

# SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #5

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

Again, I would remind everyone who is not aware of it, we are in a WAR. This WAR has been going on now for about 7,000 years. This WAR is between the GENETIC children of Yahweh and the GENETIC children of Satan; this WAR is between the White children of Adam and Eve and the offspring of Satan through Cain whom we know today as "Jews." Yes, the "Jews" are the literal progeny of Satan walking about today in shoe-leather. The "Jews" of today and the scribes and Pharisees of Messiah's time should not be confused with the true Tribe of Judah. John Lightfoot understood this when he wrote in his *A Commentary on the New Testament From the Talmud and Hebraica*, volume 3, page 334 in reference to John 8:37:

"From this whole period it is manifest that the whole tendency of our Savior's discourse is to shew the Jews that they are the seed of that serpent that was to bruise the heel of the Messiah: else what could that mean, ver. 44. 'Ye are of your father the devil', but this, viz. 'Ye are the seed of the serpent?'"

Let's now take a look at John 8:38. While we do, let's remember that in verse 41 the "Jews" were very defensive of the implication of being "born of fornication." Being born of fornication implies being born of an impure racial union, Greek #4202. Dr. Spiros Zodhiates in his *New Testament Word Study Dictionary*, page 1201: "**In John 8:41, 'We be not born of fornication' means, 'We are not spurious children, born of a concubine, but are the true descendants of Abraham'.**" Sure, the Arabs can claim Abraham as their father. We know, also, that the "Jews" of Messiah's day had absorbed Edomite blood, and therefore could claim both Abraham and Isaac as their fathers. The Shelanite-Judahites could even claim an affinity with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Judah, but that doesn't make them of the true Tribe of Judah. Now let's read that passage with that in mind:

**"They answered and said unto him, Abraham is our father. Yahshua saith unto them, If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham."**

Verse 39 really clears up the whole matter. *The Holy Bible New Century Version* puts it very nicely in verse 39:

**"They answered, 'Our father is Abraham.' Jesus said, 'If you were really Abraham's children, you would do the things Abraham did'."**

*A Commentary On The Holy Bible*, edited by Rev. J. R. Dummelow M.A., page 789 remarks on John 8:37 in this manner:

**“ Their desire to kill Christ, the promised seed of Abraham, proved that they were not children of Abraham, but of Satan.”**

*The Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the Bible*, abridged by Ralph Earle, agrees with Dr. Lightfoot on John 8:37 as quoted here above:

“ *My word hath no place in you.* Or, ‘ This doctrine of Mine has no place in you.’ You hear the truths of God [Yahweh] but you do not heed them; the word of life has no influence over you. And how can it when you seek to kill Me because I proclaim this truth to you? From what is here said it is manifest, says Dr. Lightfoot, that the whole tendency of our Savior’s discourse is to show the Jews that they are the seed of the serpent which was to bruise the heel of the Messiah. Else what could that mean, v. 44: ‘ Ye are of your father the devil’ ie., ‘ Ye are the seed of the serpent?’ ”

Maybe, at this point, it would be well to consider Lightfoot’s history. For this we shall go to his *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica*, volume 1, in the introduction, pages iii & iv:

“ Lightfoot was one of many earnest Christian scholars of his time. Master of St. Catherine Hall, Cambridge, he possessed the classical learning of those days. He was at home in Latin and Greek, and he was a master not only of classical Hebrew, but also of Mishnaic Hebrew and the Aramaic of the Talmud. We are reminded of his elder contemporary Lancelot Andrews, one of the translators of the King James Version of the Bible, who composed prayers for himself in Hebrew!

“ Aside from Lightfoot’s scholarly writings and productive teaching, he took part in the Westminster Assembly, which sat from 1643 to 1649. He belonged to the Erastian party, favoring an established church, and this is reflected in the present work in his letter of thanks to Gilbert, who Lightfoot says is, ‘ by divine providence, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England.’ Lightfoot lived in troubled times. Born in the last days of Queen Elisabeth, he was a boy when the King James Version was published. He sat in the Westminster Assembly while the Long Parliament beheaded King Charles I, then somehow survived the restoration under Charles II, all the while maintaining a real Christian testimony and making an important scholarly contribution to Scripture study. From his commentary one would hardly guess at the turbulent times in which he lived. One point is of interest. In the days of Oliver Cromwell, when Lightfoot was at the height of his powers, the Jews were allowed again in England after 250 years of proscription [prohibition].”

