

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #2

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

After finishing my *Special Notice To All Who Deny Two Seedline, #1*, I realized there was much more evidence which could be presented on the subject, so I decided to post another paper concerning it. In that paper, I reminded everyone concerned of the fact that we are in a 7,000-plus year-old WAR. *The Book Of Enoch, 22:6-7* speaks of this WAR where it says:

“ 6 Then I inquired of Raphael, an angel who was with me, and said: Whose spirit is that, the voice of which reaches to heaven, and accuses? 7 He answered, saying: This is the spirit of Abel, who was slain by Cain his [dizygotic] brother; and he will accuse him, until his seed be destroyed from the face of the earth.”

I added the word “dizygotic” to the above quote inasmuch as Cain was only a half brother. Because Cain's descendants (the “Jews”) have as yet to be totally destroyed, Abel's blood is still crying from the ground! I know there are some in Israel Identity who claim that Abel, because he shared the womb with Cain, was of polluted seed. I do not share that premise, for my Bible says Abel was “Righteous”, (Matthew 23:35). Abel could not have been considered Righteous if he was of polluted seed. We read in Genesis 4:25 that Seth was appointed as another seed in place of Abel. Therefore, Seth was the same identical seed as Abel. The word “Seth” is #8352 in the *Strong's Concordance* and means “substitute.” Substitute for whom? If Seth were of pure seed, he couldn't have been a substitute for polluted seed, could he?

For a moment, let's consider the argument the anti-seedliners put forth that Cain was a full-blooded son of Adam. Let's just stop and think for a moment: (1) Cain and Abel are born, (2) Cain kills Abel, (3) Cain is kicked out of the family, (4) There are no qualified heirs for Adam. If, then, Seth were a substitute, he would, by Law, have to be a substitute for the disinherited firstborn Cain. Why, then, does Genesis 4:25 indicate Seth is a replacement for Abel instead of Cain? Even if Cain was disqualified for the act of murder, Seth legally would have to be a replacement for Cain, the firstborn son. If you will remember, in the case of Judah and his Canaanite wife, he had three sons by her, yet Pharez, his fourth-born son by Tamar was considered his firstborn! Actually, Cain was a son of Adam, a stepson, for when Cain was born of Eve his wife, Adam became his legal father, just as in the case of Mary, the Messiah became the legal stepson of Joseph. And, just as in Matthew 13:55, James, Joses, Simon and Judas are

called Yahshua's brothers when they were only half brothers, or maybe, only legal brothers if they were children of Joseph by a former marriage.

Before we quit this concept of Seth's seed being a replacement for Abel's seed, let's look into another aspect of this thing. In the Bible there is a thing called the Levirate Law. If an Israelite wife's husband was killed in battle, and they had no children, the Law required a brother to supply his seed so the widowed wife might be able to raise up seed (children) to her deceased husband. Because both the husband's and brother's seed were identical, it was considered her husband's seed. The only way Abel's blood can be crying from the ground for revenge is: if Seth is the identical seed as Abel, and that Seth's seed will, in the end, destroy Cain's seed. If what I am saying here is true, we, as Israelites, are descendants of Abel as well as Seth. Thus, we must avenge Cain on behalf for Abel's seed!

Here are some excerpts concerning Cain and Abel taken from *Matthew Henry's Commentary*, volume 1, pages 38, 40, 41 & 43 on chapter 4 of Genesis . In these separate quotations, you will notice several very outstanding observations which could constitute individual lessons in themselves:

"The Pharisees walked in this way of Cain, when they *neither entered into the kingdom of God themselves nor suffered those that were entering to go in*, Luke 11:52" ... "A fruit of the enmity which is in the seed of the serpent against the seed of the woman. As Abel leads the van in the *noble army of martyrs* (Matt. 23:35), so Cain stands in the front of the ignoble army of persecutors, Jude 11. So early did he that was after the flesh persecute him that was after the Spirit; and so it is now, more or less (Gal. 4:29), and so it will be till the war shall end in the eternal salvation of all the saints and the eternal perdition of all that hate them. ... Thus, in Cain, the devil was both a murderer and a liar from the beginning. ... In the original the word is plural, thy brother's bloods, not only his blood, but the blood of all those that might have descended from him; or the blood of all the seed of the woman, who should, in like manner, seal the truth with their blood. ... He [Cain] went and *dwelt on the east of Eden*, somewhat distant from the place where Adam and his religious family resided, distinguishing himself and his accursed generation from the holy seed."

