

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

This is the third part of a critical review. As I explained in part #'s 1 & 2, 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. With this issue, we'll see more of the serious errors which this alias-gabriel makes. I'm not talking about some minor infractions, but departures from the truth of the utmost catastrophic kind! On pages 5-6, alias-gabriel states in part:

"In order to understand the rest of the Bible, one has to comprehend this very critical point ... In [Gen. 2] verse 19, we also discover that Yahovah [sic Yahweh] God calls this especially endowed man 'Adam.' To get more light on this name we must look up the meaning of Adam in the language the Old Testament was written in, because all the names in the Bible have a definite meaning. Adam *aw-dam* is the Hebrew word meaning: to show blood in the face, able to blush, rosy, ruddy, #119 (Strong's Concordance)."

In stating this, alias-gabriel was making a glaring error which I will explain after clarifying the matter and putting it to rest. The reason why alias-gabriel chose Strong's #119 is because he is attempting to make the "man" of Gen. 2:7 a different man than the "man" found at Gen. 1:26-27. The truth of the matter is that both the man at Gen. 1:26-27 and the man at Gen. 2:7 are the same Strong's #120! At this point we'll have to consult Strong's on #'s 119, 120, 121 & 122 to make any sense of all of this, and I will use the *Enhanced Strong's Lexicon* from the Libronix Digital Library:

"**119** אָדָם [*adam /aw-dam/*] verb. Of unknown derivation; 10 occurrences; AV translates as 'dyed red' five times, 'red' four times, and 'ruddy' once. **1** to be red, red. **1A** (Qal) ruddy (of Nazarites). **1B** (Pual). **1B1** to be rubbed red. **1B2** dyed red. **1B3** reddened. **1C** (Hiphil). **1C1** to cause to show red. **1C2** to glare. **1C3** to emit (show) redness. **1D** (Hithpael). **1D1** to redden. **1D2** to grow red. **1D3** to look red."

“ **120** אָדָם, אָדָם, אָדָם; [*'adam /aw·dawm/*] noun masculine. From 119; 552 occurrences; AV translates as ‘man’ 408 times, ‘men’ 121 times, ‘Adam’ 13 times, ‘person(s)’ eight times, ‘common sort + 7230’ once, and ‘hypocrite’ once. 1 man, mankind. 1A man, human being. 1B man, mankind (much more frequently intended sense in OT). 1C Adam, first man. 1D city in Jordan valley.”

“ **121** אָדָם, אָדָם [*'Adam /aw·dawm/*] noun pronoun masculine. The same as 120; Nine occurrences; AV translates as ‘Adam’ nine times. **1** first man. **2** city in Jordan valley. *Additional Information:* Adam = ‘red’.”

“ **122** אָדָם [*'adom /aw·dome/*] adjective. From 119; Nine occurrences; AV translates as ‘red’ eight times, and ‘ruddy’ once. **1** red, ruddy (of man, horse, heifer, garment, water, lentils).”

The first thing to be observed here is that #119 is a verb, #120 is a masculine noun, #121 is a masculine noun or pronoun, and #122 is an adjective. One of the lies of alias-gabriel is demonstrated by the fact that #119 is a verb (action word) rather than a noun (name word). The second lie of alias-gabriel is demonstrated by the fact that #120 is used 552 times, whereas #119 is used only 10 times. In fact, #119 is not used until Exodus 25:5, where it is used to describe the skins of rams which were dyed red, and it again appears in that context at Exodus 26:14; 35:7, 23; 36:19 and 39:34. At Proverbs 23:31 the word describes red wine; at Isaiah 1:18 it is used to describe sins “red like crimson”; at Lam. 4:7 it is used to describe the Nazarites, who were “more ruddy in body than rubies”; and at Nahum 2:3 it describes the shields of mighty men “made red”. Do you still want to believe alias-gabriel that the Adam at Gen. 2:19 is #119? Rather, the Adam at Gen 2:19 is #121, which in turn is the same as #120, as Strong indicated, being either a noun as Adam, or a pronoun where it is used as “son” twice! Not only is #121 the same as #120, but #120 is from #119, so all of these Strong’s #’s 119, 120, 121 & 122 are the same identical Hebrew word, but represent different parts of speech. That is why in Strong’s, under “Comparative Concordance” in reference to Adam, it connects Gen. 2:19², 20 to “the man”; Gen. 2:20 to “man”; Gen. 2:21, 23 to “the man”; Gen. 4:1 to “the man”; Deut. 32:8 to “men” & Hos. 6:7 to “men”.

