

RESEARCH PAPERS PROVING TWO SEEDLINE SEDUCTION OF EVE

RETYPE, REFORMAT, REEDIT REVIS & UPDATE

By: Clifton A. Emahiser

1012 North Vine Street

Fostoria , Ohio 44830

Ph. (419)435-2836

PREFACE

(The following paragraph was written in 1995 with my article entitled *The Problem With Genesis 4:1*.) In the following articles you will encounter some of the most problematic materials probably anywhere. It is not claimed here that these articles are 100% perfect. It is believed, though, a substantial part of these treatises are correct by the law of reasoning. Like all matters, the reader is requested to use good judgment while approaching these subjects, for they are very serious. Actually, you owe it to yourself to read and study these articles even though you may not ultimately agree with them. It is possible, after you have read this material, you may want to do further detailed studies of these subjects. It is, therefore, desirable that a greater personal insight might be obtained by what is written here. It is understood that this may cause fear in some people because it is going contrary to established traditional thought. One might even be left with an empty feeling, wondering whether the entire Bible can be trusted. Your very faith may be tested. It is believed, though, once one has overcome this shock, in the end, it will only lead to a higher respect for Holy Writ. Once the true theme of the Bible is understood, it should create a greater foundation than ever before.

(May 1, 2000) Little did I know when I wrote my first article five years ago that I would find myself in the middle of a war on this subject. The only reason I wrote the first article five years ago, was that I had heard of a young man who was hung-up on the meaning of Genesis 4:1. Realizing that Genesis 4:1 did not harmonize with the rest of Scripture, I did my best to discover the reason why. As it turned out, I found there wasn't anything wrong with the translation of this passage, it was a matter of how we read it. I will not explain that part of it here, for I have adequately spelled it all out later on. In 1997, I discovered there was a man by the name of Ted R. Weiland teaching exactly the opposite to what I had written in 1995. Upon hearing his 10 cassette tape series, *Eve, Did She? Or Didn't She?*, I resolved to search into the matter to a greater degree than I had ever done before. I have to admit, the more I listened to Weiland's presentation, the more disturbed I became. I wrote Weiland and notified him I considered his presentation as a declaration of war in no uncertain terms. Later I was to learn that Weiland was only parroting Stephen E Jones from his book entitled *The Babylonian*

Connection” which was a thesis refuting Two Seedline doctrine. In that book, Stephen E. Jones prefabricated some of his documentation. I will present it here, and you can decide for yourself to what extent he may have lied. Weiland is aware that Stephen fabricated some of his documentation, because I sent him the information concerning it. If you have a copy of Jones’ book, you can find it on page 154. I am taking this evidence from my booklet: *Book Review Of Stephen Jones’ “The Babylonian Connections”*, with some editing.

“We have one more thing about Jones. This item will really show Jones up for what he really is. If a man is untruthful, he should be exposed for that untruthfulness! It is my own personal opinion that Jones is a untruthful, and as such, he cannot be trusted with “Identity” teaching. I will offer the following evidence as proof of these charges. If a man is deliberately untruthful once, he will be untruthful again. I am going to show you where, in my opinion, Jones told a downright falsehood and he used subliminal suggestion in doing it. We will find it in his book *The Babylonian connection* on page 154, and it reads as follows:

“Liberty under God’s Law is our God-given inheritance. When Protestant reformers of 400 years ago discovered this liberty, they forsook the Papal dictatorship. God opened their eyes to the truth of His Word, and they rejected the serpent’s lies taught by the Catholic church. Martin Luther wrote:

My hope is built on nothing less
Than Jesus’ blood and righteousness;
I dare not trust the serpent’s lie,
Concerning immortality.
On Christ the solid Rock I stand,
All other ground is sinking sand.”

When I read this over, the words seemed familiar — they just kept going through my mind. I kept asking myself, Where Have I heard them before? Well, I kept going over and over them and then some familiar music began to come to me. It took me about 10 minutes to begin to recognize the melody that went with the words, but I couldn’t think of the name of the song. I proceeded to go and find some old hymn books and started to see if I could find the song that matched the words. I probably was the better part of an hour doing this after I found my song books, and I was probably at least an hour in just finding the books. I didn’t seem to have much luck in the indexes of the hymnals, so I just leafed through the pages one at a time. While I was searching, the words that seem to come to me were: “I dare not trust the sweetest (something), but (something something) Jesus’ name.” Finally I found it; the name of the song was “The Solid Rock.” and in some song books it is just “Solid Rock.” But the words “*the serpent’s lie, Concerning immortality*” were not there! Apparently Jones changed these words in order to prove his thesis.

