

# SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #3

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

Two papers have now been completed on *Special Notice To All Who Deny Two Seedline, #1 & #2*. This will be #3. If you don't have numbers #1 & #2, you may want to get copies in order to bring yourself up-to-date on this present one. How many more there will be in this series has not yet been determined. Again, it cannot be overstated; we are in a 7,000 plus year-old WAR. In this paper we will continue to point out what this WAR is all about and who the opposing forces are. In the last paper, we left off with Colossians 2:15 showing how Yahshua put the Satanic-Jew-seedline to an open shame and stripped them of their authority. With this endeavor, we will start with Luke 11:49-51. We will use this passage rather than Matthew 23:34-36, for there are problems with Matthew's version. Now reading from Luke:

**“ 49 Therefore also said the wisdom of Yahweh, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall slay and persecute: 50 That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required (ἐκζητέω, to demand an account of) of this generation [#1074, genea]; 51 From the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation [#1074, genea].”**

Here, Messiah is charging the “Jews” with the murder of Abel. It would have been criminally illegal on the part of Yahshua to make such a charge if it were not true. The only way He could legally have produced such a serious charge was if the “Jews” of His day were descended from Cain, for no other person in all of history was responsible for the murder of Abel, but Cain. Most anti-seedliners are strangely quiet on this passage, although Ted R. Weiland in his booklet *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?* erroneously tries to prove the scribes and Pharisees were true Israelites [on page 68] where he makes the following statement:

“Seedliners claim that because the Pharisees and their progenitors were charged with the murders of all the righteous from Abel to Zacharias, *they cannot be Israelites but instead must be Cainites of the seed of Satan*. The truth is that because the Pharisees and their forefathers were indicted for the murder of the righteous martyrs, *they cannot be Cainites but instead must be Israelites.*”

Weiland further states on page 94: “The seedliners teach that the Pharisees were *Cainites of the seedline of Satan*, whereas Matthew 3:7-8, 27:6-10, John 7:19,

8:28-37, Acts 4:5-10, 24-35 and 7:2-52 declare that the Pharisees were *Judahites of seed line of Jacob/Israel.*”

If what Weiland is implying were true, the Messiah would be condemning the entire race of Israelites (including Himself, His family, the Apostles, Disciples, etc.) in speaking of them as a “generation”, for the word “generation”, used in this passage, is #1074, and in the Greek means “race” according to *The Complete Word Study Dictionary New Testament* by Spiros Zodhiates, page 362: “... a race; then generally in the sense of affinity of communion based upon the sameness of stock. Race or posterity ... A descent or genealogical line of ancestors or descendants ...” The *Greek-English Lexicon Of The New Testament* by Joseph Henry Thayer agrees, page 112: “... a begetting, birth, nativity ... passively, that which has been begotten, men of the same stock, a family ... the several ranks in a natural descent, the successive members of a genealogy ... metaphor, a race of men very like each other in endowments, pursuits, character; and especially in a bad sense a perverse race ...” It would appear that maybe Weiland should have checked his Greek before he made such a spurious statement. Therefore, the only conceivable meaning this passage could convey is: the “Pharisees” were the *genea* of Cain. Yahshua plainly told the “Jewish” Pharisees, John 10:26, “... **ye are not my sheep** ...” There is nothing more blasphemous than to imply that Yahshua the Messiah was a racial brother to the “Jews”!

Evidently, Ted R. Weiland never read *Josephus, Wars 2:8:2*. Josephus makes it quite clear the Pharisees and Sadducees were not Israelites by birth. Let’s now read this passage:

“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 [Judah] 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 mentioned, only the Essenes could claim to be pure blooded Israelites; that many, perhaps a majority of the Pharisees and Sadducees were neither true Israelites nor of the true Tribe of Judah. Why didn’t Josephus mention the Pharisees and Sadducees as being Jews by birth? I know that in John 8:33 & 37, it appears from the rendering, that the scribes and Pharisees might be true Israelites. 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. Recent archaeological finds are showing evidence two of Esau’s wives were, more than likely, of the Cain-Satinic-seedline. Even Howard B. Rand in his book *Primo-genesis*, plate 11, at the end of his book, shows Pharaohs Ramesses I & II of Egypt being descended from the House of Esau through Eliphaz.

