

Analytical Review of Philip Jones' *The Negro, Serpent, Beast and Devil*, #4

Clifton A. Emahiser's Non-Universal Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

At the end of paper #2 of this series, it was shown from the *Aramaic Targum pseudo-Jonathan* that it was not a negro who seduced Eve, but the fallen angel Sammael, at Genesis 4:1! Some may scoff at the Aramaic Targums, but Aramaic Targum paraphrases were first used at Nehemiah 8:8. Not only that, but the Aramaic Targums of Genesis agree with Rev. 12:3, 7-9, where **“that old serpent”** that seduced Eve is also **“called the Devil, and Satan. which deceived the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him.”** Hence, Philip Jones errs by claiming the serpent was not a fallen angel! We will now pick up Philip at p. 15:

“WHO WAS CAIN?”

“We have seen already that Nachash alone was punished to walk on his belly and eat dust, we find that Eve too was *personally* punished to bring forth children (literally ‘sons’) in sorrow or heartache. She was to discover to her dismay that she had been a party to a sin which produces wicked fruit, or seed. Matthew 13 calls that fruit ‘tares’, or weeds. Tares have a leavening effect upon wheat, or bread. The negro named Nachash sowed the wicked seed, but Eve nurtured it. Therefore Eve named her firstborn ‘Cain’, which means *acquired* or *purchased*. Eve exclaimed in Gen. 4:1, ‘I have gotten (bought) a man from the Lord,’ because Cain was paid for at a high price. Hence God told Eve that her desire (her sexual attraction) would be for her husband, Adam (Gen. 3:16).”

[Comment by Clifton A. Emahiser: First of all, we should consider the *Aramaic Targum*, called pseudo-Jonathan, on Genesis 3:6, which is unique inasmuch as it identifies the angel Sammael as the “serpent”:

“And the woman saw Sammael, the angel of death, and she was afraid and knew that the tree was good for food, and that it was a remedy for the enlightenment of the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise. She took of its fruit and ate and also gave (*it*) to her husband and he ate.” And again, the *Aramaic Targum* pseudo-Jonathan, on Genesis 4:1:

“And Adam knew that his wife Eve had conceived from Sammael the Angel (of death) and she became pregnant and bore Cain. And he was like those on high and not like those below. And she said: ‘I have got a man from the angel of the LORD.’” [back to Philip Jones]

“Should there be any question whether Eve could have Cain by Nachash, and Abel by Adam, (*Christian Vanguard*, No. 32, July 1974, p. 4, *Black And White Twins Born To Mother*) has given examples of twins, one black and the other white, being born to a White mother. The phenomenon is called superfetation. Homer Brown, in his

booklet *Who Was the Only Woman in Scripture Ordained to Carry the Word?* p. 30, says: 'Superfetation is a double pregnancy in which the two fetuses were conceived at different times. Being of different age, they are different in size'. The two fetuses are not true twins, for they are not the offspring of one father, and they can be born several days or even weeks apart. This seems to have occurred in the case of Cain and Abel (see Gen. 4:1-2)."

[Comment by Clifton A. Emahiser: I agree with Homer Brown and Philip Jones that Eve's double pregnancy was a process of "superfetation", but the "nachash" in question was not a negro, but rather "Sammael, the angel of death". However, the negro is a satyr, or a satanic devil-ape in his own category! – back to Philip]:

"Homer Brown continues: Superfetation is possible only 'when the woman has intercourse with two different men in very short succession. She is only susceptible to impregnation for an hour or so. If this woman had relations with her lover, then went home immediately and took part in relations with her husband, it could happen' (*Black And White Twins Born To Mother* p. 29).

