

THE TWO CREATIONS THEORY

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

Proponents of the "Two Creations" theory assert that some strange god, or gods, as they read "elohim", were responsible for the creation account in Genesis chapter 1, while Yahweh later performed only the creation of chapter 2, as if two separate creators were being portrayed in Genesis, by different gods.

It is simply amazing how some people come up with such preposterous, screwball ideas for what they assume the Bible is saying! Two such proponents are J. Richard Niemela and Lloyd Palmer. Palmer has written a book, *THE TWO CREATIONS – Elohiym and Yahovah in Genesis*, and can be ordered from Gabriel's Enterprises, P.O. Box 507, Albert Lea, MN. 56007. Heartily, Niemela promotes Palmer's book, but don't waste your money.

Not only do these two promote the "two creations" theory, but they are venomously opposed to Biblical Two Seedline doctrine. How do they then account for both "thy seed" and "her seed" at Genesis 3:15? In their writings, they habitually use ellipses where they are not needed. "Ellipses" means "The omission of a word or words necessary for the complete grammatical construction of a sentence" (*The Reader's Digest Great Encyclopedic Dictionary*). *Practical English* in volume 2, section 27, p. 7, describes ellipses thusly:

"4. The period is used to indicate the omission of words in quoted passages. (a) Use three periods (...) to indicate the omission of words within a quoted passage. 'I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States ... one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all' –Francis Bellamy (b) Use four periods (....) to indicate the omission of words at the end of a quoted passage. 'Fame is the spur.... –John Milton'"

Niemela and his crony David Lee Saxon use ellipses indiscriminately wherever and whenever it suits their fancy. They also use 2, 3, 4, and 5 periods ("..", "...", "....", and ".....") randomly. Mentally, Niemela and his affiliates have used ellipses, so to speak, to completely omit Genesis 3:14-15 entirely from Holy Writ. And where they don't like what the Bible truly says, they blame it on the interpreters or the Catholic church.

In an E-mail from J. Richard Niemela to Lloyd Palmer, dated 7/24/2007 7:42:19 AM, Niemela said in part:

"I would suggest that they read the footnotes in the Companion Bible p. 4, as relates to Genesis 1:26, where this verse reads: 'And God said, Let Us make man in

Our image, after Our likeness....' For what the footnote for verse 26 has to say is pertinent to this issue and spoils the ideas of Emahiser... [ellipses not mine]

"Here are those footnotes: "26: Let Us. The Divine purpose is here stated. The Divine act not described til [sic] Gen. 2:7 & 21-24. Image - [sic] Likeness. [missing text, should have used ellipses, but didn't] One thing not two= "In the likeness of our image", viz, of Elohim (not Jehovah), the 2nd person, who had taken the creature form in order to create (Col.1:15- [sic no hyphen] Heb.1:3 - Rev.3:14 - [sic Companion has "cp."]) Prov.8:22-31 - [sic text has "and", not hyphen] 1 Cor.11:3-11, (all interesting references) [sic added remark without needed brackets] Refers only to the outward form, not to attributes. So He afterward took human form in order to redeem (John 1:14 - [sic no hyphen, and "Cp." missing from the text] Rev.4:11, & [sic Companion has "with", not "&"] 5:9.) [sic parentheses misplaced] In any case the 'image and likeness' is physical, not moral. Man fell an [sic] is a moral ruin, but some physical likeness to elohim still remains. [sic text missing "Cp."]) (Gen. 9:6 - 1 Cor.11:7 - James 3:9) [sic no parentheses in original text] No indication that [sic missing text, a second "that"] similitude was ever lost. (Gen.5:3, and see note on Gen.3:7) [sic no parentheses in original text]" [+ other typing errors]

By reading J. Richard Niemela, and some of his cronies, it will become glaringly apparent that they use ellipses where they shouldn't and omit them where they should. I have only observed ellipses within quotations where words or a portion of a text is omitted. If they are somehow under the illusion that scattering ellipses all over the place makes them appear intelligent, it accomplishes quite the opposite! And makes one wonder if they can even read.

These people misuse a footnote from the *Companion Bible* at Gen. 1:26: "So He afterward took *human* form in order to *redeem* (John 1:14) Cp. Rev. 4:11 with 5:9."

From this they arrive at a faulty premise. Their hypothesis is that the God ("elohim") of Genesis chapter 1 is a different entity than the Lord ("Yahweh") of chapter 2. By this they theorize that Adam was created by Yahweh at Genesis 2:7 and the other races at Gen. 1:26-27. So if the *Companion Bible* footnote at Gen. 1:26 is correct, and that the "He" (Yahshua Christ) was the one who took human form in order to redeem, then Christ must have been either a black or a mongoloid. They have just voided their own argument. What they think they are reading is not at all what is being said!