From Lightfoot’s comments on John 8:37, we can plainly see he understood the “ Jews ” were the seed of the serpent of Genesis 3:15. This is the same position as taken by the teachers of Two Seedline. It seems, then, that Lightfoot understood the tenet of Two Seedline!!! But Mr. Jeffrey A. Weakley, a fervently caustic anti-seedliner, in his booklet *The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History*, page 15 says: “ The Satanic Seedline doctrine was brought into the Identity teaching with San Jacinto Capt and Wesley A. Swift. Actually, San Jacinto Capt claimed he had gotten Wesley A. Swift started ... In any case, Wesley Swift presented the seedline doctrine to Gerald L. K. Smith ... From there Swift got Bertrand Comparet started ... and shortly later San Jacinto Capt ... introduced William P. Gale to Swift ... ” I submit that Two Seedline doctrine has been around for quite a long time, and was not the invention of Capt, Swift,

Comparet, or Gale as Weakley spuriously suggests. Now for some quotes from other commentaries on John 8:37:

*Matthew Henry's Commentary*, volume 5, page 997: "Now Christ overthrows this plea, and exposes the vanity of it by a plain and cogent argument: 'Abraham's children will do the works of Abraham, but you do not do Abraham's works, therefore you are not Abraham's children.' The proposition is plain: *If you were Abraham's children*, such children of Abraham as could claim an interest in the covenant made with him and his seed, which would indeed put an honour upon you, then you would *do the works of Abraham*, for to those only of Abraham's house who *kept the way of the Lord*, as Abraham did, would God [Yahweh] *perform what he had spoken*, Genesis 18:19."

*The Interpreter's Bible*, volume 8, page 605: "Nonetheless, Christ's answer to them is grim indeed. You are not of God. You are of your father the devil, and his nature shows itself in you. He was a murderer from the beginning; and you seek to kill me; he has nothing to do with the truth, and true to your blood and ancestry, when and because I tell you the truth, you do not believe it, resent it, fling it from you."

*Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, Page 855: "The Jews have described themselves as 'descendants of Abraham'; this leads to a second point. If they were truly Abraham's children they would resemble their father; but in seeking to kill an innocent man, whose only crime is to speak the truth, they are unlike Abraham as could be. Jesus [Yahshua] is the Son of God, and declares the truth he receives from God; but who can their father be? The charge is repelled with a sneer; *they* [the Jews] are the children of God; Jesus (it is implied [by the Jews]) was born of fornication. This slander was current later; probably it was used in anti-Christian propaganda in John's time, and perhaps earlier. But they [the Jews] are not God's children; if they were, they would love his Son ... No, their father is the devil; that is why they seek to kill, and prefer falsehood to truth ..."

### **WEAKLEY'S WEAK POINTS**

In chapter 2 of Jeffrey A. Weakley's booklet *The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History*, he puts together a composition on words found in Genesis 3:6, 13 and 4:1. These words are: tree, food, desired, took, fruit, eat, beguiled and knew. It will be necessary here to give this chapter a critical review, for some the conclusions in his research are sadly faulty. Actually, Weakley proves Two Seedline in many ways rather than disproving it, and you will see what I mean as we go along. At this time, we will consider the word "tree" in his presentation. Eventually, it is hoped that we will cover this entire chapter. It's simply amazing, for Weakley doesn't believe or understand some of his own research:

"We will now look at the Satanic Seedline doctrine as compared to Scripture. Any teaching that we hear should not be accepted or rejected as truth until we have reexamined the Scriptures. This is what the Bereans did in Acts 17:10-11. So let us now be 'more noble' as the Bereans and search the Scriptures on this matter. The first point of the seedline doctrine is that Eve was sexually seduced. In Genesis 3:6 we find: '*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.*’ Now according to the seedliners, this passage is just written with good taste and is really talking about a sexual encounter. Let’s see. First we’ll examine some words in this verse: tree: (*ets*) ⇒ a tree (from its firmness); hence wood. (*Strong’s Concordance*) ⇒ (1) a tree (follows analogy of the verb *atsah*, to be hard, firm) (2) wood, specially of a wooden post, stake, gibbet. (*Gesenius’ Lexicon*) ⇒ tree, wood, timber, stock, plank, stalk, stick, gallows. (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* edited by R. Laird Harris). This Hebrew word is translated over 100 times in the Old testament as: ‘trees(s)’, ‘wood’, ‘timber’, ‘sticks’, ‘helve’, ‘stalks’, ‘staff’, ‘gallows’, ‘stock(s)’, and ‘plank.’ From the above, I find it difficult to believe that this tree from which Eve obtained the fruit was anything other than a tree.”