"Since the natural precedes the spiritual in type, or in symbolism, we must interpret the Bible this way, for the Apostle Paul says in II Cor. 11:1-4 that the 'Church' is espoused to 'one husband', she should present herself as a 'chaste virgin', uncorrupted by 'another spirit' (seed). Also, as death came upon us through Adam and will be lifted off through Christ, so the woman will be saved in childbearing, because that was the source of her sorrow (in bearing Cain, sowed by 'the devil' – Mt. 13:39). Romans 6:6 also implies that 'the body of sin' is a 'work of the devil' like Cain.

"Briefly, we should also note that the human body in Scripture is likened to a tree. Our women are called 'fruitful vines' (Psa. 128:3). Israel is called 'God's vineyard' (Isa. 5:7), and Jesus Christ is the father of that vine (Jn. 15:5). Those who depart from the 'true vine' are adulterers, for the 'fruit of the womb' Gen. 30:2; Dt. 7:13; Lam. 2:20) belongs to God and must be holy, or pure (Lk. 2:23). The word 'eat' in Genesis 3 signifies having sexual relations, similar to Prov. 30:20. The only fruit which God ever warned against 'eating' was fruit containing another racial seed. Ignoble as fornication is, and, much as we would like to shield Eve of this sin, the only way that we can change the facts is to give up our belief in the Bible or our belief in the book as it is now translated.

"Eve, like all women, fits the description of Ezekiel: 'Thy mother is like a vine in thy blood, planted by the waters ...' (Ez. 19:10). We must all remember that we have our roots in our *blood*, and we are to honor our race by receiving and giving seed to our own 'body', the body which we received from Adam. We must return to the rock from which we were *hewn*, and to the 'pit' from which we were 'dugged' (Isa. 51:1), because the seed is man's blood being transferred, or planted where it can develop into a new person.

"Many people never stop to think that Cain is never once stated in the Bible to be the seed of Adam. Why is this? Is it not because Eve sinned against her own body, her husband, and so Cain was not considered to be one of Adam's seed? The Apostle writes: 'Every sin that a man doeth is without [outside] the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against [inside] his own body' (I Cor. 6:18). Was Cain cursed by God, sent into exile, forfeiting the family name and the rights of a firstborn son, just because he murdered Abel, or was he cursed because he already was a worthless

seed, fit for destruction? The *Jewish Encyclopedia* says under the topic 'Eve', that 'Cain's real father was not Adam, but one of the demons'. Eve certainly realized that Cain was not the son of Adam too (Gen. 4:25; 5:3)."

[Comment by Clifton A. Emahiser: The former four paragraphs are excellent by Philip Jones. – back to Philip]

"One ancient Akkadian inscription recognizes Cain's (another name of his was Sargon) father as being 'Satan', according to Comparet: 'The divine Sargon, the illustrious king, a son of Bel the Just, the King of Akkad and of the children of Bel' Other legends of Sargon's origin say that he was adopted by Akki and raised as a gardener. The basic root of Akki is found in the Hebrew word Nachash; Naka, the Egyptian word for serpent; Naga, the Hindu word for serpent, particularly serpent god; Ahhi, a serpent water god ...' (*What Happened To Cain?* p. 19). The Arabic root words 'akhnas', 'akhanasa', and 'khahars' have the same meaning as Nachash, but also signify 'devil' or 'ape' (*The Tempter of Eve*, Savannah pp. 280, 283). The negro has all the characteristics that the name implies! Cain was therefore a mulatto, and he was often called 'Bel' after his father. The title 'Bel' signifies 'to mix' in the Hebrew language (*The Two Babylons*, Alexander Hislop, p. 124). He took a wife from among the negroes, and her name was Ishtar, Isis, or Kali, depending on which country you happen to be in (*The Mystery of Satan*, bk. 2 by B.F. Jackson 70:6). She and Cain determined to absorb and destroy the seed-line of Adam and Eve (*Testimony Of Tradition and The Origin Of Races*, p. 14). Kali's emblem was the cobra and she was known as a female viper (*The Mystery of Satan*, bk. 2. p. 12). Cain was also called Merodach ('to rebel'), or Marduk (Jer. 50:2).

