SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #19

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

With this *Special Notice*, we again focus on the world's greatest problem which has now been with us for over 7,000 years. We are confronted with this great issue every day of our lives, and we face it every direction we turn. Try as we may, it cannot be avoided. And while we attempt to deal with this subject in a rational manner, there are hecklers on the sidelines ridiculing our efforts. They use every opportunity to belittle and mock the endeavors of those who expose the nature of the enemy. Top among these, at the present time, is Ted R. Weiland. Up until Weiland, Stephen E. Jones held first place. You may think it is not nice to point fingers and name names, but Ted R. Weiland in his book *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?* instructed me to point fingers. Let's see what he said on page 1:

"If the seedliners' assessment of the events in the Garden of Eden can be proven scripturally correct, then no matter how unorthodox or unpopular this doctrine may be, we are duty bound as adherents of the Word of God to accept and teach it ... Spiritual leaders are admonished by the Scriptures to address false doctrine, especially doctrine injurious to the gospel of Yahshua the Christ — Titus 1:7-14."

What Weiland had in mind with this passage was to use it to justify his own personally contrived point of view. This passage says in part: *"Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith."* That is exactly what I have been doing in this *Special Notice* series! The anti-seedliner's position is totally irresponsible, and before we are finished, we will see how spurious their claim is.

Early in his book on page 2, Ted R. Weiland plays with words in an attempt to discredit the Two Seed doctrine of Genesis 3:15. Of the words he toys with, "fact, theory and hypothesis", he settles on the latter. In his effort to play a game with words, he forgets the most important element; that being to check his premise. It doesn't matter how many cunning words one might use, if the premise is not correct, the conclusion will be false. As we will see later, Weiland didn't check his premise. Not only does Ted R. Weiland characterize the truth of Genesis 3:15 as being an hypothesis, he also accuses the Two Seedliners, page 2: *"... who proceed to ignore clear textual intent, who disregard the principles of Hebrew and Greek idioms and the rules of consistency, and who assume a literal interpretation of clearly non-literal statements."* If anyone is disregarding Hebrew and Greek, it's Ted R. Weiland! He disregarded the Greek when he scoffed at John 8:44 where our Savior said directly to the 'Jews' *"Ye are of your father the devil."* The Greek for the word "of", in that case, meaning "sons of a father", as I covered in *Special Notice #1*.

In addition to his charge that we disregard the principles of Hebrew and Greek, Weiland accuses the Two Seedliners of misinterpreting literal and non-literal Hebrew and Greek idioms. Then on page 3, Weiland says: *"However, as Bible students already know, there are no scriptures that expressly teach any of these false conclusions."* Inasmuch, as he demands the Scriptures to teach *"expressl y",* is proof positive that Weiland himself has a total disregard for Hebrew and Greek idioms concerning Two Seedline doctrine, or any other doctrine. Again, he makes the same allegation on page 7 where he says, *"If these state ments were true, certainly God would have inspired His writers to warn His people of these dangers somewhere in the Bible."* Weiland evidently forgets that Matthew 13:34-35 says: *"All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them. That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet ..."* **Speaking in parables is hardly speaking *"expressly."*** This is why Ted R. Weiland has a total disregard for the parable of the **wheat and the tares** in Matthew 13, as he demands it to be rendered *"expressly".* Not only did Yahshua speak in parables, but all the prophets did likewise. So, if Weiland expects the Scriptures to be **"explicit"**, he is under a voodoo induced hallucination. It seems, whether a Scripture is literal or non-literal, depends on how the all-wise Weiland interprets it. Is that **"rebuke"** sharp enough (Titus 1:13)? It also appears, according to his book on page 1, that he is the only one authorized to give a "rebuke"!

Ted R. Weiland, and all the other anti-seedliners, continue to denounce and down-play the fact that nowhere in Scripture is Adam recorded as the father of Cain. They neglect to observe that in Genesis 3:15, Adam is left totally out of the equation. Had Adam's name been mentioned in that verse, it would have said that "the seed of Adam would bruise the head of the serpent." Therefore, the "enmity" was between Eve and the serpent alone. Thus the anti-seedliners unwittingly, and effectively, change the reading of Genesis 3:15 from the "woman" to "Adam." They further fail to perceive that Cain's genealogy is treated separately in Genesis 4:17-24, while Adam's is recorded in chapter 5:1-32.