Psalms 33:6-9 makes it quite clear that Yahweh was the creator and in the middle of the action for all of Genesis chapter 1, although one-passage experts might conclude otherwise: "⁶ **By the word of Yahweh were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth.** ⁷ **He gathereth the waters of the sea together as an heap: he layeth up the depth in storehouses.** ⁸ **Let all the earth fear Yahweh: let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him.** ⁹ **For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast.**"

Niemela, in an E-mail with Palmer, receiving a carbon copy: "That 2nd note on Gen. 3:7 in the *Companion Bible* is on page 7 and of interest. It certainly is strange how the two seedliners can inject meanings into verses that have no valid support other than what the Talmud and the Targums have injected into their interpretation of verses;

meanings which they (seedliners) then follow religiously, ignoring the fact that they do consider what the Talmudists have written as valid, while at the same time disparaging Judaism..An apparent dichotomy.. Dick”

Niemela here uses two-period ellipses (i.e. “..”). Three-period ellipses are used to indicate words or groups of words omitted, so what does he mean? Does he even know? Surely, none of his readers would have any idea! In the *Companion Bible* footnote at Gen. 3:7, it speaks of a term “*Metonymy*”, and Niemela didn’t explain the meaning! Did he even look it up, or has he something to hide? According to the *Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary* from the Libronix Digital Library:

“*Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary*, (10th ed.). **me•ton•y•my** \mə-**t**ä-nə-mē\ *noun* plural **me•ton•y•mies** [Latin *metonymia*, from Greek *metōnymia*, from *meta-* + *-ōnymon* -onym] (1547) : a figure of speech consisting of the use of the name of one thing for that of another of which it is an attribute or with which it is associated (as ‘crown’ in ‘lands belonging to the crown’) — **met•o•nymic** \me-tə-**ni**-mīk\ or **met•o•nymic•al** \-mi-kəl\ *adjective*.”

Whatever Gen. 3:7 is speaking about, it is “a figure of speech.” Genesis 3:7 says: “**And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons.**” Anyone who takes Gen. 3:7 literally is a fool!

An E-mail from Niemela to Palmer dated 7/24/2007 3:53: 14 PM, says: “These people follow the words of the seedliner, Clifton Emahiser...who is determined to thwart Christianity and force it to accept the Jewish themes of satan, devil, hell, Lucifer, etc...and make Eve the culprit..I wonder if these guys are not a bit queer? Always seeking to castigate Eve...Dick” [ellipses Niemela’s] It appears that Richard can’t even spell “Dick” correctly! And notice how Niemela scatters those ellipses all over the place like a bantam rooster strutting his stuff.

At a website which has posted an Email from Niemela to a David Lee Saxon, Wed May 19 19:03:38 PDT 2004, which in part exposes the flawed position of the “two creations” theory:

“Such is the formation of Adam....but by Yahovah, God, by Himself, Singular! No Elohiym or ‘Plural’ beings were involved in this forming of Adam and the Unique Grant of having that ‘breath of life blown into his nostrils.’ Only Adam and his progeny were the recipients of that Breath of Life and the Quality that made him a ‘living soul.’

“If you go back to Gen.1..you can see that the Elohiym were the ‘creators’ of That ‘man and woman’ of Gen. 1...They were not given that breath of life and Were told only to ‘replenish’ the earth....Replenish tells me that there Were ‘other’, earlier creations that no longer existed and the earth needed Replenishment...

“This ‘man and woman,’ unlike Adam, and his agricultural pursuits, were Simply told to subsist on nuts and fruit...in a life style that was not Limited in geographic boundaries or by any legal strictures as were levied Upon Adam...In fact, if you read Gen. 1:29, you can find a specific Reference that God made to this man and woman regarding ‘Trees’! Here is a Part of it: ‘...and every tree, yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.’

Niemela and Palmer are hung-up on the word “us” at Genesis 1:26, believing falsely that the Hebrew term “elohim” is always plural where Niemela states “No

Elohiym or 'Plural' beings were involved in this forming of Adam ..." This is not true, for the following grammatical rules must be followed, as explained by Michael S. Heiser, PhD candidate, Department of Hebrew and Semitic studies, University of Wisconsin - Madison:

"The word 'elohim' CAN mean either plural 'gods' or singular 'god' (or 'God' as a proper name). The meaning of any occurrence of Elohim must be discerned in three ways:

"A. Grammatical indications elsewhere in the text that help to determine if a singular or plural meaning is meant.

"B. Grammatical rules in Hebrew that are true in the language as a whole.

"C. Historical / Logical context.