I will agree with Mr. Jeffrey A. Weakley that it is paramount we should examine and reexamine the Scriptures. And, yes, the Two Seedliners do point to Genesis 3:6 as a sexual encounter with Satan, at least on the part of Eve. Yes, the word “tree” as used in this verse means a hard, firm or solid tree such as wood, timber, stocks, helve, stakes, gallows, stock, or plank. As a matter of fact, the counterpart word for the Hebrew #6086 (tree) is #3586 in the Greek and means the same thing. The problem, though, for understanding the “trees” of Genesis 3 is in the **Hebrew idiom**. George M Lamsa in his booklet *Idioms In The Bible Explained*, points out, page ix, that both the “tree of knowledge” and the “tree of life” have sexual connotations. In addition, Lamsa said this in his introduction:

“I chose the King James text from which to pick the idioms quoted in this book (unless otherwise indicated), because the King James text is the most widely used Bible translation in the English speaking world. Moreover, the King James translators were more faithful to the texts from which they translated into English, making fewer additions and omissions than later English version translators and revisors. They translated many Eastern idioms and metaphors literally, not knowing their true meaning. For instance, ‘You shall handle snakes.’ They did not know that the word ‘snake’ refers to ‘an enemy.’ ‘Beware of dogs’ was not understood to be ‘beware of gossipers’, in Semitic languages.”

So we can observe very quickly Weakley is taking literally the idioms of Genesis 3, as did the KJV translators when they translated many of the Hebrew and Greek idioms in a literal manner. The bottom line is: if one cannot understand the idiom, one cannot understand the Bible, in numerous cases. As we go along, you will find that Weakley discovered many idiomatic expressions in various places of his research and refused to accept their idiomatic meanings. He did this mainly because the literal meanings outnumbered figurative meanings.

## LITERAL TREES, OR FIGURATIVE TREES?

Maybe we can find what the “tree of knowledge of good and evil” is if we first investigate the meaning of the “tree of life.” In both cases, the word for tree is #6086, meaning literally a firm wooden tree. In the various Bible commentaries and dictionaries there are a multitude of ideas on what the “tree of life” might be. It really goes back to Weakley’s definition of a wooden tree. As stated before, the counterpart word in the

Greek is #3586, and means literally a wooden tree. In Dr. Spiros Zodhiates' *New Testament Word Study Dictionary*, he says this on page 1023 concerning #3586, (*xulon*) "In Rev. 2:7; 22:2, 14, it is conceivable that the 'tree of life' may be an allusion to the cross and could be rendered 'wood of life' (a.t.). Sept.: Gen. 1:11,12; 2:9." This makes a lot of sense! In other words, the wooden tree represents the wooden cross (whatever kind of device it might have been) on which our Messiah wrought Redemption! And how else do we "eat" of "the tree of life" but by the partaking of Communion? Inasmuch as a few Bible scholars understood it this way, let's now consider some of their comments:

*Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, page 1072, under the topic "TREE OF LIFE": "Adam and Eve's inability to eat from this tree after their sin showed that they failed to gain immortality, or eternal life. Because of their sin, they were subject to death and dying. This condition lasted until the coming of Jesus Christ [Yahshua], the second Adam, who offers eternal life to all [of Adam] who believe in Him (1 John 5:11-12)."

*Matthew Poole's Commentary On The Holy Bible*, volume 3, page 1008: "... That they may have right to the tree of life; to Christ, called before, *the tree of life*, [Rev. 22] ver. 2, by virtue of the promise, chap ii. 7, for no works of ours will give us a right of purchase to it. *And may enter in through the gates into the city ...*"

*A Commentary On The Holy Bible*, edited by Rev. J. R. Dummelow M.A., page 10: "... the fruit of His perfect obedience, and have a right to the tree of life. 'As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive'."