As was indicated at the start of this third paper, there are problems with Matthew 23:34-35, a parallel of Luke 11:49-51, quoted above. In these passages, we are being told that (1) The Almighty would send apostles and prophets (future tense), (2) That there had been scribes and prophets sent in the past, (3) These past scribes and prophets were all the way from, and including, Abel, to Zacharias, and, (4) That this

race of Cain was in times past, and throughout the future, responsible for their deaths. If you will read these passages very carefully, you will notice Abel was the first righteous prophet. The next thing which should be noticed is the fact that Luke does not mention Zacharias' father. From research, it seems to appear that someone added the words "son of Barachias" in Matthew 23:35. If this is the case, it has caused a lot of confusion. Quoting now from *A Commentary on The Holy Bible*, edited by Rev. J. R. Dummelow M.A., page 701:

"Zacharias son of Barachias] Jesus probably said 'Zachariah', as in St. Luke, without mentioning the father's name, but the evangelist or one of the earliest copyists, who thought it necessary to distinguish among the twenty-nine Zachariahs of the Old Testament, and understood the canonical prophet to be meant, added the words 'son of Barachias' There can be no real doubt that the person meant is Zechariah, son of Jehoiada (see 2 Chr. 24:20), concerning whom there was a Jewish tradition, that his blood could not be removed by washing, but remained bubbling on the ground where it had been shed. In the Jewish\* arrangement of the books of the sacred Canon, Chronicles stands last, so that Jesus chose His examples from the first and last books of the Jewish\* Bible." [\*It should be Hebrew, not "Jewish" Bible.]

The story told here can be found in many reference books. The account might even have a thread of truth. The problem here is: it doesn't square with the rest of Scripture. While the story about the Zechariah of 2 Chronicles 24:20 is undoubtedly true, it is probably the wrong Zechariah. No doubt, some copyist did insert "son of Barachias", for it is not found in Luke. The problem is: most of the recorded prophets were after 878 B.C. when this particular Zechariah lived. In other words, if Yahshua was talking about the prophets between Abel and the Zechariah of 2 Chronicles 24:20, it would exclude most of the major and minor prophets. If you will check the dates in which most of the major and minor prophets lived, you will see what I mean. I am sure the Cain-Satanic-seedline killed most of Yahweh's prophets after 878 B.C. It's like saying that the WAR started with the killing of Abel and continued to the Zechariah of 2 Chronicles 24:20; then subsided until the time of Yahshua, and then resumed. This WAR has been continuous ever since it started in Genesis 3:15!

Another Zechariah to be cited is the Zechariah mentioned by several commentaries and reference books, who lived about 40 years after the Messiah. This one can be found in Josephus' *Wars* 4:5:4. The only one left that really makes any sense is the death of Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, found in The "Protevangelion" of *The Lost Books Of The Bible And The Forgotten Books Of Eden*, 16:9-21, page 36:

**"9 But Herod made search after John, and sent servants to Zacharias, when he was (ministering) at the altar, and said unto him, Where hast thou hid thy son? 10 He replied to them, I am a minister of God [Yahweh], and a servant at the altar; how should I know where my son is? 11 So the servants went back, and told Herod the whole; at which he was incensed, and said, Is not this son of his like to be king in Israel? 12 He sent therefore again his servants to Zacharias, saying, Tell us the truth, where is thy son, for you know that your life is in my hand. 13 So the servants went and told him all this: 14 But Zacharias replied to**

them, I am a martyr for God [Yahweh], and if he shed my blood, the Lord [Yahweh] will receive my soul. 15 Besides know that ye shed innocent blood. 16 However Zacharias was murdered in the entrance of the temple and altar, and about the partition; 17 But the children of Israel knew not when he was killed. 18 Then at the hour of salutation the priests went into the temple, but Zacharias did not according to custom meet them and bless them; 19 Yet they still continued waiting for him to salute them; 20 And when they found he did not in a long time come, one of them ventured into the holy place where the altar was, and he saw blood lying upon the ground congealed; 21 When, behold, a voice from heaven said, Zacharias is murdered and his blood shall not be wiped away until the revenger of his blood come ...”

