

# Nimrod and Semiramis

2/3/2017

## Introduction

Myths and legends surrounding Nimrod make discerning factual data about him difficult. Some pose a rather natural explanation as to how these myths may have originated. At the scholarly level, K. van der Toorn and P. W. van der Horst, “Nimrod Before and After the Bible,” have traced possible ways that the biblical data may have been extrapolated to merge with historical and fictional material to contribute to these myths and legends. Michael Heiser says this is an “excellent essay” and posts it on his website.<sup>1</sup> However, one would have thought that in his book, *Unseen Realm*, which purports to recover a supernatural world review of the Bible, Heiser might have entertained a more supernatural biblical view of Nimrod. Unfortunately, he does not. Fortunately, other nephologists do.

Even so, I will credit Heiser with changing my mind as to the identity of the *sons of the Most High* in Ps 82:6. In my book, *The Outer Darkness* (TOD), I had assumed that these mortal sons were humans, while the *sons of God* found elsewhere in the OT were angels (Gen 6:2,4; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7). After all, the expression for *sons of God* in Genesis and Job is not identical with Ps 82:6, and Heiser himself will appeal to the lack of identical phraseology elsewhere, where humans are called *sons of the living God* in Hosea 1:10, as justification for not equating them with the angelic *sons of God* in Genesis and Job. For such reasons, my original assessment in TOD was that the mortal sons of God in Ps 82:6 were human. I might also point out that *sons of the Lord* in Dt 14:1-2 refers to humans, a fact Heiser failed to note in his book. Thus, in two out of three occurrences, when a non-identical yet equivalent phrase is used, it refers to humans. Why not conclude that it also refers to humans on the third occasion in Ps 82:6 as well, especially since these sons will die? Notwithstanding this line of reasoning, I found Heiser’s thesis convincing in understanding the sons in Ps 82:6 were fallen angels who became mortal, part of what he would call *the death of the gods*. Therefore, in my more recent book, *Monogamous Sex in Heaven* (MSIH), I have adopted and adapted that vantage point. A principle component of my adaptation therein was to note that the same principle applies to female fallen angels also, thus to *the death of the goddesses*. Just as *male angels* who left their heavenly state and estate to mate with *human females* became subject to death (Jude 1:6), so *female angels* who left their heavenly state and estate to mate with *human males* became subject to death. The purpose of the present inquiry is to explore the additional possibility that Nimrod’s mother (and thus wife) might be a historical example of such an occasion.

## Coincidental Confirmation

As I was wrapping up my final rough draft of MSIH, I came across a quote which I had read earlier by Missler and Eastman but had forgotten: “**If Nimrod were a Nephilim, then his father, Cush, would have had to consort with a fallen angel in the form of a succubus (the female form).**”<sup>2</sup> Since that quote would be highly supportive of my thesis in MSIH about OT goddesses being fallen angels who mated with human males to produce Nephilim offspring, I spent that day—Saturday—finishing a footnote in MSIH to outline why the assessment by Missler and Eastman might be plausible. At the same time, I noted that there were other competing theories, for I was in the process of reading material, like the article by Torn and Horst, which, in contrast, provide naturalistic explanations. I observed that Wikipedia had an article on Semiramis that concluded with section entitled, “Hislop’s goddess claim,” which summarized some of the findings of Alexander Hislop’s book, *The Two Babylons*.<sup>3</sup> Although nothing was said about her being a fallen angel in this summation, at least Hislop’s book, if correct, would confirm that Semiramis was Nimrod’s consort and that she deified herself as the Queen of Heaven. The Wikipedia section noted that this perspective was still circulated by some Christian fundamentalists in the forms of Jack Chick tracts, specifically his tract *Men in Black* (2003).<sup>4</sup> Yet an opposing article by Ralph Woodrow was also cited.<sup>5</sup> So who do you believe?

---

<sup>1</sup> Michael S. Heiser, *The Unseen Realm: Recovering the supernatural worldview of the Bible* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2015), 111, n. 111. See <http://www.michaelsheiser.com/PaleoBabble/NimrodHTR.pdf>. Accessed 10/2/2016.

<sup>2</sup> Chuck Missler and Mark Eastman, *Alien Encounters: The Secret Behind the UFO Phenomenon*, revised and expanded, Kindle Edition (Coeur d’Alene, ID: Koinonia House, 1997), n 351.

<sup>3</sup> See “Semiramis.” Available at <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Semiramis>. Accessed 10/2/2016. A PDF of Hislop’s book, *The Two Babylons: The Papal Worship Proved to be the Worship of Nimrod and His Wife*, is available at: <https://ia800309.us.archive.org/6/items/theTwoBabylons/TheTwoBabylons.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> For the tract, see [http://www.chick.com/reading/tracts/5023/5023\\_01.asp](http://www.chick.com/reading/tracts/5023/5023_01.asp). Accessed 11/30/2016.

<sup>5</sup> Ralph Woodrow, “The two Babylons: A Case Study in Poor Methodology,” CRI, 22:2 (2000). Available at <http://www.equip.org/PDF/DC187.pdf>.

These thoughts were going through my mind that Saturday night. The next morning, I finished reading the article by Toorn and Horst. That afternoon, I decided to write the current article to document this material a little more thoroughly than I did in SMIH. So I dug through some old Jack Chick tracts that I had from many years ago, when I used to use those tracts back in my youth, long before he produced his 2003 tract, *Men in Black*. I found one of his old comic books on my bookshelves called, *Sabotage*. Sure enough, it had a couple of pages summarizing the history of Semiramis, citing Alexander Hislop in support.<sup>6</sup> I proceeded to write the above introduction. Then it was time to join my wife, Dianne, for a Sunday afternoon walk. I left the Chick comic book open on my desk. As Dianne and I were walking the greenway in our neighborhood, I was reading a book on the electrical universe theory on my tablet. She stopped and motioned for me to look up from my tablet. A youth was offering me a Chick tract!!! I have had someone offer me a tract only once or twice in my life. What are the odds that a youth would offer me a Chick tract when I had just opened one from the days of my youth and had it laying at home open on my desk?!? I thanked the young man for his offer and commended him. Even though I do not use such tracts anymore, because I have long since moved from a Lordship Salvation soteriology to a Free Grace soteriology, it was a heartwarming experience. At the same time, having a mathematical background, I wondered what would be the mathematical odds of such a coincidence. The mathematical improbability prevented me from considering it a mere coincidence. I just smiled as Dianne and I resumed our walk, silently saying to the Lord, “Thank you for that tap on the shoulder.” No sooner than I had expressed that prayer than a falling leaf tapped me on the top front of my right shoulder! The leaves were just beginning to fall. I was not aware of any leaves having hit me during our walk. What are the odds that a well-aimed leaf would tap me on my shoulder at that precise moment? For myself, I believe there was something supernatural about the timing of the tract and leaf. They were not coincidences. They were simply the Lord’s subtle way of confirming that I was on the right track in suspecting that Chick may have been correct to a sufficient degree to cause me to suspect that something supernatural might be afoot in the association between Nimrod and Semiramis and that Missler and Eastman might have hit the nail on the head. Let us at least give them a fair hearing.

### Biblical Deduction

The biblical data is where we should begin. Nimrod is called a *gibbor* in the Hebrew text of Gen 10:9. A standard Hebrew lexicon like BDB would give *mighty* as its meaning in this verse, specifically *mighty in hunting*, and HALOT would give *mighty hunter*. But *gibbor* could be used of mighty beasts (Prov 30:30), mighty men (Josh 1:14), mighty God (Is 10:21) or mighty angels (Ps 103:20). Granted, the giant Goliath was called a *gibbor* (1Sam 17:51), and some nephologists have grossly oversimplified the lexical relationship by implying, on that singular basis, that *gibbor* means *giant*. Obviously, if one looks that the other usages of the word just mentioned, *gibbor* does not mean *giant*. Goliath was a *mighty warrior*; therefore, *gibbor* is appropriately used of Goliath. This giant was a *mighty warrior*. *Mighty (gibbor)* is used of this giant, but *gibbor* cannot be simplistically equated with *giant*.

The first biblical occurrence of *gibbor* is in Gen 6:4: “The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore children to them. Those were the *mighty men* who were of old, men of renown.” Some nephologists interpret *Nephilim* to mean *fallen ones*, thus referring to fallen angels who mated with human women. Others interpret *Nephilim* to refer to the giants who were produced because of that mating. Heiser provides lexical reasons for adopting the latter perspective (*Realm*, 105-107). The only other use of *Nephilim* in the Bible is Num 13:33, where it refers to the giant offspring, thus confirming Heiser’s deduction. *Nephilim* means *giants*. The LXE and LXX translate it as *giants (gigantes)* respectively, as do some English translations (e.g., KJV, NKJ).

What about *gibbor*, however? We already have observed that, in and of itself, *gibbor* does not mean *giant*. Nevertheless, surprisingly, the LXE and LXX render *gibbor* as *giants (gigantes)* in Gen 6:4: “Now the *giants* [Heb. *Nephilim*; Gr. *gigantes*] were upon the earth in those days; and after that when the sons of God were wont to go in to the daughters of men, they bore children to them, those were the *giants* [Heb. *gibbor*; Gr. *gigantes*] of old, the men of renown.” Why would the Greek render the Hebrew *gibbor* as *giants* on this occasion? Apparently, the translators of the Septuagint believed that these particular *mighty men (gibbor)* were mighty because they were *giants (Nephilim)*.

The only other occurrence of *gibbor* in Genesis is used of Nimrod and is dealt with in the same way by the LXX and LXE: “Cush became the father of Nimrod; he began to be a *giant* [Heb. *gibbor*; Gr. *gigas*] upon the earth. He was a *giant* [Heb. *gibbor*; Gr. *gigas*] hunter before the Lord; therefore, it is said, ‘Like Nimrod a *giant* [Heb. *gibbor*; Gr. *gigas*] hunter before the Lord’” (Gen 10:8-9; TM).<sup>7</sup> The LXX, and thus the LXE as well, evidently felt justified, based on the context in Genesis, in deducing that Nimrod became a *gibbor* like the *Nephilim* in Gen 6:4. Thus, from the LXX-LXE perspective, Nimrod began to become *gigantic*, a *giant*. These Greek translations rendering it as such in harmony with

<sup>6</sup> Jack T. Chick, *Sabotage?* The Crusaders, vol. 11 (Chino, CA: Chick Publications, 1979), 17-18.

<sup>7</sup> *Gigantes* is the plural form of *gigas*.

contextual sensitivity. The LXX also extends that reasoning to a different word in a similar text outside of Genesis: “And Cush begot Nimrod; he began to be a *giant* [*gigas*; LXX] hunter on the earth” (1Chron 1:10; TM). The LXE, however, is content here, outside of the Genesis context, to render it as *mighty hunter*. In any event, the LXX has reasonably deduced:

1. In Genesis, the *gibbor* were giants/Nephilim.
2. Nimrod became a *gibbor* in Genesis.
3. Therefore, per Genesis, Nimrod became a giant/Nephilim.

Nimrod began to be something he was not before—a giant (i.e., a Nephilim). Pure linguistic and contextual analysis yields this result. One does not need to resort to myth and legend to make this deduction. Nimrod is linked by the word *gibbor* to the Nephilim of Genesis. But how did the giants (i.e., Nephilim) in Genesis 6:4 come about? By fallen angels mating with humans. By the same process of reasoning, one would deduce that the contextual inference is that if Nimrod is a giant (i.e., Nephilim) like the those in Gen 6:4, then he became a giant/Nephilim in the same way: by the matting of fallen angels with humans. No contextual indicator of any difference source for the giant/Nephilim is given in Genesis with one exception, which Moses supplies in the immediate context: Cush, not a fallen angel, fathered Nimrod. So if Nimrod was born as the result of a fallen angel mating with a human (as implied by the Gen 6:4 context) and if he was a first generation giant/Nephilim (like those in Gen 6:4), then the only logical conclusion left is that Nimrod’s mother was a fallen angel. Cush married a fallen female angel. Nimrod was the offspring of that union—just as Missler and Eastman had deduced.

