject for sure, but underpinning a Christian who is filled with the Spirit of God should be two things:

God is love
All things work together for good, for those that love God.

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by EverestoSama, on: 2012/7/12 12:16

Quote:
-----In "The Pursuit of God," AW Tozer talked about reading scripture as "an intelligent plain man" and commended this approach. He said the intelligent plain man "approaches the Bible without any previous knowledge of what it contains. He is wholly without prejudice; he has nothing to prove and nothing to defend."

Frankly, at this point in my life this is the only way I want to approach scripture. I have heard enough of everyone else's theories. If I have to know "midrash" or whatever to understand the scriptures, then I am hurtin' for certain. Of course, I don't believe a person has to know midrash to understand the scriptures.

I mean, that's fine, man. I'm not saying you need midrash to understand the basic truths about the Bible, but if your question is to understand why certain things in Jewish prophecy are interpreted the ways that they are, you're going to need to understand the way Jews read and interpreted prophecy themselves (midrash).

Midrash is clearly demonstrated as being used all throughout Paul's letters, and it's extremely apparent in John's Gospel at the beginning (which is a midrash on the creation narrative).

You can continue to try and understand a Jewish book, with a Jewish God, using Jewish methods, to a Jewish audience through the lens of a twenty-first century western approach, or you can take a stab at understanding it in the way it was written and would have been received.

I appreciate Tozer, but if I have to look at how to view Jewish prophecy, I'm going to use the same method that Paul, John, Mathew, and the other apostles used over Tozer's approach.

Like I said, these few words will not do any justice to what I'm talking about, as the topic is much larger than I have the time to address, but again, send me an email if you wish and I can present you with a much stronger argument with much more relevant material. If you want to at least hear out why it's a good method to understand prophecy, I can help you out there. If you want to reject it before knowing anything about it, that's your call too.

A little teaser, though. The word "midrash" itself, is actually in the Bible, and is shown as a valid method for the understanding of Scripture, as Scripture itself actually validates it. It's not some new or foreign concept. It's an old one that's always been there.

There's at least four sermons here on SI specifically talking and teaching about/with it as well. Though there are probably more.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/7/12 16:53

Hi Everest--

I didn't mean to come across like I see no value in knowing "midrash" etc because I am sure it IS valuable. I have no idea what it is, but I am sure it was valuable and if I could snap my fingers and know all about it I would do so.

But honestly I don't think I have the time or patience to begin a study of that now. That probably sounds bad but it's the truth.

Perhaps you can succinctly explain for me how using midrash would result in the conclusion that the Isaiah passage and the Ezekiel passage in the OP are talking about Satan. I mean, assuming the passages DO have the dual meaning you describe, how do we know the "hidden" meaning is about Satan, and not something or someone else?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/7/12 16:58

Hi Pilgrim--

I certainly agree with your last post!

Re: - posted by EverestoSama, on: 2012/7/12 23:18

Quote:
-----I mean, assuming the passages DO have the dual meaning you describe, how do we know the "hidden" meaning is about Satan, and not something or someone else?

Pattern.

Again, I may sound like a broken record here, but if you understand the basic concepts of midrash it will make a lot more sense, and you'll be able to get a clearer picture over all, but it's not something that I can explain in just a line or two and do it proper justice.

Here;

<http://media.sermonindex.net/12/SID12037.mp3>

Start with this. It doesn't address the issue of Satan directly if I remember (though it's been a long time since I've heard it). If you understand this, you might see how this works. Give it a listen, and we can go from there if you're interested.

Re: Satan as a "serpent"? - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/7/13 14:21

Satan as a serpent?

Why was the word in the Hebrew ever translated "serpent"? It has given rise to a very false idea about the facts of Genesis 3: 1-5 - that there was in the Garden of Eden a talking snake.

I have no doubt in my mind that if God chose to make a snake talk, He could. I accept fully the other account in the Bible of a talking animal, when God opened the mouth of Balaam's ass and spoke to the prophet through the donkey. I have no problem with this. Even man can teach animals to talk, and surely God can do so.

But the interesting thing is that this account in Gen. 3: 1-5 does not really say that there was a snake in the Garden of Eden. The Hebrew word here is a verb form of "nachash", which means literally "to shine", or in the noun form here, "a shining one." If you read it that way, an entirely different being emerges,

"Now the shining one was more subtle than any other wild creature that the Lord God had made..." (Gen. 3: 1).

So, how did we get a "serpent" from a "shining one"?

Love-in-Christ

KP

Re: Tozer Does it Again - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/7/13 14:40

Amen!

Are we forgetting the power of the Holy Spirit in revealing God's Word to his people?

Only a god of the Pharisees would want his word to be a secret or inside joke in which only a few and proud get the punchline.

"I mean, that's fine, man. I'm not saying you need midrash to understand the basic truths about the Bible, but if your question is to understand why certain things in Jewish prophecy are interpreted the ways that they are, you're going to need to understand the way Jews read and interpreted prophecy themselves (midrash)."

"the basic truths about the Bible" is Christ, Him Crucified and Resurrected. I can see Christ making incarnate cameo appearances all through the OT. Though the OT and NT are all the more enriching as they are embedded into the cultural identity and values of a particular nation.

