

LIES MASQUERADING AS “THE TRUTH”, A Critical Review Of The Book, *THE TWO CREATIONS*, Part #5

Clifton A. Emahiser's Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Phone (419)435-2836, Fax (419)435-7571
E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

As I explained in part #'s 1, 2, 3 & 4, since the author didn't use his own name but instead used the pseudonym of "Gabriel", I will continue to refer to the author as "alias-gabriel", whoever he happens to be. This alias-gabriel is quite a Scripture-twister as I demonstrated several times in this series. His flawed premise is that the "man" at Genesis 1:26-27 is a different person than the "man" at Genesis 2:7. This is what alias-gabriel said on page 4 of his *The Two Creations*: "Moving on to verse 5 of chapter 2, we notice the Lord (Yahovah) [sic Yahweh] God came into the picture, apparently acting alone now." What alias-gabriel is intimating here is that the god Elohim was primarily the creator of Gen. ch. 1, and that Yahweh was the god that made Adam in Gen. ch. 2. By saying "... acting alone now ..." alias-gabriel is insisting that in Gen. ch. 1 there were two gods, and in ch. 2 only one (a two-god theory). So with alias-gabriel there are two gods working in tandem to create the "man" at Gen. 1:26-27, and only one at Gen. 2:7. Yet in his "Author's Explanation of Title" on page ix, he states: "Elohiym is the plural written name of the Godhead who did the creating in Genesis 1." It seems that alias-gabriel can't make up his mind on how many Almighty Gods he thinks there are, and who did what!

What alias-gabriel doesn't seem to grasp is the fact that both the terms "Lord" (Yahweh) and "God" (Elohim) as used in the Bible address a singular deity. Yahweh is simply His name, and Elohim simply means "Almighty". What it amounts to is: the heathen have their (plural or singular) false elohim, and we have our (singular) Elohim (cf. Micah 4:5)!

The *Enhanced Strong's Lexicon* in the Libronix Digital Library states in part for "elohim" #430: "... 2606 occurrences; AV translates as 'God' 2346 times, 'god' 244 times, 'judge' five times, 'GOD' once, 'goddess' twice, 'great' twice, 'mighty' twice, 'angels' once, 'exceeding' once, 'God-ward + 4136' once, and 'godly' once. **1** (plural). 1A rulers, judges. 1B divine ones. 1C angels. 1D gods. **2** (plural intensive—

singular meaning). 2A god, goddess. 2B godlike one. 2C works or special possessions of God. 2D the (true) God. 2E God.”

Had alias-gabriel read Gen. 2:4 & 5, he would have realized that the “Lord God” (Yahweh *singular*-Elohim) was present as a singular deity throughout all of the creation in Genesis chapter one. So, alias-gabriel’s flawed conclusion is: there are two gods and two creations!

Not being familiar with the true nature of the Hebrew language, alias-gabriel resorts to developing his own arbitrary translations from the *Strong’s Hebrew & Chaldee Dictionary* by picking and choosing at random whichever Strong’s Hebrew number that supports his defective supposition. I will cite an example of how he does that later in this paper, but first let’s examine what the Hebrew really says.

To demonstrate that the “man” at Gen. 1:27 and the “man” at Gen. 2:7 are the same person, they are both derived from the same identical Hebrew word “אֱתֵהָאָדָם”. Therefore to separate these two passages as being two separate creations has absolutely no foundation whatsoever! Not only is this same particular Hebrew word used here, but it is also used at Gen. 2:8; 2:15; 3:24; 6:6, 7; 9:6; Deut. 5:24; 2 Chron. 6:18; Ecc. 7:29; Isa. 6:12; Jer. 27:5 Zep. 1:3 & Zech. 11:6. Let’s now break this Hebrew word “אֱתֵהָאָדָם” down into its component parts, reversing its order from right to left to left to right:

WHERE

אֱתֵהָאָדָם

IS REVERSED TO

אֵת = eth, ׀ = MAQAF, הָ = ha, אָדָם = adam

This is what is known as a “noun common masculine singular absolute”, according to the electronic program “Bible Works”. Each one of these component parts of this Hebrew word is very important to fully understand the meaning of the noun (or name). Let’s now consider each one of these elements of this noun in their proper order:

אֵת = eth

This is #853 in the Strong’s Concordance, thus:

“**853.** אֵת *’êth, ayth*; apparently contracted from 226 in the demonstrative sense of *entity*; properly *self* (but generally used to point out more definitely the object of a verb or preposition, *even* or *namely*):— [*as such unrepresented in English.*]”

As we can see, *’êth* simply is used to point out more definitely the object of a verb or preposition. To get a better concept of the Hebrew word *’êth*, let’s go to Strong’s #226:

“ **226.** אָזַיִן ’ôwth ôth; probably from 225 (in the sense of *appearing*); a *signal* (literal or figurative), as a *flag, beacon, monument, omen, prodigy, evidence, etc.*:-mark, miracle, (en-) sign, token.”