"Please witness: there is no denial that Elohim can mean 'gods'. Mr. Parker either did not read my material, or (more probable) is so deficient in his understanding of grammar (even English grammar terms) that he hasn't gotten the point. To continue - what I am saying is that, by itself, the word Elohim is ambiguous in meaning - as are all words, to some extent - it needs to be put into a sentence (I hope I don't have to define 'sentence'). We have words like this in English, such as: 'deer', 'sheep', 'fish' - the point is you need other words to help you tell if one or more than one of these animals is meant. Some times these other words are verbs that help you tell. Compare the two examples:

"1) 'The sheep is lost' - the word 'is' is a singular verb (It goes with a singular subject; one wouldn't say, for example, 'I are lost' - you would use a verb that goes with the singular subject ('I am lost').

"2) 'The sheep are lost' - the word 'are' is a plural verb (again, another word next to our noun 'sheep' tells us in this case that plural sheep are meant).

"All of this is just basic grammar - and every language has grammar. Biblical Hebrew has its own ways of telling us if Elohim means ONE person or many gods. It matches the noun Elohim to singular or plural verbs, or with singular or plural pronouns (to use 'sheep' again as an example: 'Those sheep are white'). The word 'those' is what's called a demonstrative pronoun - it automatically tells us that sheep in this sentence is meant to be understood as a plural."

In an E-mail from Niemela to Don Brown, dated 7/28/2007, 5:01:21 PM, he states this about Michael S. Heiser: "Don..I find that many of our Phd's are so skilled in rhetoric that they fail to understand common sense...I have debated and argued with many...But what is it about the word "US" that seems to be so difficult to understand...JRN" Clearly, like the pope, Niemela considers himself infallible, and he continues to use ellipses haphazardly.

Obviously, those who champion the "two creations" theory also worship the same polytheism of multiple gods spewed out by Herbert W. Armstrong. John 10:30 verifies that there is but one God: "**I and my Father are one.**" In reply to Niemela's question, "But what is it about the word "US" that seems to be so difficult to understand?" I would ask Niemela, what is there about the word "ONE" that is so difficult? John 14:8-9 reads: "⁸ **Philip saith unto him, Master, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us.** ⁹ **Yahshua saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you,**

and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou *then*, Shew us the Father?" How long had Yahweh and Yahshua been one? Answering, John 17:6 states: **"And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."** Therefore, Yahweh and Yahshua are one and the same! Yahweh was Spirit and Yahshua became Yahweh in the flesh, a God-man (elohim-adam). It is not Yahweh plus elohim, but Yahweh is elohim! Every time it says "Lord God" (Yahweh-elohim) it is singular throughout the entire Old Testament because of the verb! Strange that Niemela agrees with the bad-fig-jew, Zecharia Sitchin?

Why are the proponents of the "two creations" theory any different than the bad-fig-jews who advocate two messiahs: a suffering messiah from the tribe of Ephraim, and a conquering messiah from the tribe of Judah?

Colossians 1:12-17 shows but ONE creation, where it states: ¹² **Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: ¹³ Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated *us* into the kingdom of his dear Son: ¹⁴ In whom we have redemption through his blood, *even* the forgiveness of sins: ¹⁵ Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: ¹⁶ For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether *they be* thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: ¹⁷ And he is before all things, and by him all things consist."**

If Niemela and Palmer are correct, then this passage at Colossians chapter 1 is a lie, but if this passage is correct, Niemela and Palmer are liars of the most detrimental kind. This passage speaks of both "the Father" and "his dear Son", making the "US" of Genesis 1:26 one entity, not two. Anyone disavowing this must also deny John 1:14 which reads: **"And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth."** Thus, the Father and Son are one person in Spirit and in flesh, not two, three, or four like the pagan's claim. And at Exodus 20:3 it states: **"Thou shalt have no other elohim before me."** Here elohim is plural, but not so with Yahweh *singular*-elohim. Elohim is not always plural as some people insist. Sometimes elohim refers to pagan gods which is plural. Sometimes elohim refers to a single pagan god which would be singular. But when elohim refers to Yahweh, elohim it is always singular. Elohim is not the name, but simply alludes to something which is mighty. Pagan gods have no power, but the pagans think they do, so they refer to them as "mighty ones". Occasionally the pagans had a single god, thus singular. When referring to Israel's God, it is Yahweh *singular*-elohim, every time in the Old Testament bonding the two words tightly together. They cannot be separated as those promoting the "two creations" theory allege. Additionally, elohim is a term also used of angels and judges in the Old Testament as mighty ones, and the two creations and no-Satan crowd denies angels as did the Sadducees of Yahshua's time (Acts 23:8). Thus, making themselves modern-day Sadducees!

