

“SPIRITUAL SPERM”

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

In all likelihood you're wondering, why such a title? And, no doubt, your first impression is that you've never heard of such a harebrained expression, to which I must agree. But, believe it or not, a majority of people insist that such a thing exists. In fact, they will go to extraordinary lengths and through all kinds of verbal contortions to validate their hypothesis. Yet in spite of their strenuous oral gymnastics, they will usually unwittingly disprove their very own argument.

The subject of this composition is about 1 John 3:9 and the scriptural setting in which it is written, especially verses 4 through 15. 1 John 3:9 in the KJV reads:

“Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.”

To come to an understanding of this verse, one must first comprehend what “born of God” means, and it's not speaking of being “born again” as Nicodemus wrongly understood it. It is not some kind of mysterious “spiritual birth” as many maintain. Yahshua Himself indicated that one must be born both of water and the Spirit, and Yahshua didn't mean water baptism. Neither did He mean some kind of mysterious “spiritual birth.” Christ was alluding to being “born from above”, or being born of the heavenly race. We do the same thing today when, upon the birth of a White child we send announcement cards by mail to all our relatives and friends showing a stork in flight carrying a baby. The stork is symbolic of a bird that flies in the heavens, and thus, the happy parents consider the child to be a gift from heaven, which it truly is, and this is exactly what Christ was alluding to. Never should a stork symbol be depicted as delivering a non-white child, for such a one is void of the Spirit. Therefore, 1 John 3:9 is not speaking of the false doctrine of being “born again”.

This is the erroneous position held by all who deny two-seedline based upon Genesis 3:15. Some deny the “seed of the serpent” entirely, while others consider the “the seed of the woman” to be “literal”, and the “seed of the serpent” to be only “spiritual”. The two seeds of Genesis 3:15 are respectively #2233 (*zera*) in the Hebrew and #4690 (*sperma*) in the Greek *Septuagint*, and thus there can be no differentiation made between the two, either in the Hebrew or the Greek. If the “seed of the serpent” is “spiritual”, so also must the “seed of the woman” be “spiritual”. If the “seed of the woman” is literal, so also must the “seed of the serpent” be literal. Thus, the reader should begin to grasp why I chose the title “Spiritual Sperm”, however ridiculous though it may seem. To differentiate between the two seeds in Genesis 3:15 is to add to Scripture what is not there, and no amount of hocus-pocus can change their mutual

meaning whatsoever. Therefore, 1 John 3:9 is speaking exclusively of the people **racially** “born from above”.

To substantiate beyond all reasonable doubt that both of the seeds of Genesis 3:15 are literal, I will cite Paul at Romans 16:20:

“ And the God [Yahweh] of peace shall crush Satan under your feet shortly. The grace [favor] of our Prince Yahshua Christ be with you.”

Paul was predicting that the Romans would shortly besiege and destroy Jerusalem along with Herod’s temple, although he would not live long enough to see it accomplished. The Romans had given opportunity for any Christian to leave before the siege, and history shows they did so. The reader will better understand this by going to the account in Josephus at Wars 2.19, as the Roman general Cestius besieged Jerusalem (Luke 21:20) and then lifted the siege for no apparent reason, although he was very close to taking the city. After Cestius lifted the siege, the good, noble people of the city fled (Wars 2.19.6, 2.20.1). Some time later – at least about two years – Titus then came and destroyed the city, just as Yahshua Christ had predicted at Matt. ch. 24 (Mark 13, Luke 21).

By-and-large, all that was left at Jerusalem were the bad-fig variety of “Jews”, or the “seed of the serpent”. Jeremiah had described the bad-fig “Jews” at 24:2 as being so rotten they could not be eaten. The term “eaten” has sexual connotations as it did in the episode with Eve. Therefore, Jeremiah was resolutely declaring that the bad-fig “Jews” were so race-mixed, one could not marry any of them and have children by them. And the Romans (who were the seed of the woman) really trounced the hell out of those residing at Jerusalem (who were the seed of the serpent), and it was a **literal physical** “crushing” of a **literal physical** “people”. Anyone today can read the account by Josephus of that “crushing”, though there still remains a remnant of the “seed of the serpent” to be crushed. Can there still be anyone so mentally lethargic, with the witness of Josephus to continue to designate the “seed of the serpent” at Genesis 3:15 as “spiritual sperm”? I would strongly suggest that all the “one-seedliners” obtain a copy of Josephus, and start a serious study of it! All you one-seedliners, sit up and take note: both the Bible and history call you **the liars you really are!** Hence, you should hide your face in shame and let your contradictory words be silenced!