In order to support their hypothesis, it would be necessary to rewrite most of the Bible, or interpret much of it out of context, which is exactly what they do. There is good reason why Cain is never recorded as Adam's son. Where it says in Genesis 5:1 "This *is* the book of the generations of Adam ...", and does not include specifically his supposed "firstborn son", it would be a total lie, and our Bible would be blatantly untrustworthy. You will notice that Genesis 38:3-5 truthfully and honestly mentions Er, Onan and Shelah, the first three sons of Judah by a Canaanite [non-Israelite] woman. Not only are those three half-breed sons of Judah mentioned there but also at Genesis 38:6-8; 46:12; Numbers 26:19-20 and 1 Chronicles 2:3. Oh, the anti-seedliners will wrangle, "Cain was unworthy to be mentioned"! Question: Who could be more unworthy than Er, Onan and Shelah?

The anti-seedliners completely overlook the significance of Seth being a replacement for Abel, not Cain. Even if Cain was disqualified for the murder of Abel, which he was not (for that reason), Seth would then had to have been a replacement for Cain, not Abel. Again, the anti-seedliners are ignoring the importance of the Biblical Law of the Firstborn Son. But, after all, they know better than the Almighty! The Hebrew

says, "in place of Abel", not Cain. According to the Aramaic *Targum of Jonathan,* Genesis 4:1 should read something like the following: (The italics are from that Targum.):

"And Adam knew his wife Eve, *who was pregnant by Sammael [Satan]*, and she conceived and bare Cain, *and he was like the heavenly beings, and not like earthly beings,* and *she* said, I have gotten a man from *the angel of* the Lord."

"Oh", you say, "every word in the Bible is God-breathed." Yes, the original was, but **we don't** have an original God-breathed copy today. To prove to you there are omissions in various passages, I will show you an example that was found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. This information comes from the book *Understanding The Dead Sea Scrolls* edited by Hershel Shanks, pages 160-161. The scroll is designated 4QSam[a], and was found in cave #4. The passage is 1 Samuel 11:1-3. The following in italics is the part missing in our present Bibles:

"[*Na*]*hash, king of the children of Ammon, sorely oppressed the children of Gad and the children of Reuben, and he gouged out a*[*ll*] *their right eyes and struck ter*[*ror and dread*] *in Israel. There was not left one among the children of Israel bey*[*ond the Jordan who*]*se right eye was no*[*t put o*]*ut by Naha*[*sh king*] *of the children of Ammon; except that seven thousand men* [*fled from*] *the children of* [*A*]*mmon and entered* [*J*]*abesh-Gilead. About a month later* Nahash the Ammonite went up and besieged Jabesh-Gilead. All the men of Jabesh-Gilead said to Nahash, 'Make a treaty with us and we shall become your subjects.' Nahash the Ammonite replied to them, 'On this condition I shall make a treaty with you, that all your right eyes be gouged out, so that I may bring humiliation on all Israel,' The elders at Jabesh said to him, 'Give us seven days to send messengers throughout the territory of Israel. If no one rescues us, we shall surrender to you'."

This chapter in this book was written by Frank Moore Cross (a member of the staff editing the Qumrân Dead Sea manuscripts), and he explains how he thinks the omission came about: "The missing paragraph was lost probably as a result of a scribal lapse — the scribe's eye jumped from one line break to the other, both beginning with Nahash as subject." This is very understandable, for I too have made this same kind of error when typing, for when I read back what I have quoted from some book, often I will inadvertently skip a line of the text. You can be sure, if it happened once, as you see here, it has occurred in other places. The Interpreter's Bible has pointed out that Genesis 4:1 doesn't make any sense. When the evidence in the Aramaic targums are considered, Genesis 4:1 makes all the sense in the world. As I covered that in other *Special Notices*, I will not elaborate further here.

Since the full text has now been restored to 1 Samuel 11, the entire chapter comes to life. We now know that some seven thousand surviving Israelite warriors from Gad and Reuben, after their defeat by Nahash's forces, escaped and found shelter north of the territory of Ammon near the Jabbok River in the Gileadite city of Jabesh. About a month after their escape, Nahash decided to enslave Jabesh-Gilead for sheltering these runaway "subjects." Thus, we can see the motivation for Nahash's assailing Jabesh-Gilead far north of his usual declared borders, a Gileadite city affiliated with Benjamin and Saul.