The anti-seedliners point to Genesis 4:1 quoting: "**And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain ...**" and say: "that settles the matter, Adam was Cain's father." The problem is: they are reading the account in English and it was originally written in Hebrew. In the original Hebrew, there were no punctuation marks; no capital letters at the beginning of a sentence nor periods at the end; there were no vowels; nor were there any chapter and verse divisions as we know them today. Therefore, we have to hope that the translators put all of these things in their proper places. Yet we know that they didn't always do that, for many times part of a topic is given at the end of one chapter, and continued into the first part of the following chapter. So, if they were inconsistent with the chapter and verse divisions, so might they also be on these other things.

In Ralph Woodrow's *Babylon Mystery Religion*, page 146, there is a footnote which reads: "Note: When the Bible was originally written, commas (and other punctuation marks) were completely unknown. Punctuation marks were invented by

Aldus Manutius in the Fifteenth Century. Since the original manuscripts had no punctuation marks, the translators placed commas wherever they thought they should go — based entirely on their beliefs ...”

With this, you can begin to see the problem we are up against with the interpretation of Genesis 4:1! We must give the translators credit though, as they placed a semicolon (;) between, “ And Adam knew Eve his wife ” (;) “ and she conceived and bore Cain.” A semicolon indicates the greatest degree of separation possible within a sentence before dividing it into two separate sentences. It is my opinion that the translators should have used two separate sentences in this case as Adam knowing Eve, in this particular case, had nothing to do with Eve bearing Cain. Should it have two sentences, or one? Once we begin to understand that Eve was pregnant with Cain before Adam ever knew her, we can realize Adam knowing Eve didn’t have anything to do with Eve bearing Cain. It’s the old concept of cause and effect. I could say I went to a movie one evening and the sun rose the next morning. If this was said, it would be true. But, even though it was true, it does not mean that the sun rising the next morning had anything to do with my having gone to a movie.

EVE HAD TWINS

Genesis 4:2 says, “ ... **she again bore his brother Abel.**” The word in Hebrew for “again” is #3254 and means “to continue something or to add.” In other words, after she bore Cain, she “continued” bearing Abel. I have heard some say that Abel wasn’t born for several years after Cain, but the Hebrew doesn’t support such an idea. The Hebrew word #3254 can also mean “conceive again”, but this does not seem to fit the context.

MORE ON JOHN 8:44

We will again quote this verse from *Smith & Goodspeed* as we did in *Special Notice To All Who Deny Two Seedline, #1*. With this rendition, there can be little doubt the “Jews” are the genetic descendants of Satan:

“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.”

This is what the *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary* has to say concerning this verse, page 109: “The true reason for their [the Jews] failure to receive him [Yahshua] was their kinship with the devil. He was their father. No wonder they acted as he does (cf. Mt 23:15). His special sins are lying (seen in connection with the temptation in the garden) and murder (in the incitement of Cain to slay his brother — 1 Jn 3:12).”

Please notice the word “**kinship**” here. It’s not talking about something “spiritual”, but **literal** and **genetic**. The *Matthew Henry’s Commentary* understands it this way also, volume 5, page 999:

“Having thus disproved their relation both to Abraham and to God [Yahweh], he comes next to tell them plainly whose children they were: *You are of your father the devil*, v. 44. If they were not God’s [Yahweh’s] children, they were the devil’s, for God

[Yahweh] and Satan divide the world of mankind; the devil is therefore said to *work in the children of disobedience*, Eph 2:2 ... All wicked people are the devil's children, *children of Belial* (2 Cor. 6:15), the serpent's seed (Genesis 3:15), children of the wicked one, Matt. 13:38. They partake of his nature, bear his image, obey his commands, and follow his example ..."

