

IDENTIFYING THE “BEAST OF THE FIELD”, #6

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

This investigation of the *Beast Of The Field* is turning into quite a detective story. In part #1 of this series, I told you: “About two years ago, a very good friend of mine gave me a copy of a video presentation by pastor Allen Campbell of Belfast, Ireland entitled *Who Are The Beast of the Field?*” As I explained in that first paper on this subject, initially I was very much in agreement with Campbell's premise. However, upon checking out the Scripture references and the meanings of the Hebrew words he used to substantiate his thesis, I found he really didn't establish solid Biblical evidence for his sermon on this topic! Therefore, for the sake of Campbell's general – but not entirely correct premise – I would not discourage anyone from studying his presentation if done while, (1) scrutinizing the Hebrew or Greek words, (2) keeping in mind the context of the rest of the Bible, and (3) taking into account the meaning of Hebrew idioms, of which many people don't have the slightest clue as to whether the text is literal or figurative.

After I had listened intently to Campbell's spoken presentation on this subject, I was very pleased, as it was much in line with my own findings. I was excited to the point that I decided to write my own paper on the topic, hoping to find even more evidence in Holy Writ to display just who these “beast of the field” are.

However, I was not about to write a single word until I had checked all of the references which Campbell cited, along with the key words of those citations, whether Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek. It is hard for me to describe how disappointed I was when Campbell, in almost every instance, identified the wrong Hebrew word, and in many cases his definitions didn't match the word he cited. While consulting with my numerous lexicons and realizing his many inconsistencies, I asked within myself, “What kind of Bible lexicon does this man use?” To say the least, I put my goal for writing a composition on “the beast of the field” on the back burner until I had done some serious contemplation, and I was better prepared!

In order to understand this sixth paper, it would be advisable for the reader to get copies of the first five, especially part #1, as the first one is where I addressed the problems with Campbell's contribution to this topic. He telegraphed the origin of his sources where on a couple of occasions, he spelled out the individual alphabetical letters of “cheva”, or c-h-e-v-a, and “behema”, or b-e-h-e-m-a.

As it turned out, a very shrewd lady in the UK caught this – whom I will not name as material like this is not entirely safe to mention over there – sent me an E-mail stating:

“In your paper *Beast of the Field Part 1*, when you wonder where Alan Campbell [AC] obtained his information from, I think I have the answer.

“In Nord Davis’ *Star Wars* series, Lesson Six, written I think before AC’s sermon, he too spells *bhema* ‘*behema*’ and makes the identical mistakes which AC makes. Too much of a coincidence?

“This is pure speculation on my part and there could be an earlier source, of course. Anyway, it gives me the opportunity of saying how excellent the BOF papers are and enjoyable.

“Also, I am pleased you undertook the exposure of Ron Wyatt. I always thought his claims were such rubbish that I never bothered to look into the subject. However, now I have useful ammunition for which I am grateful.”

After looking into this evidence sent to me, I also believe it is too much of a coincidence! Upon contemplating the matter further, I returned an E-mail answer back to this very astute lady in the UK, stating:

“Thank you for bringing this to my attention! I did a search on the Internet for the words ‘*behemeh*’ and ‘*chay*’, and sure enough these words brought up Nord Davis’ *Star Wars*. I have an original printing press hard copy of Davis’ *Star Wars* lessons 1 through 15. In lesson #6, Davis made a major error by making the assumption that both ‘*behemeh*’ and ‘*chay*’ had essentially the same meaning. I also found out that ‘*behemeh*’ had another spelling, ‘*behemah*’. Interestingly, the Internet took me to Eli James’ website in my search. It is quite clear now that Eli has a lot more confidence in the late Nord Davis’ ability than in me. But that is the way things go!, *Clifton*”

In lesson six of his *Star Wars*, page 46, Nord stated:

“Here you see that these Beasts are described as having hands, not paws or hooves. The context, if you will examine it, indicates that these Beasts of the earth would be aware of man’s origin, made in God’s Image, and therefore could be commanded to abstain from murder or forfeit his life. Such a Beast would have to have sufficient intellect to be morally responsible for his actions. As we have stated in the Footlight [of lesson five], the best word for these Negro people would be *Chay*, Strong’s Hebrew word #2416. However, a more generic word for Beast, used in Exodus 19:11-13 and 23:10-11 are from the Hebrew word *behemah*, Strong’s Hebrew word #929, and discuss Beasts which eat grapes and olives. No farmer in his right mind would turn their cattle, sheep and horses into their vineyards and among their olive trees to trample and destroy them. So, these *behemah* Beasts can also refer to mankind who are not of the Adamic race. If you ask your pastor, he will probably tell you that the Beasts of the field are domesticated animals, but none of these are flesh-eating animals. Yet, as stated in I Samuel 42-44, and II Samuel 21:10, the Beast of the field is a cannibal, a man-eater.”

