

# ***WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER***

Monthly Letter #60; April, 2003 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser  
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)-435-2836

## **ISRAEL COVENANT TWO SEEDLINE RACIAL IDENTITY**

### **AN ANGLO-ISAAC-SON CAUCASIAN CULTURE AWARENESS TEACHING LETTER**

#### **A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER**

This is my sixtieth monthly teaching letter and completes my fifth year of publication. Five years ago I decided to make this ministry an independent endeavor. I was aware that I could in no way, in all good conscience, associate and identify with those teaching **against** Two Seedline. Then too, I realized there were those in Two Seedline who were going off on tangents in various unrelated areas, and I needed to separate myself from that kind of environment. Therefore, my main effort is research in proving YHWH's Word to be true in every respect. I have literally put thousands of hours of study into these teaching letters and brochures which I have put into your hands. The primary reason for segregating from the anti-seedliners is because their erroneous position helps to promote race-mixing, which is almost out of control at our present time. I will continue to try and counsel those who are caught-up in the error of the one-seed theory.

In the last teaching letter, I showed you there were four different men by the name of Nebuchadnezzar somewhat contemporary with Daniel. Actually, there were five Nebuchadnezzars in all, and I will explain that in this lesson. I also gave evidence that the Nebuchadnezzar of Daniel 4 was not Nebuchadnezzar II but instead Nabonidus. In all of my days of going to church, I never heard a single minister explain that fact. Nor have I ever heard any radio or television evangelists give any insight on this. I am also persuaded there are very few pastors in Israel Identity who are aware of this. Usually when this subject is commented on, it is not in the plural, but in a singular sense, making one think it is speaking of one individual. It is a very good case-in-point that if one does not understand history, one will have difficulty grasping the full narrative of the Bible. And why are the anti-seedliners so strangely quiet about such things? The following chart shows the five different Nebuchadnezzars:

• Nebuchadnezzar I	1124-1103	B.C.	(22 yrs.)
• Nebuchadnezzar II	604-562	B.C.	(43 yrs.)
• Nabonidus (using Nebuchadnezzar's name)	555-539	B.C.	(17 yrs.)
• Nebuchadnezzar III	-522	B.C.	(6 mos.)
• Nebuchadnezzar IV	-521	B.C.	(3 mos.)

This chart shows a very large gap between Nebuchadnezzar I and II, and as can be observed could not have been immediate father and son. Also, Nebuchadnezzar I was of the second Isin Dynasty while Nebuchadnezzar II was of the Chaldean Dynasty. Should one desire more information on this subject, in addition to the books I cited in Lesson #58, I highly recommend the book *Ancient Mesopotamia; Portrait of a Dead Civilization* by A. Leo Oppenheim. In addition to the 1st and 2nd Isin and Chaldean dynasties, there were: the Dynasty of Akkad; the 1st & 2nd, Dynasty of Ur; the Kassite Dynasty; the 1st, 2nd, 9th & 10th Babylonian Dynasty; the Dynasty of the Sealand; the Dynasty of Sisku; the Dynasty of Sape; the Kings of Assyria; the Dynasty of Bazi; and the Persian Kings.

If you will notice the above chart, you will see the last petty tyrant usurper using Nebuchadnezzar's name was IV. When I wrote my *Watchmen's Supplement Teaching Letter* of August 14, 1998, I based the seven times over the stump from the tyrant Nebuchadnezzar III. Seven times over the stump would be 2520 years to the end of the Babylonian System. Had I used IV instead, my calculations would have lined up with the fall of the World Trade Towers pretty much on the money. I had figured: 2,520 minus 522 = 1998 (1999 + adjusting for the B.C. to A.D. conversion factor). I now see that had I used IV at 521 B.C., it would have put it at 2000 + B.C. to A.D. conversion factor which might amount to about a year and a half. How does September 11, 2001 sound? I'm really not a prophet. I try only to understand what the prophets have already written.

