

# SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #1

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

For those who may not be aware of it, we are at WAR! Even at the time of our birth, there was an enemy in the background plotting to destroy us along with all that we hold dear. This WAR has been going on continuously now, without a break, for over 7,000 years. There have been many fatalities by murder including Abel, the prophets, John the Baptist and his father Zacharias, the Messiah, and in more recent history, 20,000,000 White Ukrainians. While we have a genuine enemy, there are those on the sidelines who declare the enemy doesn't exist. Such an attitude is the zenith of irresponsibility. While the enemy is literally destroying our very being, those distracting gainsayers only want to play a game of theology.

Ted R. Weiland, Jeffrey A. Weakley, Stephen E. Jones, among other one-seedliners (or maybe you could call them "non-seedliners") go to a lot of effort to prove that the Two Seedline doctrine is a "dangerous" teaching. I will tell you what is really dangerous: When we have an enemy who has a history of 7,000 years of murder, including the Messiah, and to proclaim this enemy doesn't exist, **NOW THAT IS DANGEROUS!** Because of this, I am getting a little perturbed and distraught over all the refuse being promoted by people well-meaning, but really immature-in-the-Word-of-Yahweh, who ridicule Two Seedline teaching. They go to great lengths with their oral gymnastics trying to prove it's all a "spiritual" matter. They scoff at the idea of a **GENETIC** enemy. I am not the one making the claim that it is a matter of **GENETICS**, but the Bible unmistakably conveys this definite fact in no uncertain terms.

The one-seedliners (or non-seedliners, or maybe anti-seedliners) point to Genesis 4:1 where it says: "**And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from Yahweh.**" They will say: "You see there, Cain was the son of Adam." They don't seem to realize that Eve was already pregnant with Cain before Adam "knew" her. If they would take the time to study and see what the rest of the Bible has to say on the matter, they wouldn't come to that erroneous conclusion. Let's consider 1 John 3:12:

**"Not as Cain, *who was of* that wicked one, and slew his [½] brother..."**

Here, the word "**of**" in Greek is #1537 in the *Strong's Concordance*. When used implying a person, it means "a son of." (Will develop more on this shortly.) To show this, we will consider some of the various translations of the Bible on 1 John 3:12:

*The New Testament in Modern English* by J.B. Phillips: “**We are none of us to have the spirit of Cain, who was a son of the devil ...**”

*Smith And Goodspeed*: “**We must not be like Cain who was a child of the evil one ...**”

*Living Bible*: “**We are not to be like Cain, who belonged to Satan ...**”

*New English Bible*: “**... unlike Cain who was a child of the evil one ...**”

*New Century Bible*: “**Do not be like Cain who belonged to the Evil One.**”

*The New Jerusalem Bible*: “**... not to be like Cain, who was from the Evil One ...**”

*The Modern Reader's Bible*: “**... not as Cain was of the evil one ...**”

Now that we have consulted some various translations on 1 John 3:12, let's take a look at some Bible commentaries on this same verse:

*The Wycliffe Bible Commentary* page 1473: “**He [Cain] is said to have belonged to the family of the wicked one.**”

*Matthew Poole's Commentary On The Holy Bible*, volume 3, page 936: “**Which showed him [Cain] to be of that wicked one, of the serpent's seed: so early was such seed sown, and so ancient the enmity between seed and seed.**”

*Matthew Henry's Commentary*, volume 6, page 1077: “**It showed that he [Cain] was as the firstborn of the serpent's seed ...**”

That it is speaking concerning the GENETICS of Cain and his descendants compared to the GENETICS of the woman and her descendants can be readily observed in 1 John 3:9 (three verses before) contrasting the seed (offspring) of the serpent and the seed (offspring) of the woman:

**“Whosoever is born of Yahweh doth not commit sin; for his seed (*spérma*) remaineth in him: and he cannot sin because he *is* born of Yahweh.”**

Here the word for seed in the *Strong's Concordance* is the Greek word #4690, *spérma*, **AND YOU CAN'T GET ANY MORE GENETIC THAN THAT!** In other words, the reason the descendants of Satan through Cain (the “Jews”) act the way they do is because it is in their GENES. Likewise those born of Adam and Eve, the offspring of Yahweh, will behave according to their GENETICS.