Most likely, Missler and Eastman, as well as the LXX and LXE, have correctly picked up on Moses’ insinuation. Consider the genealogical chain: Noah—Ham—Cush—Nimrod (Gen 5:32; 10:6; 10:8). Nimrod was a descendent of Cush, not of Cush’s brother Canaan. Noah cursed Canaan, not Ham. Although Ham’s wife seduced Noah, resulting in Canaan’s birth and Noah’s curse, Ham was an innocent party (see MSIH).<sup>8</sup> Ham’s wife had the latent Nephilim DNA. Although Cush and Canaan had the same father—Ham, they may not have had the same mother. After Ham’s wife seduced Noah (and their offspring—Canaan—was cursed by Noah because of her), Ham may not have had any further sexual relations with her. Ham eventually may have taken another wife who was not tainted by Nephilim DNA so that his other three sons could be born of a mother who was free of the serpent’s seed and thus not be cursed. On the other hand, even if one believes that all four of Ham’s sons were born of the same mother, the curse was only invoked on Canaan—the one conceived by the illicit seduction. Regardless, the contextual implication of the curse is that Cush was not tainted by Nephilim DNA. Only Canaan had Nephilim DNA. Nimrod’s mother, rather than his father, is the more plausible source of Nimrod becoming a Nephilim. The biblical evidence would lead one to suspect that Nimrod’s mother was a fallen female angel—a goddess. Like the Nephilim in Gen 6:4 who were giants born of a supernatural origin, Nimrod was also a *gibbor* born of supernatural origin, a mighty giant born by the sexual union of a human with a fallen angel. Since this deduction is the most possible explanation of the biblical data, I will adopt it as my skeleton key in unlocking the most plausible biblical associations and legendary speculations.

### Biblical Associations

According to some legends, Nimrod married his mother *Semiramis* (which is the Greek form of her name), in whose land he built his tower in the land of *Shinar* (Hebrew).<sup>9</sup> She became known as the *Queen of Heaven*. Either she was a mere human mortal making herself out to be a goddess or, more likely, a fallen immortal doing the same. If the latter is correct, then she was either (1) the daughter of a goddess or (2) a goddess who became mortal to mate with human men to produce Nephilim offspring and institute goddess worship, deifying herself as Ishtar—and Nimrod (or their son) as Gilgamesh in the process. Another variation posits that Gilgamesh’s mother was *Ninsum*, a goddess (thus a fallen angel). My theory is that when this beautiful, fallen, earthbound, Nordic angel got the chance, she made herself out to be a goddess and thus became the goddess of legend.

Nimrod was not born a Nephilim (giant); he *began to be(come)* a Nephilim (giant) later as he started to grow. Obviously, the Nephilim in Gen 6:4 were not giants at the point of birth. These Nephilim offspring subsequently grew to be giants, which is why Nimrod became a giant later, as he grew. Unlike the alternate proposals, this deduction is in full harmony with the link established by Genesis between the Nephilim and Nimrod.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Also see <http://misthology.org/pdf/articles/Naamahs-Seduction-of-Noah.pdf>.

<sup>9</sup> As a result of the division of languages going from one to seventy, Nimrod was known by many names, as was his wife.

<sup>10</sup> Regardless of which goddess myth is invoked, fallen-goddess hypotheses are more likely than alternatives, which pose that Nimrod merely (1) activated dormant Nephilim genes or (2) modified his own genes or (3) opened his third eye by marrying his mother or (4) became mighty at the age of twenty by putting on the garments of skin that God created for

Chick masterfully summarizes Hislop’s position in three pages. Per the legend that Chick cites, “during a riot in the city of Babylon, Semiramis was spotted. She was so beautiful, the riot stopped so everyone could look at her and admire her beauty.” If this legend is to be treated as historical fact, then why not accept the fact that her exceeding beauty is attributable to her heavenly origin?<sup>11</sup> Chick surmises, “Cush married the most beautiful woman on Earth. Her name was Semiramis. She became the Queen of Babylon” (*Sabotage*, 17). If she was indeed the most beautiful woman on Earth, this would make her more beautiful than any fallen female angel on Earth at the time. This proposition only makes sense if she was a fallen angel herself. Her unnatural beauty should hint at her supernatural origin. Hislop, whom Chick is citing, provides documentation that Semiramis was a blond hair, blue eyed beauty (which would fit the description of a Nordic). Schnoebelen believes that when angels initially fall, they are exceeding handsome or beautiful Nordics. Over the passage of time, however, fallen angels become serpentine, reflecting the nature of their new leader—Satan.<sup>12</sup> If Schnoebelen is correct, Semiramis would have been a recently fallen postflood angel, and the serpentine gods and goddesses of Sumer would have been ancient preflood fallen angels who had been on earth in their earthbound state for an extended period of time.

*Illustration 1. Mother Goddess*



As noted in MSIH, my assessment is that the snake goddess holding a serpentine infant represents a fallen female angel who, after mating with a human male, has given birth to a genetic hybrid. To expand upon that assessment in the present discussion I call attention to the manuscript evidence cited by Putnam and Horn from the Dead Sea Scrolls that

Adam and Eve.

<sup>11</sup> Jack T. Chick, *Angel of Light?* The Crusaders, vol. 9 (Chino, CA: Chick Publications, 1978), 13-15.

<sup>12</sup> At the point they become serpentine, they become totally given over to evil. Greys are failed genetic mistakes with limited intellect, drones, robotic clones, like mules in being unable to reproduce, doing the work of their masters. They are never leaders. Schnoebelen goes on to say that these Reptilians (Draconians) welched on their agreement with the US government. So the US government went into the underground bases and kicked them out, like the TV mini-series V. Bill Schnoebelen, “Exposing The Illuminati from Within (Part 2 of 2)” (1:54:57-2:03:38). Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kW7QRycd4cw#t=3678.424049>. Also see “Bill Schnoebelen talks about the reptilians. Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q0SBnJK98G0>. Also see interview by Josh Peck: “Bill Schnoebelen and the Extraterrestrial Deception.” Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ldGTEahFHQc>. All last accessed 10/16/2016. **Schnoebelen believes that fallen female angels also came down to Earth at the time of Genesis 6 sexual incursion** to mate with humans and thereby “defile the DNA of the people” (“Deception,” 39:03). Either way, you would get *FADNA* (*fallen angel DNA*). Josh Peck has written some very good books and hosts *Into the Multiverse* on SkyWatchTV. In short, some people whom I respect hold Schnoebelen’s testimony to be valid, which increases my confidence in his testimony as well. Thus, I am not appealing to Schnoebelen’s testimony just because it supports my theory. In the interview, Schnoebelen says that he “was opening up doorways to the parallel universes” through occult magic back in his warlock days (15:18). Today, Peck is investigating parallel universes from a scientific point of view. Schnoebelen was converted by Chick’s comic books: *Angel of Light* and *Spellbound* (17:21). As a curious point of coincidence, just a few minutes before I listened to this interview by Peck, I had found my old copy of *Angel of Light* and added a comment in this article concerning it. I still had both comic books on the floor beside my chair when I heard Schnoebelen’s comment. Pretty neat coincidence, if it be that.

“a Watcher named Melkiresha” was “in the form of a *reptilian*....the Watchers are described in explicitly *reptilian* terms by the ancient Hebrews” (emphasis theirs).<sup>13</sup> Putnam and Horn show the serpentine picture and entitle it: “Sumerian deity with reptilian features.” The above illustration concisely connects the Putnam-and-Horn dots visually. They surmise: “Inanna, the ‘Queen of Heaven,’ a mother goddess who much later would be called by some, ‘Mary, the Queen of Heaven and the Mother of Jesus Christ.’”<sup>14</sup> Putnam and Horn list three possible explanations “regarding the origin of the early mythological gods: 1) The Euhemerus View; 2) The Ancient Astronaut Theory; and 3) the Biblical View. **The Euhemerus View was based on the historical theories of the Greek scholar Euhemerus who claimed that the pagan gods originated with certain ancient kings who were later deified**” (p. 316). The second view attributes these ancient gods to ancient aliens who came to this planet in UFOs. Putnam and Horn opt for the third view—the biblical view—that these early *gods* are explained by fallen angels coming down and mating with human women.

Their explanation for the *gods* is very good, except for the fact that they showed the picture of a *goddess*—a female serpentine deity! Accordingly, they should have explicitly acknowledged that implication of their argument is that some of these fallen angels were *goddesses*. I am simply following their argument through to its logical implication. Nimrod was not merely a human king who was later deified via legends. The Euhemerus View is not sufficient to explain the biblical data. Nimrod was a demigod. This is the biblical view. Similarly, Semiramis was more than just a woman who became a queen and who was later deified as the Queen of Heaven simply by the force of legends. She was in fact a fallen goddess.

The infant by the serpentine goddess is not yet a Nephilim (giant) but has Nephilim DNA and will eventually grow into a Nephilim (giant). The female Ashtoreth represents Semiramis, who even had the children of Israel fooled into thinking that she was the wife of Yahweh (Asherah).<sup>15</sup> The Mother Goddess (Mother of God) is holding her deified infant (Tammuz), who is a hybrid that also would grow to be a giant like his father, Nimrod. Per Hislop’s documentation (p. 86), Semiramis had blond hair and blue eyes. Therefore, in my opinion Semiramis was a Nordic rather than a Reptilian.

In a slide discussing the Mother of Harlots, Missler says, “All occultic practices originated in Babylon.” He goes on to explain that (1) our observance of Christmas is linked with “Tammuz, the son of Nimrod and his queen, Semiramis, [who] was identified with the Babylon Sun God (about Dec 22) and that (2) our observance of Easter is associated with “the Babylonian worship of Ishtar, the Golden Eff of Astarte, and the fertility rights of spring.”<sup>16</sup> These are matters that Hislop documents at length, and Missler will cite Hislop elsewhere.<sup>17</sup> If Hislop and Missler are correct, as I suspect, then the mystery religion of Babylon is traceable back to Semiramis. She is the focus of many OT texts and possibly the principle figure in a key NT discussion dealing with mystery Babylon and the woman riding the beast (Rev 17:1-7).

MSIH provided the key OT texts but did not make the connections since I did not want to be base my argument therein on such possible connections. In this companion discussion, however, I will make these connections. The *goddess* mentioned in 1Kgs 11:5,33 is Ashtoreth, the goddess of the Sidonians. She is also mentioned in other passages. *Ashtaroth*

<sup>13</sup> Cris Putnam and Thomas Horn, *Exo-Vaticana* (Crane, MO: Defender Publishing, 2013), 92-93.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 314. Fallen male and female angels mated with human males and females. If Putnam and Horn are to accept the force of their own argument, they would have to conclude that the female deities in the illustration are fallen female angels. They go on to say “that after God judged the celestial beings that cohabited with Noahic women, all such comparable activity *diminished* until about the year 1947” (p. 319). They correctly say that such human-angelic mating *diminished* rather than *ceased*. My postulation is likewise that fallen angels mating with humans diminished rather than ceased. Semiramis, for example, was an exception to the rule that such activity ceased after the flood. Personally, I suspect that her male angelic counterpart fell before the flood, but she did not fall until after the flood, when such activity had diminished rather than ceased. Such activity diminished until about 1946 when Semiramis was unleashed. Now other angels are following her example. Such activity is increasing.

<sup>15</sup> “Semiramis in the Bible.” Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P9IkQtulHOg> (1:39). Accessed 10/12/2016.

<sup>16</sup> Chuck Missler, “The Mystery of Babylon Session 2” (29:57; 33:06). Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3EGzWja-k1s>. Accessed 10/11/2016. Also see Chuck Missler, “The Origins of our Christmas Traditions.” Available at <https://www.khouse.org/articles/2004/555/print>. Accessed 11/18/2016.

