

IDENTIFYING THE “BEAST OF THE FIELD”, #3

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

In pamphlet #'s 1 and 2 on this subject I have given substantial evidence that the Biblical phrase “beast of the field” (often meaning four-footed/quadruped animals, domesticated or wild) is sometimes used as a Hebrew idiom for two-legged/biped creatures appearing as men. In paper #1, I showed adequate documentation that neither Strong's Hebrew word #2423 “chêyvâ”, nor #2416, “chay”, could support, or be translated or interpreted as a two-legged/biped “beast of the field”. With this paper I will show evidence that the “devil” and the “ape” have the same name! Also, that “Satan” is likened to “orangutan”. To document this, I will use Adam Clarke's *Bible Commentary*, volume 1, pp. 47-50 under “Notes On Chapter III”, and especially on the terms “*nachash*” and “*beast*” at Genesis 3:1.

I would point out, what you are about to read was edited out of Ralph Earle's abridged edition of Clarke's *Bible Commentary*, no doubt believing he was doing God and nominal churchianity a favor! Also, Clarke was a master of several languages:

“NOTES ON CHAP. III

“Verse 1. *Now the serpent was more subtle*] We have here one of the most difficult as well as the most important narratives in the whole book of God. The last chapter ended with a short but striking account of the perfection and felicity of the first human beings, and this opens with an account of their transgression, degradation, and ruin. That man is in a *fallen* state, the history of the world, with that of the life and miseries of every human being, establishes beyond successful contradiction. But *how*, and by what *agency*, was this brought about? Here is a great mystery, and I may appeal to all persons who have read the various comments that have been written on the Mosaic account, whether they have ever yet been satisfied on this part of the subject, though convinced of the fact itself. *Who was the serpent?* of what *kind*? In what *way* did he seduce the first happy pair? These are questions which *remain yet to be answered*. The whole account is either a *simple narrative of facts*, or it is an *allegory*. If it be a historical relation, its literal meaning should be sought out; if it be an *allegory*, no attempt should be made to explain it, as it would require a direct revelation to ascertain the sense in which it should be understood, for fanciful illustrations are endless. Believing it to be a *simple relation of facts* capable of a satisfactory explanation, I shall take it up on this ground; and, by a careful examination of the original text, endeavour

to fix the meaning, and show the propriety and consistency of the Mosaic account of the fall of man. The chief difficulty in the account is found in the question, Who was the *agent* employed in the seduction of our first parents?"

My comment: It is my opinion that the story of "Satan" and "the beast of the field" are in allegory and hidden in idiomatic language, and that we will find the answers to the hidden symbolism in other passages of Scripture, as in many cases the Bible explains itself! Back to Clarke:

"The word in the text which we, following the Septuagint, translate *serpent*, is נחש *nachash*; and, according to *Buxtorf* and others, has *three* meanings in Scripture.

1. It signifies to *view* or *observe attentively*, to *divine* or *use enchantments*, because in them the augurs *viewed attentively the flight of birds*, the *entrails of beasts*, the *course of the clouds*, &c.; and under this head it signifies to *acquire knowledge by experience*.
2. It signifies *brass*, *brazen*, and is translated in our Bible, not only *brass*, but *chains*, *fetters*, *fetters of brass*, and in several places *steel*; see 2 Sam. xxii. 35; Job xx. 24; Psa. xviii. 34; and in one place, at least *filthiness* or *fornication*, Ezek. xvi. 36. 3. It signifies a *serpent*, but of what kind is not determined. In Job xxvi. 13, it seems to mean the *whale* or *hippopotamus*: *By his spirit he hath garnished the heavens, his hand hath formed the crooked serpent*, נחש ברח *nachash bariach*: as ברח *barach* signifies to *pass on* or *pass through*, and בריח *beriach* is used for a *bar* of a gate or door *that passed through rings*, &c., the idea of *straightness* rather than *crookedness* should be attached to it here; and it is likely that the *hippopotamus* or *sea-horse* is intended by it.

"In Eccles. x. 11,, the creature called *nachash*, of whatever sort, is compared to the *babbling*: *Surely the serpent (נחש nachash) will bite without enchantment; and a babbling is no better*.