Not only that, but I found that “**Martin Luther**” **never wrote these words!** I have an old hymnal entitled *The Evangelical Hymnal*, published by “Board Of Publication of the Evangelical Church, Cleveland, Oh. & Harrisburg, Pa., Copyrighted 1921. For the song “Solid Rock”, page 150, it has “Edward Mote” as the author and “William B. Bradbury” as the composer. From pages xxxiv

to xxxvi is found a list of authors. Rev. Edward Mote is listed on page xxxv as the author and flourished from 1797 till 1874. From pages xxxvii to xxxix are listed composers. William B. Bradbury is listed on page xxxvii as the composer and flourished from 1816 till 1868 and composed 21 melodies including "Solid Rock." **Now you can judge from this evidence for yourself whether or not you think Jones is being honest or not when he says that "Martin Luther" wrote these words, (and Jones changed the words to his own use to boot). Now if "Martin Luther" wrote these words, then Edward Mote is a plagiarist.** In this hymnal the words, "*Used by permission of The Biglow & Main Company, Owners*", is used. This indicates that this company had a copyright against this song and only could be used by their permission. Question: How could "Edward Mote", "William B. Bradbury" and "The Biglow & Main Company" get a copyright on something "Martin Luther" wrote hundreds of years before? Under copyright law, it would be unethical and illegal for Mote to claim authorship if it were Martin Luther's work! **IS THIS GOOD A EXAMPLE OF JONES' CHARACTER? AND DOES IT PROVE, AS A WRITER AND RESEARCHER, HE CANNOT BE TRUSTED? AND THIS IS THE BOY THE "ONE SEEDLINERS" ARE PARROTING!!!** Well, anyway, now we know more about Stephen Jones!

Lets' take a look, now, at the true words to this line of the stanza of Mote's poem which was later put to Bradbury's melody:

"I dare not trust the sweetest frame, But wholly lean on Jesus' name."
(Not) *"I dare not trust the serpent's lie, Concerning immortality."*

By suggesting these words, Jones was using "subliminal suggestion" in his deceitful tactics to get you to buy his argument. The average person would say in his/her mind, "Oh yes, I know those words, so Jones has a good point here." "Subliminal suggestion" is a science, and is practiced much by the "Jews." The question here is: "Who might be the Jew behind Jones doing this?"

For the record, let's observe what the **true words** of the song, "The Solid Rock" are:

Stanza #1,

My hope is built on nothing less Than Jesus' blood and righteousness. I dare not trust the sweetest frame, But wholly lean on Jesus' name.

Stanza #2,

When darkness seems to hide His face, I rest on His unchanging grace. In every high and stormy gale, My anchor holds within the veil.

Stanza #3,

His oath, His covenant, His blood Support me in the whelming flood. When all around my soul gives way, He then is all my Hope and Stay. (By the way, the "whelming flood" is all of these "strange" aliens coming into Israel countries today.)

Stanza #4,

When He shall come with trumpet sound, Oh may I then in Him be found; Dressed in His righteousness alone, Faultless to stand before the throne.

Refrain,

On Christ, the solid Rock, I stand; All other ground is sinking sand. All other ground is sinking sand.

Notice, here, again, no words about *"the serpent's lie, Concerning immortality."* They were added by Jones who misrepresented the true author and thought you would never notice! So much for this story, but for anyone who does not believe that Weiland is parroting Jones, I suggest you read the book by Stephen E. Jones *The Babylonian Connection*, published by America's Promise, and Ted R. Weiland's new book *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?* and compare the two.

TED R. WEILAND GOOFS IN HIS BOOK, "GOD'S COVENANT PEOPLE,
Yesterday, Today and Forever"

Ted R. Weiland, Stephen E. Jones, James Bruggeman and Charles Weisman are doing their best (or maybe their worst) to make Esau-Edom the only enemy of Israel, and prove that the Ashkenazim Jews are just converts to the Jewish religion, and therefore not of the Satanic race of Cain. They, in doing this, make our present day problems seem like a quarrel between two brothers, Jacob and Esau. Weiland speaks of Esau-Edom on pages 309-311 making it seem like a quarrel between two brothers, Jacob and Esau as I said before. Weiland speaks of the Ashkenazi Khazar Jews on pages 59-74; 93-94; 126; 140 and 327 making it appear like a race of people who just happened to accept the Jewish religion. By doing this, Weiland completely avoids the "Satanic Seed-line" doctrine. Weiland has very little to say of the Sephardic Jews, and what he does say is completely in error. Weiland quotes, (page 68), a Jewish source, James Gaffe in his book *"The American Jews"* which says this:

"... the early Sephardic settlers for example, left practically no descendants who are still Jewish.... they disappeared not because they intermarried but because they refused to intermarry - and so, without sufficient choice among their own, they remained unmarried and died out. ...choosing extinction rather than assimilation."