The *Enhanced Strong's Lexicon* in the Libronix Digital Library states in part on #226: “... 79 occurrences; AV translates as ‘sign(s)’ 60 times, ‘token(s)’ 14 times, ‘ensign(s)’ twice, ‘miracles’ twice, and ‘mark’ once. **1** sign, signal. 1A a distinguishing mark. 1B banner. 1C remembrance. 1D miraculous sign. 1E omen. 1F warning. **2** token, ensign, standard, miracle, proof.” I only included this data on Strong's #226, for Strong's #853 stated that it was “... apparently contracted from 226 in the demonstrative sense of *entity* ...”

This dissertation on the word ’êth has been given for those who are unfamiliar with the Hebrew language and are unaware that it exists. Inasmuch as it is used in conjunction with the term “man”, articulated as “adam” at both Gen. 1:27 & 2:7, as presented here, its use should be taken into account. The word ’êth, is used 689 times in the book of Genesis alone, and a grand total of 7302 times in the entire Old Testament! The problem is, I am not aware that there are any interlinear Bibles, or other Bibles with the Strong's numbers above each word which designate where the occurrences of ’êth (#853) are. The only source which I know of that one can find this information is on the Internet at:

www.qbible.com/genesis-a/1.html

There are only two other ways by which one can find such information: (1) learn to read the Hebrew and recognize each ’êth when it is seen, or (2) use an electronic Bible program such as Bible Works. For those who don't have a computer or an electronic program such as Bible works, I will describe how this can be done, hoping that it won't be too boring, but can be verified by those having this program:

One would go to WTT Hebrew Old Testament at Gen. 1:27 and place the cursor on each Hebrew word, and when it displays “n.m. man, mankind” one will know one has the right word. It is the same word as enlarged and displayed in this document. Then by placing the cursor on various parts of the word, one can recognize (1) the particle ’êth, (2) the particle article “ha”, and (3) “adam” in the Hebrew. Then one can go one step farther by highlighting the entire Hebrew word and right-click, and a box will open, and then select “string search”, and every time that same word appears with the same parts of speech, each occurrence will be listed along the side. When selecting one of the passages that Hebrew word will light up in red. Then if one only wants to isolate the particle ’êth, just highlight that part of the word and right-click and one can find every time that it is used in the Old Testament, again lighting up in red wherever it is to be found.

My motive for explaining the use of electronic data in Bible programs is so that all of those people out there who are dreaming up new ways to twist the Scripture will become aware that they need do some serious study before they put their proverbial foot in their mouth.

There is another electronic source called E-sword which shows only part of the particle ’êth (#853) Hebrew words, and therefore cannot be trusted by the serious Bible

student, and I don't recommend it for this purpose, but it has it right on Gen. 1:27 thusly:

“So God<430] created<1254] [853>man<120] in his *own* image,<6754] in the image<6754] of God<430] created<1254] he him; male<2145] and female<5347] created<1254] he them.” Notice #853 here!

It should now be evident that attempting to make an assessment on Old Testament passages without first knowing about the Hebrew ׀, (#853, 'êth), and other such particles, could be hazardous.

– = MAQAF

We will now address what is known as the “MAQAF”. The symbol which is called MAQAF “-” is the equivalent of a hyphen for ancient Hebrew. Just like the hyphen in English, the MAQAF in Hebrew is used to connect two words. To give you an illustration in English, I often write of a “Canaanite-jew”. In doing so I'm showing a connection between the Canaanites of the Bible and a minor few of the Judahites who had mixed racially with the Canaanites. In other words, since these half-breed Canaanite-Judahites have something in common to both the Judahites and the Canaanites, I simply use a hyphen “-” to identify them as both Canaanite and jew, or “Canaanite-jews”.