There is a real problem with the word “seed”, *spérma*, expressed by W.E. Vine in his *An Expository Dictionary Of New Testament Words*. This is what he says on page 339:

“While the plural form ‘seeds’, neither in Hebrew nor in Greek, would have been natural any more than in English (it is not used in Scripture of human offspring; its plural occurrence is in 1 Sam. 8:15, of crops), yet if the Divine intention had been to refer to Abraham's natural descendants, another word would have been chosen in the plural, such as ‘children’ ...”

Note: There is nothing wrong with the first half of Vine's statement, which is actually helpful, explaining that in Hebrew and Greek a singular “seed” is used to denote a collective plural, as in English. It is the second half of Vine's statement which is faulty, using a word that describes a collective and limiting it to a single one. Further, in the original Hebrew, it may very well be that “seed” is always singular except in 1 Samuel 8:15, where multiple varieties are implied, and the plural would certainly be

proper! It would, therefore, be proper to indicate that Eve's "seed", like Jacob's "seed", would be a singular kind of seed. There is a world of difference between a single variety of seed and a single seed. How are we to interpret Genesis 17:7 where it says: "**... thy seed after their generation(s)**"? It should be noted that all of Yahweh's Covenants with Adam-man were made with a single variety of "seed." The word "seed" in Scripture is important, for it excludes all those who are not "seed." Whether or not Vine had an ax to grind is hard to say, but he doesn't seem to ring entirely true according to *Wilson's Old Testament Word Studies*, page 377 where Wilson states concerning this word:

"... *semen virile*, hence children, offspring, posterity; spoken also of one child when an only one ..."

It would seem that Vine is applying the singular "seed", *spérma*, in all cases, whether in a collective sense or in situations where there is but one child. Also, Vine's statement does not square with #2233 (seed) in the *Gesenius' Old Testament Lexicon*. I believe that many of the one-seedliners have been misled by Vine. By Vine applying a false premise for the word "seed", *spérma*, it would be hard to estimate his influence in many Bible commentaries and religious books. There is one thing about it: either Vine is wrong or Wilson is wrong! It should also be noted, Vine referred to various "Rabbis" regarding the word "seed." More than likely, this is where he got the idea that in all Scripture, both Old and New Testament, in every case, the word "seed" was used in the singular.

### HOW THE IDEA OF ONE SEED CAME ABOUT

If you will look up #2233 in your *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*, page 255, you will find the following comment in brackets, which indicates it is the writer's opinion:

"[The remark upon Gen. 3:15 is intended apparently to contradict its application to the Lord Jesus Christ and his redemption, as if he could not be the seed of the woman; in reply it will here suffice to remark, that in the very passage cited, immediately after Gen. 4:25, it is clear that [2233, seed] is used of *one son*, namely, Seth, when he was not an only one, because Cain was yet alive; and further, this seed of the woman was to bruise the head of the tempter, 'thy head', which can in no sense apply to any but Christ individually, who became incarnate 'that by means of death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil.']"

There are several things the writer has assumed which really are not in context or Biblically applied correctly:

**(1)** The death of Yahshua was not the bruising of the head of the serpent, but the bruising of the heel of the Messiah for He arose again. **(2)** The "seed" of the woman of Genesis 3:15 is not implied in the singular, for in Hebrews 2:11 it indicates Yahshua has many physical brethren, and He is not ashamed to call them as such. Also, I would remind you again of Genesis 17:7 quoted above. **(3)** In Romans 16:20, Paul told the Romans they would soon tread upon the head of Satan. By Yahshua using the Romans as His representatives to do this, suggests very strongly, with this "bruising", He was NOT acting in a "singular" individual sense. No doubt, this

“bruising” took place when the Roman army besieged Jerusalem, for the majority of “Jews” there at that time were of their father, Satan. Those who know the story of the establishing of Rome, understand it was founded under the sign of the wolf, Romulus and Remus. This is the insignia of Benjamin. In other words, many of the Roman soldiers under Titus were Benjamites. Also Zerah-Judah had settled in that same area at one time and probably had a bigger role than imagined, and was in all likelihood part of that Roman army. Also, if you will check Josephus Antiquities 17:8:3, you will find there were Israelite-Germans and Israelite-Galatians (Scythians and Kelts) in that Roman Army to help bruise the serpent’s head. With this, Yahshua was using His people Israel to incapacitate the Satanic “seed” at Jerusalem. While the Serpent’s head was bruised with the siege of Jerusalem, I am sure that it was just the beginning of the bruising which he will eventually receive.