All of that said, we must now ask the question: just who was this Nebuchadnezzar I who lived and reigned as king of the Isin Dynasty some 570 years before Nebuchadnezzar II of the Chaldean Dynasty in Babylon at Daniel's time? If you happen to already have the book mentioned above by A. Leo Oppenheim, you might check pages 151, 159, 254 & 269 for that data. Otherwise, information on Nebuchadnezzar I is somewhat difficult to come by. According to the dates, Nebuchadnezzar I was even before the time of David and Solomon. That would place him somewhat contemporary with Eli or Samson. Now that we have an idea of the time-period involved, let's take a look at page 151 of *Ancient Mesopotamia; Portrait of a Dead Civilization* by A. Leo Oppenheim:

“... Such events seem to have been the military triumph of Tukulti-Ninurta I, who was the first Assyrian king to conquer Babylon; the destruction of the famous city by the Elamites (under Kudur-Nahhunte); and the spectacular successes of Nebuchadnezzar I, king of Babylon, against the Elamites. On the other hand, the Babylonian poets and scribes had a difficult task explaining the tragedy of Babylon abandoned by its god Marduk and conquered by enemies ...”

This is an interesting bit of information inasmuch as we can now grasp that not only was Nebuchadnezzar I of the Isin Dynasty, but he was a king of Babylon. With that piece of evidence, we can now safely conclude that Nebuchadnezzar I was head of the Isin Dynasty in the city of Babylon near 1124-1103 B.C. We can also deduct from this that Nebuchadnezzar I fought successfully against the Elamites who were descendants of Shem. If that is true, jokingly, by today's standards, Nebuchadnezzar I was an “anti-

Semite.” Putting that aside, we have to wonder whether or not Nebuchadnezzar I was a good guy. On the other hand, Nebuchadnezzar II was of a royal line, and considering the fact that the enemy trace their lineage through their mother’s side rather than the father, they have no royal line as such. On the same page, A. Leo Oppenheim comments thus of a similar situation where a Dynasty originated from a female. (And it should be noticed that this dynasty was that of the line of Cain.):

“... Among them is Ku-Baba, a female innkeeper who founded the third dynasty of Kish; Sulgi, the most powerful king of the third dynasty of Ur; and Irra-imitti, of the dynasty of Isin, who died a strange death — to mention only the best-known personages ... such as Sargon of Akkad and Ibbi-Sin of Ur. Sargon remained a semimythical king throughout much of the second millennium ...”

This appears to be damning evidence against Nebuchadnezzar I, for he was also of the Isin Dynasty. On the other hand, Sargon and Naram-Sin go back to the Dynasty of Akkad 1200 years earlier, and a lot of changes can take place in that amount of time. But if the “female innkeeper” connection with Nebuchadnezzar I is correct, it is still damning, though the Dynasty of Ur is still dated 700 to 900 years before Nebuchadnezzar I. If this evidence is not condemning to Nebuchadnezzar I, it is overwhelmingly detrimental to the line of Cain! Because the anti-seedliners hold a false premise on Genesis 3:15 and 4:1, and are willingly blind, then no comment will be heard from them on matters such as these involving the lineage of Cain.

On page 159, A. Leo Oppenheim fills in some of the period between Nebuchadnezzar I and Nabopolassar, Nebuchadnezzar II’s father:

“The victory of Nebuchadnezzar I (1124-1103 B.C.) over the Elamites ushered in the half millennium through which Babylonia first slowly and with many setbacks, then with ever-increasing momentum, rose again to power. This movement which continues with Nabu-nasir (747-734 B.C.), whose role and impact is still beclouded by lack of evidence, culminated in Nabopolassar, the first king (625-605 B.C.) of a new dynasty which was to become for a short time heir to the Assyrian supremacy over a large section of the ancient Near East. Much of that span of time is as dark an age as the Dark Age itself.”

This should now give you some idea of who Nebuchadnezzar I was and a glimpse of history during and shortly after his time. You should also now realize the fact there were five different Nebuchadnezzars, and have a new insight on Daniel 4 where the Nebuchadnezzar mentioned there was really Nabonidus. Whenever we consider Nabonidus, we should never forget he was the father of Belshazzar.