<sup>17</sup> Chuck Missler, “Genesis Session 14 Ch 11 (The Tower of Babel)” (29:57). Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=odQekSKMj9I>. Accessed 10/11/2016 Missler says that Hislop’s book is a little argumentative and thus recommends David Hunt’s book, *A Woman Rides the Beast*. One might also consult Dave Hunt, “A Woman Rides the Beast, The Roman Catholic Church.” Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k28enf-GRIM>. Accessed 10/12/2016. Hunt’s thesis is that the woman who rides the beast is the Roman Catholic Church (RCH). This may be the religious entity, but in the present discussion I am more interested in the spiritual entity worshipped by the Roman Catholic Church—Semiramis—worshipped under the guise of the Madonna holding her infant.

is the plural form of *Ashtoreth*. This form is also used several times in the OT. Among the Assyrians, Ashtoreth is identified as *Ishtar*, from which our word *Easter* is derived. She was the planetary goddess of Venus, the goddess of love and fertility. The Greeks would call her *Aphrodite*. The Israelites idolatrously worshipped her as the *Queen of Heaven* (Jer 7:18; 44:17-19; 44:25). Posing that she is one of the fallen female angelic watchers who desired worship seems reasonable enough. She is also worshipped as *Asherah*. She and her sacred Asherah pole are mentioned nineteen times in the OT. Baal had 450 prophets, while Asherah, his consort, had 400 prophets (1Kgs 18:19). Baal and Asherah were counted among the hosts of heaven by their followers (2Kgs 23:4). Asherim were cultic objects used in her worship (mentioned in twenty OT verses).

### Legendary Speculations

According to some legends, Semiramis was a virgin that sprung from the sea. Perhaps an element of truth is in this legend, signifying that she was a fallen angel who descended from Heaven to take a human form and mate with human men. Initially, she did so as a prostitute at a brothel where she met Nimrod. Because of her extreme beauty, he took her as his wife. Rather than publicize her background as a prostitute, the background story of her coming from the sea was used to go back even farther to her descent from heaven. Semiramis is her Greek name derived from her original Assyrian name Sammuramat (gift of the sea). Her fame eventually surpassed that of Nimrod.

Plausible counters include the possibility that Sammuramat was the wife of Adad-nirari III (812 to 783 B.C) who reigned during the time Jehoahaz was king of Israel, which was obviously much later than the time of Nimrod. Joshua Mark discusses this possibility but says that it depends on which historical sources one consults. Regardless, he considers Hislop's book to be a propaganda piece against the RCH.<sup>18</sup> So one must decide if Hislop and those following his thesis against the RCH, such as Chuck Missler and David Hunt, are simply doing nothing more than spouting off false propaganda. For myself, though, I believe that the Hislop-Missler-Hunt identification of the RCH with Mystery Babylon going back to the original literal Babylon makes sense. Therefore, a connection with Nimrod and his wife is plausible. Separating myth from legend may not be possible, however. My working theory is that this convolution is not accidental.

Michael Lake gives two options as to how to look at history. We can either take an (1) *accidental view* in which "historical events occur by accident, for no apparent reason" or a (2) *conspiratorial view* in "which historical events occur by design for reasons not generally made known to the people."<sup>19</sup> Lake follows the Hebraic hermeneutics in posing four levels of understanding of the Scripture: explicit, implicit, typological, and hidden (p. 23). He uses *gematria* and the *law of double reference* as useful tools for the latter (p. 31). Gematria assigns words and numeric value to Hebrew letters and then finds hidden meaning in the words of Scripture using Kabbalistic decoding. Lake uses these techniques to locate Lucifer in the gap of Gen 1:2, where the Earth *became* formless and void.

The gap theory does not require such arguments, to be sure. Nevertheless, such arguments can be illuminating. The same is true of the working theories I am developing herein pertaining to Nimrod and Semiramis. I am only adding this model as a possible deeper, hidden meaning of the text. The Kabbalistic tool I am using, however, is the *Principle of First Appearances* (PFA). (Missler will use the *Law of First Mention* in his presentations, and Lake appeals to it as well.) This principle or law is subject to subjectivism, particularly in some of its forms.<sup>20</sup> Therefore, I am only using it in a supplemental fashion to give deeper collaboration and illumination for points that can be demonstrated independently—at the explicit, implicit, and typological levels.

As to Nimrod, in Gen 10:8 he *began (chalah) to become (hayah) a giant* (Heb. *gibbor*; Gr. *gigas*). *Hayah*, the verb for *become*, is the same verb found in Gen 1:2: "The Earth had *become* formless and void" (TM). In conjunction with the classical gap theory, I hold that the Earth became formless and void as a result of Lucifer's fall. The action of this fallen angel resulted in the Earth becoming formless and void. By invoking PFA in conjunction with the Genesis 6 explanation, I hypothesize that that Nimrod likewise became a *gibbor* as a result of the action of a fallen angel, namely

<sup>18</sup> Joshua J. Mark, "Sammu-Ramat and Semiramis: The Inspiration and the Myth." Available at <http://www.ancient.eu/article/743>. Accessed 10/13/2016.

<sup>19</sup> Michael Lake, *The Shinar Directive: Preparing the Way for the Son of Perdition* (Crane, MO: Defender, 2014), 12.

<sup>20</sup> Lake's definition of the *Law of First Mention* is well received herein as "the principle that requires one to go to that portion of Scriptures where a doctrine is mentioned for the first time and to study the first occurrence of the same in order to get the fundamental inherent meaning of that doctrine....the simple precedes the complex" (p. 299). Unfortunately, some ministers have abused this law so as to claim that the first occurrence of a word determines its meaning in any following context. Not true! Context must be consulted to determine what meaning a word has, from the range its lexical domain, in any given context. Therefore, I am not suggesting that just because the word *hayah* has one meaning in one context it must have that same meaning in another context. Other factors must be considered. My perception, though, is that these other factors may justify seeing a deeper association between *hayah* in these two verses, rather than just saying that they share the same lexical domain or that it means to *become*.

his mother.<sup>21</sup> Whether Semiramis was her original name is a matter of speculation. In any event, after the division of the languages at the tower of Babel, she would have had seventy names. Pinpointing her original name before that division is not necessary. For sake of argument, let us suppose that Sammuamat was one of her many names. Could another Sammuamat subsequently exhibit many of the same characteristics? Of course, she could. Would it be a mere accident? Probably not. Adopting the conspiratorial mindset, I pose that there was a second Sammuamat and that her appearance in the annals of history was not accidental; rather, it was purposefully conspiratorial. My hypothesis is that Satan used Sammuamat II to confuse historians concerning Sammuamat I.

The alternative is to assume, as Derek Gilbert does, and many more do, that those making a connection between Nimrod and Semiramis are gravely mistaken. Gilbert says that the Calah in Gen 10:11 was “the city where the real Semiramis lived. She lived in the late 9<sup>th</sup> century BC, so about 2300 years after Nimrod. So the whole Nimrod-Semiramis thing [is] bad scholarship.”<sup>22</sup> Perhaps Gilbert is correct in thinking that Christian writers like Alexander Hislop, Jack Chick, Minister Donte Fortson, Chuck Missler, Michael Lake, Trey Smith, and Rob Skiba are evidencing poor scholarship in linking Nimrod with Semiramis. Gilbert would apparently throw Tom Horn and Cris Putnam under the bus as well, as being poor scholars in this regard, since they reject the Euhemerus View, which seems to be the view that Gilbert is adopting regarding Semiramis. On the other hand, I am not so quick to dismiss the arguments by various writers as evidencing poor scholarship in linking Nimrod with Semiramis. For example, even though I disagree with Skiba’s version of the *Nimrod-Semiramis thing*, in which he regards Semiramis to be a mere Nephilim, I am favorably inclined to think that Skiba may be right in concluding that Semiramis

was known as Ishtar to the Mesopotamians, Isis to the Egyptians, Astarte in the Northwestern Semetic regions, and Inanna to the Sumerians.

She had temples at Sidon and Tyre, and the Philistines of Ashkelon apparently venerated her as well. [See 1 Samuel 31:1-10 and Herodotus i. 105]. She was everywhere! In North Africa, she was known as Tanith, which means the “Face of Baal” signifying that she was his consort. [ See Barton, *Semetic Origins* page 253, note 6.] And in the land of Canaan, she was known as Ashtoreth and even King Solomon went after her [1Kgs 11:4-5].<sup>23</sup> (Inserts his.)

Naturally, Skiba is by no means alone in linking Semiramis with Ashtoreth. But if this association is correct, then postulating that the Semiramis with whom the Ashtoreth is associated did not live until the 9<sup>th</sup> century BC makes no sense whatsoever. *Ashtoreth* (*Astarte*) is the Hellenized form of *Ishtar*. *Ashtaroth* is the plural form of *Ashtoreth*. She was the fertility (sex) goddess who had been an object of worship for the Jews since they arrived in Canaan: “They forsook the Lord and served Baal and the Ashtaroth” (Judg 2:13). Baal was no mere Nephilim. Neither would Ashtoreth be a mere female Nephilim. As discussed in MSIH, Heiser gives extended discussion regarding Baal in *Realm*, but Heiser practically ignores Baal’s consort. Still, with Baal having 450 prophets and Ashtoreth (Baal’s consort) having 400 prophets (1Kgs 18:19), you would think that she would be deserving of more discussion. This female goddess was just as famous as her male counterpart. After all, vessels were made for both her and Baal (2Kgs 23:4). Yet if Baal was a fallen male angel, then his consort should be considered a fallen female angel. Furthermore, if Baal was a member of the divine council, then his consort probably was as well.

If in his forth coming book, *The Great Inception*, Gilbert breaks the connection between the 9<sup>th</sup> century Semiramis and Ashtoreth and yet concludes that Ashtoreth was a fallen angel, then his position would be very intriguing. Granted, Gilbert can appeal to the popular opinion that Hislop mixed various myths together to create a misguided composite of Semiramis. Wikipedia cites an article by Ralph Woodrow to this effect. Woodrow’s article is brief and easily found

---

<sup>21</sup> No doubt, transmutation is possible: A person’s DNA can be modified so that he or she becomes a Nephilim. Canaan found the writings of the watchers and sought this ability. Ken Johnson, *Fallen Angels* (USA, 2013), 38-40. This will also happen when humans take the mark of the beast. However, Lake follows Horn in posing that this is what happened to Nimrod (p. 92). Although this is an attractive proposition, I find it more likely that Cush experimented with transmutation on himself and married a fallen angel. Therefore, Nimrod was born of a transmuted father and a fallen-angel mother. Nimrod’s father was a demigod and his mother a goddess. Therefore, Nimrod was Gilgamesh, two-thirds (66.6%) god. His number is 666.

<sup>22</sup> Derick Gilbert, “ Clintons and Soros Launch Purple Revolution” (13:49-14:00). Available at <http://skywatchtv.com/videos/skywatchtv-news-111616-clintons-soros-launch-purple-revolution>. Accessed 11/17/2016.

<sup>23</sup> Rob Skiba, *Archon Invasion: The Rise, Fall and Return of the Nephilim* (Kindle edition, 2012), 164-165. For further interaction with Skiba, among other authors, see my reviews in “Return of the Nephilim.” Available at <http://mishology.org/pdf/articles/Return-of-the-Nephilim.pdf>.

online. Originally, Woodrow had written a book, *Babylon Mystery Religion*, which was an easier to read adaptation of Hislop's perspective.<sup>24</sup> But Woodrow withdrew this book because of misgivings being expressed by others about the historical accuracy of this perspective, and he replaced his earlier book with a subsequent book, *The Babylon Connection?* which abandoned Hislop's position. Such rejection of Hislop's position may be premature, however.

### Hislop's Dual Semiramis Hypothesis

Hislop cites Eusebius' *Chronicle* to place Semiramis in the time of Nimrod: "Eusebius says that Ninus [Nimrod] and Semiramis reigned in the time of Abraham" (*Babylons*, 5). According to Eusebius, the Septuagint reads thus: "The first year of Abraham, who was the forefather of the Jewish nation. In his time, Ninus and Semiramis ruled over Assyria and the whole of Asia."<sup>25</sup> Hislop is not unaware that a later Semiramis is also postulated:

**Sir H. Rawlinson having found evidence at Nineveh, of the existence of a Semiramis about six or seven centuries before the Christian era, seems inclined to regard her as the *only* Semiramis that ever existed. But this is subversive of all history. The fact that there was a Semiramis in the primeval ages of the world, is beyond all doubt, although some of the exploits of the latter queen have evidently been attributed to her predecessor. Mr. Layard dissents from Sir. H. Rawlinson's opinion.**<sup>26</sup> (Italics his).