From this, it is obvious the “seed of the woman” of Genesis 3:15 is collective in nature as well as the serpent’s “seed.” Let’s now consider John 8:44:

### **SMITH & GOODSPEED ON JOHN 8:44**

**“The devil is the father you are sprung from, and you want to carry out your father’s wishes. He was a murderer from the first, and he has nothing to do with truth, for there is no truth in him. When he tells a lie, he speaks in his true character, for he is a liar and the father of them.”**

You can see very clearly, then, this verse is not speaking in a “spiritual” sense as most one-seedliners would have you to believe. If so, how would one murder someone spiritually? It would be ridiculously absurd to interpret this verse in a “spiritual” manner. When it is speaking of murder in this verse, it is speaking of Cain murdering Abel. It is not speaking of Cain murdering Abel “spiritually”, but physically. I am not the only one who understands this verse in such a way. *The New Treasury of Scripture Knowledge*, edited by Jerome H. Smith, published by the Thomas Nelson Publishers, page 1203, understands John 8:44 to be speaking of the murder of Abel by Cain, for it makes reference to Genesis 4:8. This is an entire book of cross-references. As far as I know, this book is in no way promoting the Two Seedline doctrine, nor does it have an ax to grind on this subject. Let’s take a look at Genesis 4:8 to which this book makes reference from John 8:44:

**“And Cain talked with Abel his brother: and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him.”**

For evidence to help prove that John 8:44 is speaking of the “Jews” as being descendants of Cain, and that Smith & Goodspeed have translated this passage correctly, we will check on the word “**OF**”, like in “Ye are **OF** your father the devil.” The Strong’s number in the Greek is 1537. The *New Testament Word Study Dictionary* by Dr. Spiros Zodhiates devotes five pages to define and expound the word “**OF**” as used in the Greek, pages 529-534. Obviously, I cannot quote this entire document here, but cite only that which is relevant to John 8:44:

**“1537. ... Preposition governing the genitive, primarily meaning out of, from, of, as spoken of such objects which were before another ... Of the origin or source of anything, i.e., the primary, direct, immediate source ... Of persons, of**

**the place, stock, family, condition, meaning out of which one is derived or to which he belongs ... Of the source, i.e., the person or thing, out of or from which anything proceeds, is derived, or to which it pertains ...**

### **MORE ON THE WORD “OF” IN JOHN 8:44**

As I stated before herein, we really need to examine the word **“OF”** in John 8:44, for it is very critical in understanding that the “Jews” are the descendants of Cain. The word **“OF”** is the Greek word #1537 in the *Strong’s Concordance*. Most one-seedliners will claim John 8:44 should be taken spiritually only; that it is not speaking of a literal GENETIC offspring of Satan through Cain. Jeffrey A. Weakley (a one-seedliner) in his 1994 booklet *The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History*, page 24, in his attempt to discredit the Two Seedline teaching, says this of John 8:44 (this is an “Argument” and “Answer” debate conducted solely by him in his booklet):

“This does not show that Cain was of that wicked one physically, but rather he was of that wicked one spiritually. Let’s look at part of 1 John 3:8: ‘He that committeth sin is of the devil ...’ When one studies out 1 John 3:8-12 the meaning becomes crystal clear. It must be talking about who we are serving spiritually. If it is talking about physical descendants, then all of us are physical descendants of Satan because we all have sinned. ‘For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God ...’ (Rom 3:23) ... So if we have all sinned and if he that committeth sin is of the devil, we must conclude that all of us are of the devil ... So what is it saying? Are you of the devil by physical descent or are you of the devil because you serve him (or have served him in the past)?” ... “ARGUMENT [of the two seedliners]: John 8:44 says, ‘Ye are of your father the devil ...’ This shows that the devil is their physical father” ... ANSWER [by Jeffrey A. Weakley]: “Wrong. This once again shows that the devil is their spiritual father (the one that they serve).”