Again, in the book *Ancient Mesopotamia; Portrait of a Dead Civilization* by A. Leo Oppenheim we find more information pertaining to Nabonidus’ preoccupation with the moon-god Sin on page 395:

“HARRAN A city in northern Upper Mesopotamia, attested first in the Hittite texts from Boghazkeui, then in the Old Testament and in the Assyrian royal inscriptions from the last third of the second millennium onward. It was conquered by the Assyrians pushing toward the west but became (under Sargon II) an integral part of Assyria, rivaling

in importance the old cities of the Assyrian heart land. Its main deity was the moon god [Sin] whose temple was sumptuously rebuilt by the Babylonian king Nabonidus ...”

Since we have established that the Nebuchadnezzar of Daniel 4 was in fact Nabonidus, let’s take a look at the transfer of power from one to the other. For this, I will quote from the book *Clash of East and West* by Daisy More and John Bowman, on page 39:

“Nebuchadnezzar was determined to hold the southern half of the Assyrian domains that his father, Nabopolassar, had taken. When a city was not cooperative, Nebuchadnezzar seized its inhabitants — as he had the men of Jerusalem from their hilltop — marched them to Babylon with all their goods from their ruined temples, and put them to work as slaves. One building project, called the Hanging Gardens by the Greeks, had a garden placed over a vaulted substructure to look like a hill, as a gift for Nebuchadnezzar’s Median wife. Another was the long wall between the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, dubbed the Median wall, for the Babylonians had begun to suspect that their allies the Medes might one day grow strong enough to turn against them.

“In 566 B.C., shortly after Cyrus had become king of the Persians, Nabonidus took over the kingdom of Babylon. Both of his predecessors, who had succeeded Nebuchadnezzar, had brief and ineffectual reigns. Nabonidus did what he could in the midst of the fever and famine that beset Babylon during his rule, and he marched north to bring back thousands of new slaves. But through a series of miscalculations and blunders, he incited the anger of the city’s more powerful inhabitants. He was [geographically] an Aramaean, and while attempting to establish the Aramaean moon god, Sin, in Babylon, he reduced the royal allowance to the priests of the chief Babylonian god Bel-Marduk. Then, he left his unpopular son Belshazzar in charge of the city and went off to the Arabian desert to seize the city of Tema and make it a base from which to control the trade route to Egypt [*just like a kike*]. He lost many warriors and many noblemen in the process. He seldom returned to Babylon for the important New Year’s Day celebrations. He failed to drain the gulf, which was silting so badly that ships could not reach the tiled quays on the lower Tigris and Euphrates; nor did he fence property as was customary. To make amends, he finally threw a huge New Year’s feast, but it was too late to quell the growing hostility of the priests, nobles, merchants, and landholders.”

It might be added that Nabonidus had a daughter who was a high-priestess at Ur named Bel-shaltinannar (*Atlas of Ancient Archaeology* by Jacquetta Hawkes, page 173). In fact, Nabonidus built a palace there for her, and she was, no doubt, a high-priestess to the moon-god, Sin. Our people didn’t use women as high priests! For further confirmation that Nabonidus’ daughter was indeed a high-priestess to the moon-god Sin, I will quote from *Ancient Mesopotamia* by A. Leo Oppenheim, page 213:

“This is corroborated by a curious late text in which the scholarly Chaldean king Nabonidus describes in considerable detail how his own daughter was selected by the moon god for the highest priestly office of his cult.”

Now back to cover the short period from Nebuchadnezzar II to Nabonidus in greater detail, I will quote from the book *Light from the Ancient Past* by Jack Finegan, (who was a director of religious activities at Iowa State College at Ames, Iowa), page 189, under the subtitle “Nabunaid And Belshazzar”:

“The new Babylonian empire also was destined to fall, and the decline came rapidly. Nebuchadnezzar II was followed on the throne by his son Amel-Marduk (562-560 [B.C.]), or Evil-Merodach as he is called in II Kings 25:27. This man was soon slain by his brother-in-law, Nergal-shar-usur (Neriglissar). The latter ruled but four years (560-556 [B.C.]) and his son Labashi-Marduk (Laborosoardoch), was on the throne only a few months (556 [B.C.]) when conspirators made away with him. One of the conspirators, a Babylonian noble named Nabunaid (Nabonidus), then ruled (556-539 [B.C.]) as the last king of Babylon.