The Jewish nation is a macrocosmic example of what goes on in the spiritual life of every individual who comes to Christ. They are a truly blessed people, the very wife of God as the church is the bride of Christ. And both Jew and Gentile have the appropriate revelation which God allots thru His Word.

Love-in-Christ,

KP

Re: , on: 2012/7/13 14:45

Gen 3:1 Now the serpent^{H5175} was^{H1961} more subtil^{H6175} than any^{H4480} H3605 beast^{H2416} of the field^{H7704} which^{H834} the LORD^{H3068} God^{H430} had made.^{H6213}

H5175

נָחַשׁ; naw-khawsh' From H5172; a snake (from its hiss): - serpent.

H5172

נָחַשׁ; na^{ch}ash A primitive root; properly to hiss, that is, whisper a (magic) spell; generally to prognosticate: - X certainly, divine, enchanter, (use) X enchantment, learn by experience, X indeed, diligently observe.

H5175

נָחַשׁ; Total KJV Occurrences: 31

serpent, 25

Gen_3:1-2 (2), Gen_3:4, Gen_3:13-14 (2), Gen_49:17, Exo_4:3, Exo_7:15, Num_21:9 (3), 2Ki_18:4, Job_26:13, Psa_58:4, Psa_140:3, Pro_23:32, Pro_30:19, Ecc_10:8, Ecc_10:11, Isa_27:1 (2), Jer_46:22, Amo_5:19, Amo_9:3, Mic_7:17

serpents, 4

Num_21:6-7 (2), Deu_8:15, Jer_8:17

serpent's, 2

Isa_14:29, Isa_65:25

Gen 3:14 And the LORD^{H3068} God^{H430} said^{H559} unto^{H413} the serpent,^{H5175} Because^{H3588} thou hast done^{H6213} this,^{H2063} thou^{H859} art cursed^{H779} above all^{H4480} H3605 cattle,^{H929} and above every^{H4480} H3605 beast^{H2416} of the field;^{H7704} upon^{H5921} thy belly^{H1512} shalt thou go,^{H1980} and dust^{H6083} shalt thou eat^{H398} all^{H3605} the days^{H3117} of thy life:^{H2416}

.....

*2Co 11:2,3 For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ.
But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.

Rev 12:9, 14, 15 & 20:2

Re: Serpent or Shining One? - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/7/13 14:57

But why choose "snake" over "shining one"?

Wouldn't the second meaning adequately capture satan's deceptive guise as an "angel of light"?

And the "shining" feature of the tempter would more likely attract the desire of woman than the features of a serpent.

This is a big deal to me because Satan is a tempter and it would be helpful to know the form and matter in which the tempter presents itself.

Maybe there was something about the "shining" feature of this tempter which contributed to its potency in deception.

KP

Thank you for the above references.

Re: Serpent or Shining One?, on: 2012/7/13 15:09

Quote:
-----by IssacharSon

But why chose "snake" over "shining one"?

Wouldn't the second meaning adequately capture satan's deceptive guise as an "angel of light"?

And the "shining" feature of the tempter would more likely attract the desire of woman than the features of a serpent.

This is a big deal to me because Satan is a tempter and it would be helpful to know the form and matter in which the tempter presents itself.

Maybe there was something about the "shining" feature of this tempter which contributed to its potency in deception.

KP

Simply - Because GOD chose "serpent" and because in all definitions, both in the Hebrew and Greek - nowhere is that word "serpent" found defined as "shining".

Does that mean that every serpent/snake that you see is Satan? Of course not. He can appear in any form he chooses - human and otherwise or just invisibly more often than any way.

The main point being that - we don't change GOD's Word to suit our understanding - but search out the Words He uses to

o understand it and Him.

Could you provide your source for this word that is translated as "serpent" - where you found it as a "verb of shining"?

Thanks!

Quote:
-----Satan as a serpent?

Why was the word in the Hebrew ever translated "serpent"? It has given rise to a very false idea about the facts of Genesis 3: 1-5 - that there was in the Garden of Eden a talking snake.

I have no doubt in my mind that if God chose to make a snake talk, He could. I accept fully the other account in the Bible of a talking animal, when God opened the mouth of Balaam's ass and spoke to the prophet through the donkey. I have no problem with this. Even man can teach animals to talk, and surely God can do so.

But the interesting thing is that this account in Gen. 3: 1-5 does not really say that there was a snake in the Garden of Eden. The Hebrew word here is a verb form of "nachash", which means literally "to shine", or in the noun form here, "a shining one." If you read it that way, an entirely different being emerges,

"Now the shining one was more subtle than any other wild creature that the Lord God had made..." (Gen. 3: 1).

So, how did we get a "serpent" from a "shining one"?

KP

Re: - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/7/13 15:19

Sure!

Give me a second...

KP

Re: , on: 2012/7/13 15:25

No problem Friend. I believe you're thinking of the name "Lucifer" and that word is from "shining".

No problem - just being careful over His words.

Thanks!

Re: Nachash - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/7/13 15:30

נָחָשׁ (naḥaš) is a combination of two words: נָח (naḥ) and חָשׂ (chaš). נָח (naḥ) is the root of נָחָשׁ (naḥaš) and נָחָשׁ (naḥaš) is the root of נָחָשׁ (naḥaš). * נָחָשׁ (naḥaš) is the root of נָחָשׁ (naḥaš) and נָחָשׁ (naḥaš) is the root of נָחָשׁ (naḥaš).