At Revelation 1:8, Yahshua Christ declares: **“I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith Κύριος ὁ θεός, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.”** It would be well to mention here that “elohim” is always translated into the singular θεός in Greek, unless the context dictates that elohim is plural. Hence, θεός is always singular in Genesis 1 in the LXX, thus Yahweh *singular*-elohim in the Hebrew. There is nothing said here to indicate that there was a second god from the beginning as Niemela and Palmer would have you to believe!

The proponents of the “two creations” theory follow paganism with their two gods; they also add the no-Satan doctrine to their witches’ brew. Like Mark Downey, they do not grasp Hebrew, Greek or English grammar. They pour all of their “two creations” theory into their large witches’ iron kettle and place it over the fire. They then add their perverted “no-Satan” doctrine and fill it up, and then they stir it all together and cast their evil spell over it, and claim it is “God’s Almighty truth”, and no one dare question their credibility. We will now scrutinize their perverted no-Satan theory:

“An E-mail from Niemela to Kyle Robertson, dated 7/23/ 2007 9:04:03 AM, stated in part: “FOR ALL>> Another of the two seedline bits of chicanery..There is NO Satan mentioned in Genesis, thus this comment regarding Gen. 4 is a stretch of the imagination..but, there are those who NEED this to be so...as they, like some old pagans, NEED a Satan/Devil about to satisfy their hopes and justify their worship of such an entity...for anyone who considers that such an omniscient being is real and justified, are "worshipping" it...that is even recognition of such an entity makes it to be the worship of some diety..as a diety [sic twice, should be “deity”].

“Further, Eve’s ‘sin’ was not sexual in nature, (despite what the Talmudist’s say) as she was simply ‘beguiled’ by that ‘most subtle of all the beasts of the field’ -- and if you examine the meaning of ‘beguiled’ in Strong’s Concordance, it means FIRST, to ‘mentally delude’, that is to confuse the mind of the hearer...Which is what this most subtle beast of the field did when he advised or ‘whispered’ (Hebrew-Nachash) that she would not die if she ate of that tree, despite what God had said.. [sic]

“(Was he thinking right, did his convoluted logic, gained from having been formed long before Eve, and his experiences, convince him otherwise? Likely--but He did not have that Divinely granted ‘breath of the Spirit’ in his nostrils as Adam and Eve had been given, and could not be conscience stricken.)

“That , [sic] Don, is the beguiling and not some physical sexual trickery that you confused and misguided two seedliners adhere to, following the likes of several Americans, now dead, but who developed this idea from Talmudic sources back in the 1920’s-30’s..

“Go now to Genesis 3:6 to see EXACTLY what Eve’s sin was, as that verse reads as follows: ‘And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her: and he did eat.’” [typing Niemela’s]

Again, Niemela with his helter-skelter ellipses! I would advise the reader to go back over the last six quoted paragraphs and take notice that Niemela is attempting to

limit Eve's temptation to her mentality only. In other words, Eve's sin, according to him, was a thought crime. Remember how Niemela tried to put us on a guilt-trip because we might not have read the footnotes in the *Companion Bible* at Gen. 1:26? And remember how he took those footnotes completely out of context? Rightfully, he should have read the footnotes at Gen. 3:6 as well, for they blow his faulty premise clean out-of-the-water!

The footnote at Gen. 3:6 in the *Companion Bible*, page 7 reads thusly: "6 good for food. See 1 John 2:16, 'Lust of the flesh'. Cp. Matt. 4:3. pleasant to the eyes. See 1 John 2:16. 'Lust of the eyes'. Cp. Matt. 4:5. make one wise. See 1 John 2:16 'Boastful of life' Cp. Matt. 4:8. gave. See 1 Tim. 2:14."

Let's now see what these passages at 1 John 2:16, Matt. 4:3, 5, 8 & 1 Tim. 2:14 say:

1 John 2:16: "**For all that *is* in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world.**"

Matt. 4:3: "³ **And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread ...** ⁵ **Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple ...** ⁸ **Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them.**"

1 Tim. 2:14: "**And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.**"

Are we to believe that the "lust of the flesh" at 1 John 2:16 (or in the case of Eve having sexual intercourse) is mental only? Are we to believe that the eating of bread at Matt. 4:3 (had Yahshua turned the stones to bread and eaten them) was something mental only? If you think so, sometime when you're real hungry, try eating some mental bread! And were not the "kingdoms of the world" with which the devil tempted Christ physical? If you think so, sometime try buying an airline ticket to Atlantis, Shangri-La, Lilliput or some other place, all mental inventions. It's like looking for a mental rest room when in desperate need. Niemela's arguments are just as silly!

And as far as Adam not being in the transgression at 1 Tim. 2:14, the next time your wife causes an accident with your car resulting in several thousands of dollars of damage liability, try getting out of paying the bill! When she ate, Adam as much as ate also, and became liable to pay for her error! What is there about "... the woman being deceived was in the transgression ..." that we don't understand?