Now I will back up to a note by Weiland: *"Note that he (Gaffe) considers the Sephardic Jew extinct"*

I could make long quotes from the 7 volume *History of the Jews* by Graetz, *The Story of the Jew* by Levinger, the 2 volume *History of the Jews* by Henry H. Milman, *History and Destiny of the Jews* by Josef Kastein and *A History of the Jews* by Abram Leon Sachar that the Sephardic Jews still exist. I will be quoting from a book *Our Crowd* by Stephen Birmingham, but before I do, you have to know that the Khazar kingdom accepted the religion of Judaism under king Bulan in 740 A.D. Upon doing so, they brought in Rabbis from Babylon and the race-mixing began between the Cain Satanic Jews and the Khazars infusing them with the Satanic bloodline, if they didn't already have it. In 960 A.D. the Khazar Jews made contact with the Sephardic Jews in Spain and more race-mixing between the two branches of Jewry ensued further spreading the Satanic bloodline. From 720 A.D. until today has given the "Jews" of Ashkenazim and Sephardim 1,278 years to completely mix the Cain Satanic blood among them.

THE SEPHARDIM ARE STILL AROUND!

In the book *OUR CROWD*, 'The Great Jewish Families of New York', pages 29-30, and I will have to paraphrase the story: Sometime in the 1650s a ship ("bark", 3 masted sailing ship, *St. Charles*) dubbed the "*Jewish Mayflower*" brought twenty-three Sephardic Jews from the culture of medieval Spain and some of the great Sephardic families of New York descended from the "*St. Charles*" arrivals which included the Hendrickses, Cardozos, Baruchs, Lazaruses, Nathans, Solises, Gomezes, Lopezes, Lindos, Lombrosos & Seixases. Just check out these names and you will know the Sephardic Jews are still around. On page 31, it tells how the Sephardic and German (Ashkenazi) Jews of New York began to "intermarry." It was the Sephardic that were the old Canaanite Jews that came from Palestine. They had the blood of Cain, Esau and of the race of Rephiam (fallen angels). **If the Sephardic Jews are extinct, as Ted R. Weiland implies, there is no longer an Esau-Edom!!!! Why, then, even make an issue of Esau-Edom if this is the case?????** This is just one example of the many spurious statements Weiland, Jones, Bruggeman and Weisman make in their presentations to mislead and confuse the issues. Anything but anything to destroy the ministries of Bertrand L. Comparet and Wesley A. Swift!

TED R. WEILAND WRITES NEW BOOK REFUTING TWO SEEDLINE

Before he wrote this recent (Spring, 2000) book, Weiland had his material on a ten cassette tape series entitled *Eve, Did She? or Didn't She?* Weiland also had written an article (11 pages) in the *Kingdom Journal*, Spring, 1998, a publication under the auspices of James W. Bruggeman. Again, the title of that article was *Eve, Did She? or Didn't She?* His latest book seems to be an expansion with refinement of his former work on the topic. I understand he also has this same book available on Internet. Weiland, in his new book on the subject, names very respectable teachers like the late Bertrand L. Comparet, the late Nord W. Davis, Jarah B. Crawford, James E. Wise and many others in his "source notes." As Ted R. Weiland had mentioned my name in his work, he sent me a complementary copy. I don't have the room here to give a long rebuttal, I will only make some short comments about his new publication.

TED R. WEILAND EXPOSES HIS TRUE MOTIVES

When analyzing a book, it is necessary to skip over all the small talk and get to the heart of what is being said, and thereby, understand the motives of the author. I am sure, once I point out some of these subtle hardly noticeable passages, your evaluation, as well as mine, will be changed to a large degree. No matter how well an author of a book, like his, tries to cover up his hidden agendas, certain passages will reveal the innermost secret passages of his thinking. And reveal himself, Ted R. Weiland did!

THE LAW TREE

Although Weiland does not say it in terms of a “law tree”, he highly suggest that this is what the “tree of the knowledge of good and evil” was that Eve partook of in the garden. I will quote some excerpts from his book, pages 40-44, and I am sure you will have to agree with my analysis of what he, in essence, is saying:

There are no scriptures that categorically tell us what the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was ... Genesis 3:22 clearly reveals that the knowledge of good and evil resides not with some demon of darkness, but rather with our omniscient God, Yahweh ... God's law itself is good because it reflects Yahweh's nature. Consequently, Yahweh uses it as the vehicle through which the knowledge of good is commuted to man. The knowledge of evil is imparted by means of the law as well ... Furthermore, Genesis 3:6 describes the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as being able to make one wise, being pleasant to the eyes and good for food. These qualities also describe the law of God ... At this point someone is likely to inquire “If the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was the law of God, would not that have made God's law evil because God did not want Adam and Eve to partake of it? ... There may be Christians, especially those who understand the vital goodness and importance of God's law for us today, who may still have difficulty reconciling in their minds that Yahweh would ban His law from Adam and Eve. Such Christians should consider that when God prohibited Adam and Eve from partaking of the tree of life, that prohibition did not make the tree of life evil ... So why would Yahweh want to keep Adam and Eve from His law? ... Perhaps God initially forbade Adam and Eve the knowledge of good and evil by way of His law because He knew He would have to hold them accountable to use it, and He knew the heartache and death that would ensue as a result ... On the other hand, if the eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil was an unlawful partaking of God's law, then there is a connection between Adam and Eve's sin and all other sin.