"In Isa. xxvii. 1, the *crocodile* or *alligator* seems particularly meant by the original: *In that day the Lord – shall punish leviathan the piercing serpent*, &c. And in Isa. lxxv. 25, the same creature is meant as in Gen. iii. 1, for in the words, *And dust shall be the serpent's meat*, there is an evident allusion to the text of Moses. In Amos ix. 3, the *crocodile* is evidently intended: *Though they be hid in the bottom of the sea, thence will I command the serpent*, (נחש hannachash,) *and he shall bite them*. No person can suppose that any of the *snake* or *serpent* kind can be intended here; and we see from the various acceptations of the word and the different senses which it bears in various places in the sacred writings, that it appears to be a sort of *general term* confined to no one sense. Hence it will be necessary to examine the root accurately, to see if its ideal meaning will enable us to ascertain the animal intended in the text. We have already seen that נחש *nachash* signifies to *view attentively*, to *acquire knowledge* or *experience by attentive observation*; so נחשתי *nichashti*, Gen. xxx. 27: *I have learned by experience*; and this seems to be its most general meaning in the Bible. The original word is by the Septuagint translated οφις, a *serpent*, not because this was its *fixed* determinate meaning in the sacred writings, but because it was the best that occurred to the translators: and they do not seem to have given themselves much trouble to understand the meaning of the original, for they have rendered the word as variously as our translators have done, or rather our translators have followed *them*, as they give

nearly the same significations found in the Septuagint: hence we find that οφις is as frequently used by them as *serpent*, its supposed literal meaning, is used in our version. And the New Testament writers, who seldom quote the Old Testament *but from the Septuagint translation*, and often do not *change* even a word in their quotations, copy this version in the use of this word. From the Septuagint therefore we can expect no light, nor indeed from any other of the ancient versions, which are all *subsequent* to the Septuagint, and some of them actually made from it. In all this uncertainty it is natural for a serious inquirer after truth to look *everywhere* for information. And in such an inquiry the Arabic may be expected to afford some help, from its great similarity to the Hebrew. A root in this language, very nearly similar to that in the text, seems to cast considerable light on the subject. *خانس* *chanas* or *khanasa* signifies *he departed, drew off, lay hid, seduced, slunk away*; from this root come *آخنس* *akhnas*, *خانساً* *khanasa*, and *خنوس* *khanos*, which all signify an *ape*, or *satyrus*, or any creature of the *simia* or *ape* genus. It is very remarkable also that from the same root comes *خانس*: *khanas*, the DEVIL, which appellation he bears from that meaning of *خانس* *khanasa*, he *drew off, seduced, &c.*, because he *draws* men *off* from righteousness, *seduces* them from their obedience to God, &c. See *Golius*, sub voce. Is it not strange that the *devil* and the *ape* should have the same name, derived from the same root, and that root so very similar to the word in the text? But let us return and consider what is said of the creature in question. *Now the nachash was more subtle*, *צרום* *arum*, more wise, cunning, or prudent, than any *beast of the field which the Lord God had made*. In this account we find, 1. That whatever this *nachash* was, he stood at the *head* of all inferior animals for wisdom and understanding. 2. That he *walked erect*, for this is necessarily implied in his punishment – *on thy belly* (i.e., on all fours) *shalt thou go*. 3. That he was *endued with the gift of speech*, for a conversation is here related between him and the woman. 4. That he was also endued with the *gift of reason*, for we find him reasoning and disputing with Eve. 5. That these things were *common to this creature*, the woman no doubt having often seen him walk erect, talk, and reason, and therefore she testifies *no kind of surprise* when he accosts her in the language related in the text; and indeed from the manner in which this is introduced it appears to be only a *part* of a conversation that had passed between them on the occasion: *Yea, hath God said, &c.*

“Had this creature never been known to speak before his addressing the woman at this time and on this subject, it could not have failed to excite her *surprise*, and to have filled her with *caution*, though from the purity and innocence of her nature she might have been incapable of being affected with *fear*. Now I apprehend that none of these things can be spoken of a *serpent* of any species. 1. None of them ever *did* or ever *can* walk erect. The tales we have had of two-footed and four-footed serpents are justly exploded by every judicious naturalist, and are utterly unworthy of credit. The very name *serpent* comes from *serpo*, to creep, and therefore to such it could be neither *curse* nor *punishment* to go on their bellies, i.e., *to creep on*, as they had done from their creation, and must do while their race endures. 2. They have no *organs* for *speech*, or any kind of articulate sound; they can only hiss. It is true that an ass by