Here Nord introduces the Hebrew terms “*chay*” and “*behemah*”, but in lesson five under the heading “Footlights”, page 45, he attempts to merge the meanings of these two words to mean the same thing, so read his following words very carefully:

“You cannot get that understanding from studying Strong’s Concordance. James Strong was a contemporary of Cyrus Scofield, preparing his concordance in the late 1800’s. He apparently based his lexicon upon the misleading King James which he took as an infallible standard. Another modern authority used by Bible students is Vine’s

Expository. William E. Vine was born in 1873 and did his work during the Scofield revolution. The problem I have as a teacher presenting the great overview of Scripture, and suggesting word meanings, is that the doubting student quickly goes to some of these 'authorities' and from their work properly questions the thesis and thrust of my teachings. We make no apologies. The very fact that these 'authorities' are sold on the same shelves as the Scofield Reference Bible should tell you something. I will present more examples as we go along, but here is one that we will be using in the next Lesson [#6]. I want you to look at Jonah 3:8. It is written in my King James:

“But let man and beast be covered with sackcloth, and cry mightily unto God: yea, let every one turn from his evil way, and from the violence that is in their hands.”

“Here, this **beast** is going an evil way; he has hands, and is supposed to put on sackcloth and ashes, and to cry mightily unto God. The word for **beast** here is Strong’s word #929, *behemah*. Strong’s says that this is a ‘large fourlegged animal.’ Vine’s Expository defines it the same way. Young’s Concordance also says the same thing. Therefore, I suppose we must believe that the **beasts** in Jonah 3:8 must be knowledgeable sinful cows which have hands and can cry mightily unto the Lord wearing sackcloth and ashes. Nonsense! The original Paleo-Hebrew word here could be interpreted as a large animal of either the two or four-legged variety. In this case, because these **beasts** have hands, are **sinner[s]** [sic, evildoers] cover themselves with sackcloth and ashes, and cry unto the Lord, they must be men which are identified elsewhere in Scripture as one of the various versions of **beast** such as *chay*, *chevah*, *cheyva*.; and *cheveh*. The true Biblical meaning of **beast**, whether as *behemeh* or *chay*, being a nonwhite person, has been deliberately hidden from us in Scofield-type reference materials. Isn’t that interesting? We see the plague of ‘boils’ on man and beast in Exodus 11:9 because of sin. We see that the **beasts** of Exodus 19:14-15 should not let their hands touch the mountain or they would die. Exodus 22:19 states that those who have sex with a **beast** are to be executed. Jeremiah, in Chapter 31 at verse 27, states that the sin of the last days will be that Adam’s children will mix their seed with that of the **beasts**. That is going on all across America and the churches do not preach against it. Exodus 23:29 shows concern that the **beasts** would multiply against God’s Israel people. We find that the *behemah*, translated **beasts**, in Zechariah 8:10 are unemployed. These **beasts** cannot find jobs to do, and so forth. One of the judgments of God for ignoring His Laws, Statutes and Judgments, is that His Word would be hidden from you. This is how it has been done.”

Like I said about Allen Campbell, I have no problem with Campbell’s premise, but the Hebrew words simply don’t support all of his conclusions. Likewise with Nord Davis, and it should be noted that Campbell followed Nord Davis’ references, and commented, in some cases, almost word for word! Hence, this is more evidence that Campbell was following Davis’ outline, making the same errors that Nord made.