Hebrew Nachash (נָחָשׁ) IS A COMBINATION OF TWO WORDS: נָח (naḥ) & NA-CHASH - THE FIRST PART OF THE WORD NAGA - NA AND THE SECOND PART OF THE WORD NACHASH - CHASH. The neuro-lingual container of word נָחָשׁ (naḥaš) is CHSH or SHCH. Together it will fuse or morph two neuro-lingual containers together: נָחָשׁ (naḥaš) and נָחָשׁ (naḥaš) as NA-CHASH. Both words NAGA (נָחָשׁ) and NACHASH (נָחָשׁ) are describing absolutely completely the same SEED or ANCESTRAL BLOODLINE AND THE ORIGIN OF THE FIRST CROSSBREEDS: CALLED HEBREWS, except the neuro-lingual container of NAGAS as it is in Sanskrit (NAGI) is older approximately 110,000 years than NACHASH (נָחָשׁ).

The origin of word נָחָשׁ (naḥaš) is Old Slavic: НЪСЪ (nъsъ). The original word and neuro-lingual container was COSCHEI (נָחָשׁ) with neuro-lingual root CHSH or SHCH. After transliteration into Hebrew it became the word NHSH (נָחָשׁ).

1513;ׁ) with the same neuro-lingual container as in Old Slavic and before that in H'Aryan. Word COSCHEI in Old Slavic is almost (with slight diviation) means exactly the same as neuro-lingual container of Sanskrit NAGI. Simply put two words abbreviate the entity which is Saurian in nature. As in Hebrew Torah the same entities are called NHSH (נ ָחַשׁ ‎ nâchash) or Shining Ones, including Shining One in Torah being the Tetragrammaton called YHWH (Jehovah).

Citation: <http://www.thedivinecouncil.com/nachashnotes.pdf>

Love-in-Christ,

KP

Re: , on: 2012/7/13 15:39

"Christ" is "The WORD" and He chooses His Words - not interpreters.
We must be careful to not go beyond 'what is written'.
We must interpret His Word 'with' His Word.

As posted on the previous page - the word nachash is only interpreted "serpent" though-out the Old Testament and GOD uses "serpent" in the New Testament as well.

H5175

נחשׁ Total KJV Occurrences: 31

serpent, 25

Gen_3:1-2 (2), Gen_3:4, Gen_3:13-14 (2), Gen_49:17, Exo_4:3, Exo_7:15, Num_21:9 (3), 2Ki_18:4, Job_26:13, Psa_58:4, Psa_140:3, Pro_23:32, Pro_30:19, Ecc_10:8, Ecc_10:11, Isa_27:1 (2), Jer_46:22, Amo_5:19, Amo_9:3, Mic_7:17

serpents, 4

Num_21:6-7 (2), Deu_8:15, Jer_8:17

serpent's, 2

Isa_14:29, Isa_65:25

Re: - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/7/13 16:15

Yes, and I can see the references to Satan as a "dragon" can correlate with mythical reptilian derivatives.

YET, This is an issue with me for the following reasons:

(1) This is the very first appearance of Satan and encounter with man and woman - Hence, his identity in form and matter in this particular instance is especially important. It has to reflect an eternal Form which comprehensively captures the full nature of the tempter - "Shining" is an essential almost indispensable feature of a Tempter's premiere and nature.

(2) His identity as a shining one contextually matches the circumstances involved in the deception. The temptation was visually stimulating in its initial manifestation:

"And when the woman saw that the tree good for food, and that it pleasant to the eyes," (Gen. 3: 6)

(3) Consider the result of mankind's Fall...the birth of sin and death via the vehicle of "self-consciousness" -

(Please stay with me, here, I'm about to get a little allegorical)

(4) Self-consciousness was the matter of the Form of sin and death which ensued:

"And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they naked;"

Self-realization. Eyes opened. Self-Image. Consciousness of a "self". They saw themselves for the first time. What's the easiest most immediate way to see oneself? Through a mirror. The "shining one" was this mirror into the human soul without God. "Look at me, I'm naked!" The immediate effect is shame and guilt.

Bad Move. Why? Because at this very moment of self-perception, man stops seeing the world as only God sees it and starts to have a competing perceptual experience of the world. His own. After all, what is knowledge of Good? Simply, knowledge of God alone. The world as only He sees it. Things as they REALLY are. Truth. Christ.

What is knowledge of Evil? Knowledge of things other than God. Primarily the "self". God did not make us to be primarily "self-conscious" but rather "other aware" - the latter of which is the essential element of true sacrifice. Sacrifice is a necessary element in man's salvation. Self-consciousness impedes sacrifice. This is why we must "die to self" as exemplified by Christ's Death on the Cross before we can experience the Glory of Christ's Resurrection.

Self-consciousness is evil. Why? Truth is no longer rooted solely upon the consciousness of God alone, but instead God's perfect and good reality becomes subject (instead of object) to a 4-billion headed relativistic monster constantly distorting truth into the form of man's image and imagination:

"The Lord saw that the wickedness of humankind was great in the earth, and that every inclination of the thoughts of their hearts was only evil continually" (Gen. 6: 5).