In Strong's *Dictionary of The Hebrew Bible* under “Hebrew Articulation”, he says: “5. The *Maqqêph'* (-), like a *hyphen*, unites words only for purposes of pronunciation (by removing the primary accent from all except the last of them), but does not affect their meaning or their grammatical construction.” Yes, it would not affect the meaning of their individual grammatical construction, but surely the (-) denotes some sort of interrelationship between the two words! If Strong is correct here, it would place the accent on “adam” rather than “ha”, or ha **adam'**. This would make **adam'** very important, and at Gen. 1:27 & 2:7 it does indeed articulate as “**adam'**”!

הַ = ha

Next to be addressed is what is known as the “particle article” (“הַ”). In order to understand the importance of an article in grammar, it would be well to review the use of the article in English.

Evidently alias-gabriel is sadly lacking the knowledge of the importance of the part of speech called the *article*. In *Practical English*, chapter 2, entitled “The Parts Of Speech II”, page 6, we find a definition for what *articles* consist of in English: “The words *a*, *an*, and *the* are adjectives, although in grammar they are called **articles**. The word *the* is called the *definite* article. The words *a* and *an* are called the *indefinite* articles. When we say ‘*the* book on *the* table’, we are pointing out a particular book on a particular table. When we say, ‘*I have a book*’, no specific or particular book is indicated.”

Surely, most of you who are reading this paper and remember your English classes in school know that this description of the English definite and indefinite articles are correct. Whereupon realizing this, you will immediately be wary once you observe the likes of alias-gabriel and his ilk abusing the Hebrew and Greek articles. Like the English definite article, both the Hebrew and Greek articles modify the subject to a noun.

The Reader's Digest Great Encyclopedic Dictionary, page 1933, has this to say about what an **article** is: "**article** A special form of adjective. 'The' is called the **definite article**. 'A' and 'an' are **indefinite articles**."

The *Encyclopedia Americana*, 1948 edition, volume 1, page 357, says this of the **Article**: "**Article**, in grammar, a part of speech used before nouns to limit or define their application. In the English language *a* or *an* is the **indefinite article** (the latter form being used before a vowel sound) and *the* the **definite article**. The English **indefinite article** is really a modified form of the numeral adjective *one*; so the German *ein* and the French *un* stand for the numeral and the **article**. There are traces in various languages showing that the **definite article** was originally a pronoun; thus the English *the* is closely akin to both *this* and *that*. The Latin language has neither the definite nor the indefinite article; the Greek has the **definite**; the Hebrew and Arabic **definite article** was prefixed to its noun, while on the other hand, in the Syriac and Chaldee it was affixed to the noun, as it is in the Icelandic. In the Scandinavian language the **definite article** is appended to the end of the word as *hus-et*, the house. There is no **article** in Russian."

Why is it so necessary to stress the use of the **article** when we study the Scriptures? For one reason, if we don't know about the use of the **article**, whether it is present or absent, we cannot know what the Scriptures are saying. Not only do we have to know what the **article** means in English, but we have to understand the **article** in Hebrew and Greek. With the **definite article**, the Scriptures are speaking of a genuine person: [’êth]-[ha **adam**’]! In Strong's *Dictionary of The Hebrew Bible* under "Hebrew Articulation", and reversing the order to right to left, we have the same identical Hebrew for the "man" of both Gen. 1:27 & 2:7 as follows:

א = aw’lef, ך = daw’-leth, ם = mame

How alias-gabriel gets something other than "Adam" out of this, I'll never know! But, add the Hebrew ’êth and the Hebrew Article to this, and it becomes an absolute! How can alias-gabriel argue that the "man" at Gen. 1:27 is a different person than the "man" at Gen. 2:7, when it's the same identical Hebrew word with the same identical parts of speech, and at both places with the ’êth and Article? But I guess anything goes when one becomes a pretzel twister!

We have now covered all of the elements making up the Hebrew word for Adam at both Gen. 1:27 and 2:7, and I have given you in this paper the 13 other places in the Old Testament that the same identical word occurs.