In other words, Hislop postulates two different queens by the name Semiramis—*Semiramis I* and *Semiramis II*—and he believes that some of the actions of the latter were attributed to the former. He cites Layard in support. And in support of Hislop, Bruns calls attention to this footnote and adds:

**The *Illustrated Dictionary & Concordance of the Bible* claims other women in history have also been called Semiramis.**

"...queen Margaret of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway (1353-1412 A.D.) [a]nd Catherine II the Great of Russia (1729-1796) were both labeled as the Semiramis of the North." [Foryan, George, Ed. *Illustrated Dictionary & Concordance of the Bible*; G.G. The Jerusalem Publishing House Ltd. Jerusalem.]

**Could it be that the name Semiramis is like the name Candice or Cleopatra? Was the wife of Nimrod just Semiramis the first?**<sup>27</sup> (Insert his.)

### Woodrow's Two-Semiramis Dismissal

In his original book, *Babylon Mystery Religion*, Woodrow cites many sources, not just Hislop, in linking Nimrod with Semiramis. For example, citing *Encyclopedia of Religions*, Woodrow says, "Numerous monuments of Babylon show the goddess mother Semiramis with her child Tammuz in her arms" (p. 13).<sup>28</sup> And "Diodorus spoke of an obelisk 130 feet high that was erected by Queen Semiramis in Babylon" (p. 39).<sup>29</sup> Citing Seymour, Woodrow exclaims, "Tradition ascribes the invention of the punishment of the cross to a woman, the queen Semiramis!"<sup>30</sup> (p. 52).

Nevertheless, Woodrow is overstating his case, at least in the case of the latter. If you consult Seymour, you will find that a question mark rather than an exclamation mark would be more appropriate, as Seymour immediately adds: "As it is uncertain when the celebrated Assyrian Queen lived, it may be doubted whether she is entitled to the unenviable credit of devising the most agonizing death possible. Josephus says that Pharaoh's chief baker was

<sup>24</sup> A PDF of this book is also obtainable online.

<sup>25</sup> "Eusebius: Chronicle." Available at <http://www.attalus.org/translate/eusebius5.html>. Accessed 11/30/2016. Even so, accepting this citation at face value is not without problems. For example, Woodrow would say that Eusebius "was prone to edification and was accused as a 'falsifier of history'" (*Religion*, 55).

<sup>26</sup> Hislop does not specify which of Layard's writings he is referring to on this occasion (p. 22), though he repeatedly cites *Nineveh and its Remains* and the later book *Babylon and Nineveh*. Presumably, the former book is intended. A PDF is available here: <https://ia802705.us.archive.org/3/items/ninevehanditsre03layagoog/ninevehanditsre03layagoog.pdf>. A PDF of the latter here: <http://www.aina.org/books/dan.pdf>.

<sup>27</sup> George C. Bruns, "In Defense of Hislop's *The Two Babylons*." Available at <http://www.british-israel.ca/two%20babylons.htm>. Accessed 12/3/2016.

<sup>28</sup> Woodrow is citing J. G. R. Forlong, *Encyclopedia of Religions* (New Hyde Park, New York: University Books, 1964), vol. 2, p. 398.

<sup>29</sup> Woodrow is citing *Encyclopedia of Religions*, vol. 3, p. 264.

<sup>30</sup> Woodrow is citing William Wood Seymour, "The Cross in Tradition, History, and Art" (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1897), 64.

crucified not hanged, as our English translation reads, and Pharaoh may have preceded Semiramis.”<sup>31</sup> Even more importantly, in Seymour’s footnote to this material, he further explains, “Semiramis by some historians is supposed to have lived B.C. 2000; by others, B.C. 1250.”

Here, then, is the crux of the matter. Some historians place Semiramis at a time compatible with her being the wife of Nimrod, while other historians place her later. In *Religion*, Woodrow is assuming the former. Hislop is focused on the former but allows that two different women by that same name lived in both time periods. This proposition poses an easy reconciliation between the two groups of historians. Woodrow’s follow-up book, *The Babylon Connection?*, supplies a question mark but is still prone to overstatement. Whereas before he overstated his argument in favor of a Nimrod-Semiramis connection, in this book he overstates his criticism. He acknowledges: “History about Semiramis is so confused, some have supposed there were two women by this name, and that one may have lived earlier” (p. 19). He immediately dismisses such a reconciliation between the historical data, giving no creditability to the possibility of such a proposal. One reason is because he finds it preposterous to think that Semiramis could have been the mother, wife, and sister of Nimrod. His short-sightedness is obvious in that Skiba poses a simple solution: Semiramis’ father took his daughter as his wife and begat Nimrod, who later took her as his wife. This postulation maintains the *mother-wife-sister* relation. Nevertheless, since I theorize that Semiramis was a fallen angel rather than a Nephilim, I would pose that Nimrod took his mother as his wife after his father died. My hypothesis maintains a *mother-wife* relation and would attribute the *sister* relation to historical confusion.

Woodrow is very critical of Hislop’s procedure: “As was the case with Nimrod, so Hislop finds similarities between various goddesses, and on this basis, supposes all of them were but different names for Semiramis” (p. 11). Woodrow argues as if the similarities mean nothing because of the differences. He acknowledges that Hislop would attribute the similarities to a common point of origin—Babylon—and the differences to dispersion that took place over “*all of the earth*’ (Gen 11:9)” (emphasis his, 23). Yet he rejects this proposal because he believes that the division at the Tower of Babel was just a local dispersion over “that part of the world—that *land*—not the entire planet” (emphasis his, 24). Perhaps proponents of the local flood will find Woodrow’s argument more compelling than I do. As a proponent of a worldwide flood, I am inclined to see a worldwide dispersion and division of the languages based on what happened at the Tower of Babel. Most cultures throughout the world have flood stories with remarkable similarities. To be sure, these flood stories have their differences as well, but I do not discount their common point of origin because of these differences. Likewise, I would not be necessarily inclined to discredit the premise of Hislop’s thesis because of the differences in the legends. Bruns rightly points out this weakness in Woodrow’s criticisms of Hislop’s methodology:

With all due respect to Mr. Woodrow it is the linking of similarities in myths that help us determine what the truth once was as evinced [sic.] by the very universal flood myths Mr. Woodrow mentions. This writer has personally studied hundreds of flood myths from around the globe and it is their similarities not their differences that unite them with the Truth as found in Scripture! It is the key words and phrases that many of these myths share, such as “a righteous man,” “flood,” “rain,” “boat,” “ark,” “mountain,” “raven,” “dove,” “alter,” “sacrifice,” “all the earth was covered,” “all people died,” etc. that point to a common denominator of truth. The differences in the details within these myths only identify them with their specific cultures.

Perhaps these legendary blond-hair-blue-eye goddesses, at least in many cases, point back to mother-wife of Nimrod, known as Semiramis. I find this proposal much more persuasive than Woodrow’s speculation that “primitive people who had no contact with each other—or with ancient Babylon—might develop [such] similar practices and beliefs” (p. 25). Woodrow objects, asking: “Would a Babylonian woman have blond hair and blue eyes?” (p. 34). I would respond, “Certainly, if she were really a fallen angel of the Nordic variety.” But, then again, I hold to the fallen-angel understanding of Gen 6:4 and find confirmation in Jewish works. Woodrow, on the other hand, would discount “Jewish legends” about Nimrod as being nothing more than “‘Jewish fables’ (Titus 1:14)” (p. 26-27). In contrast, I am inclined to think that such books as *1 Enoch* and *Jasher* retain some level of historical credibility.

As a corollary, Woodrow would also discount any connection between the Washington Monument and the capitol building as pagan sex symbols (pp. 30-31). Writers such as Thomas Horn would insist upon this association, however.<sup>32</sup> My point of interest will be to see if writers such as Gilbert, who support the historical association made by writers such as Horn between these pagan symbols and the monuments, will consistently be able to deny any

<sup>31</sup> Seymour, 64-65.

<sup>32</sup> Thomas Horn, *Zenith 2016* (Crane, MO: Defender, 2013), 294-295, 334-337, 352-353.

historical connection with Nimrod and Semiramis. For instance, Woodrow would reject the notion that Tammuz was “an actual person” because various encyclopedias do not consider him such (p. 41). But if the historicity of a person or event is decided by the encyclopedias he mentions (Americana, Britannica, Judaica, of Religion, New Catholic, and Word Book), then my natural question would be: “How many of these sources affirm as historical true (1) that fallen angels mated with human women in Gen 6:4, (2) that a worldwide Noahic flood took place just as described in the Bible, and (3) that Nimrod was a giant (Nephilim)?” If these sources consider these items as mere legend, then their attributing any connection between Nimrod and Semiramis or Tammuz to mere legend is not surprising. Is Gilbert being consistent in his use of sources to discount the scholarship of those who maintain a historical connection between the Nimrod-Semiramis Mystery Religion while affirming the scholarship of those who consider Nimrod a Nephilim or who make a historical connection between our monuments and the Babylonian Mystery Religion? If so, then good. My thesis in MSIH does not require that the various biblical goddesses be associated with Semiramis. In that case, one is left to postulate that various fallen angels are regarded as goddesses in the OT. On the other hand, if writers such as Gilbert and Heiser are citing sources against the credibility of the Nimrod-Semiramis association, when those same sources would also reject the credibility of Nephilim (particularly pertaining to Nimrod), then Gilbert and Heiser strain their own credibility in rejecting the Nimrod-Semiramis connection. Why use the same set of sources to deny one part of the equation while rejecting those same sources in affirming another part of the equation? If the credibility of Gilbert and Heiser fails a consistency check, then one may still conjecture that the Semiramis who started the Babylonian Mystery Religion could be a fallen angel and the historical figure behind many of the OT references.

### Icke’s Reptilian-Semiramis Hypothesis

The Wikipedia article on Semiramis also cites David Icke as incorporating “Hislop’s claims about Semiramis into his book *The Biggest Secret*, claiming that Semiramis also had a key role in the Reptilian alien conspiracy that he [Icke] asserts is secretly controlling humanity.” Icke basically takes the ancient alien theory and postulates that the human race was created by Reptilians who modified our DNA. He claims that Sumerian Tablets attributes the creation of the human race to two reptilian scientists: Enki (a male) and Ninti (a female). The latter became known as Queen Semiramis (pp. 6-7). “Nimrod and Semiramis (or the beings those names symbolized) were from the reptile bloodlines” (p. 50). Icke’s reptilian conjectures would be foreign to Hislop. Even so, linking Nimrod with Semiramis is a proposition made popular by Hislop. Hislop uses Semiramis to explain the origin of the Babylonian Mystery Religion and the pagan modification of the proto-gospel. In his estimation, she took the prophesies about the coming Messiah and applied them to Nimrod and Tammuz. According to Hislop, her gospel was a forgery of the prophecy. Icke takes the opposite point of view—that the biblical story is a forgery of her legend (p. 52). In fact, according to Icke, Jesus never existed: “There was no Jesus and Mary because these are symbolic figures in a story which has been told endless times throughout the pre-Christian world” (p. 141). “There was no Jesus or crucifixion” (p. 143). “Jesus...did not even exist” (p. 148).