Let's now sort out all this gibberish. What are the consequences of what Weiland, in essence, is saying? Weiland is inferring that Yahweh deliberately withheld His Law from Adam and Eve so they wouldn't be condemned by their sin — that as long as they didn't know the Law, they were innocent — that by partaking of the law, it brought about death. If Weiland is correct (and Yahweh forbid), and Adam and Eve would have never partook of (as Stephen E. Jones calls it) the “law-tree”, we would be living in innocence today partaking in every kind of immorality and it would not be considered by Yahweh as sin because we never ate of the so-called “law-tree.” . Wouldn't all the homosexuals of today love that situation?

THEORY OF EATING OF THE LAW NOT ORIGINAL WITH WEILAND

This idea is not original with Weiland. Stephen E. Jones in his book *The Babylonian Connection*, pages 60-61 says this in part:

The tree of life (Grace) and the tree of knowledge (Law) both were planted in the same garden by God. They grew together. The Law-tree provided the righteous standard; the Grace-tree provided the means by which the standard could be met ... First they disobeyed God by eating from the Law-tree, and for that act they were made mortal. Then their eyes were opened to know both good and evil, and they recognized their mortality in contrast to God's immortality ... Because they had broken His Law, they stood naked (mortal) and without excuse.

WEILAND BELIEVES THE "JEWS" ARE GOD'S CHOSEN PEOPLE

Maybe I am reading Weiland's statement incorrectly concerning Weiland believing the "Jews" are among God's Chosen. All I can do is present to you Weiland's own words, and you will have to decide for yourself what his position on the "Jews" is. We find it on page 94 of his new book *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?*:

The seedliners teach that the Pharisees were Cainites of the seed line 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 the seed line of Jacob/Israel.

If what Weiland states here is true, then, how does he explain Revelation 2:9 and 3:9?, which says:

I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan ... Behold, I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie.

INTRODUCTION TO TWO SEEDLINE

(This was written sometime in 1997 when I put together my article *Research Papers Proving Two-Seedline Seduction Of Eve*. At the time, I considered rewriting and reformatting all my work on the subject. The message seemed too important, though, to take time to do that, so I renumbered the pages I already had using numbers and letters to keep track of the pages. What I had already done seemed to be quite effective, so I decided to go with what I had. The following is what I wrote as an introduction for this booklet.) — I will start my story with the genealogy chart of Esau on the last page of this booklet. (I am not including that chart with this up-dated article) I made this chart in the late 70s, and at the time, I had no idea of what Israel Identity was all about. I can't even give you a good reason why I made this chart in the first place. All I know is, that this chart was going to have a very dramatic affect upon me from that time until now. In the late 70s, I knew there was something wrong, but I couldn't put my finger on it. I had made a very serious study into the eastern religions along with witchcraft thinking

that this might be where the problem was. Well this was part of the problem, but later, I would find how it fits into the scheme of things. Then a Catholic priest, a customer at my place of business, introduced me to the story of the Illuminati and a character by the name of John Todd, and I thought I had found the answer. As I would find out later, John Todd only knew about half of what he was talking about. I acquired about 50 of his cassette tapes and started to copy them and pass them around. No sooner than I had gotten involved with John Todd and his version of witchcraft and the Illuminati, than another customer brought in a copy of *Billions For The Bankers And Debt For The People* by Sheldon Emry. Then another customer brought me a copy of *The United States and Britain In Prophecy* by Herbert W. Armstrong. And yet another customer brought me four cassette tapes by Jim Shaw on Freemasonry. Along with the tapes by Jim Shaw was a small book list with a book entitled *Fourth Reich of the Rich* by Des Griffin which John Todd had talked about on one of his cassette tapes. I immediately ordered this book from Shaw. When I got it, in the back of the book was advertised about 200 more books, and I was on my way. Now I didn't trust Armstrong, so I sent to Sheldon Emry for more information on Israel Identity. Now Emry only understood the Edomite connection with Jewry and you can begin to see how the chart I had previously made started to affect me — I knew all about those Edomites and who they were, so I thought. Anyway, I was headed in the right direction. Well, again, I felt I had found the final answer and I informed everybody I knew about those Edomite-Jews. Since the early 1980s I have spent 35,000 to 40,000 hours of study on Israel Identity and the great "Jewish" conspiracy.