Now that both our **biblical** and **historical** evidence stands on **solid ground**, maybe we can read 1 John 3:4-15 in its proper perspective. Let’s read 1 John 3, especially verses 11 & 12:

“¹¹ For this is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another. ¹² Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother’s righteous.”

Take special note here where verse 12 says: **“Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one ...”**. It is important to consider the Greek, which the McReynolds *English Interlinear Bible* with the NA27 text of the Greek translates “from the evil was”, ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν. It should be mentioned that the Greek Article is translated “that” rather than “the” and is τοῦ in the Greek. It is not just simply “evil” but “the evil”; or in other

words “Satan”. Where Christ said to Peter, “Get thee behind me Satan”, the Greek article is not there, whereas at Rev. 12:7 it is “the Satan”. πονηρός by itself is an adjective. With the Article, as it is here in the Genitive Case τοῦ πονηροῦ, it is a Substantive, a word or group of words used as a noun. Now if Adam was the natural father of Cain, as all the one-seedliners insist, then the only conclusion that could be made, under such a premise, is that **Adam was Satan**. Then, inasmuch as Christ was in the image of Adam, it would, in turn, make Christ in the image and genetics of Satan. Can you now see how dangerous this line of man-manipulated reasoning can be?

Most of the anti-seedliners use Genesis 4:1 to support their claim that Adam was Cain’s father. They overlook the fact that Genesis 4:1 in our present Bibles is but a corrupt translation from a corrupt text found in both the Masoretic and Septuagint manuscripts. Only the Aramaic targums furnish us with the true sense of the passage. The RSV further confuses the issue by adding the words “the help of”. For anyone interested, concerning the corruption of this passage, get a copy of my brochure *The Problem With Genesis 4:1*.

It is quite apparent that not all of the story of Eve’s seduction is portrayed in the early chapters of Genesis, as at 1 Timothy 2:14 we read:

“And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.”

The anti-seedliners are evidently ignorant of Yahweh’s Law of adultery. Adam was well aware that Eve had an extramarital affair with Satan, and when Eve offered Adam to have sexual intercourse with her after that affair, and Adam consented, then Adam became as guilty as Eve. Satan’s and Eve’s penalty according to the Law is spelled out in Deuteronomy 22:22 as follows:

“If a man be found lying with a woman married to an husband, then they shall both of them die, both the man that lay with the woman, and the woman: so shall thou put away evil from Israel.”

Adam’s sin then, if you can call it that, was not demanding justice in the face of all the facts, and then after her seduction, accepting Eve, as a whore, rather than putting her away or causing Eve to be stoned to death. Eve’s situation is similar to that of Joseph’s Mary who mothered Yahshua the Christ, as Joseph also had to contemplate putting Mary away, and Joseph was well aware that by Law it required that Mary also be stoned to death. But Joseph, after learning the circumstances, kept Mary as his wife, and thus accepted the responsibility as being the legal father to her issue, although the Christ-child was not his. Like Joseph becoming the legal father of Christ, Adam became the legal father of Cain, Eve’s issue by Satan, and therefore Cain became Abel’s legal brother. We should take note that there is no such term as “half”-brother or sister anywhere in Greek or Hebrew, in the Bible. If in Greek a distinction was made by secular writers, it would usually be “brothers by the same father” (implying different mothers), or likewise with the mother. Yet the singular term “brother” was commonly used of half-siblings also.

Many are unaware that Mary’s Joseph had the curse of Jeconiah on him. In Jeremiah 22:30, Yahweh pronounced a curse on this man: Thus says Yahweh: “Write this man down as childless, A man who shall not prosper in his days; For none of his

[male] descendants shall prosper, Sitting on the throne of David, And ruling anymore in Judah.” (Check *Believer’s Bible Commentary* by William MacDonald, page 1011.)

Had Yahshua been the real son of Joseph, He would have come under this curse. Yet He had to be the legal son of Joseph in order to inherit the rights of the throne of David. The problem was solved by the miracle of the virgin birth: Yahshua was the legal heir to the throne through Joseph. He was the real Son of David through Mary. The curse on Jeconiah did not fall on Mary or her child since she did not descend from Jeconiah.

By teaching against two-seedline, the anti-seedliners are proclaiming to the sheep that they have no enemy! And wittingly or unwittingly, it’s an inexcusable, damnable lie. And as I stated before, the Bible and history literally screams “**IT IS A LIE.**” Luke clearly tells us, recording the prophecy of Zacharias, that indeed we do have enemies (plural – not just one ‘satan’), thus Satan and his children! Luke 1:71.