You can plainly see here the description of Zacharias’ death at the hand of Herod fits Luke 11:47-51 and Matthew 23:34-36 quite well. More importantly, it doesn’t leave any huge gaps in history from Abel to this Zacharias. Also, with the future tense, it covers the entire time period from Yahshua up until our present time. There have been no time-outs in this WAR. For evidence that it is a genetic race war between the children of darkness and the children of light, I will quote the *Believer’s Bible Commentary* by William MacDonald on Matthew 23:36, page 1291; also, from page 1416 concerning Luke 11:50-51. While MacDonald doesn’t grasp the “Jew” question, he understands it is a matter of “race”:

“The guilt of all the past would come on the generation or race to which Christ [Yahshua] was speaking, as if all previous shedding of innocent blood somehow combined and climaxed in the death of the sinless Savior. A torrent of punishment would be poured out on the nation that hated its Messiah without a cause and nailed Him to a criminal’s cross. He would require of that generation the blood of all God’s [Yahweh’s] spokesmen, beginning with the first recorded case in the Old Testament, that of Abel, down to the last instance, that of Zechariah, who perished between the altar and the temple ... Therefore the Lord Jesus [Yahshua] ran the entire gamut of martyrs when He mentioned Abel and Zechariah. As He uttered these words, He well knew that the generation then living would put Him to death on the cross, and thus bring to an awful climax all their previous persecution of men of God [Yahweh].”

It was not at the cross that Messiah imposed revenge for all the prophets from Abel up until His time, but at the siege of Titus at Jerusalem in 70 A.D. For insight on this, I will quote from the *Adam Clarke’s Commentary On The Bible*, abridged by Ralph Earle, pages 816 and 874. Again, these are comments on the passages; Luke 11:47-51 and Matthew 23:34-36:

“The Lord [Yahshua] would, after the crucifixion of Christ [Yahshua], visit upon them the murder of all those righteous men, that their state should grow worse and worse, till at last the Temple should be destroyed, and they [were] finally ruined by the Romans. *Required*. May be translated either by the word ‘visited’ or ‘revenged’, and the latter word evidently conveys the meaning of our Lord [Yahshua]. They are here represented as having the blood among them; and it is intimated that God [Yahweh] will come by and by to *require* it, and to inquire how it was shed, and to punish those who shed it.”

If you don't understand Two Seedline, you can't grasp the meaning of all that was going on at that particular time. Now a comment from *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary* concerning Matthew 23:34 on page 971: "These persecutions here foretold would fill up the measure of the Jew's guilt, so that divine destruction would come upon that generation [race of Cain] of the nation."

The *Matthew Henry's Commentary* on Luke 11:49-51 found in volume 5, page 704:

"That they must expect no other than to be reckoned with, as the *fillers up* of the *measure* of persecution, v. 50, 51. They keep up the trade as it were in succession, and therefore are responsible for the *debts of the company*, even those it has been *contracting* all along *from the blood of Abel*, when the world began, to that of Zacharias, and so forward to the end of the Jewish state; it shall all be *required of this generation* [race], this last generation of the Jews, whose sin in persecuting Christ's apostles would exceed any of the sins of that kind that their fathers were guilty of, and so would bring *wrath* upon them *to the uttermost*, I Thess. 2:15, 16. Their destruction by the Romans was so terrible that it might well be reckoned the completing of God's [Yahweh's] vengeance upon that persecuting nation ... They are reprov'd for opposing the gospel of Christ [Yahshua], and doing all they could to obstruct the progress and success of it, v. 52 ... They had not, according to the duty of their place, faithfully expounded to the people those scriptures of the Old Testament which pointed at the Messiah, which if they had been led into the right understanding of by the lawyers, they would readily have embraced him and his doctrine: but instead of that, they had perverted those texts, and had cast a mist before the eyes of the people, by their corrupt glosses upon them, and this is called *taking away the key of knowledge*; instead of *using* that key for the people, and helping them to use it aright, they *hid* it from them; this is called, in Matthew, *shutting up the kingdom of heaven against men*, Matt. 23:13."