We must then determine whether John 8:44 is speaking of a “spiritual children or a physical children.” The word **“OF”** is critical in John 8:44 for determining this. The word in the Greek is #1537. In John 8:44 the Greek form is: ἐκ which is sometimes ἐξ. You can check this out in most any of the Greek interlinears. The *New Testament Greek Study Aids*, by Walter Jerry Clark, says, on page 230, about the Greek word ἵ6: “out of ... with the genitive: by means of, out of.” The *Intermediate New Testament Greek* by Richard A. Young, page 95 says the following about the Greek word ἐκ: “ἐκ often conveys special extensions ‘out of’ or ‘from.’ For example, the prophet said that God would call His Son out of Egypt (Matthew 2:15)” From the *Greek to English Interlinear* by George Ricker Berry, page 31 of his *Greek-English New Testament Lexicon*, we have this on ἐκ: “ἐκ or before a vowel, ἐξ, a preposition governing genitive, from, out of.” The *Thayer Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, page 189 expresses ἐκ this way: “... out of, as separation from, something with which there has been close connection ...” In other words, the “Pharisees” in John 8:44 had a close GENETIC connection out of or from “the devil.”

There are 32 other places in the New Testament where this Greek word (1537) ἐκ is used in the same sense. Let’s see if these other passages are speaking of physical or “spiritual” beings: In Matthew 1:3 it speaks of “Phares and Zara being

‘OF’ Thamar.” Does that sound “spiritual”? Again in Matthew 1:5 it says “Booz begat Obed ‘OF’ Ruth.” Again, does that sound “spiritual”? In Matthew 1:18 it speaks of the “child being ‘OF’ the Holy Ghost.” Again, does that sound “spiritual”? In Matthew 1:20 it again speaks of the “child being ‘OF’ the Holy Ghost.” Again, does that sound “spiritual.”? In Mark 5:8 the Redeemer commanded an unclean spirit to “come out ‘OF’ the man.” Does the “man”, from which the spirit was cast, sound “spiritual”? In Luke 2:36 it speaks of one “Phanuel ‘OF’ the tribe of Aser.” Does this sound like a real person or a spirit? In Acts 13:21 it speaks of “a man ‘OF’ the tribe of Benjamin.” Again, are we talking “spiritually” here? In Romans 1:3 it speaks of Yahshua being “made ‘OF’ the seed of David according to the flesh.” How do the one-seedliners claim this one to be “spiritual” when it states outright, “flesh”? After all, it’s the same word “OF” as used in John 8:44?!?! In Romans 16:10 it speaks of “them which are ‘OF’ Aristobulus’ [household].” Can we ask again if this is someone who is a real person or something strangely “spiritual”? In Romans 16:11 it speaks of “them that be ‘OF’ the [household] of Narcissus.” Does the word “OF” here apply to some real person or do we have to relegate it to something “spiritual”? In 1 Corinthians 11:12, it says “the woman [is] ‘OF’ the man.” I can just imagine some ardent one-seedliner explaining to his wife she is not a real person! In Philippians 4:22 it speaks of “they that are ‘OF’ Caesar’s household.” I guess that we Two Seedliners are now supposed to believe that Caesar was something spiritual! In Hebrews 7:5 it speaks of “the sons ‘OF’ Levi ...” and “out ‘OF’ the loins of Abraham.” I guess the one-seedliners would now have us Two Seedliners to believe that the Levite’s and Abraham’s loins were some kind of a “spiritual” mirage! In 1 John 3:8 we are told: “He that committeth sin is ‘OF’ the devil.” The devil (Satan) was the original lawbreaker, and that is what sin is all about! In 1 John 3:12 it further describes “Cain [who] was ‘OF’ that wicked one.” The one-seedliners really do some rhetorical gymnastics with this passage. Jeffrey A. Weakley said this passage was also “spiritual”. In Revelation 3:9 it states: “I will make them ‘OF’ the synagogue of Satan ...” A synagogue is a worship house of Satan. The “Jews” truly do worship Satan their father and they admit with their own words that they are descended from Cain. I have in my possession a quotation from a publication *Liberal Judaism* published January, 1949 by a Rabbi Dr. Abba Hillel Silver who states in part, speaking of the then new State of Israel: “... **the concept of the wandering Jew ... For the curse of Cain, the curse of being an outcast and a ‘wanderer’ over the face of the earth has been removed ...**”