[Comment by Clifton A. Emahiser: While we are on the topic of "Sargon", the following is what I wrote in my WTL #59:

While the book *Sargon the Magnificent* by Mrs. Sydney Bristowe, page 93 is informative, she confuses fact with fiction: "In the 'Legend of Sargon' he calls his adopted father 'Akki', which is evidently another name for the Devil, for it is closely connected with the name of Nakash the Hebrew serpent – with Ahi, the water-god and serpent – with Ahriman, who in the Persian religion is the 'source of all evil, the devil' – with Agni, the Indian god of fire – with the Egyptian Naka, the serpent – with Naga, the Indian serpent-god – with the Maori demiurge Tiki and with Agu or Acu, another name for the Babylonian moon-god, otherwise called Sin."

Correctly she links "Akki", "Devil", "Nakash", "serpent", "Naka", and the moon-god, "Sin", but erroneously applies Sargon's legend as fact. In *The Penguin Ency. of Ancient Civilizations*, ed. Arthur Cotterell, page 84, Thorkild Jacobsen explains that the enemies of Sargon characterized him as being illegitimately born of a temple prostitute priestess, not knowing his father, and then being exposed to the elements to die, but rescued and adopted by a humble fruit grower. Further, the "legend" maliciously implies that Sargon was sired by the "devil." To make a long explanation brief, Mrs. Sydney Bristowe confused propaganda as fact!

[wmFinck note: The attributions of the meanings of the names for Bel, Merodach and Marduk are fanciful, as one can tell by referring to their original Akkadian roots. Rather, Hislop. Jackson, Bristowe and their followers have taken advantage of similarities between English forms of disparate Hebrew and Akkadian words. The names should be studied in Assyrian first, which is possible by perusing *The Assyrian*.

Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, which is freely available in PDF format. – back to Philip]

“Cain’s firstborn was named *Enosh*. Ariel explains why: ‘We admit that the MS. from which our English translation is made has it *Enoch*, and some few others, but the older MSS. and versions have it *Enosh* ...’ (*The Negro: What Is His Ethnological Status?* by Buckner H. Payne, p.111). The name *Enosh* means ‘beyond the power of resurrection’ (Ibid. p. 111).

“Hislop writes that Bel was the founder of Babylon (*The Two Babylon’s* p. 25). It is not clear if Cain or his father is meant, however. Cain and his son Enosh built the city of ‘Enoch’ (or Unuk, later called Erech), while Cain’s capital city was Akkad. His subjects were Sumerians and were called ‘black heads’ (*What Happened To Cain?* p. 11).”

[Comment by Clifton A. Emahiser: Caution is advised when reading *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop, because he habitually twists the facts of history to substantiate his play-pretty convoluted conjectures. I stopped quoting Hislop for this very reason. Biblically, according to the 10th chapter of Genesis, Nimrod was the son of Cush, who was the son of Ham, who was the son of Noah, who was in the “the seed of the woman”, of Gen. 3:15, so there is absolutely no possibility that Nimrod was of “the seedline of the serpent!

[wmFinck note: The Hebrew word *enosh* refers to *mortal man*, and while *enosh* and *adam* were often contrasted, the children of Adam were also called *enosh* on many occasions, especially in Genesis.

Babylon did not arise as a prominent city until long after the Genesis chapter 11 event from which it later took its name. Furthermore, there is no solid academic basis for imagining the “black-heads” of Sumerian inscriptions to have been negroes. Other cultural factors may have been involved in the making of the description. If they were negroes, why were their heads alone called “black”? – Back to Philip]

“CAIN’S WORSHIP WAS REJECTED

“Some people object when we say that negroes cannot become Christians, for they are not subject to God’s Law, but the negro did not become mortal in Adam. Leviticus 21:18 clearly states that no man having a *flat nose* is permitted to approach God’s altar. Ariel says: ‘This includes the whole negro race; and expressly excludes them from coming to his altar, *for any act of worship*. God would not have their worship then, nor accept their sacrifices or oblations [as Cain tried to offer] ... For Adam’s children God set up his altar, and for their benefit ordained the sacrifices; but not for the race of *flat-nosed men*, and such the *negro race* is’ (*The Negro: What Is His Ethnological Status?* by Buckner H. Payne, p. 41).”