Then, in my study, I continued to read about Cain and all of the Bible references concerning him. I knew it was there — I understood it in general — I accepted it but didn't totally understand the importance of it and didn't make an issue out of it. About four years ago, I was guided by an acquaintance I had made to Bertrand L. Comparet's and Wesley A. Swift's cassette tapes. I had purchased some of Comparet's tapes before that time, but they were so poor in sound quality, I didn't order any more. My acquaintance loaned me four of Comparet's tapes, and I liked them so well I copied them and ordered everything I could get by Comparet and Swift. Out of these tapes I ordered, about 5% to 10% were not intelligible. I did end up with about 225 tapes by these two men that were from good to fair in sound quality. I would hate to estimate how many times I have repeatedly listened to these cassette tapes over and over again.

About two or three years ago, I decided to write an article on Genesis 4:1 as this seemed to be the hang-up with some people. I remember one young man in particular. This is where we are with this booklet. You will have to understand that as I was writing and speaking on this subject, I was going through a learning process as I researched it. You will notice this as you go through my presentations. You will find herein *The Problem With Genesis 4:1; Presentation On The Trees Of Genesis* (my notes) ; *Postscript To Presentation On The Trees Of Genesis; Postscript #2, To Presentation On The Trees Of Genesis; What Was It That Eve 'Did Eat'? and What Did Eve 'Touch'?*; *Postscript #3, To The Presentation On The Trees Of Genesis*; and *Esau's Genealogy*. In my research here, I have turned some new ground that no one else has touched yet. The *Postscript #3* is the best one I have done yet. If you want to read that one first, go right ahead, but be sure to read the others.

I really got into this about two months ago (1997) when a friend gave me a ten tape series, *Eve, Did She? or Didn't She?* by Ted R. Weiland. I wrote a letter to Weiland and told him he was "a liar" and a "damn fool." Then a friend sent me a cassette tape by Charles Wiseman discrediting Two Seedline doctrine. I took this 60 minute tape and put it on a 90 minute tape, breaking in at times to point out his errors making a debate out of it. Much of the material herein was used in that tape.

My biggest breakthrough I made on Two Seedline doctrine was in Genesis 15:19-21 where I identified the Kenites as descendants of Cain; the Kenizzites as descendants of Esau; the Rephaims as mutated giants from fallen angels and that all of these race-mixed together with seven other nations to form the Canaanites from which the Jews are extracted. Although this is commonly taught by some Identity teachers, to my knowledge, no one else in Identity has ever identified this from this particular passage.

I would like to dedicate the following materials to the memory of Bertrand L. Comparet, Dr. Wesley A. Swift and William P. Gale. These were real pillars and great men in Israel not to be compared with the likes of Charles Weisman or Ted R. Weiland who can't even hold the door for them. I would like to quote Isaiah 54:17: *No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; **and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn.** This is the heritage of the servants of Yahweh, and their righteousness is of me, saith Yahweh.* Note: The contents of this booklet may be freely copied and the copying cost recovered only.

THE PROBLEM WITH GENESIS 4:1

Genesis 4:1 is probably one of the most misunderstood verses in the Bible. This is really an understatement of fact to say the least. On the understanding of this verse, lies the entire theme of the Bible. Actually Genesis 3:15 is the main theme of the Bible, but without a correct understanding of Genesis 4:1, the theme becomes muddled and confused! Therefore it is of the utmost importance that one gain an understanding of this verse or the entire Bible will remain a mystery! It is with this thought, that the object of this Bible study is to completely master this passage so that the story of the Bible can be opened up to us in all of its splendor and brilliance.

It is sadly unfortunate that the many translations of the Bible do not do this verse justice! It will therefore be necessary, in light of all this, to go to the *Strong's Concordance* and check and compare each and every word in this verse. Upon checking out the original Hebrew, then, we shall attempt to untangle and make a sensible rendering as to just what this passage is saying.

Before going any further, let us see how the King James version of the Bible shows it:

And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord.

It would appear, if this were the only verse in the Bible that had anything to say about this matter of the birth of Cain, and if the King James version of the Bible were the only version of

the Bible we had, that we would have to accept the fact that Adam was the father of Cain. You see, here is the problem, Adam was not the father of Cain! Not only are the “Jews” of today not of Adam, but they know themselves they are descended from Cain. Let’s see who the “Jews” admits himself to be. In the “Jewish” publication *Liberal Judaism*, January, 1949, there is an article entitled, “Liberal Judaism and Israel” written by one of their greatest and most renowned Rabbis, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver. Dr. Silver, writing about the then new State of Israel says:

“ ... the third commonwealth of the Jewish Nation is thus an accomplished fact. The State of Israel exists.