In alias-gabriel’s *The Two Creations*, he seems to refer only to the King James Version of the Bible and to the Strong’s *Concordance*, so he is evidently limited in his resources. The Strong’s does not give the parts of speech for each of these four words for Adam, and that is regrettable, as it can lead one to arrive at some flawed conclusions as it did alias-gabriel. I have several lexicons both in book form and digital. In book form, I have Strong’s *Exhaustive Concordance*, *New American Standard Exhaustive Concordance*, *The NIV Exhaustive Concordance*, *Young’s Analytical Concordance*, and *The New Brown - Driver - Briggs - Gesenius Hebrew And English Lexicon*. And in digital form, I have *The Enhanced Strong’s Lexicon*. While Strong’s in the book form gives a few parts of speech, it is not complete, and does not give the parts of speech for Strong’s #’s 119, 120, 121 & 122, while *The Enhanced Strong’s Lexicon* in digital form does. The only other Lexicon that I’m aware of that is quite faithful in giving the parts of speech is *The New Brown - Driver - Briggs - Gesenius*

Hebrew And English Lexicon, in book form as well as digital, but the book form gives the Strong's numbers where the digital doesn't, so having both is important.

The whole contention of alias-gabriel is that he claims that the "formed man" at Gen. 2:7 is a different "man" than the "created" man at Gen. 1:26-27, ignoring the fact that in both cases the Strong's number is 120 and is a masculine noun in both cases. As I stated before, all four Strong numbers for Adam are the same identical Hebrew word (as the Hebrew characters clearly show), only the parts of speech are different, and therefore are applied differently! In addition to having several lexicons, I also have a digital program called E-sword, which allows me to search for various subjects or Strong's numbers. That is what I used to search the ten passages where #119 appears. In addition to these study aids, I also have the two volume *The Complete Word Study* of both the Old and New Testaments by Spiros Zodhiates, where the Strong's numbers are placed above each Hebrew, Chaldee or Greek word. I also have the four volume set of J. P. Green's interlinear editions of both the Old and New Testaments.

Another thing I would like to point out is where *The Enhanced Strong's Lexicon* on the Hebrew word #119 says, "Of unknown derivation". 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 you are 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 you are 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 go to the Arabic because it is a similar language and has some of the missing root words. (I am not referring to the Aramaic or Syriac, but to the Arabic.) So when #119 says, "Of unknown derivation", they are unable to find the root word in the Hebrew, Arabic, or other ancient languages. Now that you are aware of the fact that Strong's #'s 119, 120, 121 & 122 are all the same word, let's observe how alias-gabriel violates the use of it as we saw in the case of #119. We will pick this up on page 5 thusly:

"Now to those of you who have been taught that this [ch. 2] is a repeat of chapter 1 of Genesis, I would like to point out to you that it is most certainly not. This chapter 2 creation process doesn't follow the orderly process of Genesis 1, nor are the commands the same. Notice that this man 'Adam,' as he was later called, was formed first. Then the Lord, (Yahovah) [sic Yahweh] God brought forth the trees of the Garden of Eden. Then the Lord (Yahovah) [sic Yahweh] God set the bounds of the garden and told the man to stay inside it and dress and keep it. This is an entirely different command from the instructions given to the male and female of Gen. 1:27. In verse 28 of chapter 1, the male and female were created, according to the record, simultaneously. This, of course, is not the case here, in Adam's story. Also, the male and female of Gen. 1, were commanded to be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish (or fill) the earth. Adam, on the other hand, was told to dress and keep a specific area, i.e., Garden of Eden. ...