This newfound discovery of missing text from the Dead Sea Scrolls explains the reason why Nahash attacked Jabesh-Gilead; and additionally, why he insisted on the removal of the right eye as a condition for their surrender. It was not unusual, for those who harbored enemies in those days, to be punished in this manner. By the same token, Nahash named his own punishment. Upon receiving the news, Saul the Benjamite, being enraged, took immediate action by rallying the western tribes, crossing the Jordan as an Israelite militia, "slaughtered the Ammonites until the heat of day." That great victory, on the part of the leadership of Saul, brought about his kingship over the whole of Israel. Thus was sealed the Ammonite's fate. There is evidence the Ammonites traveled east, and mixing with others, form the Japanese of today.

The antichrist anti-seedliners, like Weiland and company, are so busy making **pretzels** of the Scriptures that they don't have time to research these things. They seem more intent on rewriting **The Word** to fit their own personally contrived misconstrued concepts. They twist Genesis 3: 15 into a **pretzel** to mean the "spirit against the flesh." They also **pretzel-ize** Genesis 3:15 by making the "serpent's seed" spiritual, while assigning the "seed of the woman" to be physical ("seed" in both instances being the same Hebrew word, #2233). They **pretzel-ize** the parable of the wheat and the tares by their hocus-pocus reasoning to mean "spiritually righteous and unrighteous people" instead of genetic "wheat-people" and "weed-people." They **pretzel-ize** the "tree of life" and the "tree of knowledge of good and evil" to mean wooden trees rather than family trees. They **pretzel-ize** Genesis 4:1 to make Cain a son of Adam. They **pretzel-ize** the Greek word #1537 translated "of" or "from" to mean "spiritual offspring" in John 8:44 rather than the stock or family from which one is derived. They **pretzel-ize** Matthew 23:35 to mean the "blood of Abel" was somehow "spiritual" rather than Cain physically murdering Abel. They **pretzel-ize** John 3:3 to mean "born again" instead of being born of the correct race, (*Strong's* Greek #1080 & #1085). They **pretzel-ize** 2 Corinthians 11:3 to mean mental seduction rather than physical seduction. They **pretzel-ize** both the words "eat" (#398) and "touch" (#5060), as used in Genesis 3:3, to literally mean to consume food, while Proverbs 6:29; 9:17; 30:20; Genesis 20:6; 26:10-11 prove otherwise. They **pretzel-ize** Rev. 2:9 & 3:9 by making the impostor "Jews" mentioned there, full blood brothers to Abel rather than fathered by Satan. They **pretzel-ize** the passages about Judas Iscariot, making him an ordinary person rather than a genetic "devil." They **pretzel-ize** 1 John 3:12 by spiritualizing the father of Cain rather than properly identifying him physically as "of the wicked one"; Satan. In spite of evidence otherwise, they **pretzel-ize** John 8:23 & 38 to mean that the Redeemer and those "Jews" had the same father, again by claiming it is speaking "spiritually" rather than physically. In short, they continually **pretzel-ize** both the context and the letter of the original languages in order to support their warped hypothesis.

There is probably no better example of **pretzel-izing** Scripture than Jeffrey A. Weakley in his book *The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History*; in portions taken from pages 4-9. Since I have pointed out how these antichrist anti-seedliners do this, see if you can detect this in the following segments from his book:

"... From the above, I find it difficult to believe that this tree from which Eve obtained the fruit was anything other than a tree. food: *(ma'akal)* ⇨ an eatable food (including provender, flesh and fruit), fruit, victual *(Strong's Concordance)* ⇨ food, especially corn, fruit tree, sheep to be killed. *(Gesenius' Lexicon)* ... ⇨ desire, pleasant, lust, greed, dainty, desirable, has the meaning of desire extending to both good and bad objects. (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* by R. Laird Harris). This Hebrew word is translated 26 times in the Old Testament as: 'pleasant', 'utmost bound', 'lusting', 'lust', 'dainty', 'desire', 'lusted *exceedingly*' and 'coveteth *greedily*.' This word is neutral in our discussion. It does not prove the point one way or the other as it does not indicate what the object being desired is. Nonetheless, I put this here so that the reader can see how to fairly treat a neutral word. took *(laqach)* ⇨ to take (a primary root) accept, bring, buy, carry away, fetch, get, seize, etc. *(Strong's Concordance)* ⇨ to take, to take with the hand, to lay hold of, to take away, to take possession of, to take captive, to send after, to fetch, to bring, to receive. *(Gesenius' Lexicon)* ⇨ take (get, fetch), lay hold of (seize), receive, acquire (buy), bring, marry (take a wife), snatch (take away). (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* by R. Laird Harris). This Hebrew word is translated over 100 times in the King James Version as: 'take', 'taken', 'took', 'fetch', 'receive', 'accept', 'bring', 'married', 'have (wife)', 'brought' etc. With this word seedliners will be quick to point out that it is something translated as 'marry' or 'have to wife.' I have bad news for these people. The idea of marry and have to wife is the possession of a wife — NOT SEXUAL RELATIONS! So the idea expresses when Eve 'took' the fruit was that she took possession of it. This word does *not* indicate that she was participating in sexual intercourse. fruit *(periy)* ⇨ fruit (lit. or fig.) bough, firstfruit, reward, *(Strong's Concordance)* ⇨ (1) fruit whether of the field or of a tree, Metaph[or], used of the result of labor. (2) offspring. *(Gesenius' Lexicon)* ⇨ fruit, as a verb — make fruitful — to increase — to multiply, the fruit of a tree/vine, the fruit of the womb (children), fruit as consequences resulting from an action (reward). (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* edited by R. Laird Harris). This Hebrew word is used over 100 times in the King James Version and is translated as: 'fruit(s)', 'fruitful', 'reward.' The meaning of this word is clear in this verse as we have already established that tree means (of all things) tree — thus fruit in this verse means fruit of a tree, eat *(akal)* ⇨ to eat (lit. or fig.) consume, devour, burn up, dine, eat up, feed (food). *(Strong's Concordance)* ⇨ (1) to eat, to devour (food); to eat of a land, a field, a vine; to eat of its produce or fruit; to take food, to take a meal, to dine or sup, to feast (used of sacrificial banquets), to devour people (the poor), to destroy by war and slaughter. (2) to devour, to consume (fire). (3) to enjoy (good fortune, fruit of actions and sexual pleasures). *(Gesenius' Lexicon)* ⇨ eat, consume, devour, burn up and feed. (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* edited by R. Laird Harris). This Hebrew word is used over 100 times and is translated as 'eat', 'eaten', 'consumed', 'at meat', 'devoured' etc. Once again the seedliners will be quick to point out that this word can be used of sexual pleasures. While this is true, it is only true when used in that context. In the present case the context is that of an actual 'tree' with 'fruit' and thus 'eat' rightly means the consumption of food (not sexual pleasures). So we see that only by incorrectly defining words can Genesis 3:6 be

taken to support the view that Eve was sexually seduced. Now we will look at Genesis 3:13: 'And the LORD God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.' The understanding of this verse hangs on the word 'beguiled.' Have the seedliners been honest with this word? What does it mean? beguiled *(nasha)* ⇨ to lead astray, i.e. (mentally) to delude, or (morally) to seduce, beguile, deceive. *(Strong's Concordance)* ⇨ to err, to go astray (kindred to the verb 'to forget') to lead into error, to cause to go astray, to deceive, to seduce, to corrupt. *(Gesenius' Lexicon)* ⇨ beguiled, deceive; This verb is used mainly in the sense of 'lead astray, seduce, mislead, deceive', even for self-deception (Jer. 37:9). (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* edited by R. Laird Harris). This Hebrew word in its various forms is used 16 times and is translated in the King James Version as: ⇨ 1 time — 'utterly forget' ⇨ 1 time — 'seize (Ps. 55:15-16)' ⇨ 1 time — 'beguiled' ⇨ 13 times — 'deceive' or 'deceived.' The seedliners will insist that it be translated 'seduced' and they define it as a physical sexual seduction because the English word 'seduce' can mean that. But can the word 'deceive' mean sexual seduction? Is it not proper to take the three definitions given as synonyms? As a matter of fact, I give more than one definition for every word because each source was written by fallible man and therefore could be wrong (as is the case for Dr. Strong: when he defines the word 'Gentile' in the New Testament his theology causes him to give a clearly impossible definition). In any case, the Biblical principle is to have all evidence verified by two or more witnesses. When all these definitions are taken together as synonyms, the conclusion one comes to (if he is seeking to be honest) is that Eve was deceived in the mind. NOT SEXUALLY SEDUCED! This is verified in three ways. ⇨ 1. The context established in Genesis 3:6 does not include sexual intercourse. ⇨ 2. The word 'eat' in Genesis 3:6 is the same word 'eat' in Genesis 3:13. ⇨ 3. The New Testament explains this same event in 2 Cor. 11:3 'But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.' The word 'so' in the above verse can be properly rendered 'in like manner.' It is clear that this verse indicates that Eve's mind was wholly deceived. So the first point of the Satanic Seedline doctrine does not agree with the Scriptures —Eve was not sexually seduced, but rather was mentally deceived. The next point of the Satanic Seedline doctrine is that Cain was the product of the alleged sexual encounter that Eve had in the garden. To examine this, let's turn to Genesis 4:1: '*And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD.*' Once again the meaning of this verse will become clear by looking up some words. knew *(yada)* ⇨ to know (prop. to ascertain by seeing); used in a great variety of senses, fig[uratively], lit[erally], euphem[ism], etc. *(Strong's Concordance)* ⇨ to perceive, to acquire knowledge, to know, to be acquainted. (1) to know, to perceive, to be aware of, to understand. (2) to get to know, to discover, to experience. (3) to become acquainted with (a euphemism for sexual intercourse, i.e., to lie with). (4) to have knowledge of. (5) to foresee, to expect. (6) to turn the mind to, to care for, to see about. (7) to be knowing or wise. (8) to be or become known. (9) to make to know, to show, to teach. *(Gesenius' Lexicon)* ⇨ know, is used in every stem and expresses a multitude of shades of knowledge gained by the senses ... It is also