*“As a result the concept of **the wandering Jew** is bound eventually to disappear along with the term (galut) exile. All nations send forth immigrants to all parts of the world. People are continually moving from one country to another, and change their citizenship, but they are not regarded as exiles.*

*“This fact alone — the end of national exile for the Jewish people, as such — is destined to affect favorably the psyche of the Jew throughout the world. It will endow the Jew, wherever he lives, with a self respect and a sense of security, a normal tone, long-wanting in Jewish experience. **For the curse of Cain, the curse of being an outcast and a “wanderer” over the face of the earth has been removed ...**”*

Incidentally, Yahweh’s curse upon Cain can be found in Genesis 3:14 which says:

*And Yahweh El said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou *art* cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.*

Now let's go on to the *Strong's Concordance* and check out this verse:

AND (Added by the translators, and has **no** Hebrew foundation.) #2532 Greek; and, also, even, so, then, too, both, but, even, for, if, indeed, likewise, moreover, or, so, that, then, therefore, when, yea, yet. **ADAM** #120 Hebrew; from 119 Hebrew; to show blood (in the face), i.e. flush or turn rosy:— be (dyed, made) red (ruddy); a human being (an individual or the species, mankind etc.). **KNEW** #3045 Hebrew; to know (ascertain by seeing); used in a great variety of senses, figuratively, or literally, euphemism and inference (including observation, care, recognition and causatively: instruction, designation, punishment etc.) [as follow]: - acknowledge, acquaintance, be aware, [un]awares [-not], certainly, for a certainty, comprehend, consider, X could they, cunning, declare, be familiar, friend, famous, feel, can have, be ig [norant, instruct, kinfolk, kinsman, (cause to let, make) known, (come to give, have, take) knowledge ... be learned, + lie by man, mark, perceive, privy to, X prognosticator, regard, have, respect, skilful, shew, can (man of) skill, be sure, of a surety, teach, (can) tell, understand, have [understanding], X will be, wist, wit, wot. **EVE** #2332, Hebrew, causatively from #2331; life-giver; Châvvâh (or Eve), the first woman:— Eve. **HIS** #848 Greek (Added by the translators, and has **no** Hebrew foundation.), her (own), (of) him (-self), his (own), of it, thee, their (own), them (-selves), they. **WIFE** #802 Hebrew, female of 376 or 582 ... a woman, [adulter]ess, each,

every, female, + none, one, + together, wife, woman. Often unexpressed in English. **AND** #2532, (Same as the and above, added by the translators, and has no Hebrew foundation.). **SHE** #1931 Hebrew, hûw, *hoo*; of which the feminine (beyond the Penatateuch) is ...: hîy', he; a primitive word, the third personal pronoun, sing, he (she or it); only expressed when emphatic or a verb; also (intensive) *self*, or (especially with the article) the same; sometimes (as demonstrative) *this or that*, occasionally (instead of copula) *as or are*; he, as for her, him (-self), it, the same, she (herself), such that (...it), these, they, this, those, which (is), who. **CONCEIVED** #2029 Hebrew, to be (or become) pregnant, conceive (literally or figuratively):— been, be with child, conceive, progenitor. **AND** #2532, Greek (Same as the and above, added by the translators, and has no Hebrew foundation.) **BARE** #3205 Hebrew, to bear young; causative to beget; medically to act as midwife; specifically to show lineage:— bear, beget, birth ([-day]), born, (make to) bring forth (children, young), bring up, calve, child, come, be delivered (of a child), time of delivery, gender, hatch, labor, (do the office of a) midwife, declare pedigrees, be the son of, (woman in, woman that) travail (-eth, -ing woman). **CAIN** #7014 Hebrew; Qayin, *kah'-yin*; the same as 7013; Ka'-jin, the name of the first child, also of a place in Palestine and of an Oriental tribe: -Cain, Kenite (-s). **AND** #2532, Greek (Same as the and above, added by the translators, and has no Hebrew foundation). **SAID** #559 Hebrew; to say (used with great latitude):— answer, appoint, avouch, bid, boast self, call, certify, challenge, charge, + (at the, give) command (meet), commune, consider, declare, demand, X desire, determine, X expressly, X indeed, X intend, name, X plainly promise, publish, report, require, say, speak (against, of), X still, X suppose, talk, tell, term, X that is, X think, use [speech], utter, X verily, X yet. **I** #589 Hebrew; 'anîy, an-ee'; contraction from 595; *I*:— I, (as for) me, mine, myself, we, X which, X who. **HAVE** (This word is in the Addenda of the Strong's Concordance. Evidently added by the translators, and has no Hebrew foundation.) **GOTTEN** #7069 Hebrew; (only time used in the Bible with this word); qânâh, kaw-naw'; a primitive root; to erect; by extension to procure, especially by purchase (causatively sell): by implication to own; -attain, buy (-er), teach to keep cattle, get, provoke to jealousy, possess (-or), purchase, recover, redeem, X surely, X verily. **A** (a) is listed in the appendix of *Strong's Concordance* but there is no dictionary number for either the Hebrew or the Greek. (This indicates that there is no indefinite article in either the Hebrew or the Greek so the indefinite English articles are added by translators to make the English grammatical structure correct in translations. Hebrew also has no definite article. Strong's shows no reference number for any definite article in English translation of Hebrew. Hebrew has no article. All used in translation at discretion of the translators.) **MAN** #376 Hebrew; 'îysh; contraction for 582 [or perhaps rather from an unused root meaning to be extant]; a man as an individual or a male person; often used as an adjunct to a more definite term (and in such cases frequently not expressed in translation):— also another, any (man), a certain, + champion, consent each, every (one), fellow, [foot-, husband-] man, (good-, great, mighty) man, he, high (degree), him (that is), husband, man [-kind], + none, one, people, person, + steward, what (man) soever, whoso (-ever), worthy. Compare 802. **FROM** 575 Greek; apo; a primary particle; "off," i.e. away (from something near) in various senses (of place, time, or relation; literally or figuratively):— (X here) after, ago, at, because of, before, by (the space of), for (-th), from, in (out) of, off, (up-) on (-ce), since, with. In composition (as a prefix) it usually denotes *separation, departure, cessation, completion, reversal*, etc. **THE** 3588 Greek; ... in all their inflections; the definite article; *the* (sometimes to be supplied, at others omitted in English idiom): -the, this, that, one, he, she, it etc. **LORD**