ARE THE JEWS A RACE?

James Strong’s *Exhaustive Concordance Of The Bible* with its Hebrew-Chaldee & Greek dictionaries is a great tool to aid Bible students to a better understanding, but with its often abbreviated and vague definitions of the various biblical words, it can lead the unwary scholar to some erroneous conclusions. Many regard Strong’s as an ultimate authority, and that is a mistake, for earlier H.W.F. Gesenius, with his 1847 first edition of *Gesenius’ Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament* allows us to detect many of Strong’s errors. Yet neither is Gesenius an ultimate authority. Where Strong’s will give one or two short paragraphs for a definition of a Hebrew word, Gesenius will devote several pages covering the same word. The same caution must be used for all concordances and lexicons, as none of them are perfect, and they are riddled with premises of nominal churchianity. Nevertheless, these references are needed, but one must necessarily be prudent with their use. In addition to these named reference books, I recommend W.E. Vine’s *An Expository Dictionary of New & Old Testament Words*, Spiros Zodhiates’ *The Complete Word Study Dictionary New Testament*, Thayer’s *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, Wilson’s *Old Testament Word Studies*, and as an option, The New Brown-Driver-Briggs *Hebrew- English Lexicon*. If one makes the excuse that he cannot afford to invest in these reference books, then let him cancel his subscription to his TV Guide and disconnect his cable-TV service, along with stopping all the “Jew” inspired newspapers and magazines, and then one should, in most cases, be able to afford them, probably even with some money left over!

I recently got a letter from a man on my prisoner mailing ministry whom I will not name. In fact, this is the reason for this presentation. Upon being introduced to “two-seedline” he was favorably impressed, that is, until a flaming, censorious one-seedline “pastor” (whom I will not name, unless he gets obnoxious) influenced him against two-seedline! This prisoner sent me a one page letter, along with a 4 page write-up of how this “pastor” convinced him to revert back to one-seed teaching. Upon being wrongly influenced by this pastor, this prisoner then came to many erroneous conclusions brought on by his own inability to grasp the meanings in Strong’s and causing several misjudgments. On his own, this prisoner goes to Strong’s Greek #1074, and reduces it to “... a generation ... an age ...” His faulty conclusion was that many of the “Jews” that Christ dealt with were true genetic Israelites, but were influenced by a “spiritual satan”,

and that #1074 didn't have anything to do with race. This prisoner completely overlooked that in his Strong's at #1074, the definition directs him to Strong's #1084, which is a synonym of #1074, and that is important. Had this prisoner had Zodhiates' *NT Dict.*, which he truly can't afford and has no access to, he would have discovered that Zodhiates states, in part, at #1074, "... Race or posterity ...", and under "synonyms", "(1085), kind, family, generation ...". Had he had Vine's *NT Expo.*, he would have discovered that under "Generation", Vine states, in part "... origin, a lineage, or birth ... see Kind." Then under "Kind", which is #1085, *genos*, he would have discovered that Vine makes reference to about twenty scriptural passages dealing with race. Had this prisoner had access to Thayer's *Lex.*, he would have discovered similar definitions for both of these Strong's Greek #'s. At #1074 Thayer states, in part, "... used especially of the Jewish race living at one and the same period ..." This remark by Thayer would not have been necessary had the so-called "Jews" of that period been true racial Israelites. Josephus, at *Wars* 2:8:2, testifies that by-and-large of the Pharisee, Sadducee, and Essene sects, only the Essenes were "Judah by birth".

Matt. 12:39 declares in part (Christ speaking), "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign ..." The word "generation" here, as used in the Greek, is #1074, and is speaking of a "genetic race" rather than "spiritual sperm", as both W. E. Vine and Thayer attest, and to which Strong, Zodhiates and Vine link to #1085, and #1085 means race in the strictest sense. Not only were these Pharisees and Sadducees a genetic "race", but an "adulterous genetic race", or a mixed genetic group who had been unfaithful in their racial calling. That's why Christ said to them "... and [you] shall die in your sins ...", John 8:22. What then were the sins of these "Jews"? Their sins were the fact that they were a product of miscegenation which could never be rectified. Now there were a few pure genetic Israelite Judaeans who had joined the Pharisee party who don't fall into the category of "adulterous generation", though they were very badly misled.

It is a watchman's job to not only be vigilant in carrying out his duty (not slumbering or sleeping on the night watch), but also to sound the alarm when an enemy is approaching. But for a watchman to cry "all is safe", when it isn't, is treason, and that is exactly what the "spiritual sperm" people are doing!