Why? Because they were rooted in "self-consciousness" not God's. Just read up on moral relativism.

Christ redeems us by turning our eyes from self to "Him". This is why Christ should replace our indwelling consciousness as illustrated by the new covenant truth expounded upon via Paul's letters: "Christ in me, me in Thee". Christ's self is the sufficient indwelling consciousness I need to replace my own.

Hence, the tempter first presented himself as a "shining one" essentially because he was a mirror. Mirrors reflect and shine. The mirror that this shining one reflected revealed the self to Adam and Eve for the first time and they've never looked back since.

What do you think?

I know...I know...EVERYbody's got a theory.

Love-in-Christ

KP

You Are Right! - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/7/13 16:18

Yes, thank you for reminding me of this.

It is just fascinating to get a glimpse into the eternal pattern of things, in that it's all about Christ and not us.

KP

Re: You Are Right!, on: 2012/7/13 17:15

I have no problems with what you've written except for the redefining "serpent" - a symbolism that's used in both the Old and New Testaments.

Here's the New Testament's use listed out -

G3789

οφις

ophis

Total KJV Occurrences: 14

serpent, 8

Luk_11:9-11 (3), Joh_3:14, 2Co_11:3, Rev_12:9, Rev_12:14-15 (2), Rev_20:2

serpents, 6

Mat_10:16, Mat_23:33, Luk_10:18-19 (2), 1Co_10:9, Rev_9:19

Calling Satan the "shining one" is fine, as long as we're using that as a translation for Lucifer and not removing the word "serpent" by re-translating it - as we see it used in both Testaments.

The LORD had a reason to Also describe Satan as "the serpent" and it ties in with John 3:14,15 as Jesus witnessed Him self to a good Pharisee/Jew, Nicodemus.

Again, it's fine to call Satan 'the shining one' but not at the expense of changing His use of that term "serpent" that's used in both Testaments for a reason.

I do understand who Michael Heiser is and you must wonder - How dare she -- but we needn't agree with every man with tens of degrees after their name. I can respect them - but there are just some times when changing His use of certain words or terms should be thought twice about ... because then 'we' could then begin to question more of the words that we see in both Testaments and then question more of His Book.

Not all of us have the time to sit under all of Heiser's classes and read all of his writings nor have the time to explain "which" words/terms found in both Testaments that we can change the Definition of that are found in all Lexicons and Hebrew Dictionaries.

Can we afford to open that door just for one man's interpretation when the majority have translated that same word "serpent" for all the years that we've had both languages?

I have no problem with what you've written on "self" being the root of All sin and no problem with calling this self consciousness or self centeredness.

Thanks for the forbearance in writing out your own beliefs.

Re: , on: 2012/7/13 18:33

Brother KP, something just crossed my mind, that I haven't explained why I've posted where the word "serpent" is used in both the Old & New Testaments.

We not only define words by Dictionaries, Lexicons or through ancient linguistics, when interpreting The Word - but where and how that same word is used, everywhere else in either Testament.

We see the same word 'nachash' used in 28 verses in the O.T., the list having been given in earlier post and we look at all 28 verses to see how nachash is used in all of the other books of the O.T..

With Moses with his rod that budded that The LORD asked him to throw down for a practice run and it scared him when it turned into a snake - not a mirror or a shining one and with Pharaoh's magicians - the snakes were just snakes/serpents.

I think that's enough to convince us. The 'same' word and how it's used in every verse - whether OT or NT Greek - He had a Divine reason for using it.

Thanks again for your forbearance.

Re: - posted by EverestoSama, on: 2012/7/13 19:14

@Jesus-is-God

Exactly right. Also Satan is referred to as a snake/serpent in the New Testament as well. We always interpret the Old in light of what the New has shown us.

It's really rather simple.

We are in agreement - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/7/14 14:08

Yes, Jesus-Is-GOD!

I will continue to accept the "serpent" translation / interpretation.

Yet, where "nachash" is used in Exodus in the turning the rod/staff to a snake especially in the battle with Pharaoh's gods, another translation of the word "nachash" includes words that connote "one who practices divination" which matches the context of Exodus 7: 10-13...

Exodus 7: 11:

"Pharaoh then summoned wise men and sorcerers, and the Egyptian magicians also did the same things by their secret arts:"

...whereby Pharaoh's "serpents" represent this particular translation of the "nachash"

NASB Exhaustive Concordance:

results of divination (1), divined (1), enchantments (1), indeed practice divination (1), indeed uses (1), interprets omens (1), practice divination (1), took as an omen (1), used divination (2).

Hence, I find that all of these translations of the Hebrew "nachash" have equal contextual and lexical relation to the identity of the Tempter as revealed in both the OT and NT.

Thanks to your insight, however, I will continue to interpret the "nachash" of old as a "serpent" as well as all other related translations.

Re: - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/7/14 14:12

And Vice Versa, yeah?

Re: His hand hath formed the crooked serpent. - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2012/7/14 14:30

More insight into the Serpent.

Job 26:13 By his spirit he hath garnished the heavens; his hand hath formed the crooked serpent.

Isa 27:1 In that day the LORD with his sore and great and strong sword shall punish leviathan the piercing serpent, even leviathan that crooked serpent; and he shall slay the dragon that is in the sea (sea can be a metaphor for world or peoples in the world, great multitude).