“In practice, however, Nabunaid shared the kingship with his own eldest son Belshazzar. Belshazzar is named as the first-born son of Nabunaid in Babylonian inscriptions, and in one cuneiform text we read the following statement concerning Nabunaid: ‘He entrusted a camp to his eldest, first-born son; the troops of the land he sent with him. He freed his hand; he entrusted the kingship to him. Then he himself undertook a distant campaign, the power of the land of Akkad advanced with him; towards Tema in the midst of the Westland he set his face. He undertook a distant campaign on a road not within reach of old. He slew the prince of Tema with the sword; the dwellers in his city and country, all of them they slaughtered. Then he himself established his dwelling in Tema; the power of the land of Akkad ... That city he made glorious; he made ...; they made it like the palace of Babylon ...’

“This passage plainly states that before Nabunaid started on an expedition to Tema in Arabia he divided the rule of the empire between himself and his son, entrusting actual kingship to Belshazzar. Then he undertook the distant campaign, conquered Tema, established his residence there and built that city with the glory of Babylon ...”

We can now see that during Daniel’s time in Babylon, he experienced three major power-shifts, and managed to survive them all without losing his own head.

### **THE SIN OF THE MOON-GOD SIN**

Undoubtedly, many people might envision moon-worshippers going out on the night of the full-moon, gathering in groups to do adoration in various forms to the moon. Further, they might imagine sacrifices of various kinds of animals and incense being offered to the moon. In fact, we have a case in Scripture where the moon-worshippers were baking crescent shaped cakes to honor the Queen of Heaven. One might envision special prayers being chanted to the moon. Additionally, one might envision intoxicating drink-offerings being offered to the moon-god Sin, accompanied with all kinds of immoral, associated practices. Along with that, one might expect the worship of various nocturnal creatures such as the owl and the cat. No doubt, beating of drums and chanting along with wild, discordant music might be used by the moon-god priests to

build up wild, unrestrained emotion. While moon-worship might be accompanied by all these manifestations, the sin for the moon-god Sin goes far beyond all that.

For the background of this discussion, we will use the *History Of The Persian Empire* by A. T. Olmstead, pages 199-201 under the subtitle, "Religion And The Calendar." I will not quote this passage word for word, but reduce it to a concise review.

While Darius I, being of the faith of Ahura Mazda, had little personal respect for the Akkadian priests and temples of the moon-god Sin, yet he could not entirely ignore the solid practical scholarship coming from them. In them he saw a scientific effort to make his calendar more correct. The Orient had no opposition to science, and the measuring of time was but a byproduct of the priests and temple of the moon-god, Sin. Astrology had long been a priestly observation of the heavenly bodies. Thus calendar needs brought into use an eight-year cycle, and then a nineteen-year cycle, which once combined together at its close resulted in an almost perfect lunar and solar agreement.

In 744 B.C., this system was adopted for practical use by the Babylonian king Nabu-nasir, and from that time forward the nineteen-year cycle became a standard. A bit later, Assyrian astronomers, in seeking data for purely scientific reasons, believed the foundations of a truly scientific astronomy were not laid until the Chaldean period.

For instance, by a Chaldean ephemeris (observation of the alignment of celestial bodies) prepared in 568 B.C. "On the eighteenth of the month, Dilbat (Venus) was  $2^{\circ}55'$  above the king", Regulus, brightest star of the constellation of the Lion. "Night of the eighth evening, Sin (the moon-god) stood  $6^{\circ}15'$  under the Scales of the North" ... "The tenth, Mercury at evening behind the Great Twins enters", sets with the sun; "Mercury goes farther to the east." We can see the priests of the moon-god Sin were using the same method of degrees, minutes and seconds in that time as we use today for surveying, navigation and taking alignment on the stars.