You should have observed here that Davis said: “The true Biblical meaning of **beast**, whether as *behemeh* or *chay*, being a nonwhite person, has been deliberately hidden from us ...” Then in lesson #6, p. 46, Nord states in part: “... I want to direct your

attention to the Book of Beginnings, Genesis. Here we will also find out about the beginnings of that Great Star Wars of Scripture. Read again Genesis, Chapter 1:25:

“...And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that *it was good.*”

“Please note that the Beast rendered above is singular. It does not say Beasts, as it might if the Word was speaking of elephants, lions or tigers. Note the his and their in the text. The remainder of this text refers to all of these other animals of creation. This Beast is a different creature, and the Hebrew word for him is Chay. While there are several variations of this word, Chay, we will use Chay for this race of non-white people mentioned throughout Scripture in these lessons but let the student realize that I am aware of the variations. Chay is a Beast having hands and feet, one who is described as from a ‘lively troop,’ and who works as a servant, etc.”

Contrary to Nord Davis, Genesis 1:25, “chay” does not support the rendering of “non-white people”. Charles Thomson in his *The Septuagint*, translates verses 24-25 thusly:

“[24] Then God said, ‘Let the earth produce animal life according to kind; four-footed beasts and reptiles and wild beasts of the earth according to kind.’ And it was so. [25] God indeed made the wild beasts of the earth according to their kind, and the cattle according to their kind, and all the reptiles of the earth according to kind. And God saw that they were good.”

Notice the word “his” is not there! Notice also, “their” in this rendering is used for both “beast” and “cattle”! Rather than the word “chay”, or the word “behemah” (normally four-footed cattle) is used secondarily as an idiom for “nonwhite people”! Until one comprehends that the nonwhites are halfmembers of a primate family such as apes, one will not grasp that a negro or mongol fall into the category of “behemah”, Strong’s #929!

A good example of four-footed/quadrupeds #929, “behemah” being idiomatic of the nonwhite races is found at Leviticus 20:15-16: ¹⁵ **And if a man lie with a beast<929, he shall surely be put to death: and ye shall slay the beast<929.** ¹⁶ **And if a woman approach unto any beast<929, and lie down thereto, thou shalt kill the woman, and the beast<929: they shall surely be put to death; their blood *shall be upon them.*”**

This race-mixing is referred to as “eating sour grapes” at Jer. 31:29; Ezek. 18:2 & Hos. 4:18, which the KJV states in part, **“Their drink is sour: they have committed whoredom ...”**, while Thomson’s *Septuagint* says, **“They addicted themselves to the Canaanites ...”**. This is evidence that the term #929, “behemah”, can be, and often is an idiom!

Evidently, Nord was not aware of new evidence, such as from *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A New Translation* ©1996 by Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr. and Edward Cook, on page 247, a translation of 1Q23, fragments 1 and 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 [...]”. Here, “miscegenation” implies the mixing of angel-kind with animal-

kind, and one's eyes are not lying to himself, for if it looks like an ape, chances are it is some relation to the ape family, and does not fall into the category of "good" or "very good!"

While I have a lot of respect for Nord Davis, there is another area where I have a problem with his teachings. I have his 64 page 1990 8½x11 inch format booklet, *Desert Shield*. In it he promotes king Hussein of Jordan as being a pureblooded Shemite, but his own words betray him on page 54 thusly:

"King Hussein is one man who represents two different entities. First, he is the acknowledged Royal Arab King over the lands and kingdoms of the sons of Joktan and the Queen of Sheba. Thus, he has the right and the duty to speak prophetically for the Queen of the South. Second, he is descended from both Father Abraham and Islam's Prophet, Muhammad. Thus, he has the right and the duty to speak for the Christian Arabs, the ancient seed of Jacob living in the Middle East." **"Christian Arabs"! Really?** In my *Watchman's Teaching Letter #55*, I researched the racial background of Mohammed, and came up with the following:

"Probably one of the more important aspects we should consider about Mohammed is that, reportedly among some authors, his mother was a 'Jewess.' If that account is true, apparently we have an added element to the equation. Once that added detail is brought to light, we can better understand his satanic motivated aspirations. Conceivably, he had the "seed of the serpent" flowing in his veins. With this added data, we can begin to acquire an idea of what Mohammed was all about. Before we get into the story of his escapades, let's document this apparent "Jewish" connection. For this, we will use *Alzog's Universal Church History*, ©1902, volume 2, page 192:

"Mohammed, who was the only son of Abdallah, a *Pagan*, and Amina, a *Jewess*, and was descended from the noble but impoverished family of *Hashim*, of the *priestly tribe* of *Koreish*, who were the chiefs and keepers of the national sanctuary of the Kaaba, and pretended to trace their origin to *Ismael*, the son of Abraham and Hagar, was born at Mecca, August 20, A.D. 570

