

Adam Clarke's 6-Volume *Commentary* Declares: "Devil" & "Ape" Have The Same Name

Clifton A. Emahiser's Non-Universal Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Website: emahiser.christogenea.org

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

Should one neglect to identify the Biblical "beast of the field" as being the "devil", one is inviting one's son, daughter, grandson, or granddaughter to take one as an intimate companion (and a terrible misfit at that)! A "misfit", as an entity, is one not suited to his position or associates; a maladjusted alien unfit for companionship. So if one desires to have some "devils" hanging from one's family tree, just keep watching the "devils" running up and down the football fields and basketball courts, or whatever other activities the "devils" engage in! Just continue to support the games the "devils" engage in, and they'll end up engaging in sexual intercourse with one's daughter or son! And woe to the Israel Identity pastors who continue to claim that Yahweh God created those "devils", and that He proclaimed them as "good" in the first chapter of Genesis!

Again, I will show evidence that the "devil" and the "ape" have the same name! Also, that "Satan" is likened to an "orangutan". To document this, I will use Adam Clarke's 6-volume *Bible Commentary*, vol. 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; failing to appreciate 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 frequently 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. [emphasis mine]

"In Eccles. x. 11, the creature called *nachash*, of whatever sort, is compared to the *babbler*: *Surely the serpent (נחש nachash) will bite without enchantment; and a babbler 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 οφίς 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. خنس *chanas* or *khanasa* signifies *he departed, drew off, lay hid, seduced, slunk away*; from this root come أَخنس *akhnas*, خنساً *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 خناس *khanas*, the *DEVIL*, which appellation he bears from that meaning of خنس *khanasa*, *he drew off, seduced, &c.*, because he *draws* men *off* from righteousness, *seduces* them from their obedience to God, &c. See *Goliath*, 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. [emphasis mine]*

“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 fourfooted 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 ὄφεις· and it is worthy of remark that he uses the same term employed by the Septuagint in the text in question: Οφίς ην φρονιμωτάτος, *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 *khanos*, 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 נָחַשׁ *nachash* and ὄφις *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 is mine.)

A second witness is from the *World Scope Encyclopedia*, vol. 10 under the topic “Satyrs”:

“**Satyrs** ..., in Greek legends, a race of woodland spirits, who personified the free life of the forest. They were generally represented as half human and half animal,

the upper part being that of a human being and the lower that of an animal. Their appearance was both grotesque and repulsive, but their life was one of pleasure and self-indulgence, mostly given to the chase and wild music. At intervals they partook of wine and indulged in restful slumber. Both mortals and the gentle woodland nymphs dreaded them, mostly because of their reckless sports. They were represented in the train of Dionysius and were inseparably connected with his worship. Greek poets delighted to praise the innocent frolics of the little satyrs, and sculptors represented the older forms as nearly approaching human beings, but placed horns upon their heads and gave them the feet and legs of goats. The satyr of Praxiteles at Athens is a famous specimen of Greek sculpture. Pliny used the word to indicate a kind of ape."

In researching this subject, I also find it strange that "devils" in the Old Testament is Strong's #8163 "sâ'îyr" and has essentially the same meaning as "satyr" in the Greek, so evidently they have a similar etymology. In fact, the KJV translators translated #8163 as "satyr" at Lev. 17:7; 2 Chr. 11:15 & Isa. 34:14! I will show evidence that the Greek term for the Hebrew #8163 "sâ'îyr" also has connotations of an "ape". Pliny used the word to indicate a kind of ape.

What we have here are two different stories, (1 told by the Greek language, and (2 which is older, by Greek "art" or "sculpture". Here, Pliny takes a look at Greek sculpture and declares it appears more like an ape than a goat! The *World Scope Encyclopedia*, under the topic "Satyrs" doesn't indicate whether this was Pliny the Elder or Pliny the Younger, but it doesn't make any difference as they were both highly educated men, and Pliny the Elder (23-79 A.D.) oversaw the education of Pliny the Younger (61-115 A.D.), his nephew. Pliny the Elder majored in "Natural History" (zoology). These men were Roman citizens, and Pliny the Elder published upward of 2,000 volumes of his works, and I am sure he knew the difference between an ape and a goat! So, with this, we have the Plinys agreeing with the Arabic finding of Adam Clarke, that the devil had some connection with an ape. While Clarke was a master of several languages, and had read extensively the many Classics, evidently he never read Pliny's *Natural History*, or didn't catch the connection between an ape and the Greek "satyr" when he read it.

Paul made it very clear at Hebrews 12:8 that there are but two kinds of people, "sons" and/or "bastards", and nothing in between! The only way that that could be accounted for is by the fact that the "angels who sinned" had mixed their genetics with animals, as well as Adam-kind, on separate occasions! Had the Greeks still understood the ape connotations of their earlier art and sculpture, I am sure that Christ may have said "ape nations" rather than "goat nations". There is also the possibility that the later Greeks confused earlier Greek legend equating satyrs with apes as relating to the wild goat – the Bezoar, or Cretan wild goat (*Capra aegagrus*) which is reddish-brown in winter, and of which only a few remain.

From the 4-volume *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. 1, p.155, we read in part:

"APE ... Any of the tailless manlike animals of the Primate order, of the family Simiidae comprising the chimpanzee, the gorilla, the orangutan and the gibbon ... The baboon was well known in Egypt, and where the god Thoth was often represented by

it ...” Was Thoth the god that Yahweh forbade Israel to sacrifice to at Lev. 17:7 & 2 Chr. 11:15? Was this Clarke’s “orangutan”?