The phrase 'crooked or piercing serpent' comes from the Hebrew 'nachash beriyach.' 'beriyach' literally means bars which a fugitive flees from. This is the word used for the bars in the Tabernacle (Exodus 26:26-29).

Psalms 107:16 speaks of GOD delivering man from these bars.

Psalms 107 has amazing imagery of GOD delivering mankind from the hand of the enemy....

Psa 107:1 O give thanks unto the LORD, for he is good: for his mercy endureth for ever.

Psa 107:2 Let the redeemed of the LORD say so, whom he hath redeemed from the hand of the enemy;

{Satan is the enemy of mankind, in Hebrew Satan 'literally means enemy or the one who opposes}

Psa 107:3 And gathered them out of the lands, from the east, and from the west, from the north, and from the south.

Psa 107:4 They wandered in the wilderness in a solitary way; they found no city to dwell in. {The wilderness is where serpents dwell Deuteronomy 8:15; Job 30:29; Psalm 44:19; Malachi 1:3}

Psa 107:5 Hungry and thirsty, their soul fainted in them. {This is where Satan tempts - Matthew 4:2-4}

Pilgrim

I agree with you, too! - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/7/14 14:38

Thank you for keeping me on the right path about this translation stuff.

Yes. I accept the "serpent" interpretation.

Thank You.

Love-in-Christ,

KP

Re: We are in agreement, on: 2012/7/14 15:02

Quote:

-----Yes, Jesus-Is-GOD!

I will continue to accept the "serpent" translation / interpretation.

Yet, where "nachash" is used in Exodus in the turning the rod/staff to a snake especially in the battle with Pharaoh's gods, another translation of the word "nachash" includes words that connote "one who practices divination" which matches the context of Exodus 7: 10-13...

Exodus 7: 11:

"Pharaoh then summoned wise men and sorcerers, and the Egyptian magicians also did the same things by their secret arts:"

...whereby Pharaoh's "serpents" represent this particular translation of the "nachash"

NASB Exhaustive Concordance:

results of divination (1), divined (1), enchantments (1), indeed practice divination (1), indeed uses (1), interprets omens (1), practice divination (1), took as an omen (1), used divination (2).

Hi Friend, posting on the run here, forgive if it sounds that way ... gotta go.

In Exodus 7 - the word used for serpent is not "nachash" but "tannıym", which Strong's translates as "(The second form used in Eze_29:3); intensive from the same as H8565; a marine or land monster, that is, sea serpent or jackal: - dragon, sea-monster, serpent, whale."

And that word is found used 27 times translated as such in the KJV -
dragons, 15

Deu_32:33, Job_30:29, Psa_44:19, Psa_74:13, Psa_148:7, Isa_13:22, Isa_34:13, Isa_35:7, Isa_43:20, Jer_9:11, Jer_10:22, Jer_14:6, Jer_49:33, Jer_51:37, Mic_1:8

dragon, 6

Psa_91:13 (2), Isa_27:1, Isa_51:9, Jer_51:34, Eze_29:3

serpent, 2

Exo_7:9-10 (2)

monsters, 1

Lam_4:3

serpents, 1

Exo_7:12

whale, 1

Job_7:12 (2)

whales, 1

Gen_1:21

When you speak of "nachash" being divination, etc - that would be the word numbered in Strong's' as H5172 defined as such "A primitive root; properly to hiss, that is, whisper a (magic) spell; generally to prognosticate: - X certainly, divine, enchanter, (use) X enchantment, learn by experience, X indeed, diligently observe."

--- whereas there is the "nachash" that, strangely enough, is numbered differently in the Strong's as H5175 and defined as such - "From H5172; a snake (from its hiss): - serpent."

I gave the occurrences of H5175 earlier in the thread.

So - I recommend maybe downloading e-sword.net or some other Bible program that gives the Textus Receptus Number to the Strong's' that's normally only found with the KJV - so that we all can stay on the same page, or book.

I'm just finding your post quoted above and I'm sorry it's receiving such a hurried reply but at the same time - I was just thinking of you and hoping you'd expound more on your other post - that has to do with "Self" consciousness being the root and affect of the fall. Right on!

I call it "self-centeredness or self-focused" but I think it's all the same.

I liked the direction that you were going with that topic, very much.

Thank you so much for your contributions.

Only one question - Do you live in the U.S. or elsewhere. No need to say what State or country - just wanted to know if you're here or somewhere else.

Shalom!!

editing to add: I find another mystery that although "tannıym" is used in Exodus 7 --- it is "H5175 -nâchâsh" that GOD used with Moses in Exo 4:3 And he said, Cast it on the ground. And he cast it on the ground, and it became a serpent; and Moses fled from before it.

I could really find a rod like that quite useful. :)

Any symbolic interpretation of what "the rod" is?

Re: H5175 - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/7/14 16:40

Wow!

Thank you for the expansion of the "nacash" and "nachash tanniym" translations.

I contribute nothing except enthusiastic curiosity and fascination with God's Word. It is a sustaining delight. I'm afraid that I have spoiled myself with His Word because the only time my brain lights up is when its touched by His Word.