These last two quotations are simply brilliant, yet slightly flawed. I believe it is simply amazing that these commentators had moments of inspiration, for the message of Two Seedline and Israel Identity were not to be revealed until the end times according to Matthew 13:37-43. This passage indicates (1) the tares will be gathered and burned, and then, (2) the wheat will be gathered into the kingdom. Here the tares are those of the Satanic-seedline, while the wheat are true Israel. While both of these messages are important, for the moment, the Two Seedline message has priority, for the majority of Israelites will not understand their Identity until after the tares are cast into the fire. With the Two Seedline message coming to the forefront, they are, at the present time, beginning to feel the heat. If you haven't, as yet, grasped the Two Seedline message, maybe it isn't your time to understand it. If you do fathom this message, I would encourage you to promote it, for it is the message of the hour.

For yet another comment on John 8:44, I will use the *Jamieson, Fausset & Brown Commentary On The Whole Bible*, page 1046: "Ye are of your father the devil — 'This is one of the most decisive testimonies of the *objective* (outward) *personality* of the devil. It is quite impossible to suppose an accommodation to Jewish [Hebrew] views, or a metaphorical form of speech, in so solemn an assertion as this' [ALFORD]. the lusts of your father — his impure, malignant, ungodly propensities, inclinations, desires, ye will do — are willing to do; not of any *blind necessity of nature*, but of *pure natural inclination*."

We will now consider some of the passages quoted here by these various commentaries, starting with Matthew 13:38 which reads: "**The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one.**"

The word "children", in this passage, is the Greek word #5207, and means "legitimate sons" as opposed to #3541 "illegitimate sons." How fitting is the use of this Greek term in this particular verse, for this is exactly what this passage is speaking about. In other words, it is addressing the legitimate (lawfully begotten) sons of Adam-Israel and the legitimate (lawfully begotten) sons of Satan. While it is true there was nothing "legitimate" or "lawful" concerning the birth of Cain, nevertheless the Greek words make it quite clear there are a **genuine** and **counterfeit** children spoken of. It might be said, more or less, in this manner: "the unlawful and illegitimate sons of Satan are his lawful responsibility." The *Wycliffe Bible Commentary* has the following to say in respect to this verse:

"The field is the world. Not the Church. Children of the kingdom. As in the explanation of The Sower, the seed is here regarded as having produced plants (13:19). The springing up of Christ's true followers in this world is counterfeited by the devil, whose children often masquerade as believers (2 Cor. 11:13-15)." [Verses 13:8 & 23 would be more relevant than 13:19.]

As 2 Corinthians 6:15 was referred to by Matthew Henry, let's take a look at that one next. We will quote verses 14, 16 & 17 as well, for they are pertinent to the passage. While this passage strongly commands we are not to have common ground with people of a different race or species, it also charges us to have no fellowship with the wicked unbelievers, especially the "Jews." If you will check your center reference, you will notice that it takes you to Deuteronomy 7:2-3 where we are instructed not to minge with the Canaanites representative of today's "Jews." Apparently, the anti-seedliners haven't learned this very important lesson yet:

"14 Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? 15 And what concord hath Yahshua with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? 16 And what agreement hath the temple of Yahweh with idols? for ye are the temple of the living Elohim; as Yahweh hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in *them*; and I will be their Elohim. and they shall be my people. 17 Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith Yahweh, and touch not the unclean *thing*; and I will receive you."

We will now take a survey of what some various commentaries state on this passage. As this is a very important part of the Two Seedline message, we should take special note of the following:

The *Believer's Bible Commentary* by William MacDonald, page 1845: "This section of 2 Corinthians is one of the key passages in all the word of God [Yahweh] on the subject of separation. It is clear instruction that the believer should separate himself from unbelievers, iniquity, darkness, Belial, idols ... Neither can light have communion with darkness. When light enters a room, the darkness is dispelled. Both cannot exist together at the same time."