miraculous influence may speak; but it is not to be supposed that there was any miraculous interference here. GOD did not qualify this creature with speech for the occasion, and it is not intimated that there was any *other agent* that did it; on the contrary, the text intimates that *speech* and *reason* were natural to the *nachash*: and is it not in reference to this the inspired penman says, *The nachash was more subtle or intelligent than all the beasts of the field that the Lord God had made?* Nor can I find that the *serpentine genus* are remarkable for *intelligence*. It is true the *wisdom of the serpent* has passed into a proverb, but I cannot see on what it is founded, except in reference to the passage in question, where the *nachash*, which we translate *serpent*, following the Septuagint, shows so much intelligence and cunning: and it is very probable that our Lord alludes to this very place when he exhorts his disciples to be *wise* – prudent or intelligent, *as serpents*, φρονιμοι ὡς οἱ οφεις· and it is worthy of remark that he uses the same term employed by the Septuagint in the text in question: Οφεις ην φρονιμωτατος, *the serpent was more prudent or intelligent than all the beasts*, &c. All these things considered, we are obliged to seek for some other word to designate the *nachash* in the text, than the word *serpent*, which on every view of the subject appears to me inefficient and inapplicable. We have seen above that *khanas*, *akhnas*, and *khanoo*s, signify a creature of the *ape* or *satyrus* kind. We have seen that the meaning of the root is, he *lay hid*, *seduced*, *slunk away*, &c.; and that *khanas* means the *devil*, as the inspirer of evil, and seducer from God and truth. See *Golius* and *Wilmet*. It therefore appears to me that a creature of the *ape* or *ouran outang* (orangutan) kind is here intended; and that Satan made use of this creature as the *most proper* instrument for the accomplishment of his murderous purposes against the life and soul of man. Under this creature he *lay hid*, and by this creature he *seduced* our first parents, and *drew off* or *slunk away* from every eye but the eye of God. Such a creature answers to every part of the description in the text: it is evident from the structure of its limbs and their muscles that it might have been originally designed to walk *erect*, and that nothing less than a sovereign controlling power could induce them to put down *hands* in every respect formed like those of man, and walk like those creatures whose claw-armed paws prove them to have been designed to walk on all fours. Dr. *Tyson* has observed in his anatomy of an *ouran outang* (orangutan), that the seminal vessels passed between the two coats of the peritoneum to the scrotum, as in man; hence he argues that this creature was designed to walk erect, as it is otherwise in all quadrupeds. *Philos. Trans.*, vol. xxi., p. 340. The subtlety, cunning, endlessly varied pranks and tricks of these creatures, show them, *even now*, to be more subtle and more *intelligent* than any other creature, man alone excepted. Being *obliged* now to walk on all fours, and gather their food from the ground, they are literally obliged to *eat the dust*; and though exceedingly cunning, and careful in a variety of instances to separate that part which is wholesome and proper for food from that which is not so, in the article of *cleanliness* they are lost to all sense of propriety; and though they have every means in their power of cleansing the aliments they gather off the ground, and from among the dust, yet they never in their savage state make use of any, except a slight rub against their side, or with one of their hands, more to see what the article is

than to cleanse it. Add to this, their utter aversion to walk *upright*; it requires the utmost discipline to bring them to it, and scarcely anything irritates them more than to be obliged to do it. Long observation on some of these animals enables me to state these facts.

“Should any person who may read this note object against my conclusions, because apparently derived from an Arabic word which is not exactly similar to the Hebrew, though to those who understand both languages the similarity will be striking; yet, as I do not insist on the *identity* of the terms, though important consequences have been derived from less likely etymologies, he is welcome to throw the whole of this out of the account. He may then take up the Hebrew root only, which signifies to *gaze, to view attentively, pry into, inquire narrowly, &c.*, and consider the passage that appears to compare the *nachash* to the *babbling*. Eccles. x. 11, and he will soon find, if he have any acquaintance with creatures of this genus, that for *earnest, attentive watching, looking, &c.*, and for *chattering or babbling*, they have no fellows in the animal world. Indeed, the ability and propensity to chatter is all they have left, according to the above hypothesis, of their original gift of speech, of which I suppose them to have been deprived at the fall as a part of their punishment.

“I have spent the longer time on this subject, 1. Because it is exceedingly obscure; 2. Because no interpretation hitherto given of it has afforded me the smallest satisfaction; 3. Because I think the above mode of accounting for every part of the whole transaction is consistent and satisfactory, and in my opinion removes many embarrassments, and solves the chief difficulties. I think it can be no solid objection to the above mode of solution that Satan, in different parts of the New Testament, is called the *serpent, the serpent that deceived Eve by his subtlety, the old serpent, &c.*, for we have already seen that the New Testament writers have borrowed the word from the *Septuagint*, and the *Septuagint* themselves use it in a *vast variety and latitude of meaning*; and surely the *ouran outang* (orangutan) is as likely to be the animal in question as :(1 *nachash* and οφίς *ophis* are likely to mean at once a *snake, a crocodile, a hippopotamus, fornication, a chain, a pair of fetters, a piece of brass, a piece of steel, and a conjurer*; for we have seen above that all these are acceptations of the original word. Besides, the New Testament writers seem to lose sight of the animal or instrument used on the occasion, and speak only of Satan himself as the cause of the transgression, and the instrument of all evil. If, however, any person should choose to differ from the opinion stated above, he is at perfect liberty so to do; I make it no article of faith, nor of Christian communion; I crave the same liberty to judge for myself that I give to others, to which every man has an indisputable right; and I hope no man will call me a heretic for departing in this respect from the common opinion, which appears to me to be so embarrassed as to be altogether unintelligible.” (End of quoting Adam Clarke, and all underlining was mine.)