used for sexual intercourse on the part of both men and women in the well-known euphemism 'Adam knew Eve his wife' and parallels (Gen 4:1; 19:8; Num. 31:17, 35; Jud. 11:39; 21:11; 1 Kings 1:4; 1 Sam. 1:19). It is used to describe sexual perversions such as sodomy (Gen. 19: 5; Jud. 19:22) and rape (Jud. 19:25) ... to distinguish ... to have knowledge ... etc. (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* edited by R. Laird Harris) This word is used over 500 times in the Old Testament and is translated in the King James Version as 'knew', 'know', 'known', 'perceived', 'wot', 'knowest', 'wotteth', 'can tell', 'sure', 'wist', 'understand', 'had knowledge', 'consider', 'was aware', 'learned', etc. This word is clearly being used as a euphemism meaning 'sexual intercourse' because from this Eve 'conceived' and 'bare' a son. The one who had intercourse with Eve was Adam. The son produced was Cain. Cain is clearly the son of Adam ... Thus we have seen in clear and honest study that Cain was the son of Adam and Eve. Therefore Point 2 of the seedline doctrine (i.e., Cain was the product of Eve's sexual encounter with Satan) is shown to be inconsistent with the Scriptures."

If you have followed Weakley's documentation and comments very carefully, you will notice he does **more to verify** Two Seedline rather than disprove it. Under the word "desired" Weakley said: *"pleasant, lust, greed, dainty, desirable, has the meaning of desire extending to both good and bad objects."* Then he said it didn't prove anything, implying that "lust" couldn't be applied to that word. Under the word "took" he said this: *"take (get, fetch), lay hold of (seize), receive, acquire (buy), bring, marry (take a wife), snatch (take away) ... 'have wife.'* Then he turns around and says it doesn't mean that! 1 Corinthians 6:16 says "... know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body, for two, saith he, shall be one flesh." Therefore, when Satan seduced Eve, in that union, they became "one flesh" as in marriage. Then on the word "beguiled" Weakley said: *"(morally) to seduce ... [from] Strong's."* How can Weakley deny that "morally to seduce" cannot apply to unlawful sexual intercourse? Yet he does. It seems that whether or not something has sexual connotations, depends on how Weakley interprets it. In the case of Eve and Satan, he says "no." In the case of Eve and Adam, he says "yes." He is wrong on both counts, unless Abel is included in the latter. In short, Weakley is arguing that Eve had a thought that killed. If that position is true, why didn't Yahweh tell her to change her mind? Therefore, it had to be something that could not be corrected by reversing the thought pattern. If a thought can kill, as Weakley implies, we are all in trouble. After all, Genesis 3:13 asks the question: "What *is* this *that* thou hast done?" Had it been a mental crime the question would have been: "What is this that thou hast thought." The word "done" in that verse is #6213, and in both *Strong's* and *Gesenius'* has nothing to with anything mental, and has everything to do with "to produce or create." In fact, *Gesenius'*, under #6213, includes a definition with sexual connotations:

"PIEL, *to work*, or <u>to press immodestly the breasts of a woman</u>, i. q. ... Ezek. 23:3, 8, and in Kal [Ezek. 23:] verse 21 ... So Gr. ποιεῖν, and Lat. *facere, perficere, conficere mulierem*, as a <u>euphemism for sexual intercourse</u>, see Fesselii Advers. Sacra, lib. ii. cap. 23." [Emphasis mine]

This last definition really blows Weakley and all the antichrist, anti-seedliners clean out of their fabricated theological polluted water!!!