Can you now see that Weakley, in refusing to see the Hebrew idiom, is insisting that our Messiah was a wooden tree? Not only was our Savior not a wooden tree, but neither was "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." To follow up on the theme of the "tree of life", let's quote some different passages where it is mentioned:

2 Esdras 8:50-52: "**50 For many great miseries shall be done to them [Israel] that in the latter time shall dwell in the world, because they have walked in great pride. 51 But understand thou for thyself, and seek out the glory for such as be like thee. 52 For unto you is paradise opened, the tree of life is planted, the time to come is prepared, plenteousness is made ready, a city is builded, and rest is allowed, yea, perfect goodness and wisdom.**"

Testament Of Levi as found in *The Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden*, 5:26-30: "**26 And he shall open the gates of paradise, and shall remove the threatening sword against Adam, and he shall give to the saints to eat from the tree of life, and the spirit of holiness shall be on them. 27 And Beliar shall be bound by him, and he shall give power to His children to tread upon the evil spirits. 28 And the Lord [Yahweh] shall rejoice in His children, and be well pleased in His beloved ones for ever. 29 Then shall Abraham and Isaac and Jacob exult, and I will be glad, and all the saints shall clothe themselves with joy. 30 And now, my children, ye have heard all; choose, therefore, for yourselves either the light or the darkness, either the law of the Lord [Yahweh] or the works of Beliar.**"

Once we comprehend that Yahshua the Messiah is the tree of life, our apprehension is opened up for us and our understanding comes to life. Notice verse 30

speaks of both “light” and “darkness”; the very same forces which are at WAR with each other in our world today. Beliar is another name for Satan. These two trees in Eden were not literal wooden trees, but walking, talking & breathing metaphorically idiomatic trees representing genetic people. The “tree of life” was Yahshua the Messiah and the “tree of knowledge of good and evil” was Beliar or Satan. Such family trees are described in Mark 8:22-24:

**“ 22 And he cometh to Bethsaida; and they bring a blind man unto him, and besought him to touch him. 23 And he took the blind man by the hand, and led him out of the town; and when he had spit on his eyes, and put his hands upon him, he asked him if he saw aught. 24 And he looked up, and said, I see men as trees walking.”**

It seems this former blind man had better eyesight than the anti-seedliners of today. It is simply amazing, as the anti-seedliners of today dance up and down and insist that there is only one seed in Genesis 3:15, and that seed is only one man, Yahshua. It takes two to have enmity, as enmity means: mutual hatred. Mutual means: given or felt by one another in equal amount. The word for “enmity” in Genesis 3:15 is the Hebrew word #342, and is found also in Numbers 35:21-22; Ezekiel 25:15; 35:5-6, and in every case, two parties are involved. The only way, therefore, for Genesis 3:15 to be speaking of “one seed” is if the Redeemer were to hate Himself. Can you see now how ridiculous such a premise is, that the anti-seedliners promote? They have really backed themselves into a corner on that one! Then, they rant and rave that there wasn’t anything sexual concerning Eve’s seduction, but that it was all a matter of mental seduction. They insist it is all an invention of the Two Seedliners. That there are others who interpret the seduction of Eve in a sexual manner, let’s refer to *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, volume R-Z, page 696. While this publication does not take a stand on the subject one way or the other, at least it points out that this is one of the interpretations:

“ *Sexual knowledge*. The tree of knowledge is the means to sexual knowledge. The advocates of this interpretation have pointed out that the verb [Strong’s #3045], ‘know’ occurs frequently as a euphemism for sexual relations (Gen. 4:1; 19:5). When Adam and Eve acquired the knowledge of good and evil, they recognized their nakedness and experienced feelings of shame. Finally, several parallel passages containing the phrase ‘knowing good and evil’ can be reasonably interpreted as referring to sexual knowledge (Deut. 1:39; 2 Sam. 19:35; 1QSa 1. 9-11).” [“1QSa”, abbr. for “Rule of the congregation.” (?)]

Matthew Poole states on Deut. 1:39: “ *Had no knowledge between good and evil*; a common description of the state of childhood, as Jonah 4:11.”