It used to light up with philosophy but it has become the handmaiden to God's wisdom.

I live in the USA.

Perhaps the nachash showed Eve a mirror (which like, him, shines). Eve looked in this mirror, saw herself for the first time, and was captivated by her own image as it appeared in God's image.

This image (which we still worship to this day and which Christ warned us about at the end of the Bible) was there from the very inception of sin. Self-Image and God's Image all in one creature. What a combination.

The response was not only shame and guilt, but pride. Pride which preceded the Fall of the nachash also preceded that of mankind. If the tempter wanted man to Fall, wouldn't he uses the same devices which ensured his own undoing?

Self-consciousness is a necessary condition for breeding pride, which "cometh before The Fall".

Pride which arose from Eve seeing her own reflection for the first time in God's image, yet taking credit for it.

This developed into an immediate self-preoccupation. Look a bit closer and they see themselves in the image of their "disobedience to God" - cover is blown, nakedness results. Shame and guilt arise.

What a horrific experience it is to see the world through one's own eyes. Self-focus upsets the subject/object barrier and balance of man's identity. yeah?

And most APA psych journals trace the origin of mental illness epidemics such as "Depression" and "Manic Depression" with narcissism.

Anxiety, even, can be traced to the absence of humility.

I used to be an objectivist in high school. Thank the Lord for His deliverance from that. My AP Biology and English teachers introduced me to Ayn Rand novels and almost damned my soul.

Yet, I remember what it is like to consider selfishness a virtue. It is a scary and dangerous place for the soul to tread. Selfishness is more vicious than any other vice. It perpetuates all other evils. It is the very nucleus of malice.

Re: , on: 2012/7/14 23:23

I was thinking after your first post on 'self consciousness' that the shining-one was 'the light bearer' but if you've read much about satanism - it's everything that was by and from GOD "in reverse". Even in "reverse speech"... meaning that one would deliberately say the opposite of what is true. We hear that a lot from politicians.

But back to 'the light bearer' the father of lies - 'his' "light" would be a counterfeit light and yet spiritually affective. Jesus is The Light. Satan's light is a counterfeit and it causes the person to focus on self, if it can. You said some very profound things in your first post that brings a lot of Light to what Satan did in the Garden and has done ever since.

While pondering these things, this verse came to mind - Psa 36:9 For with Thee is the fountain of life: *in Thy light shall we see light.*

But under the influence of the "angel of light" we get that counterfeit light that causes the person to focus on self -- and as you had said - the focus is off of The True Light which is Christ. Satan shines the 'spot light' on "us" - whereas The HOLY Spirit shines the spot light on Christ Jesus, The Word of GOD made flesh and what He's written and off of self.

As they say - getting self off of the throne where only He belongs. Satan wanted to ascend unto GOD's Throne, or even above it.

Satan's sin is our sin - if we allow it. "You can be as God" ... Satan said that First for himself.

Whenever we put self first - we're bordering or entering Lucifers' sin/pride that got him knocked out of his original position.

If you have ever met a man, "posing as a righteous minister of light" - then you know how utterly deceptive they can be. Quoting the Bible and getting "words of wisdom and/or knowledge" and no one is exempt from being deceived unless their dependence is so child like in trusting GOD.

I agree with so much of what you've written in your two posts on "self" and glad you somehow brought this into this thread.

There are two spiritual "light sources" and the one, as you said, shines it all on us and the True Light shines solely on Him.

Satan wanted the glory and to be glorified. How close he can get, to get us to do the same with our own lives.

in thy light, shall we see light - that can go for the light of the wicked light bearer, that angel of light or The Light Himself. Who's light are we basking in. If it's self focused - we know it's the master counterfeiter of the True and Divine Light, The GOD that deserves all of the focus and glory.

If the Light focuses our minds on Christ then we know that we're walking in His Light. Even The Holy Spirit doesn't speak of Himself but directs all attention to Christ.

Wonderful stuff, KP. Maybe our terminology differs to slight degrees but the point is - the Focus is where it needs to be.

So much of the world is to 'look out for number 1' - as they say, and that's the mentality that Lucifer had that caused and was his fall ... as you've rightly said, leads to or is 'pride'. Self-focusedness is pride.

Lots of good stuff in this 2nd post of yours as well.

Essential to coming into His Image and not the self-oriented image of the evil one or counterfeit god - even if it seems to be a humble focusing on self over our own short-comings - if it's continuous, something's wrong with our vision, faith and the Light we're walking in. It's all just focused on 'self'.

Thank you for bringing this severely important issue to the table. I may be a bit tired after today's busy-ness, but this issue of The Light and who's light is it that we're walking in, has stayed with me. We can come to understand who's light we're walking in by 'whom' is being focused on or is in the spot-light in each hour of our day - so we can redirect our the focus of our every thought taken captive to the obedience of Christ - Who was "G

OD and others minded" as you've said in your first post about self.
Seems easy enough :)

By what the light is focusing on - we know who's light we're walking in.

Bless GOD!

Re: - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/7/15 13:58

This comment reminds me of the fact that the closer a lie is to the truth, the more deceptive it is. This pattern was set in the Fall.

Self-consciousness is soooo hard to criticize in this world, whereby, as you say, we are constantly "looking out for number 1".

Darwin was on to something with his first law of nature being that of "self-preservation".