More advanced knowledge is revealed from an ancient textbook, "Appearances of the Planets, Behind You It Will Return", prepared by Labashi, son of Bel-shar-ibni in 577 B.C.: "Appearance of the god Sin, 27 days the time will return", that is, the moon cycle is 27 days. "Appearance of the goddess Dilbat, 8 years behind you she will return"; Venus returns to the same place in the heavens after 8 years; but "4 days you subtract, you observe", and the true cycle is 8 years minus 4 days. "Mercury 6 regular years behind you return"; Mercury is the most difficult of planets, and Labashi knows that this is hopelessly rough, for he adds: "Its time you shall ascertain, the time of its appearance you shall ascertain and observe", in the hope that future astronomers may be more successful. The cycle of Mars is 47 years less 12 days, Saturn returns in 59 years, but "day by day you shall observe", and the same caution is given in the case for the 27 year cycle of the "Weapon of the Bow Star", Sirius. After a period of trial and error over many years, these priests knew with a certainty all the cycles of the planets, including the "difficult" Mercury. Not being satisfied, the astronomer priests sought ever increasing accuracy. They had already discovered *sar* (which is still employed by modern astronomers), a period of 6,585 days or a little more than 18 years, after which eclipses recur almost exactly in the same order.

A. T. Olmstead continues this topic for six more pages, and it is simply amazing what the ancients knew about the precise movements of the celestial bodies of the

heavens. Actually the old tables on these movements are not too far removed from what we have today. Of course, after the invention of the telescope much greater accuracy was obtainable. Nevertheless, **and this is important**, this gave the priesthood of the moon-god Sin much detrimental credibility, for they were able to predict every eclipse of the moon or sun to the very day. They kept the methods they used for doing this top secret (a hidden mystery), and the common people looked upon them as gods. This gave the wicked moon-god priests of Sin, who were descendants of Cain, the ability to proclaim any kind of lie, and be believed. This is the **SIN** of the moon-god, **SIN!** Its the same kind of deception as in the Garden of Eden. It's also the kind of **deception** the anti-seedliners are using today! (A little bit of truth followed by some downright lies!)

I will now quote word for word from A. T. Olmstead on pages 202-203:

“About the beginning of the fifth century [B.C.] appeared the first great Babylonian astronomer whose name was remembered by the Greeks: Nabu-rimanni, son of Balatu, ‘descendant’ of the priest of the moon-god, who witnessed important documents at Babylon in 491 [B.C.] and 490 [B.C.]. Strabo called him Naburianus and gave him the deserved title ‘mathematician’, for, while his tables were based on observation, the details are the result of most elaborate calculation. His system is explained in a textbook, copied in early Seleucid days, which gives directions for construction of such lunar computation tables and eclipse tables as are preserved from late Seleucid and early Parthian times.”

After this statement, A. T. Olmstead shows more data on the very detailed calculations made by the moon-god priests. To sum up the nature of these calculations, Olmstead says this:

“... it brought true lunar and true solar years together at the end of the 19-year cycle when, after 12 common years of 12 months and 7 embolistic years with 13 months, sun and moon returned so exactly to the same position on the ecliptic that it took 236 years to bring the error to 1°.”

You will notice, while these calculations are astounding, they are arrived at by trial and error. They don't even compare to the Great Pyramid and its alignment to various stars and true north. That's because the Great Pyramid was built by Adam's descendants, not Cain's. Doubtless, the priests of the moon-god Sin stole some of their technology from Shem's people. Think about it; when taking on such a great project as building the Great Pyramid, it would be impossible to do it by trial and error; it must be calculated correctly from the start! Now some will claim there were practice pyramids, but were they our pyramids or copycat pyramids?

Speaking of the ancient astronomical tablets, Olmstead, near the finish of “Religion And The Calendar”, said this on page 206:

“... Succeeding columns [of the tablets] found the actual new moon, for by this, and not by the already calculated astronomical new moon, the Babylonians started their month. To obtain this, they observed the last appearance of the old moon as a thin sickle to the east in the morning sky. Until these columns and the corresponding sections in the

[ancient] textbook are published and explained by professional astronomers, we cannot fully appreciate Nabu-rimanni's colossal work."