At this point, my interest in Icke’s book waned too much to finish reading it, at least before writing the initial draft of this article. I find his antithetical statements regarding the historicity of Jesus to be too preposterous to even qualify as part of the Great Deception. Nevertheless, before reading his book, I had just finished reading L.A. Marzulli’s *The Nephilim Trilogy*, which poses that two fallen angels—Semyaza and Azazel—are reptilian shapeshifters who have underground cities and flying saucers. These are the two primary fallen angels who, according to 1 Enoch, left Heaven to mate with human women. Marzulli’s book is fictional but is intended to portray plausible possibilities. The fallen reptilians will claim to have created humanity. Marzulli is probably correct that this will be a key part of the Great Deception. The transition to Icke’s book was very interesting in that regard, especially in his descriptions of how they do this shapeshifting. Also, later in his book, Icke has the picture of the Sumerian serpentine goddess and infant (p. 197). One might take his argument and contend that this was a statue of Semiramis. Both Marzulli and Icke pose that Reptilians have modified human DNA. But Marzulli is looking at the evidence through a biblical lens, while Icke is looking at it through the ancient astronaut lens. The same could be said of many other things in his book. For example, Icke wants to pose that aliens came from *Planet X*. But if one wants a Christian perspective concerning Planet X, one could read Douglas Elwell’s book by that title. Or if one wants to read a Christian perspective that allows the possibility that God used angels to modify our DNA to create the human race, one could read Heiser’s chapter on panspermia.<sup>33</sup> The basic

<sup>33</sup> See Michael Heiser, “Chapter 10: Panspermia: What it is and Why it Matters” in *How to Overcome the Most Frightening Issues You Will Face This Century*, Kindle Edition (Crane, MO: Defender Publishing). Heiser argues that if panspermia were proven true, then intelligent theistic panspermia would harmonize with the Bible. If this were the case, then the highly-evolved extraterrestrials that God used to bring life to our planet and modify our DNA, via theistic evolution, until humanity reached the point that God conferred upon humans the status of His image bearers on this planet, were most likely angels (Gen 1:26-28). This postulation does not rule out His using angels to create other

thrusts of Icke's theories are better seen through a Christian worldview. I am providing a plausible Christian perspective for Semiramis that would allow the possibility that she was not human yet involved in the manipulation of human DNA.

As noted in MSIH, Marzulli portrays a man being raped by a female alien on a UFO in his fictional account (*Trilogy*, 382). Judging from many reports, his fiction may be based on reality. Now, if these aliens are shapeshifting fallen reptilian angels, then the most natural supposition would be that this female alien on the UFO was a fallen female angel, which is the impression that I get from Marzulli's book. One might even suppose that it was Semiramis and that she could shapeshift into a beautiful form.<sup>34</sup> Regardless as to what one might suppose in his fictional account and the supposed accounts by Icke confirming their shapeshifting ability, my hypothesis is that Semiramis was a fallen female angel. I am skeptical that she had shapeshifting abilities, though, at least in her physical form after the flood. My hypothesis is that once an angel transforms into human form sufficiently to mate with humans so as to produce offspring, that angel has lost his or her shapeshifting abilities. Such assessment agrees with statements made by Schnoebelen. However, those angels who have not transformed to that extent would, in my opinion, still be able to shapeshift and transform themselves into angels of light.

### Cauley's Two-Semiramis Hypothesis

The model I am entertaining herein combines the strengths of various views held by others. The Nimrod-Semiramis connection and the two-Semiramis hypotheses by Hislop, among others, is being adopted for consideration. However, Hislop's Euhemerus view of Semiramis is rejected in favor of perceiving her to be a goddess—from the biblical perspective—which makes the fallen-angel view most likely. The ancient astronaut view is rejected as an explanation of her alien origin. My working theory herein is that Nimrod's mother, Semiramis (Sammuramat I) was a fallen female angel, who became Nimrod's wife and, as the Queen of Babylon, instituted the Babylonian Mystery Religion in the wake of his death. Many legends grew out of these events, such as her becoming the Queen of Heaven. Later, Satan used another queen (the wife of Adad-nirari III) to imitate Semiramis' actions. I will postulate that this Sammuramat II was also a fallen female angel. Doing so allows me to be consistent with my thesis in MSIH that the pagan *goddesses* worshipped in antiquity were fallen *female* angels. This perspective is consistent with the postulation that the *gods* worshipped in antiquity were fallen *male* angels. Jeremiah prophesied from 627 B.C. until at least 586 B.C., which would have been around 250 years after the reign of Sammuramat II. Perhaps Sammuramat II was, in part, the legendary Queen of Heaven against whom Jeremiah was prophesizing. However, the association of the Queen of Heaven with Ashtaroth goes back further. Therefore, my supposition is that Satan used Sammuramat II to reinforce and simultaneously obscure the worship of Sammuramat I in a shroud of mystery. My reconstruction is a synthesis of various arguments held by other nephologists:

- Some nephologists believe that Nimrod was a Nephilim.
- Some nephologists believe that, in that case, his mother was a fallen female angel who also became his wife.
- Some nephologists also believe that his wife instituted the Babylonian Mystery Religion.
- Some nephologists would identify her as Semiramis.
- Some nephologists believe that Nimrod is the Assyrian beast who *was and is not and will come* (Rev 17:8).
- Some nephologists believe that the woman carried in the ephah to the land of Shinar by the two winged female entities represent this Babylonian Mystery Religion coming back home to roost (Zech 5:9-11).
- Some nephologists believe that the woman carried in the ephah is Semiramis.

I hold these theories as well. What I am adding to these suggestions is that the actions taken by Semiramis may have been imitated by at least one other woman who was also a fallen female angel who had become mortal and thus earthbound. Regardless as to this latter speculation—that Semiramis II was a fallen female angel—the most important point is that the original Semiramis may have been a fallen female angel. If so, she could have been the goddess who gave birth to the demigod Nimrod. And like Nimrod, she might return from the abyss in the future—if she has not already.

---

intelligent beings on other planets. For an opposing point of view, which basically insists that the only life on other planets would be that of fallen angels, see Jeffery W. Mardis, *What Dwells Beyond: The Bible Believer's Handbook to Understanding Life in the Universe*, third edition (Crane, MO: Defender Publishing Co., 2015). Although his book is a very commendable read, there are weaknesses in his argument which I discuss elsewhere. I pose a mediating position. God created animal and plant life on other planets but not humanoid life.

<sup>34</sup> Elsewhere, however, Marzulli will pose that they can assume the shape of either a male or female human (p. 714) and that alien hybrids also rape human males (p. 745). Therefore, the deduction that it was a genuinely female fallen angel who raped the man in the UFO in Marzulli's book is just the more natural impression from his discussion, not an ironclad deduction.

### Fallen Female Angels

Naturally, this proposal concerning Semiramis being a fallen female angel will be met with resistance since it postulates not only the existence of fallen female angels but that they mate with human males. Since MSIH defends that thesis at some length, doing so here will not be necessary. Nevertheless, since Lake's perspective has been interacted with above, a brief response to his more traditional assumption below will suffice:

It is interesting to note that all of the angels revealed in the Bible are presented as male. (I am concerned about some of today's ministers reportedly having visitations from female angels. This does not fit the biblical norm, and I believe deception is involved.) Their stories seem to deviate from the creation of mankind. God desired a helpmeet for Adam and created Eve from Adam's own flesh. This action not only gave Adam a companion, wife, and friend, but it enabled him to procreate. This ability corresponds with God's command for the two to "be fruitful and multiply." No such command was ever given to the angels. It would seem that they were all created as males, and God never intended for them to procreate. So we see, in Genesis 6, why both the concepts of sex and procreation were such an overwhelming temptation for them. This understanding allows us to correlate within our thinking: (1) Genesis 6; (2) the men of Sodom and Gomorrah wanting to have sex with the angels; and (3) what Jesus said about angels in Matthew 22:30.<sup>35</sup>

Lake's assessment is fallacious for multiple reasons. See MSIH for elaboration. The two winged female entities in Zech 5:9-11 appear to be some type of female angel. Some believe that they are fallen cherubim, which is generally admitted to be a class of angel, even by some of those holding Lake's bias. In fact, Cris Putnam is even open to the possibility that these female angels are not fallen:

Because most of these appearances recorded in Scripture are of male messengers, it is commonly assumed that there are no female angels.

In *Sense and Nonsense about Angels and Demons*, Kenneth Boa and Robert Bowman conclude that "angels can appear in bodily form, but they don't come in male and female varieties." However, the authors simply ignore or overlook contrary biblical evidence. [The same can be said of Lake.] The prophet Zechariah recorded a vision entailing two *female* supernatural entities with wings on a divinely appointed mission:

Then lifted I up mine eyes, and looked, and, behold, there came out **two women**, and the wind was in their **wings**; for they had wings like the **wings** of a stork: and they lifted up the ephah between the earth and the heaven. (Zechariah 5:9, emphasis added [by Putnam])

A stork is an unclean bird to the Hebraic mindset. Furthermore, these winged women are carrying another woman only identified as "Wickedness" (Zechariah 5:8). On one hand, it seems likely that these women are fallen angels, but on the other hand, one could argue that because it was a divinely appointed mission, it was not indicative of their status. Either way, the idea that the immortals are exclusively male seems to be based more on male-dominated tradition than on biblical exegesis.<sup>36</sup> (All emphasis his.)

Personally, I believe that these winged women are *fallen* female angels. Thus, by my count, at least four fallen female angels are described in Scripture: Lilith, Semiramis, and these two fallen cherubim (who are probably carrying Semiramis in the ephah to Babylon). God flies by means of cherubic chariots.<sup>37</sup> My speculative theory is that wingless Semiramis will fly by means of these fallen cherubic chariots to Babylon via a UFO. Regardless, experiential data confirms that female angels genuinely exist. Lake's appeal to Adam and Eve self-destructs since they were created as male and female in the image of the angels as the intermediate image bearers of God. Thus, angels would presumably be male and female as well. The reason that male and female angels do not procreate is because they are immortal, not because they are all males. Lake's argument that God made all angels male with frustrated sexual desires fails on many levels. He leaves the question unanswered: "Why would God design angels as male with attendant sexual desires but no way to fulfill those desires?" He practically accuses God's poor design as placing angels in a state of "overwhelming temptation." I would pose instead that since the earthly reality is a mirror of the heavenly reality that not only are angels

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 53.

<sup>36</sup> Thomas Horn and Cris Putnam, *On the Path of the Immortals* (Crane, MO: Defender Publishing Co., 2015), 7.

<sup>37</sup> Pastor Mike Hoggard, "UFOS: Chariots of the Beast (Angels, UFOs and Antichrist)."

created male and female, they are given the legitimate means to satisfy the functions for which they were designed. They were designed as sexual beings, so they have the legitimate means to satisfy the desires that go along with that design. In short, a verse like 1Cor 10:13 applies to our heavenly counterparts as well: “No temptation has overtaken you but such as is common to man; and God is faithful, who will not allow you to be tempted beyond what you are able, but with the temptation will provide the way of escape also, that you may be able to endure it.” God does not place us in situations of overwhelming temptation. Nor does He do so to angels. Genesis 6 is explained by the fact that those male angels who fell wanted more than just sex, they wanted procreation, something female angels could not give them, but also something for which they were not designed. If anything, the homosexual desires of Sodom and Gomorrah is refuted by, not explained by, the heterosexual desires of the angels in Genesis 6. In their original state, the sexual desires of the heavenly angels were heterosexual, only after their fall were their desires perverted to encompass homosexual desires. Jesus should be understood as saying that resurrected believers will not marry because they will be like angels in being immortal, not that they will be like angels in being all male, much less sexually frustrated males!

Lake practically concedes this last point on the next page where he explains Jesus’ comment: “The subject of these verses in Matthew is marriage and procreation” (p. 54). The point of the passage is not that all believers will be male in the resurrected state! Rather, they will not have procreative marriages. Lake then appeals to mythology as having some historical basis when it poses that “supernatural beings” (gods) had sex with human women. Agreed. But some mythology also poses that “supernatural beings” (goddesses) had sex with human men—a fact he overlooks. Then, on the next page, he cites a video in which Schnoebelen says, “To be accepted into the lower branches of the Illuminati, he was required to marry a fallen angel....Entrance in the Palladium is where **this marriage/sexual union with a fallen angel takes place**” (p. 55). Lake cites Schnoebelen as an authority on the subject, which is understandable. But why not pose that the celestial beings mating with these *human males* were fallen *female angels*? Lake did not clarify whether Schnoebelen had sex with a male or female angel, so I consulted Schnoebelen for myself to see what he had to say.