One unnamed anti-seedliner said this: “Most seedliners go wrong at this point by correlating the *eating* or *touching* of the fruit of the tree to intercourse. But, when Adam received his directions from God, there was no female around for inter course, so how could these words be made to imply sexual-activity. Now, where does that leave these speculators [meaning Two Seedliners]?” We will next see this is not speculation, on our part, concerning the words “eating” and “touching” having sexual connotations.

**WHAT WAS IT THAT EVE DID “EAT”?  
AND WHAT DID EVE “TOUCH”?**

RE. “EAT”, #398 (akal, to eat, also to lay), Scripture — “Genesis 3:13, And Yahweh said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.”

Supporting Scripture — Proverbs 30:20; “Such is the way of an adulterous woman; she eateth, and wipeth her mouth (vagina/vulva), and saith, I have done no wickedness.”

Another Supporting Scripture — Proverbs 9:17: “Stolen waters are sweet, and bread [eaten] in secret is pleasant.” [Lamsa: idiom: “*Making love to another woman in secret appears pleasant.*”]

Note: The word “eat” of Genesis 3:13 is the same word for “eateth” of Proverbs 30:20!!! In Proverbs 9:17 “eaten” is implied.

RE. “TOUCH”, #5060 (naga, to touch, also to have sexual intercourse) Scripture — Genesis 3:3: “But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.”

Supporting Scripture — Genesis 26:10-11: “10 And Abimelech said, What is this thou hast done unto us? one of the people might lightly have lien with thy wife, and thou shouldest have brought guiltiness upon us. 11 And Abimelech charged all his people, saying, He that toucheth this man or his wife shall surely be put to death.” [KJV]

Second Supporting Scripture — Genesis 20:6: “And Yahweh said unto him (Abimelech) in a dream, Yea, I know that thou didst this in the integrity of thy heart; for I also withheld thee from sinning against me: therefore suffered I thee not to touch her (Sarah).”

Third Supporting Scripture — Proverbs 6:29: “So he that goeth in to his neighbour’s wife; whosoever toucheth her shall not be innocent.”

Note: The word “touch” of Genesis 3:3 is the same word for “touch” or “toucheth” of Genesis 26:11, Genesis 20:6 and Proverbs 6:29!!!

**CONCLUSION: Both the words “eat” and “touch” can have sexual connotations when they are in that context!**

Now for some remarks from some various commentaries on these passages which contain the words “touch” and “eat” as used in Genesis 3:3:

*Matthew Poole’s Commentary On The Holy Bible* on the word “touch” of Genesis 26:11, volume 1, page 61: “... and being applied to a woman, it is used for a defiling or humbling of her as Gen. 20:6; Prov. 6:29.”

The *Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the Bible*, abridged by Ralph Earle on the word “touch” of Genesis 26:11, page 54: “*He that toucheth.* He who injures Isaac or defiles Rebekah shall certainly die for it.”

*Matthew Poole’s Commentary On The Holy Bible* on the word “touch” of Proverbs 6:29, volume 2, page 224: “*That goeth in to his neighbour’s wife; that lieth with her, as the phrase signifies, Genesis 19:31; 29:21, 23 &c. Toucheth her, i.e. hath*

carnal knowledge of her, as this word is used in Gen. 20:6; 1 Cor. 7:1, and in Terence, and other writers. *Shall not be innocent*; shall be punished as a malefactor, either by God or man.”

*The Interpreter's Bible* on the word “touch” of Proverbs 6:29, volume 4, page 822: “... There is no escape from the dire punishment that awaits the man who indulges in illicit love.”

*Matthew Poole's Commentary On The Holy Bible* on the word “eat” of Proverbs 30:20, volume 2, page 274: “*Such*, so secret and undiscernible, *is the way of the adulterous woman*; of her who, though she be called and accounted a *maid*, yet in truth is an adulteress; not a common strumpet, for of such the following words are not true, but one that secretly lives in the sin of adultery or fornication. *She eateth*, to wit, *the bread of deceit in secret*, by which is understood the act of filthiness, Prov. 9:17; 20:17, which such persons do as greedily desire, and as delightfully feed upon, as hungry persons do upon bread.”

The *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible* abridged by Ralph Earle on the word “eat” of Proverbs 9:17, page 541: “*Stolen waters are sweet*. I suppose this to be a proverbial mode of expression, importing that ‘illicit pleasures are sweeter than those which are legal’.”