It should be noted that the Babylonian moon-god system for calculating the new moon is just the opposite to that which the Israelites were instructed to observe for their required feast-days. The Israelites were instructed to sight-in the first "sickle" of the new moon after the dark of the moon rather than the "last sickle of the old moon." If one sights-in the "sickle" of the new moon, one looks west rather than east as most pagan religions do. Also, if the Babylonian moon-god system is used for calculating our required feast-days, they would be kept a day or two early. Not only that, but by the Babylonian moon-god system the full-moon festival would be celebrated at night rather than during the day, as we observe our feast-days. You will remember, our Messiah was nailed to the tree at high-noon, halfway between sunup and sunset. Inasmuch as Yahshua's disciples, including Paul, continued to observe them, is proof Israel's feast-days were never, as some people say, "done away with." To show you this, a major happening has occurred on every calculated Israelite feast-day except one: Emmanuel's Birth at the sounding of Trumps: the Crucifixion at Passover; and the Advent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. Yet to happen is the Second Advent at the Feast of Tabernacles. Therefore, if we "do away" with the feast-days, there will be no second Advent of our Redeemer. I'm sure we don't mean to propound that. Maybe, if we would start keeping Yahweh's appointed feast-days, we wouldn't have time for Cain's feast-days where Satan is literally worshipped. Why not show the manger-scene without the Wise-Men at the sounding of the Trumps at the Fall Festival? The Wise-Men and the Star may have been near December 25, but why worship Santa-Claus (Satan-claus)? There again, the manger scene with the Wise-Men and the Star is a lie, for they are two separate events! The manger-scene should include shepherds, not Wise-Men. The Wise-Men scene should include the Star, and not the manger-scene. If we are going to send Holiday cards of the manger-scene, why don't we send them out in September?

### **MOON-GOD SIN DIVINATION**

Unless we deal with the subject of "divination" as practiced in Mesopotamia, we cannot fully understand the religious atmosphere under which Daniel had to persevere. In his book *Ancient Mesopotamia*, A. Leo Oppenheim has a subchapter, under the title "The Arts of the Diviner", which every serious Bible student should read, pages 206-227. To the people of Mesopotamia, the diviners of the priesthood of the moon-god Sin had all of life's answers. A young man wouldn't so much as attempt marriage until he had consulted the diviner for its success or failure. The diviner's art consisted of various methods. These included variant forms of casting lots; interpreting dreams; future predictions based on the positions and courses of the heavenly bodies; communication with spiritual forces; by reading the forms of smoke-clouds produced by burning incense in a censer; by reading the movements of oil poured into a container of water; by killing an animal (usually a lamb) and reading the defects in the liver, gall bladder or entrails; and by observing wind, clouds and the movements of birds.



Once we understand these methods of divination, many Scripture passages open up to us. We can grasp why Nebuchadnezzar II was so distressed and demanded his dream of the image to be interpreted by the priesthood of his day, which they were unable to do. We can also comprehend Ezekiel 21:21 where “the king of Babylon” coming to a fork in the road used divination for whether he should take Jerusalem first or Rabbah. To decide, he used three forms of divination: (1) by casting arrows, (2) by *images* of talismans, and, (3) by inspecting the liver and entrails of an animal. We can also see that type of divination used in Jeremiah 44:17 which says:

“But we will certainly do whatsoever thing goeth forth out of our own mouth, to burn incense unto the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink offerings unto her, as we have done, we, and our fathers, our kings, and our princes, in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem: for *then* had we plenty of victuals, and were well, and saw no evil.”

The purpose for the “burning of incense” to the queen of heaven was to create a cloud-image so they could read some meaning into it. The divination used by the practitioners of the moon-god Sin is a lot more extensive and complex than what I have presented here, and would be an entire subject in itself. The main purpose for presenting this subject is so whenever you are studying your Bible, you can spot this kind of worship when you read it. And as you can see, it seems to have a direct connection with Cain and his progeny, though our own people got all wrapped-up in it.