Gen. 1:27: “ **So God created man [אֱתֵהָאָדָם] in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.**”

Gen. 2:7-8: “⁷ **And Yahweh singular-Elohim formed man [אֱתֵהָאָדָם] of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man [הָאָדָם] became a living soul.** ⁸ **And Yahweh singular-Elohim planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man [אֱתֵהָאָדָם] whom he had formed.**”

Gen. 3:24: “ **So he drove out the man [אֱתֵהָאָדָם]; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.**”

Gen. 6:6-7: “⁶ **And it repented Yahweh that he had made man [אֱתֵהָאָדָם] on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart.** ⁷ **And Yahweh said, I will destroy man [אֱתֵהָאָדָם] whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man [הָאָדָם], and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them.**”

Gen. 9:6: “ **Whoso sheddeth man’s [הָאָדָם] blood, by man [בְּאָדָם] shall his blood be shed: for in the image of god made He man [אֱתֵהָאָדָם].**”

A paraphrase of Gen. 9:6 might go something like this: “ **Whoso sheddeth [HA ADAM’]’s blood(DAM), by [ADAM] shall his blood(DAM) be shed, for in the image of God made He [’ETH-HA ADAM’].**” It is interesting to note here that the last two letters of Adam’s name are the same Hebrew characters that articulate as “dam”, blood [דָם]. Question: Are we to believe, as alias-gabriel insinuates, that the “man” at Genesis 1:27, who has the Hebrew letters for blood in his name, is someone other than the blushing Adam?

I fully understand the motives of those who either promote a 6th and 8th day creation theory by one God or those who promote a two-god, two-creations theory. The Bible simply doesn’t record the origin of the non-blushing races, and they were here long before Adam (the blushing man) ever came on the scene. Simply put, the entire Bible is a book of Adam, and the Adamites were to keep totally aloof from the non-blushing races. So if one wants to find the origin of the non-blushing peoples, one will have to look somewhere else to find the answer. Now while the Bible doesn’t give us the origin of the non-blushing races, it does give us specific instructions on how we are to, without exception, segregate ourselves from them, as it’s the only Christian thing to do, and highly unchristian to do otherwise!

As I promised you earlier, I will now demonstrate how alias-gabriel does some of his pretzel-twisting. On page 6 of his *The Two Creations*, item #’s 1 & 2, he said in part:

“1. The serpent (*nachash*) was a snake. Not a man, or ‘fallen angel.’

“2. It was subtil [sic subtle]. (From the primary root *aram*) meaning: smoothness ...”

Now alias-gabriel claims to have a Strong’s *Exhaustive Concordance*, and I’m quite sure that he got this definition of “subtle” from that source, but let’s do a little detective investigation to see how he arrived at that conclusion, which I believe you will find very interesting!

Now the Strong's number for "subtle" at Genesis 3:1 is 6175, and in Strong's *Hebrew Dictionary* it says:

"**6175.** עָרוּם *ârûwm, aw-room'*; passive participle of 6191; *cunning* (usually in a bad sense):— crafty, prudent, subtil."

Now alias-gabriel, when he read this definition from Strong's, didn't like it as it didn't fit his supposition, so he decided to go to the root word #6191 instead:

"**6191.** עָרַם *'âram, aw-ram'*; a primitive root; properly to *be* (or *make*) *bare*; but used only in the derivative sense (through the idea perhaps of *smoothness*) to *be cunning* (usually in a bad sense):— x very, beware, take crafty [counsel], be prudent, deal subtilly."

Then alias-gabriel didn't even like this definition, so he only used one word from this description, "smoothness"! Thus, this is a twofold deceitful move, (1) he didn't use the word that Strong designated, and (2) he refused to even use the full root word definition, as that would have destroyed his argument! It is quite evident that alias-gabriel wanted his readers to believe that Eve was deceived by an ordinary reptile snake, as most all snakes have a somewhat smooth skin. But no ordinary reptile snake could have all of the characteristics as defined by Strong's #'s 6175 & 6191! What we have in alias-gabriel is a person who has all the same characteristics as the serpent in the garden, as described in these two Strong's definitions! When it comes to deceitfulness, this is just about as bad as it can get, and we don't need anyone like that in the Israel Identity Message!!! No wonder he won't sign his true name to his work!!!

Strong's #6175 is used ten other times in the Old Testament, and never once is it speaking of a reptile snake! Strong's #6191 is used five times in the Old Testament, and never once is it speaking of a reptile snake! So why does alias-gabriel think it is speaking of a reptile snake at Genesis 3:1? If the "serpent" at Gen. 3:1 were a reptile snake, one would think it would be used in that same context at least one or two other times, but it is not! What ever happened to consistency?