Yeah. When I first studied the Gospel of Mark and God revealed the preciousness of the servant life through the actions of Christ, the Lord shifted my heart's motivation from self-interest to serving others.

Yet, when a new desire is born in one's spirit through Christ, an old one dies and it can be very painful. Now, I am only energized, motivated and happy when I'm not conscious of myself and acting in the interest of others.

The focus inevitably shifts back to the corpse of the self-interest and I fall into a pit of despair, almost automatically. When I am depressed or unhappy, without peace, I know it is because I am focusing on my self rather than Him. The focus must remain on Him, not necessarily others, because "otherness" can also be a manifestation of selfishness.

Otherness can entrap you into the "Romeo and Juliet" syndrome. My focus has to be on serving Him and then the Lord directs me from there. It is not even up to me as to whom I shall serve, where should I volunteer, which person or group should devote or commit to. I devote to Christ first and then He directs my interests from there.

This type of life is almost impossible to explain to people, so I don't bother. But I am so glad that I could share this with someone who knows what it means to truly care for others. It can only be done through abiding in Christ...and His Word abiding in you.

I lived most of my life as a self-worshipping knut-wit. Even to the point of "objectivism" (wow, what a miracle to be delivered from that level of deep self-deception). I really thought it was ALLLLL About Me! Oh God, what a slippery slope to oblivion!

I understand why prosperity is more dangerous to a man's soul than poverty. Poverty keeps us in a blessed state where we are constantly looking to God for our material provision. A Blessed state, indeed. I used to look to the wealthy as a source of wisdom, but no more! Wisdom is more likely to be found in the hearts of the poor.

I love your salutation from Galatians! That's what it's all about.

Love-in-Christ,

KP

Re: , on: 2012/7/15 15:31

Very well said, KP.

If we love Him and His Word more than anyone or anything else and more than our 'self' - then and only then can we love others with His love and not some love that's actually meant to benefit our self. ie. the "I want to be liked" syndrome or neurosis.

Thank you very much, friend.

I'd love to hear more of what you started on 'Biblical' Psychology. Blessings!

Re: Positive Psychology - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/7/15 20:35

There's this Professor doing studies in "Positive Psychology" on forgiveness, mercy and humility. His name is E. Worthington and I found him giving a Chapel service on the Dallas Theological Seminary website (my dream school!).

His brother committed suicide and left his suicide note addressed to him. He was the last person he spoke to before he took his life and Prof. Worthington (unwittingly) suggested that his (own) brother see a therapist. Worthington was a successful psychology professor at the time but most importantly "Am I (not) my brother's keeper?"

Uh, the guilt Prof. Worthington endured was resurrected into an academic career in developing Positive Psychology which included field studies and all. I would love to be his research assistant/servant. He works from the premise that most mental illnesses can be traced to unresolved guilt (a manifestation of the Fall).

I agree with him. He developed an APA approved group therapeutic model on forgiveness and has successfully applied it to "Victim's assistance" and "Forgiveness" projects which attempt to reconcile the victim with the aggressor in incremental face-to-face encounters.

See, Jesus-Is-God, there is still good working in this world. Just not as hard as darkness, which puts in overtime. I would love to work in contribution to Positive Psychology.

In particular, Worthington is trying to secure a place in psychology for Christian psychotherapy as he believes that if not for his faith, he would not have been delivered from the guilt of his brother's suicide.

He used his own experience to deduce that many other individuals struggling with varying degrees of mental illness could possibly benefit from a psychology which incorporates their faith. He is a supporter of Christian psychotherapy and his academic work focuses on the elaboration of this branch of "Positive psychology".

I want to be a positive psychologist, Jesus-Is-God!

Psychotherapy originated in the Levitical priesthood. Isn't the role of a Levite priest identical to that of a psychotherapist? Did not the priest work to reconcile and restore a man's relationship with God via the system of sacrifices which God deemed appropriate at the time.

Peter reminds us of our essential usefulness to God via faith through grace with our eternal role as priest-king. I'm not so much interested in the "king" part, but the priesthood is God's model for what the world refers to as "psychotherapy".

Melchizedek had such a profound impact on Abraham's psychological state, that he was able to refuse the offerings of the King of Sodom after his battle with the Kings of Chedorlaomer (sp).

I would love it if the Lord called me to the field of psychotherapy! Boy! Would that be an opportunity to operate in discipleship or what?

The work of the priesthood is the penultimate experience of a disciple of Christ. The call to heal others by faith through grace AND glorify God at the same time! What a true labor of true love!

(Sigh...)

I don't catch rides on bandwagons but I would love to study more closely the field of Christian psychotherapy.

I know that I must sound foolish, but it's worth the risk when sharing what is truly on my heart.

Love-in-Christ,

KP

Re: , on: 2012/7/15 21:43

Hi KP, was gone for the day again.

I think you're doing just fine with what you've posted earlier - as far as Biblical Counseling goes and are on the right track with what you've written earlier ...

**The response was not only shame and guilt, but pride. Pride which preceded the Fall of the nachash also preceded that of mankind. If the tempter wanted man to Fall, wouldn't he use the same devices which ensured his own undoing?

Self-consciousness is a necessary condition for breeding pride, which "cometh before The Fall".