### **OTHER PROBLEMS**

In some Bible dictionaries, they say that Nabonidus’ wife, Nitocris, was the daughter of Nebuchadnezzar II, and makes Belshazzar both the son of Nabonidus and grandson of Nebuchadnezzar II. If that is true, it’s another case of making marriage with the satanic race. The main thing that I have observed is that Nabonidus was not of a royal line. If that was the situation, maybe it was an incident similar to that of Prince Charles of England. I noticed that the *Nelson’s New Bible Dictionary* says, page 875, that “little is known of his activities.” I’m sure you will have to agree with me that that statement is a downright lie, and that much is known about Nabonidus. Evidently they simply didn’t want to talk about it. I have to warn you again; not all the various reference books can be trusted. I cite the *Tyndale Bible Dictionary* by Elwell & Comfort as a case- in-point. Under the subject of Nebuchadnezzar, on pages 940-941, they speak of how Nebuchadnezzar had a second dream “about a great tree that was cut down but later sprouted from the stump.” The truth is, Nebuchadnezzar II had the first dream in chapter 2 and in chapter 4, Nabonidus had the second. I don’t want to leave the wrong impression though, for there is some valuable information in Bible reference books, but we must be very careful to cull out the beneficial from the detrimental. Actually, it’s somewhat like eating out of a garbage can. I should inform you also, that Elwell and Comfort don’t even mention Nabonidus. And while the older commentaries and dictionaries might be excused for not knowing, Elwell & Comfort is a 2001 edition.

## DEAD SEA SCROLLS ON DANIEL 9:25-26

Among the findings in the Dead Sea Scrolls is confirmation for the entire book of Daniel as we now have it in our Bible up to and including chapter 11. Other indirect evidence quotes Daniel 12:10. But the one I wish to bring to your attention is evidence on Daniel 9:25-26. From *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* by Martin Abegg et al., ©1999, we find a very interesting item on page 484, speaking of scroll 11QMelchizedek, which makes reference to the “**Anointed of the Spirit, of whom Daniel spoke.**” This is simply amazing, for if Daniel 9:27 is speaking of a “future antichrist” as the futurists claim, then that so-called “antichrist” would be the “Anointed of the Spirit” [of YHWH]. Of all the downright lies of the futurists, the accusation that the “he” of Daniel 9:27 is the antichrist is the greatest blasphemy perpetrated of all time. They are actually claiming our Redeemer is Satan. We are experiencing some of the most notable happenings in our day, for through archaeology and things like the finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Almighty is making liars of all the false-prophets (including the anti-seedliners).

It mentions from the same named publication above that eight Daniel manuscripts have been found at Qumran; two in cave 4<sup>b</sup>, and one in cave 6<sup>c</sup>. While none is complete, due to the ravages of time, between them they preserve a substantial amount of the book of Daniel. They believe the eight scrolls were copied about 175 years before they were left in the caves. It should also be noted that in Daniel 7:1, the words “He related the sum of the words” is absent from 4QDan<sup>b</sup>. A second example is at Daniel 10:16 “one in the likeness of the sons of men”, but pap6QDan likely agrees with the Septuagint’s “something in the likeness of a human hand.” In the scroll pap6QDan, the verb *touched* is feminine, while in the Masoretic text it is masculine, making the *hand* in human form, whereas before the Incarnation, YHWH was in Spirit form.

If you have followed all this series on our walk through of Daniel, you should now have a better understanding of who all the players are and where they fit on the chessboard. While we have made much progress, we still have a few things to work out. Once we grasp all these things, we can have a better comprehension of 2 Thessalonians 2:3-4 where it says:

“Let no man deceive you by any means: *for that day shall not come*, except there come the Apostasy first, and that man of [the moon-god] sin be revealed, the son of perdition; Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called Divine, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.” The Roman Pope reigned 1260 years as Cain over the kings of Europe.