"*The History Of The Decline And Fall Of The Roman Empire* by Edward Gibbon, vol. 5, p. 205 (speaking of his grandfather and father), although debated, also witnesses to this: 'The glory of Abdol Motaleb was crowned with domestic happiness; his life was prolonged to the age of one hundred and ten years; and he became the father of six daughters and thirteen sons. His best beloved Abdallah was the most beautiful and modest of the Arabian youth; and in the first night, when he consummated his marriage with Amina, of the noble race of the Zahrites, two hundred virgins are said to have expired of jealousy and despair. Mahomet, or more properly Mohammed, the only son of Abdallah and Amina, was born at Mecca, four years after the death of Justinian, and two months after the defeat of the Abyssinians, whose victory would have introduced into the Caaba the religion of the Christians ...' Then, in a footnote on page 205 we read this: '**Amina was of Jewish birth.**' **Von Hammer, Geschichte der Assass, p. 10 ...**"

I must now make known some little-known-facts concerning traditional arab beliefs; about half of them claim descent from Ishmael while the other half claim

descent from Joktan, who is recorded as being the brother of Peleg, (first mentioned at Gen. 10:25), an ancestor of Abraham. Like most poorly informed Christians, I was aware of the Ishmael connection but totally oblivious to that of Joktan. I first gained the information on Joktan by reading some of Nord Davis' literature. I then discovered that Nord was correct when I found the same data about Joktan (Yoktan) in *The History Of The Jews* by Heinrich Graetz, vol. 3, pp. 60-63. Since these two finds, I have found many references to Joktan being the father of the arab people. But it is parallel to a similar claim by the bad-fig-jews to be Israelites. It is evident that alien peoples dwelt in and/or moved into the geographic area which the descendants of Joktan once occupied, in what is now southern Arabia, and have absorbed – or been absorbed by – Joktan's descendants, claiming Joktan's heritage. Of course, it cannot be told whether Joktan's descendants did themselves, through raids, pillage and rape, gradually absorb the genetics of various alien peoples, or whether they were victims of such. The Sabians, as recorded at Job, were descendants of Joktan, who was a White man, but one can read in Job the pillage they did of Job's possessions. In those ancient times, usually rape was part of the plunder. All we know today is that the arabs are **NOT** White, so it is glaringly apparent that something drastic happened to their genetic makeup along the line somewhere." Nord Davis said the following in his 1990 booklet *Desert Shield* on page 49:

"My teacher's historical panorama of Arabia, with its people descending from Shem through Joktan, the brother of Peleg, began to open the eyes of those who make a study of racial backgrounds and peoples.

"About three years ago, my friend made a whirlwind tour of America, speaking to 50 groups in 36 states telling these Christian Americans the story of Joktan, and the Queen of Sheba. One of his stops was at Northpoint Team headquarters here in the Smoky Mountains. He spoke to us regarding the urgency of getting a pro-Arab public relations effort going to prevent the upcoming war in the Middle East."

About six years after this publication, Nord died of cancer. Nord was a tremendously gifted Two Seedline Bible teacher, but I have often wondered whether or not Yahweh took him home to prevent his involvement with the multi-breed arabs. I will now cite the 9th edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* under the topic "Arabia" and subtopic "Origins of Koreysh", where one of the editors scoffingly remarked:

"In this assembly the immediate local proximity of the Koreysh chiefs, joined to their personal wealth, courage, and address, assigned them a predominant position.

"Of their pedigree, which, as is well known, includes that of Mahomet himself, we have a carefully – too carefully, indeed, for authenticity – constructed chronicle, bringing the family tree up in due form to Ishmael, the son of Abraham, of whom the Koreysh figure as the direct descendants. In the same artificial annals the Yemenite or genuine Arabs appear under the cousinly character of the children of Joktan, the son of Heber. On these points all Mahometan annalists are equally positive and distinct; all other Arab testimony equally adverse or silent. That a fable so utterly defiant of reasonable chronology, and even of the common sense of history itself, should have been adopted as matter of fact by Arab vanity and ignorance, is less surprising than that it should

have found favor in the eyes of not a few, indeed of most, of our own European writers.”