It is only the one-seedliners who do not understand that Cain was to be a “vagabond”, a “wanderer” and having the “curse of Cain” upon him. Name one other group today that fits this category. In Revelation 5:5 it speaks of “the Lion of the tribe ‘OF’ Judah.” Are we also supposed to believe that this is something “spiritual”, and deny that Yahshua came in the flesh? In Revelation 7:5-8 we have: “‘OF’ the tribe of Judah ... ‘OF’ the tribe of Reuben ... ‘OF’ the tribe of Gad ... ‘OF’ the tribe of Aser ... ‘OF’ the tribe of Nephtalim ... ‘OF’ the tribe of Manasses ... ‘OF’ the tribe of Simeon ... ‘OF’ the tribe Levi ... ‘OF’ the tribe of Issachar ... ‘OF’ the tribe of Zabulon ... ‘OF’ the tribe of Joseph ... ‘OF’ the tribe of Benjamin.” If we are to be consistent, (a word which the one-seedliners like to use), if the same Greek word that is used in all

these references is physical in nature, **so, too, is the word “OF” in John 8:44!** Very convenient to throw up the word “spiritual” whenever you want to forge a barrier and not accept the truth which Yahshua spoke: “**Ye are OF your father the devil.**” Yahshua was simply saying to the “Jews” that they were GENETIC chips off the old block.

Also, I suggest that most people who use the word “spiritual” in this way don’t even know what the word means. The dictionary might lead to the idea of a disembodied soul or an apparition; something mysterious or mystic. The Bible meaning for “spiritual” is: life as opposed to death. How does such a description of the word “spiritual” fit John 8:44? It’s obvious, it doesn’t!

### **WOMEN HAVE “SEED” TOO**

While women do not produce sperm, they contribute as much to the DNA of a child as does the man. The very instant at which the sperm unites with the ovum is when the life of a newly conceived child begins. This very first united living cell begins the birth process. This process is then continued until every single cell in the newly formed child is married with the blueprints of both the father and the mother. Science knows today that each single cell of the human body has two sets of 23 chromosomes, or a total of 46. I will now quote *The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 9, page 192d:

“Every human body cell contains two sets of 23 chromosomes. These two sets look very much alike. Each chromosome in one set can be matched with a particular chromosome in the other set. Egg cells and sperm cells have only one set of 23 chromosomes. These cells are formed in a special way, and end up with only half the number of chromosomes found in body cells. As a result, when an egg and a sperm come together, the fertilized egg cell will contain the 46 chromosomes of a normal body cell. Half of the chromosomes come from the mother, and half from the father.”

With this in mind, we know then, the female supplies 23 chromosomes from one of her egg cells and the male supplies the other 23 chromosomes from one of his sperm cells. Once we understand this, it gives a better portrayal of what the Bible is talking about when it mentions the word “seed.” One particular one-seedliner, Charles Weisman, went to great lengths to try to prove Eve didn’t have any “seed.” Inasmuch as Eve was taken from Adam, she could only have the very identical DNA (or “seed”) as Adam.

### **THE PARABLE OF THE “TARES”**

The parable of the wheat and the tares is found in Matthew 13:24-30, 37-43. Sandwiched in-between these passages in verse 35 is the statement: “**I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.**” Yahshua then revealed the significance of the parable as meaning He, being Yahweh, had fathered the good “seed” (wheat), and that the tares were fathered by the wicked *one*. At this point, His disciples were introduced to Two Seedline doctrine. If the disciples had understood it before, they wouldn’t have made the request to him to “declare the parable.” The declarations of the wheat and the tares are as follows:

(1) The good seed, *spérma*, (Adam and his descendants) were fathered by the Son of Man (Son of Adam, Yahweh/Yahshua). (2) The field is the world. (3) The good seed, (Adamites) are the GENETIC sons of Yahweh. (4) The tares (“Jews”) are the GENETIC sons of Satan. (5) The enemy that fathered the tares is the serpent of Genesis 3:15. (6) The harvest of both the wheat and the tares is at the end of the age. (7) The reapers are messengers (angels) identifying both the wheat and tares. (8) The tares are gathered by the messengers and put into fiery judgment. (9) The tares will wail and gnash their teeth at the messenger’s Two Seedline message. (10) Then the GENETIC sons of Adam will shine as the sun, and will inherit the Kingdom after the tares are destroyed.

The one-seedliners are identifying the “wheat”, but the Two Seedliners are identifying both the “wheat” and the “tares”! Only the messengers of Two Seedline fit this description as angels. While Judeo-churchianity claims the “tares” are the “wheat”, the one-seedliners declare there are no “tares.” I guess that makes the one-seedliners half Judeo-churchianity and half Israel Identity with only a half a message!!! (Maybe, also, half hot and half cold? Revelation 3:15-16, lukewarm.)