#3068 Hebrew; yeh-ho-vaw'; from 1961; (the) self - Existent or Eternal; Jehovah (correctly Yahweh), Jewish (correctly Hebrew) national name of God:— Jehovah the Lord (correctly Yahweh), Compare 3050, 3069.

From reviewing the breakdown of the Hebrew, word-for-word, in this verse, a problem here should immediately jump out at you. Do you notice that all of the words here are not in Hebrew, but some of them are in Greek? But you were always told that the Old Testament was written in Hebrew and Chaldee. Then, Why do we find some Greek words in the Old Testament? (Actually, we do **not**. The Hebrew manuscripts have **no** Greek words ... I thought you would never ask. Now in the original writings the Old Testament it was entirely in Hebrew and Chaldee. In the third century B.C. somewhere between 280 to 130 B.C. in Alexandria, Egypt on the island of Pharos, because of the expansion of the influence of Hellenism and the Greek language, it was decided by some Alexanderian "Jews" that they wanted the Scriptures of the Old Testament in a Greek version. The story goes that they appointed 72 scholars in Hebrew (six from each tribe) to come up with a Greek version of the Old Parchments (kind of like a Sanhedrin). When they had finished their task they called it, or later on it was referred to as the Septuagint (LXX). The question that should be asked here is: Where did they find the six from each tribe since the ten northern tribes had gone into Assyrian captivity in 720 B.C. and were nowhere close to be found in Alexandria, Egypt? They might have found some from the tribes of Judah and Benjamin or maybe even some of the tribe of Levi. Well it makes a good story anyway. Then the story goes that the 72 scholars (each one working separately) completed their task in 72 days. Because the old Hebrew language was a very abbreviated type of language (it didn't take very many words to say a lot), that these "Jews" felt that they must add some Greek words to make the text more understandable. God needed their help you know! Now the biggest question of all: How do we know that they picked the correct Greek words to fill in with? With any translation you never know. It would have been proper, in principal, for the translators to have added definite articles where indicated, but the problem is in determining just where a definite article is indicated since the Hebrew has none. It is entirely discretionary with the translators.

At this point, in this discussion, you will probably wonder where this information about the Septuagint is coming from. Well it is coming from the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Ninth Edition, 1894 and the Dictionary Of The New Testament by Hastings. At this point let's take some excerpts from the Dictionary Of The New Testament by Hastings: "**Septuagint**.— *The Version 'according to the Seventy.'* 1. *This name for the Greek translation of the Old Testament has its origin in the legend that Ptolemy II. Philadelphus was advised by his librarian Demetrius Phalereus to procure, from Jerusalem, copies of the Hebrew Scriptures, and men learned in the Hebrew and Greek languages to translate them. (Bingo, now we know, at least in part, where the Greek came from.) Ptolemy accordingly sent ambassadors to Eleazar the high priest, who sent back to Alexandria seventy-two elders, six from each tribe, with magnificent copies of the Hebrew Scriptures. They were treated with the highest honour; they were assigned a quiet and convenient building on the island of Pharos, removed from the distraction of the city; and there in seventy-two days, they translated the Hebrew Bible into Greek. ... And the early Fathers of the Christian Church from the 2nd century onwards received the story without suspicion, and amplified it. ... Being entirely dependent on it, and unable to appeal to or form comparisons with*