From *Matthew Poole's Commentary On The Holy Bible* we get this on Luke 11:51, volume 3, page 232:

"The Pharisees, like a company of wretched hypocrites, under a pretence of their honouring the memories of the prophets under the Old Testament, took great care to repair and to adorn their sepulchers, while in the mean time their hearts were as full of malice against the truth, and against Christ [Yahshua], and those who came to reveal God's [Yahweh's] will to them, as ever were their fathers against the prophets; and, saith our Savior, I who am the Wisdom of God, tell you, that I shall send you apostles and prophets, and some of them you shall kill, others you shall persecute; that all the righteous blood that hath been shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zacharias, may come on you ..."

You will notice there is some question as to who the correct Zacharias of Luke 11:51 and Matthew 23:35 is, but there is absolutely no question from these references just quoted as to who was Abel's killer. As you can plainly see, the anti-seedliners have a problem with Luke 11:47-51 & Matthew 23:34-36, and they refuse to address it!

## “ AS THE SERPENT BEGUILED EVE ”

The next passage we are going to consider is 2 Corinthians 11:2-3: “... for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present *you as a chaste virgin to Yahshua*. But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Yahshua.”

The anti-seedliners really like to jump on this one and proclaim it's all a matter of mental seduction. It would appear that before Eve was seduced by Satan, she was a “chaste virgin” according to this passage. Was Eve then a chaste virgin physically?, or a chaste virgin mentally? It should be obvious that Paul is telling the Corinthians that he desired their minds not to be violated as Eve was physically violated. Why even use the term “chaste virgin” if Eve was not violated physically? Notice that Paul tells these Corinthians he had espoused them to one husband. He is saying that he would rather not have them to become espoused to an additional husband as Eve was. In other words, “*I have espoused you to one husband*” ... not as “*Eve*.” Paul was simply implying that Eve, after her encounter with Satan, was no longer a chaste virgin.

### THE GREEK PROVES EVE WAS BEGUILED MENTALLY & PHYSICALLY

The anti-seedliners simply haven't done their homework on the Greek in this passage. If it were speaking of being mentally “beguiled” by words, it would have used the word #538, *apatao*, meaning to deceive, bring, seduce or mislead into error. Or, if Paul would have meant mental seduction, he probably would have used #5422 or #5423 as in Galatians 6:3 & Titus 1:10. Instead the word #1818, *exapatao*, is used. W. E. Vine in his *An Expository Dictionary Of New Testament Words*, page 112, explains it like this: “*exapatao* is a strengthened form of *apatao* ... is rendered ‘beguile’, 2 Cor. 11:3; the more adequate rendering would be ‘as the serpent thoroughly beguiled Eve.’ So in 1 Tim. 2:14, in the best mss., this stronger form is used of Satan's deception of Eve, literally thoroughly beguiled; the simpler verb *apatao*, is used of Adam.” If a mental seduction were meant, the word #538, *apatao*, would have been used. W. E. Vine repeats his explanation of the use of the Greek words *apatao* and *exapatao* on pages 278 & 279 under the word “deceive.” Under the heading “verbs”, on the word *apatao* he says this: “... of those who deceive ‘with empty words’, belittling the true character of the sins mentioned, Eph. 5:6; ... of the fact that Adam was ‘not beguiled’, 1 Tim. 2:14, R.V. (cp. what is said of Eve; see *exapatao* below ...” Then Vine continues: “*EXAPATAO* ... intensive ... signifies to beguile thoroughly, to deceive wholly ...” Thayer in his *Greek Lexicon* and Dr. Spiros Zodhiates in his *Word Study Dictionary N.T.* agree with W. E. Vine.

### ANTI-SEEDLINER ADDRESSES 2 CORINTHIANS 11:3

Most anti-seedliners avoid this passage with a twenty-foot pole, but, in his booklet *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?*, Ted R. Weiland takes a blind stab in the dark at 2 Corinthians 11:3. First, I would mention that Weiland does not point out the difference between *apatao* and *exapatao* as has been explained by W. E. Vine above. Without

such an explanation, one can see how Weiland might drift into a dangerous state of error. As I quote Weiland now on pages 28-29, you can perceive his careless, or maybe blatant, omission:

“Just as they misconstrue the Hebrew word, the seedliners distort the meaning of the Greek word ‘exapatao’, translated ‘beguiled’, to mean ‘sexual seduction’ in 2 Corinthians 11:3. ‘Exapatao’ is found six times in the New Testament; it is translated ‘beguiled’ once and ‘deceived’ five times. As was the case with its Hebrew counterpart ‘nasha’, the Greek word ‘exapataho’ [sic] is *not once* used with sexual connotations.