[Comment by Clifton A. Emahiser: Philip Jones is absolutely accurate that negroes cannot become Christians, as only Adamites can show blood in the face, and only Adamites received the breath of Yahweh’s Spirit! As for the “flat nose” of Lev. 21:18, the context concerns the “sons of Aaron”. However, Philip makes a very good point, as with the negro and his numerous ape-like deformities, it is overwhelmingly true, “flat nose” and all! – back to Philip]

“The world’s oldest religious book, the *Maneva- Darma Sostra*, says: ‘Woman is an altar to which man brings as a pleasing sacrifice to God, his seed.’ It is therefore

incumbent that only God's seed (Adam) be sacrificed as an act of worship upon the altar of the woman of Adam's race. No other seed except Adam's will do. This is why God considers race-mixing and proselytizing the negro an act of idolatry or adultery. An idol is a false god, and the negro is a seed which appears to be in the likeness and image of Adam, but he is not. The Adamic White Race is God's husbandry, his 'plant' which is 'perfect'. God's seed is likened to the *Word* (Jn. 1:1-2) which was sown in Adam in the beginning: 'and it shall bring forth fruit in you, and ye shall be honoured in it for ever' (II Esd. 9:31)."

[Comment by Clifton A. Emahiser: I agree wholly with Philip that the ape-like negro **IS NOT** in the likeness and image of Adam! Anyone who would claim otherwise has to be a turkey from Clownsville, or clown from Turkeysville! – back to Philip]

"Cain, being a 'bastard' (mongrel) seed (Dt. 23:2), was unable to stand in God's presence. His worship was in imitation of Abel's and was a profanation of the name of Yahweh. The nature of Cain's offering was not the sole reason for his offering being unacceptable to God, but Abel's offering was *blood*, representing himself. Abel offered himself symbolically on the altar to God as a 'living sacrifice', and God accepted him because his seed-line was pure. This made Cain angry with Abel, since Cain could do nothing to make himself equal to Abel or fit to marry one of the daughters of Adam.

"Eve admits in Gen. 4:25 that she considered Abel to have been her seed, and so Seth was to be Abel's replacement to carry on the struggle with Cain. The conversation which God had with Cain is garbled in Gen. 4:6-7 and should be rendered like this: 'If you do well, will you not be accepted? and if you do not reform yourself, sin lurks in your beginning (origin). And *against* you shall be his (Abel's) compelling need, and you shall force yourself against him (Abel).' Then, in verse 8, we have the account of Cain 'talking with' (or *speaking against, challenging*) Abel, and Abel's murder.

"Let me repeat that the sin which lurked at Cain's 'door' was not simply a suppressed hatred or jealousy of Abel, but an indication of why Cain was unacceptable to God as a son. Thomas Inman writes that the 'door' refers to the 'door of the womb' from which 'life issues to the world' (*Ancient Pagan And Modern Christian Symbols*, p. 127). As far as Cain being able to 'reform' himself in Eve's womb (literally, to be 'born again'), God does not grant men that option. Men must be born right the first time (literally, *righteous* – Gen. 6:9).

[Comment by Clifton A. Emahiser: The following is what I wrote in my *Research Papers Proving The Two Seedline Seduction Of Eve* in part:

You can see here it is speaking about the birthright quite plainly! As Cain was the firstborn, he would be in line for the family priesthood as well as the inheritance. We are talking about big stakes here! There is more to this than just the acceptance of the sacrifices. Cain evidently wanted to kill Abel all along for losing his position as firstborn and used the rejected sacrifice for an excuse to justify it.