While I believe that this is a valuable contribution on the part of Adam Clarke, I am not entirely in agreement with him. Especially, I do not accept the idea that *nachash* may have been only an “agent” for Satan in the seduction of Eve, where Clarke asked the question: “Who was the *agent* employed in the seduction of our first parents?”

What the serious Bible scholar must understand is that the Hebrew, as we have it in our Bible, doesn't represent the complete Hebrew language. Whenever one is consulting Strong's *Concordance* on any one word, and it says that it's from another Strong's number, that word is considered the root word of the word one is referencing. Some of the Hebrew root words are known and others are not. Strong was a Hebrew scholar and was aware of this, and that is why he'll direct the reader to the root word. But when they can't find the origin of the root word in the Hebrew, they will go to the Arabic because it is a similar language and has some of the missing root words. This is simply what Adam Clarke was doing, and he did a superb job of it. McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopedia* states: "It is well known that after the Jews [sic Judahites] returned from the captivity of Babylon, having lost in great measure the familiar knowledge of the ancient Hebrew, the readings from the books of Moses in the synagogues of Palestine were explained to them in the Chaldaic tongue." Thus, we can begin to see why some of the Hebrew root words were lost! Also, we can begin to comprehend why Adam Clark investigated the Arabic language to clarify Genesis 3:1 on the word "serpent", and the phrase "beast of the field". Inasmuch as Genesis 3:15 speaks in part, "... **and between thy** (the serpent's) **seed ...**", Cain and his offspring were the direct descendants of Satan, not through some kind of third party agent! With this paper, I will show how Clarke is in agreement with the Dead Sea Scrolls!

And although Clarke is surely incorrect about a third party "agent" seducing Eve, we must seriously consider his equating *satyrus* (satyr), *ape* and *ouran outang* (orangutan) with the "serpent" and "beast of the field" at Genesis 3:1! Surely the phrase "the beast of the field" is a foundational Hebrew idiom for the existence of the non-white peoples who were not created by the Almighty, but are a product of fallen angel-kind mixed with animal-kind! And the ape family are four-footed/quadrupeds as are the #929, "bhemah" in the many (but not all) passages where the nonwhite races are meant.

From the book, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A New Translation* by Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr. and Edward Cook, ©1996, on page 247, a translation of 1Q23, fragments 1 + 6: "1 [... two hundred] 2 donkeys, two hundred asses, two hund[red ... rams of the] 3 flock, two hundred goats, two hundred [... beast of the] 4 field from every animal, from every [bird ...] 5 [...] for miscegenation [...]" These fragments are from the oldest known manuscripts of *The Book Of Giants* reputedly written by Enoch whom we are told "... **walked with God: and he was not; for God took him.**", (Gen. 5:24). Being found among early manuscripts dating before the time of Christ, is sufficient evidence that they were considered vitally important to the text!

Even more solemn evidence can be found in the book *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* (second edition) by Florentino Garcia Martinez, ©1996, where on page 260 he translates line 5 of fragment 1Q23 as: "5 of dilute wine [six] thousand, of [...]" As many of us know, most wine is red in color, and therefore would be #119 in the Hebrew in Strong's *Concordance*, and is the exact same Hebrew as for Adam-man, or #120. In fact, #'s 119, 120 & 121 are all the same exact Hebrew word, except #119 is a verb, #120 is a noun, and #121 is usually a pronoun (understood as a proper name)!

Adam Clarke is not the only one to declare that satyr means “ape”. From *A Greek-English Lexicon* by Liddell & Scott, page 1232, on the Greek equivalent to the Hebrew word “satyr” we find the following definition: “ὄνοκένταυρα ἢ, or ὄνοκένταυρος, ὄ, a kind of tailless ape, Ael. NA 17.9. 2. a kind of *demon* haunting wild places, LXX Is. 13:22, 34:11, 14.” Notice especially Isa. 34:14! What better description could be given of a negroid than a “tailless ape”? [underlining mine]