#### Sex with Lilith

Schnoebelen describes his sexual experience as a “congress (meaning sexual introitus).” Sexual introitus would be expected to refer to entrance into the vaginal tubular opening. He says that he had “sexual introitus, sexual intercourse” with this fallen angel. Would this not be sex with a fallen *female* angel? He says that, in doing so, he became one flesh with the entity, and the biblical passage to which he alludes is describing sexual relations between a male and a female: “Do you not know that the one who joins himself to a harlot is one body with her? For He says, ‘The two will become one flesh’” (1Cor 6:16). Schnoebelen says, “**You are becoming one with a fallen angel.**”<sup>38</sup> But the implications of his terms and citation are more explicit: If you are a male, you are becoming one with a fallen female angel. Lake gives a great deal of credibility to Schnoebelen’s testimony.<sup>39</sup> Fine. So do I. But we should give equal credibility to the sexual implications of the gender of fallen female angel Schnoebelen describes, as he goes on to explain:

A satanic wedding was performed, where **I was married to the arch goddess Lilith. And she actually came down.** And how many of you have heard of Lilith? She is a very nasty, very ancient **demoness**, strongman type being. Maybe I should say *strongwoman*; I don’t want to be sexist. Anyway, and in rabbinic legend, she was the first wife of Adam. And He [God] made her at the same time that He made Adam, same way out of the dust of the earth. But she wouldn’t submit to Adam. Specifically, she wanted to be “on top,” to put it delicately. And Adam didn’t like that. He said, “I don’t like this woman. I want a divorce.” And so Yahweh threw her out of the garden and figured He’d make a more compliant partner, so He made Eve out of the rib. And you all know that story. Well, anyhow, the story is that Lilith was pregnant by Adam, and she was enraged at having been thrown out of this wonderful place into this bleak land outside the garden precinct. And when she had the baby, she was on the banks of the Euphrates River, and she took the baby and dashed its brains out on the rocks just to spite Adam and to spite the Almighty and out of the baby’s brains came all the demons in the universe. And so she is regarded as the mother of all demons. And she is regarded as the patron saint of crib deaths and abortions.....So I got to marry this creature. I tell you that was one heck of a honeymoon. (“Part 1,” 2:19:10-2:21:32)

Schnoebelen explains that some Jewish people even today are afraid of Lilith, and he goes on to affirm the reality of male incubus and female succubus. As seen above, he uses rabbinic legend to explain the origin of Lilith. Mark Biggs has written a very good book, *The Case for Lilith*, defending this perspective. Nevertheless, I personally do not believe Lilith was the first wife of Adam. I discuss Lilith in more detail in SMIH. My working theory is that she is Lucifer’s

<sup>38</sup> Bill Schnoebelen, “Exposing The Illuminati from Within (Part 1 of 2),” 2:18:48. Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ckDxBhMt2GA>. Accessed 10/14/2016.

<sup>39</sup> Lake cites Schnoebelen at length (pp. 55, 145-147, 185, 194).

fallen soulmate and that she mates with human males. I have no reason to doubt that it was Lilith herself who mated with Schnoebelen. She is not bound in the pit of Tartarus, for example. Yet one could at least allow the possibility that it might have been another fallen female angel impersonating Lilith that had sex with Schnoebelen. Regardless of these finer details, I concur with Lake in accepting Schnoebelen's testimony as basically valid. Schnoebelen's explanation might need a little fine tuning, but even he will go on to explain that he does not believe this Jewish legend regarding the origin of demons but rather holds to the more traditional view in which demons are the spirits of deceased Nephilim.<sup>40</sup> Even so, the personal part of his testimony is completely believable where he relates his experience: He had vaginal intercourse with a fallen female angel. Surely, he could tell that it was a female angel rather than a male angel with whom he was having sex! I will accept that part of his testimony at face value. I have no reason whatsoever to believe that it was a male angel impersonating female angel or taking on a feminine form!<sup>41</sup> I gave up that rut-stuck mentality because of my research in SMIH. Additionally, some abductees claim that they can sense the gender of the Greys even apart from any apparent genitalia. If Schnoebelen had the experience he claimed to have, then the mental merging would have confirmed the physical merging as to the gender of the angel with whom he was sexually engaging. Schnoebelen had sex with a genuine fallen female angel. Lake should have informed his readers that it was a female angel with whom Schnoebelen copulated. Evidently, Lake was blind by his traditional mindset so that he failed to see the full significance of Schnoebelen's testimony regarding the fallen angel's gender.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Schnoebelen, ("Part 2," 1:38:48).

<sup>41</sup> One reason I am open to the possibility of fallen female angels impersonating other well-known fallen female angels is that I suspect that they would do so in order to give the illusion that these fallen female angels are omniscient, spanning history in time and space. For example, *Our Lady of Fatima* is based on the apparitions of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the village of Fatima in 1917. Actually, in my opinion, these were apparitions of Semiramis who was probably locked away in Tartarus at the time. In my working model, Semiramis was not released from her imprisonment until 1946. Semiramis was (and still is) assisted in her impersonating the Virgin Mary by other fallen female angels performing these apparitions. Semiramis knew the biblical prophesies of the virgin who would give birth to the Messiah and, as the wife of Nimrod and queen of Babylon, Semiramis created a false religion in which she made herself out to be that virgin. Therefore, very early in human history, she imitated the blessed virgin while in her earthbound mortal form. After her death, Semiramis was imprisoned in Tartarus. Aspirations of Mary would have had to be performed by other fallen female angels until Semiramis was released. The spirit of the mystery religion of Babylon and the worship of Our Lady (actually of Semiramis under the guise of Mary) has been kept alive and well on planet Earth, even during Semiramis' imprisonment, by the assistance of other fallen female spirits. For Schnoebelen's discussion of the Fatima Apparition and its UFO connection and the 1947 Roswell incident, see ("Part 2," 1:01:16). In that discussion he says that he would never confuse a demon with a fallen angel because he has encountered both and the difference between them is like that of a mosquito compared to a human being. "Fallen angels are awesome beings...demons are not." (1:37:55). If we accept his testimony as creditable, should we not accept it as reliable when he says that he had sex with a fallen female angel? Can we not trust that the difference between a male and female angel is sufficient so that he is a credible witness?

<sup>42</sup> More surprisingly, even Schnoebelen seems to be inconsistent regarding angelic gender. Elsewhere, even Schnoebelen will say, "From all indications, the angels in the Scripture are male" ("Angels," 32:00). His assessment here is refuted by his own testimony on another occasion (see "Part 1" cited above) in which he said that he had sex with the goddess Lilith and that, in doing so, he became one flesh with a fallen angel. But this fallen angel is mentioned in Scripture. One might make allowance for this inconsistency since, in that context, he is not (consistently) counting cherubim and seraphim as angels ("Angels," 45:10). Even so, he gives credibility to the testimony of others that Nordic angels can be female ("Angels," 1:09:51). Apparently, he must rely on the testimony of others on this matter because he has only seen angels one or two times ("Angels," 32:27). He places angels in the lowest level of the celestial council (1:34:35). So if Lilith and the stork-women were higher ranking celestial beings, they would technically not be angels if the designation *angel* is limited to the lowest ranking celestial council members. Even so, he is inconsistent in that he says that seraphim "are the most awesome of all angelic beings...the highest order of angels" (1:36:16). Consistency dictates that one acknowledges that not all angels in the Scripture are male. He makes a number of interesting comments in this video. He says that fallen angels must drink blood to reproduce, which is where we got our vampire stories ("Angels," 53:44). He offers confirmative proof of DUMBs (deep underground military bases, 1:29:20), wars, and tunnels in that he has had one or two encounters with the Reptilians (1:33:42). He says that fallen angels become mortal when they fall, which is why Reptilians can be killed. Apparently, Schnoebelen believes in the legitimacy of the Dulce Wars. Bill Schnoebelen "The Angels of God and The Antichrist!" Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=duhChVe8GJ4>. Accessed 10/19/2016.

### Semiramis was a Fallen Angel

Lake's blind spot regarding angelic gender shows up again. Lake and I both believe that Nimrod became a Nephilim. The difference in our approaches is that, given this admission, I am following Missler and Eastman in posing that Semiramis was a fallen female angel. Lake says, "In Babylon, Nimrod married Semiramis, his mother" (*Shinar*, 104). Agreed. However, I would add that she was no mere mortal. A few pages later Lake will provide the mythic background for Semiramis as the Dove-Goddess, worshipped under various names such "as Ashtaroth, Astarte, the heavenly Aphrodite, and Venus" (p. 113). Once again, this possibility is all the more plausible if Semiramis actually were a goddess—a fallen female angel. After all, the biblical texts cited above regarding the various names of this goddess do not treat her as a mere mortal. She is a false goddess. The biblical supposition seems to be that the false gods and goddesses in Scripture refer to fallen angels.

Lake proceeds to discuss the Mystery Religion of Babylon as the unfinished work of Nimrod, which is all fine and well, but it might be better described as the unfinished work of Semiramis. Historically, the Babylonian Mystery Religion was her baby. Mystery Babylon was started by a woman and will end with a woman (Rev 17:5).<sup>43</sup> Rob Skiba argues that the antichrist (the beast who comes out of the bottomless pit a few verses later in Rev 17:8) is Nimrod. If the beast is Nimrod, a mere demigod, why not allow the possibility that the woman in ch. 17 is Semiramis, a fallen angelic goddess? After all, she is depicted as the Queen of Heaven, spanning the pages of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation. Skiba even quotes Tom Horn, who perceptively implies that she was a fallen angel:

Nearly three decades after the Amalantrah Working, rocket scientist and cofounder of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory Jack Parsons and his pal L. Ron Hubbard (Church of Scientology founder) conducted a second ritual [in 1946], the "**Babylon [Babalon] Working,**" in an attempt to reopen the gateway created by Crowley. The two men were not seeking audience with Lam. Instead **they wanted the spirit of Babylon, the archetype divine feminine, to pass through the portal and to incarnate itself within a human being.** Many adepts of Enochian magic and Ordo Templi Orientis believe they succeeded and that **she — the whore of Babylon — walks the earth today.** It would come as no surprise, as Babylonian and earlier "gods" have been depicted as coming through "gates" for some time.<sup>44</sup>

This statement is good, as far as it goes, but Horn does not pursue the implications of his observation. Elsewhere, Horn discusses various gods and goddesses of mythology and the fallen angels behind them and postulates: "The

<sup>43</sup> According to some legends, Semiramis killed Nimrod and then used him to formulate her mystery religion. In the end, he may return the favor by using her and her mystery religion and then kill her and destroy her mystery religion (Rev 18).

<sup>44</sup> Thomas R. Horn, *Nephilim Stargates: The Year 2012 and the Return of the Watchers* (Crane, MO: Anomalos Publishing House, 2007), 21-22, quoted in Rob Skiba, *Babylon Rising: And The First Shall Be Last* (updated and expanded), Kindle Edition (King's Gate Media, 2013), KL 876-882. In a section entitled, "Were there female Nephilim too?" Skiba correctly answers affirmatively, thus explaining why, in passages such as Dt 3:5-7 and 7:1-3, God demanded that the women and children be killed. Rob Skiba, *Archon Invasion: The Rise, Fall and Return of the Nephilim* (Kindle Edition, 2012), 163. In this discussion, he astutely perceives Semiramis to be a goddess worshipped under many names: Diana, Artemis, Ishtar, Isis, Astarte, Inanna, Tanith, Ashtoreth, Aphrodite, Juno, Venus, Caelestis, Urania, Columbia, Liberty, and Queen of Heaven. Unfortunately, though, Skiba claims that these goddesses were nothing more than demigoddesses (female Nephilim or offspring of Nephilim): "We find absolutely no evidence in Scripture for the notion of female angels, we must therefore conclude that these so-called 'goddesses' were in fact giants, Nephilim, and/or Elioud [i.e., offspring of Nephilim]" (p. 167). He notes, "Some will try to use Zachariah [sic.] 5:9 as an example of female angels, but the Hebrew words used to describe these individuals do not indicate this to be true. They are simply described as women (Hebrew: *ishshah* – Strong's # 802) with wings. This could either be allegorical or we could be looking at hybrids, but one thing is certain, there is no supporting evidence in Scripture that would indicate they are female angels" (n. 14). He overstates his case with this circular reasoning. Zech 5:9 could readily be interpreted as supplying the supportive evidence which he denies to exist. The fact that we are created in the image of male and female *elohim* provides grounds for concluding that we are created in the image of male and female angels. Therefore, nothing prevents us from taking Zech 5:9 as collaborative evidence in Scripture for female angels. *Ishshah* does not necessarily mean a *human woman*. *Female* is the appropriate translation on various occasions, as noted by BDB: *female children* (Num 31:18); *female animals* (Gen 7:2; Is 34:15). One could just as easily pose that these winged women were *female angels*. In short, Skiba's postulation that Semiramis rebuilt Babylon after the Tower of Babel incident is plausible (Babylon, KL 3373). His belief that Semiramis was a Nephilim daughter of Cush (KL 5563) is less plausible than my proposal that she was a fallen angel who married Cush.

iconographies, myths, and rituals of each deity exhibited the specific characteristics (nature, **gender**, underworld authority, etc.) of that particular deity.”<sup>45</sup> Since Horn acknowledges that the gender of the god and goddess worshipped matches the gender of the spiritual entities behind those gods and goddesses, he should have entitled his book, *The Gods and Goddesses Who Walk Among Us*. In *The Ahriman Gate*, he graphically portrays the reality of such a goddess.<sup>46</sup> In *Nephilim Stargates*, Horn notes that the Bible agrees with mythology in picturing such gods and goddesses imprisoned behind gates (extradimensional portals) within the Earth.<sup>47</sup> What Horn is saying, therefore, is that Parsons and Hubbard were trying to open up a portal to bring back the archetype divine feminine spirit, the whore of Babylon—who is none other than the goddess Semiramis! Many adepts believe that Parsons and Hubbard succeeded, and Horn leaves open the possibility that they are right. If this is true, then while so many nephologists are waiting for Nimrod to return, they are overlooking the fact that Semiramis already has returned! She’s back! She has been released from the pit, that is, from her imprisonment behind an extradimensional portal. The preliminary fulfillment of Zech 5:9-11 already has taken place!