The *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible*, abridged by Ralph Earle, page 1140: "*Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers*. This is a military term: keep in your own ranks; do not leave the Christian community to join in that of the heathens ... As *righteousness* cannot have communion with *unrighteousness*, and *light* cannot dwell with *darkness*."

The *Jamieson, Fausset & Brown Commentary On The Whole Bible*, page 1243: "... As Satan is opposed to God [Yahweh], and Antichrist to Christ; Belial being here opposed to Christ, must denounce all manner of Antichristian uncleanness [Bengel]. — he that believeth with an infidel — Translate, 'a believer with an unbeliever'."

The *Wycliffe Bible Commentary* contributes this on page 1273: "The word concord (*sunkatathesis*) is found only here in the New Testament. The holiness and purity of Christ [Yahshua] cannot harmonize with the wickedness and impurity of Belial (a synonym for Satan). Cf. 1 Cor. 10:21 ... The word agreement (*sunkatathesis*) climaxes the four previous words that Paul used to express sinful union between the sons of God [Yahweh] and the children of the devil. This word suggests a sympathetic union of mind and will in a plan mutually agreed to ... God [Yahweh] cannot lovingly entertain those who are knowingly and willingly involved in evil."

From the *Matthew Poole's Commentary On The Holy Bible* we get the following, volume 3, page 618: "It is a metaphor drawn from horses or oxen; which should draw

together, being in the same yoke, neither standing still, nor yet holding back. It is a general precept, prohibitive of all unnecessary communication and intimate fellowship with such, as either in matters of faith or worship, or in their lives and conversations, [who] declare themselves to be unbelievers ... *And what concord hath Christ with Belial?*, Christ, who is the Head of believers ... and to him who is the head of all unbelievers, and the god of the world ... therefore we ought to have no unnecessary communication with such who manifest themselves to be of their father the devil ...”

The *Matthew Henry's Commentary* has this to say concerning this passage, volume 6, page 625: “It is an unequal yoking of things together that will not agree together; as bad as ... to have ploughed with an ox and an ass or to have sown divers sorts of grain intermixed. What an absurdity is it to think of joining righteousness and unrighteousness, or mingling light and darkness ... and what comfortable communion can these have together? Christ [Yahshua] and Belial are contrary one to the other; they have opposite interests and designs, so that it is impossible there could be any concord or agreement between them ... therefore, the exhortation is (v. 17) *to come out from among them*, and keep at a due distance, *to be separate*, as one would avoid the society of those who have the leprosy or the plague, for fear of taking infection ...”

There probably is no better an example of fellowship of “light” with “darkness” than the blatant organization “The International Fellowship of Christians and Jews”, 309 W. Washington Street, Chicago, Illinois. They say their aim is: “*Working to strengthen Christian-Jewish understanding on issues of shared concern.*” Supporters of this organization are people like Pat Robertson, Jerry Falwell, Pat Boone, Jack Hayford, Rabbi Yechiel Eshkstein, Senator Joseph Lieberman, Charles Colson, Sallai Meridor, Yuli Edelstein, Zvi Raviv, and Ehud Olmer among others. And, let’s not forget John Hagee, as he is really in bed with the “Jews.” They promote a program called “On Wings Of Eagles” where they dupe the ignorant Christians into donating money to fly a “Jew” from Russia to Jerusalem, and help them to get established with a job, home and food when they get there. Ted R. Weiland, an anti-seedliner, in his booklet: *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?*, page 94, went so far as to say the scribes and Pharisees of Yahshua’s time were true members of Jacob’s household as follows: “**Acts 4:5-10, 24-35 and 7:2-52 declare the Pharisees were Judahites of the seed line of Jacob/Israel.**” While it might be true that there were still a smattering of pureblooded Judah left in that area, they would have been significantly few. To equate these few with the scribes and Pharisees would be like, saying, in effect, the scribes and Pharisees were and are children of light rather than children of darkness. Revelation 2:9 & 3:9 make it quite clear there were both true and false members of the Tribe of Judah. No doubt, Weiland is a product of the Judeo-Christian college, “Christian Leadership Bible College” in Denver, Colorado, where he attended for four years, as he makes mention on page 133 (a college for fellowship of “light” with “darkness”).