"In verses 16 and 17 of Genesis 2, Yahovah [sic Yahweh] God tells Adam that he may freely eat of all the trees of the garden except one. And if he ate of the one

called the Tree of knowledge of good and evil, that Adam would surely die. This is the first giving of a law, in that its violation would result in death. It was given to Adam to test his obedience. From the context, we can deduce that if he obeyed Yahovah's [sic Yahweh's] command and partook only of the good trees of the garden, which included the Tree of Life in the midst of the garden (verse 9) that Adam would live forever.

"Now back in Genesis 1, this promise was not given to the male and female of verse 27. And they also were not given any law that, if broken, would result in death. ...

"So, in review, Adam was created of the dust of the ground, a mortal creature. He had access to immortality, if he obeyed the law of not partaking of the Tree of knowledge of good and evil.

"Moving on to verse 18, we find that Yahovah [sic Yahweh] God decides that Adam should have a helper. But before he causes a sleep to fall on Adam and takes one of his ribs to make the woman, the Lord (Yahovah) [sic Yahweh] God forms the beasts of the field and fowls of the air within this garden, and brings them to Adam to see what he would name them. Now notice here again, these beasts, cattle, and fowls were created after Adam was formed, and not before as in Genesis 1."

It should be pointed out that in Genesis chapter 2 "man" is mentioned 10 times, and in every case it is Strong's #120, the same as the two times it is used at Gen. 1:26-27! It is asinine to claim that it is two different people! Also in chapter 2, the name "Adam" is used 6 times and in every case it is Strong's #121, a proper name. It is clear from the context of chapter 2 that the "man" and "Adam" are the same person. Also notice that alias-gabriel claims at chapter 2 that Adam was "formed" rather than "created", but if we will go forward to Gen. 5:1-2, it says of Adam and Eve:

"¹ This *is* the book of the generations of Adam[121]. In the day that God created man[120], in the likeness of God made he him; 2 Male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam[121], in the day when they were created." [emphasis mine]

If there existed any uncertainty that Adam and Eve were indeed "created", there should no longer be any doubt after examining this passage! Also, if there existed any uncertainty that the terms "man" and "Adam" refer to the same person, there should no longer be any doubt about that either! And, if there existed any uncertainty that Strong's #'s 120 & 121 referred to the same person, doubts about that should also vanish! And, if there existed any uncertainty that the "man" and "Adam" of Genesis 2 were the same "man" of Gen. 1:26-27, that doubt should also fade away! Notice also, this is the same "man" named "Adam" that was made in the "likeness" of God at Gen. 1:26! But in spite of the evidence of this passage, alias-gabriel's lies continue to masquerade as the truth! In the Brenton's Septuagint, Gen. 5:1-2 is translated thusly:

"¹ This *is* the genealogy of men in the day in which God made Adam; in the image of God he made him: ² male and female he made them, and blessed them; and he called his name Adam, in the day in which he made them." So it is evident that the LXX translators understood that "likeness" is to be closely associated with "image".

Since I have now addressed some of alias-gabriel's trivial, worthless speculation of little worth on Genesis chapter 2, I will now cite a portion on page 3 where he continues to make several serious mistakes thusly:

"Now I have gone through all of this for a very good reason, which we'll get to very shortly. But now let's examine verses 27-30 [of ch. 1]. Notice in verse 27 ... God (Elohiym) created in his own image. This word image comes from the Hebrew word *tselem* meaning to *shade*. It comes from the primary root word *tsalal* meaning: to be dark, shadowing. Have you ever wondered where the dusky races came from? As we go on in this study you will see this more clearly. Continuing on in this verse it says '... male and female created he them.' Notice there is no break of thought. This is very significant, so keep this in mind. In verse 28, God (Elohiym) commands the male and female to:

"... 'be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish [or fill] the earth and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowls of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.'

"Next, in verse 29 ... God (Elohiym) commands the male and female to only eat the herb bearing seed and the fruit of the tree yielding seed. In other words, they were to be gatherers and vegetarians. Next, in verse 30, God (Elohiym) commands the beasts of the earth and the fowls of the air and every thing that creepeth upon the earth to eat only the green herb for food. Did you get that? There were to be no carnivorous creatures on the face of the earth. Now the creatures of the sea were not commanded to be vegetarians, so we can assume they could feed off each other, as it is this day.