### Gilgamesh’s Mother was a Fallen Angel

Fortson’s book, *Beyond Flesh and Blood*, is a great introductory text and excels where most books fail in explicitly acknowledging the existence of female angels. Although he does not personally believe that Lilith was Adam’s first wife, he acknowledges that some students of the Bible do.<sup>48</sup> As seen above, Biggs would certainly be in that number and Schnoebelen entertains it. Fortson adds that, per Babylonian legend, Gilgamesh’s father was Lilu, who “was known to sexually seduce women in their sleep, which leads many to believe that he may have been an incubus” (p. 27). Some pose that Lilu is the male counterpart to Lilith. Speculations regarding Gilgamesh get particularly interesting when nephologists make him out to be Nimrod—or Tammuz (who was the alleged son of Nimrod, thus Nimrod reincarnated). According to other legends, Gilgamesh’s father was a demigod and his mother was a goddess.

If Gilgamesh’s father was the demigod Nimrod and his mother was the goddess Semiramis, then the legends that make Gilgamesh out to be the son of a demigod and goddess naturally fit. Understandably, some nephologists therefore pose that Gilgamesh was the son of Nimrod.<sup>49</sup> Some would question the computation, however. How would having a mother who is 100% goddess and a father who is 50% god result in an offspring that is 66.6% god? Would the offspring not be 75% god? On the other hand, if Cush modified his own DNA so that he was 26% ( $\approx 1/4$ ) god, then the math and legend would work out. Nimrod would have gotten 13% from his alien DNA from his father, Cush, and 50% of his alien DNA from his mother, Semiramis. He would be 1/3 human and 2/3 god. Thus, Nimrod (rather than Tammuz) would be Gilgamesh. I suspect this is the case.

### Transmogrification and Incursion

My synthetic hypothesis, that Nimrod’s parents were a genetically modified father (Cush) and a fallen angelic mother (Semiramis), gives me an advantage over the simplistic hypothesis of nephologists who reject a second sexual incursion in favor of simple transmogrification to explain postflood Nephilim. First, my proposal bases its principle argument on the primary document. I am drawing my principle deductions from the context and syntax of the biblical material. The most natural deduction from the primary source material (i.e., the book of Genesis) is that Nimrod became a *gibbor* through the same means that the Nephilim did in Gen 6, which is through the mating of fallen angels with humans. This is the only means supplied in the context of Genesis for becoming a *gibbor*. The LXX makes the proper deduction. Second, my rejection of the transmogrification of Nimrod is supported by the verbal syntax. In Gen 10:8 and 1Chron 1:10, *chalal* (plus the Lamed) is in the Hiphil tense, in which case BDB defines it as **begin to**. The LXX/LXE renders it accordingly: *Nimrod began to become a giant*. The transmogrification theory should not be misconstrued to give the impression that *chalal* could be translated in the verse to mean that *Nimrod began to corrupt himself to become a giant*.<sup>50</sup> Not so! Had this reflexive meaning been intended, then a Niphil tense would have been implemented. BDB

<sup>45</sup> Thomas R. Horn and Donald C. Jones, *The Gods Who Walk Among Us* (Lafayette, LA: Huntington House Publishers, 1999), 133.

<sup>46</sup> Thomas and Nita Horn, *The Ahriman Gate* (Sisters, OR: Musterion Press, 2005), 63, 114-115.

<sup>47</sup> Horn, *Stargates*, 17, 63.

<sup>48</sup> Minister Dante Fortson, *Beyond Flesh and Blood: The Ultimate Guide to Angels and Demons* (USA: Impact Agenda Media, 2012), 25.

<sup>49</sup> Smith believes that Gilgamesh was the offspring of Nimrod and Semiramis. Trey Smith, “Occult: Birth of ALL Occult. The TRUTH behind the Tower of Babel, Nimrod, Abraham and Israel” (1:43). Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S80z3kC31uw>. Accessed 10/16/2016. Trey’s website is <http://godinanutshell.com>.

<sup>50</sup> Putnam and Horn (*Exo-Vaticana*, 31-33) suggest that some moral decision on Nimrod’s part may have triggered a change in his genetic code by turning on a genetic mutation which had been passed down to him by his bloodline. This mediating postulation is perhaps permissible because it places the original mutation in the DNA passed down to him by

supplies a couple of examples of the reflexive meaning: *to profane himself* (Lev 21:4), *she profanes herself* (Lev 21:9). Nimrod, in contrast, did not profane himself, as is proven by the Hiphil rather than Niphal tense. The genetic corruption was passed on to him by his parents. He did not corrupt his own DNA. Third, those posing that Nimrod transmogrified his own DNA must leave the primary source material and run to secondary sources to import their theory of transmogrification into the Genesis text and, in doing so, supplant the contextual and syntactical implications of the primary source material. Secondary source material should be used to supplement, not supplant, primary source material. Do not treat secondary as primary. My synthesis allows for transmogrification from secondary sources to be applied to a secondary agent. Rather than apply it directly to Nimrod, my *transmogrification-incursion* hypothesis applies *transmogrification* to Nimrod indirectly through Cush (and the *incursion* to Semiramis). Thus, I can concur indirectly with nephologists such as Horn, Johnson, and Skiba who assert postflood transmogrification in relation to Nimrod. Fourth, my *transmogrification-incursion* theory is supported by those myths which assert that Nimrod's father was a demigod but his mother was a goddess. She was an agent of the second incursion. Accordingly, my model concurs directly with nephologists like Missler and Eastman who believe that Nimrod's mother was a fallen angel.

### Semiramis was a Member of the Divine Council

Horn and Putnam make a claim that is astonishing regarding its implications:

During the time of Peleg (cf. Genesis 10:25), God descended from Heaven with the seventy angels in order to teach the people of the earth their respective languages. Later, Michael, at the behest of God, asked people to choose its patron angel, and each nation chose the angel who had taught it its language....This **pantheon of divine beings** or angels who were originally to administer the affairs of Heaven and earth for the benefit of each people group **became corrupt** and disloyal to God in their administration of those nations (Psalm 82). They then began soliciting worship as **gods [and goddesses]**, and because these angels, unlike their human admirers, would continue on earth until the end of time, each "spirit" behind the pagan attributes would become known at miscellaneous times in history and to various cultures by different names. This certainly agrees with the biblical definition of idolatry as the worship of fallen angels, and means the characterization of such spirits as Nimrod/Apollo, Jupiter, Zeus, **Isis[i.e., Semiramis!]**. (*Immortals*, 185.)

Unwittingly perhaps, Horn and Putnam put Isis/Semiramis in this pantheon of seventy angels who became corrupt! By implicitly putting Isis in this fallen pantheon, they have acknowledged that goddesses were part of the group, as I pointed out in the inserts above. MSIH provides reason to believe that female angels were probably part of this pantheon. No surprise there. Putnam opens their discussion in *Immortals* by affirming his belief in female angels, and elsewhere Horn states that the specific gender of the gods and goddesses of antiquity is accurately portrayed by the myths and icons of those fallen angels. Postulating that Putnam and Horn believe that female angels were part of this seventy-angel pantheon is reasonable. My surprise was that their argument would lead to the conclusion that Isis herself may have been one of these seventy angels! I had forgotten about this statement in their book until I thumbed back through *Immortals* after I had finished MSIH. In any event, if their statement means that the very spirits that possessed Nimrod and posed as his wife, Semiramis, were part of the seventy angels who taught the seventy languages, then they are mistaken. God would not have put these fallen spirits in charge of teaching the languages. Semiramis would have fallen before the division of the nations at the Tower of Babel and thus not have been a candidate to be one of the seventy angels who descended from Heaven with God. Yet the male and female angels who were members of that seventy-angel group may have followed the examples of Nimrod and Semiramis, respectively, and thus contributed to the Nimrod-Isis legend. Horn and Putnam probably mean something along this line, which is entirely possible, even probable. Semiramis would not have acted alone in spreading her Babylonian Mystery Religion throughout the Earth. Surely, she would had fallen accomplices who assisted her through imitation.

### Fallen Angels are Still Having Sex

Skiba devotes an entire book, *Archon Invasion*, to refuting *the multiple incursion theory* (MIT).<sup>51</sup> Skiba believes that the initial group of Nephilim were produced by a sexual incursion of fallen male angels having sex with human females. These angels were imprisoned in Tartarus and had to watch their Nephilim offspring kill one another. Therefore, per Skiba, no other fallen angels would dare do such a thing. All subsequent Nephilim DNA contamination must be

---

his parents. As an alternative, they pose that a retrovirus may have modified his DNA. In view of the legends and the verb tense, though, the more likely scenario is that Cush modified his own DNA via a retrovirus and then passed that on to his son, Nimrod.

<sup>51</sup> Rob Skiba, *Archon Invasion: The Rise, Fall and Return of the Nephilim* (Kindle edition, 2012).

explained by: (1) *DNA transference theory* (DNATT)—the offspring of these original Nephilim passing on this contamination to their offspring and thus subsequent generations, (2) *human DNA modification theory* (HDNAMT)—humans modifying their own DNA, and (3) *angelic-human DNA modification theory* (AHDNAMT)—fallen angels modifying human DNA through scientific experimentation on humans without having sex with humans. Because Skiba is correct in affirming these three forms of contamination, his book is a worthy read. On the other hand, he overstates his case at various points, giving too much weight to secondary sources, and failing to address all relevant facts.

The primary source material is the Bible, according to which pre-flood Nephilim were the result of a pre-flood sexual incursion of male fallen angels mating with human females (Gen 6:4). The only other time the Bible uses the word *Nephilim* is in Num 13:33: “There also we saw the Nephilim (the sons of Anak are part of the Nephilim); and we became like grasshoppers in our own sight, and so we were in their sight.” Skiba insists that these post-flood Nephilim were not the result of a second incursion because they are *the sons of Anak*, not the sons of fallen angels. Presumably, these Anakim were a simple case of DNA transfer since Anak “was himself a son of a giant name Arba” (Josh 15:13; 21:11).<sup>52</sup> And Arba was an Amorite (p. 209), a descendent of Amorous (the father of the Amorites) and thus descendent of Canaan (pp. 255-274). Therefore, Skiba gives this genealogy: Ham—Canaan—Amorous/Amorites—Arba—Anak/Anakim. Skiba is correct to infer that Nephilim DNA was transferred through Ham’s wife to his descendants. Yet it must be pointed out that this is only an inference. The text does not make it explicit. Skiba is critical of MIT because the biblical text does not make it explicit that a second incursion occurred. Thus, MIT is dependent upon logical inference. What he fails to note is that his own DNATT is likewise just as dependent upon logical inference within the biblical narrative. His argument is highly dependent upon the inference that Ham’s wife, who gave birth to Canaan, was genetically tainted. He makes a great case in this regard, and I concur (see MSIH). Nevertheless, the biblical text does not make this explicit and even goes to some length to make it ambiguous as to why Canaan was cursed. Moreover, the Bible does not clarify why some of his decedents were marked for extermination while others were only submitted to servitude. MIT can offer the hypothesis that those decedents who were born as a result of a second incursion were more genetically tainted than those who simply tainted by DNATT. Thus, these Nephilim were larger than other giants and marked for extermination.