To answer Weiland’s preposterous statement that “...the Pharisees were *Judahites of the seed line of Jacob/Israel*”, I will use Colossians 2:15: “**And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it.**”

Quoting now from the *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible*, abridged by Ralph Earle, page 1200. Let's see if what Clarke has to say agrees with Weiland: "It is very likely that by the *principalities and powers* over whom Christ [Yahshua] triumphed the apostle means the *nesioth and roshoth, who were the rulers and chiefs in the Sanhedrin and synagogues*, and who had great authority among the people, both in making constitutions and in explaining traditions. The propagation of Christianity in Judea quite destroyed their spiritual power and domination."

The Wycliffe *Bible Commentary* portrays the picture on this verse even to a greater extent on page 1341: "Spoiled, or better, *stripped (apekdyomai)* is a compound not essentially different from another Pauline expression *ekdyo*. The latter, as used in the LXX (and classical Greek) of the defeating or stripping of enemies in war, provides a clue to the meaning here. In Old Testament times captives were stripped of most or all clothing. This action came to symbolize defeat, and for the prophets it signified the judgment of God [Yahweh] (cf. Ezk 16:39; 23:26). In the New Testament this idea moves into the realm of 'last things', when the righteous will be clothed, in contrast to the wicked, who will stand stripped and naked under God's [Yahweh's] judgment (cf. Mt. 22:11; Rev. 3:17,18; 16:15; 2 Cor. 5:3,4)."

Matthew Henry's Commentary, volume 6, page 759 describes this verse as follows: "He *spoiled them*, broke the devil's power, and conquered and disabled him, and *made a show of them openly* — exposed them to public shame, and made a show of them to angels and men ..."

The Matthew Poole's Commentary On The Holy Bible, volume 3, page 718, comments on this passage thusly: "... delivering his subjects *from the power of darkness*, Col. 1:13, according to the first promise, Genesis 3:15. He *made a show of them openly*; yea, and Christ [Yahshua] did, as an absolute conqueror, riding as it were in his triumphal chariot, publicly show that he had vanquished Satan and all the powers of darkness ..."

The Interpreter's Bible, volume 11, page 199, makes the following observations concerning this passage: "The mighty spirits [Jewish control] which once held men in their 'dominion of darkness' (Colossians 1:13-14) are now reduced to impotence ... Paul depicts the breaking of their dominion under the figure of a military defeat, and the parade of the vanquished in the triumphal procession of the conqueror. God [Yahshua] has stripped them of their arms, displayed them in public as his trophies of victory, leading them in captive chains at his chariot wheels."

Many commentaries try to connect Colossians 2:15 with Yahshua dying on the cross, but this refers rather to Messiah's encounters with the scribes and Pharisees, and His open denunciation of them. If the Satanic "Jew" scribes and Pharisees are not meant here, who, then, pray tell, is it speaking of? To help answer this, let's find out who the scribes and Pharisees are, and are not. For this we will read Josephus', *Wars* 2:8:2: "For there are three philosophical sects among the Jews. The followers of the first of whom are the Pharisees; of the second the Sadducees; and the third sect, who pretends to a severer discipline, are called Essenes. These last are Jews by birth, and seem to have a greater affection for one another than the other sects have."

It would appear from this, that of these three, only the Essens could claim to be pure blooded Israelites of the Tribe of Judah. Why didn't Josephus mention the Pharisees and Sadducees as being Jews by birth? Evidently, Weiland believes himself more of an authority on the origin of the "Jews" than Josephus; and more of an authority than even Yahshua Himself.