Secondly, there is something here that should stand out conspicuously to everyone who reads it, and that is: "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door." What does this mean, "**and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door?**" A lot of people try to read this as if Cain had a choice in the matter. That is not at all what it is saying! What is it saying then? Yahweh through Moses is speaking of Cain's conception and birth here – his natural tendency toward sin as a result of the character of his father. Cain's conception was therefore his "door."

Yahweh knew that he couldn't "do well" and wasn't fit for the birthright and He told him as much! Let's see what the word "door" means in Strong's Hebrew:

"Door – #6607 **pethach**, *peh'-thakh*; from 6605; an *opening* (literally), i.e. *door (gate) or entrance way*:– (KJV) door, entering (in), entrance (ry), gate, opening, place." – back to Philip]

"Jesus Christ identified Himself with the seed of Adam and Eve, not with that of Cain, when He said that the Jews were responsible for murder, for the blood of Abel to the blood of Zacharias (Mt. 23:35; Lk. 11:50-51). Those who are responsible for shedding all of this blood are symbolized by 'Mystery, Babylon the Great' (Rev. 17:5; 18:24) and are called 'beasts'. We know of two seedlines which correspond to this symbology: (1) the negro and his mixed-flesh offspring, which includes the Jews and most of the 'races' on earth, and (2) the Man (Adam, the son of God), 'written' in the *Lamb's book of life* from the foundation of the world (Rev. 13:8). The first is responsible for bringing sin and death upon the second."

[Comment by Clifton A. Emahiser: Here, again, Philip errs by identifying the negro as the one who seduced Eve, by taking the term "beast" out-of-context. – back to Philip]

"The call to separate from the 'beast' and cling unto the Man (Adam, or Christ) is thus made only to those who are of the 'flesh, bones, and body' of Adam. Those who are not of this seed-body are not invited to *eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ*, because they oppose us:

"THE DEVIL IS A SEED

"The belief that the 'devil' is omniscient or omnipresent is an error which has been a settled opinion for quite some time. People have deified him in their minds and are in most cases unwilling to part with the concept. But since Christ was a literal, physical person of the line of the Woman, Eve, we must also look for a literal seed to oppose the 'Christ (anointed) seed'. Those who say that the whole Adamic race is Satan's seed until it 'accepts Christ' must reject most of the Bible in its primary (literal) interpretation! We hold that God has provided the natural *before* introducing the spiritual (see I Cor. 10:11;15:49)."

[Comment by Clifton A. Emahiser: I hope Philip Jones is not taking 1 Cor. 15:48-50 out-of-context:

“⁴⁸ As *is* the earthy, such *are* they also that are earthy: and as *is* the heavenly, such *are* they also that are heavenly. ⁴⁹ And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. ⁵⁰ Now this I say, brethren, that [*non-Adamic*] flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth [*non-Adamic*] corruption inherit incorruption.” (my brackets) *Revised Webster Version*

It is important that we understand there are only two kinds as stated at Hebrews 12:6-8 KJV:

“⁶ For whom Yahweh loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. ⁷ If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? ⁸ But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons.”

As for Philip Jones' position on whether or not "the 'devil' is omniscient or omnipresent", will require further examination of Scripture. Inasmuch as "omniscient" means "all-knowing" Matt. 24:36 should settle this thusly: **"But of that day and hour knoweth no *man*, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only."** As for the word "omnipresent" which means "everywhere-present", Psalm 138:7-10 & Heb. 1:7 should help resolve this:

"⁷ Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? ⁸ If I ascend up into heaven, thou *art* there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou *art there*. ⁹ If I take the wings of the morning, *and* dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; ¹⁰ Even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." ... "And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire." How can we limit the presence of the faithful angels, (the 2/3rds **NOT** cast out of Heaven, Rev. 12:4)? End of my commenting here, CAE.]