"I thought this was very significant because we know from Isaiah 65:17-25, when the New Jerusalem is established, that the 'wolf and the lamb shall feed together and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock' ... 'they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain'."

As you can see, alias-gabriel botched the meaning of the word "image", attempting to make us believe that it means the darker races. "Image" is #6754 in Strong's, and when going to the *Enhanced Strong's Lexicon* we read in part:

"**6754** זֶלֶם, זֶלֶם [tselem /tseh·lem/] noun masculine ..." (Here one is given an option of going to *A Dictionary of Biblical Languages* by James Swanson, and he has a secondary meaning for this same word): "... **image**, likeness, i.e., that which is a pattern, model, or example of something" To show you that this is a better definition of the word, I will quote Gen. 5:3 which uses this same Hebrew word:

"**And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image[6754]; and called his name Seth ...**" In other words, like father like son, or spitting image! Also at Gen. 9:5:

"**Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man[120] shall his blood be shed: for in the image[6754] of God made he man[120].**" As you can see from these two passages, this "image" has nothing to do with the "dusky" races, but everything to do with the White Adamic race! So alias-gabriel has fumbled the ball again! And if you think that was a blooper, let's take a look at the next one where he really goofs-up big-time in stating:

“ Did you get that? There were to be no carnivorous creatures on the face of the earth. Now the creatures of the sea were not commanded to be vegetarians, so we can assume they could feed off each other, as it is this day. ... I thought this was very significant because we know from Isaiah 65:17-25, when the New Jerusalem is established, that the ‘ wolf and the lamb shall feed together and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock ’ ... ‘ they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain ’.”

This is utterly silly, for Isaiah isn’t speaking of animals here but the animal symbols that the animals represent! The “wolf” here is Benjamin; the “bullock” is Ephraim; and the “lion” is Judah. It is simply saying in allegory that England will live at peace with Germany; that Benjamin will no longer ravine (tear, rend or pluck into pieces) the weaker Israel-“lamb” as Benjamin did at the time they became known as Vikings. What’s all this vegetarianism business about?

Bozo alias-gabriel made a similar absurd statement on page 2 where he said:

“ Now we know for a fact that man was not made in the image of angels, for the ‘ image ’ of their spiritual likeness is described in Ez. 1:5-11. So we must assume that the *us* is the Godhead. (Read Eph. 3:9)” At this point, alias-gabriel exposes his ignominious ignorance!

Like Isaiah 65:25 wasn’t speaking of four-footed animals, Ezek 1:5-11 is not speaking of angels! All one needs to do is read Ezek. 1:10 to verify that where it says: **“ As for the likeness of their faces, they four had the face of a man, and the face of a lion, on the right side: and they four had the face of an ox on the left side; they four also had the face of an eagle. ”**

Here the man represents the tribe of Reuben; the lion represents the tribe of Judah; the ox represents the tribe of Ephraim; and the eagle represents the tribe of Dan. This passage has absolutely nothing to do with angels and has everything to do with the twelve tribes of Israel. When Israel camped in the wilderness, Issachar, Judah and Zebulun camped on the east side under the banner of the lion; Gad, Reuben and Simeon camped on the south side under the banner of the man; Benjamin, Ephraim and Manasseh camped on the west side under the banner of the ox; and Asher, Dan and Naphtali camped on the north side under the banner of the eagle. Angels? **That’s ridiculous!** What else will alias-gabriel dream up?

These are only a few examples of alias-gabriel’s nonsense. It goes on and on for page after page in his book. This is what alias-gabriel said on page 4, “ 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).

Yet on pages 115-116, alias-gabriel states in part: “... But, as usual, God moved them to use this term [*Satan*] to lead the unregenerate man into error. ... So any way you want to cut it – the ‘ fallen angel ’ dogma is the veneration of ‘ Satan, ’ in violation of the first commandment: ‘ Thou shalt have no other gods before me ’.” It would appear that alias-gabriel is doing the very thing he is accusing others of perpetrating!