“If ‘exapatao’ means to sexually seduce, as seedline teachers claim, then in Romans 7:11 the Apostle Paul declared that sin sexually seduced him. In Romans 16:17-18 Paul warned the Roman church lest divisive false teachers sexually seduced them, and in 1 Corinthians 3:18 Paul warned the Corinthian Christians not to sexually seduce themselves. Consequently, there is *nothing* in the biblical use of either ‘nasha’ or ‘exapatao’ to corroborate, justify or validate the seedliners’ interpretation of these two words.

“If the serpent corresponds to Satan, and the beguiling in Genesis 3 and 2 Corinthians 11 was sexual in nature, then the Apostle Paul was warning the Corinthian Christians against Satan’s intention to fornicate with them. If such were the case, then why did not the other New Testament writers or Yahshua warn of the possibility? Why? Because fornication was not the sin in Genesis 3, and it was not the sin Paul warned the Corinthian Church about.”

Again, if Paul would have meant mental seduction, he probably would have used #5422 or #5423 as in Galatians 6:3 & Titus 1:10. Weiland doesn’t seem to understand the Bible, both OT & NT, uses vulgarities. The prophets called both Israel and Judah “harlots” and “whores.” The prophets really used some very graphic language at times, and Paul was no different. I would rather not have to explain to a fully grown man about the birds and the bees! Yes, Paul did compare being “deceived” to non-marital sexual intercourse! We do the same thing today. In order to explain, I will illustrate with some modern-day vulgarities similar to the prophets of old. When a man today gets cheated in a business deal, he might say something like this: “That bastard screwed me out of 100 dollars” or “I really got shafted on that one.” I think you get the point, and I would rather not elaborate any further. Yes, Paul was telling the Romans in 7:11 that his own sin (comparable to non-marital sexual intercourse) could destroy him. Yes, Paul was telling the Romans in 16:17-18 that false teachers (comparable to non-marital sexual intercourse) could corrupt them. Yes, Paul was telling the Corinthians in 1 Corinthians 3:18 that their own self-conceited wisdom (comparable to non-marital sexual intercourse) could mislead them. And, Yes, Paul was telling the Corinthian Christians in 2 Corinthians 11:3 that they could be mentally “beguiled” as Eve was literally mentally and physically sexually “beguiled.” My own advice is: be careful of people who use word trickery! The object is to set you up on one word, and then clout you with five or six reverse meaning examples. The “Jews” are masters at this sort of thing! Carefully go back over the quotation by Weiland and see if he might have been setting us up. You might start with “If exapatao means ...” If you have his book, you

might check to see if he may have used that same system in other places. Watch for the setup followed by several seemingly absurd examples! The con-artist might approach you something like this: “*If this means this, look how absurd this, and this, and this, and this, and this is.*” Once you become aware of this devious system, you can no longer be deceived into believing darkness is light and bitter is sweet!

*The Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the Bible*, abridged by Ralph Earle, has this to say about this passage, 2 Corinthians 11:2-3, on page 1147:

“*That I may present you as a chaste virgin.* There seems to be a reference to Lev. 21:14, that the high priest must not marry anyone that was not a pure virgin. Here then Christ [Yahshua] is the High Priest, the Spouse or Husband; the Corinthian church, the pure virgin to be espoused; the apostle and his helpers had educated and prepared this virgin for her husband and espoused her to him. ... *As the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty.* This is a strong reflection on the false apostle and his teaching. He was subtle, and by his subtlety he was enabled to corrupt the minds of the people from the simplicity of the gospel of Christ [Yahshua]; or, to follow the metaphor, he had seduced the pure, chaste, well-educated virgin from her duty, affection, and allegiance to her one and only true Husband, the High Priest, Jesus [Yahshua] Christ.”