Skiba has an excellent discussion of how recessive DNA traits could show up in some offspring but not in others. Still, in my opinion, MIT has the better explanation as to why the Nephilim giants were larger and why only some Canaanites were to be exterminated. Moreover, the two theories are not mutually exclusive. Based on secondary evidence (i.e., nonbiblical material), Johnson is correct to suspect that Canaan sought to perform further DNA modification. Consequently, in HDNAMT one would not have to invoke a second incursion to explain these post-flood Nephilim. Yet, once again, the two theories are complementary rather than necessarily exclusive. All four models should be deemed correct: DNATT, HDNAMT, AHDNAMT, and MIT. Granted, MIT is more restricted after the flood. For one thing, fallen angels would be less inclined to become mortal and thus be subject to Tartarus. Also, their entrance into the earthly dimension could have been made more difficult. Indeed, the portals between earth and the fourth dimension were apparently closed, requiring human sacrifice (etc.) to reopen them. Horn and Putnam have an excellent discussion of the reopening of these portals in which they cite Daniel Mastral’s *Traces of the Occult* to the effect that only seventy-two out of the ninety portals had been reopened by 2001 (*Immortals*, 267). Moreover,

Mastral tell us that some human individuals are indeed empowered by changes in their DNA. This can happen in three ways: demonic sexual spirits (incubus and succubus) can transport semen among humans; a demon possessed man can fertilize a woman, or, very rarely, a couple can pass through a portal and have sex in the other side.

In all cases, the higher energy affects the embryo’s DNA in a way that makes it easier for the individual to interact with spirits and be a channel for more powerful psychic powers.<sup>53</sup>

According to such ex-Satanists, fallen entities are still very much engaged in sexual activity, having sex with both male and female human beings. Such accounts destroy Skiba’s argument against MIT. And he ignores it! He does not discuss incubi or succubi in *Invasion*. Yet these experiences are very much a part of the post-flood invasion. He acts as if all supernatural abduction experiences are explainable by AHDNAMT, when in fact they are not. Male and female humans are being abducted and raped by fallen male and female *elohim*. MIT is occurring.

As explained in MSIH, in conjunction with the discussion by Heiser, the terms *elohim* and *demons* can be very broad terms. MSIH entertained the possibility that some succubi are *demonesses* (i.e., the deceased spirits of fallen angel-

<sup>52</sup> Ibid, 161. As Skiba points out, related cases of DNA transference are found in 2Sam 12:22; 21:18.

<sup>53</sup> See “Ex-Satanist Details Illuminati Spiritual Plan.” Available at <http://henrymakow.com/ex-satanist-details-illuminati-spiritual-plan.html>. Accessed 10/29/2016.

human hybrids), but at least some succubi are fallen female angels, thus *goddesses*. Even so, the conjecture that some succubi are merely demonesses rather than fallen angels is open to challenge. Putnam makes an interesting observation: “Not every entity labeled ‘demon’ is the same sort of being. Missler points out that holy angels seem to manifest human bodes at will, but demons seek to control the bodies of others. This is well supported by biblical texts.”<sup>54</sup> Following this line of reasoning, one would deduce that fallen entities manifesting in physical bodies to have sex are fallen angels, not deceased spirits of Nephilim, not demons in other words. However, Putnam poses an interesting case in which it is difficult to determine if the entities in question were demons or fallen angels. Invisible beings were biting a girl and leaving visible teeth marks with saliva. She could see her invisible accosters, but those observing her could not. But she did grab the hair of her invisible attackers and had some of it in her hand. Putnam then reminds us of his discussion of demons taking physical form as succubi and incubi (p. 328) and then proceeds to discuss fallen angels as sons of God (p. 331). In my opinion, the entities tormenting the girl may have been demons rather than fallen angels. Such experiences are not isolated. Putnam provides an interview with Rev. Ray Boeche (p. 411), in which Boeche says that it is “fascinating to speculate about [the differences between fallen angles and demons as their deceased Nephilim offspring], but when you’re dealing with (as I have been for the last couple of months) three women—unknown to each other—who are being sexually assaulted by invisible entities who cease their activity only at the name of Christ, how important is the distinction?” Pragmatically, the difference may be moot in such a case. Nevertheless, since they are *invisible entities*, I suspect that they are merely demons. Fallen angels could physically manifest, as Missler’s comment would lead us to deduce. Therefore, succubi and incubi taking a *visible physical form* are probably fallen angels rather than demons. Schnoebelen describes the experience:

Frequent sexual self-stimulation will often attract sexual spirits (those appearing to be men are called incubi, those looking like women are called succubi). These are spirits which will come and assume the form of impossibly perfect sexual partners. They will appear more flawless and desirable than even airbrushed centerfolds because Satan will have observed just what sort of person “turns on” his target. The spirit will exactly fulfill that fantasy. As ghastly as this idea is, it is common practice in the higher levels of Satanism. They believe these “demon lovers” will come to men and draw seed from them. Then they will steal the resulting seed and go assault a human woman in male [form] with or without her permission. Such spiritual “rape” is more common than most would think. The sick “hope” of such encounters is that the woman will conceive a child half-human and half-demon—a candidate for the anti-Christ! Needless to say, once a man or woman has experienced “sex” with such a creature, normal marital relations with their spouse (however attractive) will pale into boring routine. Thus, the victim returns more and more to the spirit lover, and the bondage grows ever deeper. This is not fiction from a horror novel. It is going on all the time. In high level Satanism, both of us were “married” to demons. We both had frequent “sex” with our Ascended Master spirit guides! We felt that this was the way we could gradually “evolve” into gods.<sup>55</sup>

Schnoebelen is an ex-Satanist. His wife was a Wiccan. They left the occult and came to faith in Jesus. During their time in the occult, they both had frequent sex with incubi and succubi who would assume incredibly sexy physical form. He calls them *demons*, evidently in the broad sense of the word, using the word demon to refer to *fallen angels*. Elsewhere, he says that when all else fails and Christian women are still being accosted by fallen angels, they should cover their hair because angels are very much attracted by their long hair (1Cor 11:10-15). He testifies that in his ministry experience this works every time. Either Schnoebelen and those like him are being fraudulent, or Skiba is completely mistaken in thinking that there are no postflood sexual incursions taking place on the part of fallen *elohim*. In my assessment, the latter is unquestionably the better conclusion. Skiba is wrong. Fallen angels are still having sex with human beings.

As a corollary, and in harmony with such experiential data and biblical inferences, we must also deduce that Skiba is mistaken in thinking that there are no female angels. My hypothesis is that female angels were involved in the pre-flood and postflood sexual incursions. Legends report not only Titans but Titanesses, such as Theia, “the ancient female equivalent of Lucifer—the female ‘light bearer.’”<sup>56</sup> Perhaps some legends regarding Titanesses recall echoes of pre-flood fallen female angels while other legends, regarding Olympian goddesses, do the same for postflood fallen female angels. In any event, Anak’s father being a Nephilim does not rule out the possibility that his mother was a goddess (a fallen

<sup>54</sup> Cris Putnam, *The Supernatural Worldview: Examining Paranormal, PSI, and the Apocalyptic* (Crane, MO: Defender, 2014), 324.

<sup>55</sup> William (Bill) Schnoebelen, *Blood on the Doorposts: An Advanced Course in Spiritual Warfare*, Kindle Edition (Ontario, CA: Chick Publications, 1994), KL 2047-2057.

<sup>56</sup> Putnam and Horn, *Immortals*, 269.

female angel). Indeed, my supposition is that Nimrod's father (Cush) had tainted DNA (via DNATT and/or HDNAMT) but Nimrod's mother (Semiramis) was a fallen female angel of the Nordic variety (thus an agent of MIT).

Regarding Nordics, Schnoebelen states: "These are reported to appear just like humans, except they are unusually statuesque and blonde, almost like "Nordic gods," hence the name. Both males and females have been reported, both equally attractive; although the males are much more common."<sup>57</sup> He gives three possibilities:

They may be first generation offspring of the fallen celestials that turned out very well (like the "mighty men, the men of renown") in Genesis. Anyone who experiments with breeding whether it is plants or livestock, knows that occasionally you get a "gem" and a lot of times you get a loser. **They also may be "newly fallen" angels that have not yet lost their original beauty.** They COULD even be elect angels, except that there is no record of them ever behaving like the angels in the Bible. It is reported that they have a policy of non-interference in human affairs (like the "Prime Directive" on Star Trek) but little is actually known of them. (Ibid., KL 1729-1735).

Perhaps some Nordics are fallen, and some are unfallen, if we allow the third possibility of non-interference. In any case, Semiramis could not be put into the third category. She was the epidemic of interference. She would have to be placed into either the first or second category. She was either the offspring of a fallen celestial, or she was a newly fallen celestial. The latter is more probable. Perhaps her male celestial counterpart was one of the 200 watchers who fell before the flood, leaving her without a sexual mate in Heaven. If so, rather than spend an eternity in Heaven without a sexual mate, she chose to leave Heaven and mate with human males since this was the only sexual option left.

#### **Sammur-amat and Shinar**

Ruark links Semiramis name with the land of Shinar:

In the midst of the tumult of war Nimrod and Semiramis met—and in none too savory circumstances, for tradition states that she was an inn/brothel keeper in the city of Erech—leading one to speculate upon the nature of their initial acquaintance. Semiramis was a native of Erech [cp. Gen 10:10], which as evidenced by it's name seems to have been built by a Hamitic family (Ham's wife was said to have been descended from Cain who built the first Erech in honor of his son). The name Semiramis is a later, Hellenized form of the Sumerian name "Sammur-amat", or "gift of the sea."

The initial element "sammur" when **translated into Hebrew becomes "Shinar"** (the biblical name for lower Mesopotamia), and is the word from which we derive "Sumeria". **This one tarnished woman then, had such a lasting impact upon world history that not only do we call by her name the land from which civilization flowed, but God himself through the sacred writer has let us know that its distinguishing characteristic was that it was "the Land of Shinar," or Semiramis.**<sup>58</sup> (Emphasis his.)

If he is correct, then the *Land of Shinar* is the *Land of Semiramis*. As to the geographical location, commentators equate it with *Babylonia* based on Gen 10:10 (NAC; WBC). Some say that Amraphel, the king of Shinar in Gen 14:1, cannot be positively identified. Yet some speculate that this might have been another name for Nimrod. In any event, if Semiramis became the Queen of Babylonia, whose fame exceeded that of her husband, then it makes sense that the land was named after her.

#### **Conclusion**

This article has interacted briefly with some of the various conjectures concerning the possible relation between Nimrod and Semiramis. Affirming such a relation practically requires that one adopt a two-Semiramis hypothesis. If so, then a reasonable case can be made that Semiramis I was a fallen female angel who became the mother of Nimrod, thereby explaining his Nephilim DNA. Possibly, Semiramis II was also a fallen female angel (or at least a hybrid). The focus of this article has been on Semiramis I, simply referred to as Semiramis in this study. After her death, Semiramis was bound in Tartarus. Apparently, she was set free from Tartarus in 1946. Presumably, rather than incarnate herself sufficiently to bear children this second time, and thus become earthbound in a mortal form, she is presently acting as a succubus. She and other fallen angels have been impersonating Mary, as the Queen of Heaven. Possibly, during the Tribulation, she will drink human blood and once again take a mortal earthbound form and once again rule as the Queen of Babylon.

<sup>57</sup> William (Bill) J. Schnoebelen, *Space Invaders*, Kindle Edition (Dubuque, IA: Xlibris, 2003) KL 1164-1165.

<sup>58</sup> Michael Ruark, "Semiramis, Ishtar, Easter, Mysteries." Available at <https://michaelruark.wordpress.com/2014/04/18/ishtar>. Accessed 11-13-2016.