Pride which arose from Eve seeing her own reflection for the first time in God's image, yet taking credit for it.

This developed into an immediate self-preoccupation. Look a bit closer and they see themselves in the image of their "disobedience to God" - cover is blown, nakedness results. Shame and guilt arise.

What a horrific experience it is to see the world through one's own eyes. Self-focus upsets the subject/object barrier and balance of man's identity. yeah?

And most APA psych journals trace the origin of mental illness epidemics such as "Depression" and "Manic Depression" with narcissism.

Anxiety, even, can be traced to the absence of humility.**

There's a Psychiatrist that's secular - but if you go to your library and get the book by Dr. William Glasser by the title "Reality Therapy" but then Biblicize his idea - you'll be a professional - combined with your thoughts above.

GOD sends people our way by Divine appointment. You pray and He'll send them to you and if that's your calling - you'll surely be given words of wisdom --- when you open your mouth, He'll fill it --- with exactly what HE knows that each person needs to hear.

I don't believe too much in any set form of "therapy" or "methods" - but do believe with all of my heart - that HE knows what is inside of each person - things that they themselves and no one else knows about and you just need to give Him your mouth and trust Him for whatever comes out.

Reckon they call that walking in the Spirit - book of Acts style?

:) Bless you!!

Bless YOU! - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/7/16 14:17

Glasser! Yep, I've come across Glasser in my curiosities!

And I've heard of "Reality Therapy"!!!

I have a question for your advising, Jesus-Is-God:

If it is the Lord's will for me to pursue this profession of Christian psychotherapy research and practice, do you think that anchoring it into Glasser's research would help to promote or add credibility to this branch of psychology?

My mother worked in a state mental hospital for 22 years and it so saddens me when she reports that the same individu

als who were receiving inpatient treatment when she first started were there when she retired recently.

Reality therapy would be a promising combo with Christian psychology, as God is a realist.

Remember, before the Fall, man saw objects and the world "as they REALLY are" without the distortion of self-perception.

Just imagine, Jesus-Is-God, before the Fall, man's perception was so rooted in truth that God entrusted Adam with "naming" and labeling His creation.

God allowed man to participate in the development of reality!!! After self-consciousness replaced God's perception, man was immersed into a metaphysical nightmare!

There must be something that is deceptive unto death about man's own perception. Man's perception and conception about things as they really are is wrong. Wrong because truth cannot be filtered through self-perception without distorting it.

Ugh! It reminds of how stupid I can be when I was first fascinated with George Berkeley's philosophy through which, he coined the phrase "to Be is to be perceived" (esse est percipi)...as the starting point of any epistemology. Perceived by what or Whom?

This is reality if the "perceiver" is the Lord alone. Reality is all that matters to God. Thank God, we matter to Him. Thank God.

Reality is what metaphysicists have grappled with age after age. An effective reality therapy has to first acknowledge and identify the nature of the "qualified perceiver" - God alone (in the triune Godhead).

Man as a "perceiver" becomes a "deceiver", yeah?

Thanks for listening and responding,

Love-in-Christ

KP

Re: Bless YOU!, on: 2012/7/16 17:07

Mutual thanks for your responses.

Oh, I do think Glasser's foundational structure is definitely biblical, even if he himself may not have developed his construct from the Word.

Reality therapy is based upon what he calls "choice theory" but I wouldn't have called it "theory" but Biblical truth. He doesn't allow clients to sit in their pasts but takes them to "today".

The place where he could use help in, is where he focuses on "a person to love". Not everyone has that privilege and it's risky to put all of one's well-being in another human being. That's where we Biblicize Glasser's work.

GOD is 'the object' of love, replacing the human in Glasser teaching.

I love his work because he doesn't believe in dependence on the therapist nor drugs - though that's his goal for them and not necessarily his initial mode with a new client.

He came to his discovery in a VA hospital where he worked back in the 60's.

One of my favorite stories that was relayed to me by a top psychiatrist that I learned from, was that they came up with a plan in a psych-ward, for the staff to begin to "act nuts" themselves. In no time, the patients began to say to one another that they needed to "get it together" to keep the place running tightly because the staff was obviously losing it. Well, the patients did "pull it together" and the point of the experiment was made. Even some of their most psychotics got a type of shock therapy out of it, as they shook themselves into action to keep the ward from fragmenting totally. :) I love it!

The same follower of Glasser therapy said, "the line between sanity and insanity is how a person CHOOSES to Cope."

Yup, it's true and Biblical besides.

I don't know how old you are, as far as starting studies for a career, but even persuing some of the things we've discussed, helps in helping others in our everyday lives.

Shock therapy, as in, 'by words only', and only the Holy Spirit can lead when to use that part. Of course you won't find the Holy Spirit in Glasser's works, but nevertheless - it's good to have a secular psychiatric source to refer back to when questioned on our beliefs on man's actions are by his own choosing ... as in 'sin' and self-centeredness.

It's a calling Brother and I've had it since I was 12 and read my first Psych book at that time. Chucked all but Glasser, later in life. Only need him when the secular world asks questions of our belief in accountability, responsibility for actions - all from 'choice'.

Yes, it's a pleasure and a mind saver as well - if and when we find ourselves under intense pressures. Amen!

Thanks, KP!