any other version, they adopted it without suspicion and with tenacity into least defensible renderings, and pressed them into the service of controversy, dogma, and devotion. 'It was argued that the errors of the Greek text were due to accidents of transmission, or that they were not actual errors, but Divine adaptations of the original to the use of the future Church' ... It is difficult to gauge the extent to which religious conceptions were affected by the results which ensued from the wedding of the Greek language to Hebrew though." Now let us take some excerpts from the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Ninth Edition, 1894: "The king consented and sent an embassy, of which the author of the letter was a member, to the high priest Eleazar at Jerusalem asking him to send six ancient, worthy, and learned men from each of the twelve tribes to translate the law for him at Alexandria. ... the whole translation was finished in seventy-two days. ... The chief thing in the *Letter* is the description of a seven days' symposium of the seventy translators at the Alexandrian court, during which each of them has a question to answer, and raises the admiration of the king for the wisdom produced among the Jews by their knowledge of the law. Further, very great weight is laid on the point that the LXX. is the official and authoritative Bible of the Hellenistic Jews ... But it has been thought much more likely that the Septuagint was written down to satisfy the religious needs of the Jews by a translated Torah, since in fact the version is fitted for Jews ... In some books the translators took the liberty to make considerable additions to the original ... The same Greek word is forced to assume the whole range of senses which belongs in Semitic speech to the derivation of a single root ... At the same time, many passages are freely rendered and turned where there is no need to do so ... The literalness of the version is due not to scrupulousness but to want of skill, and probably, in part, also to accommodation to a kind of "Jewish" jargon ... **AS THE VERSION IS THE WORK OF MANY HANDS, IT IS NATURALLY NOT OF UNIFORM CHARACTER THROUGHOUT ALL ITS PARTS, — INDEED CONSIDERABLE VARIETIES OF CHARACTER SOMETIMES APPEAR IN ONE AND THE SAME BOOK.** The older constituents of the canon have an unmistakable family likeness as contrasted with the later books; thus one may see by comparing Kings with Chronicles or Isaiah and Jeremiah with Daniel. The Pentateuch is considered to be particularly well done and Isaiah to be particularly unhappy. Some of the Hagiographa (Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Chronicles) are reproduced with verbal closeness; others on the contrary (Job, Esdras, Esther, Daniel) are marked by a very free treatment of the text, or even by considerable additions. It is not, however, always easy to tell whether a Septuagint addition is entirely due to the translator or belongs to the original text, which lay before him in recension divergent from the MASSORETIC. ... But long usage had made it impossible for the Jews to do without a Greek Bible, and to meet this want a new version was prepared corresponding accurately with the canon and text of the Pharisees. This was the version of Aquila, which took the place of the Septuagint in the synagogues ... But that it should be so appears to have been the design of providence, which has permitted the Old Testament text to reach us in a form that is often so corrupt as to sin against both the laws of logic and grammar - of rhetorical and poetical form."

We are now forced to ask the question: Can we trust these 72 so-called scholars ("Jewish" scholars) who translated the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek??? It would appear that the only way to eliminate any error that the Greek might have added to the text in any way is to read Genesis 4:1 using the Hebrew only. It would read thus: **ADAM KNEW EVE WIFE SHE CONCEIVED BARE CAIN SAID I GOTTEN MAN YAHWEH.** The problem here is the word,

knew. The Bible uses the word knew, #3045, 80 times. Out of the 80 times there are only 8 times (9 if you count this verse) where this word has sexual connotations. This word, knew, is the key to understanding the entire verse. **If** the word does **not** have sexual connotations, the verse might read something like this: **And Adam observed that Eve, his wife, was pregnant, that she had conceived, And from this pregnancy, she gave birth to Cain, And she answered, and asked, From where have I created this male person? Even Yahweh?**

By this time it should be obvious that the present Bibles and translations cannot be trusted. That the scribes, down through the ages, have done a poor job of translation and many times for religious, political and economic reasons have actually changed the Scriptures so that they back up some of their petty doctrines. Also some of these scribes have been, and are, the very enemies of the Almighty! When we come to realize how the Scriptures have been manipulated in this way, then we can better adjust our study habits so we can discern the truth! But these manipulations by the scribes are only part of the problem.

Not only do we have to adjust for **error**, but there is the matter of **idioms** and **parables**. The dictionary says an idiom is: *A speech that is peculiar to itself within the usage of a given language*. Inasmuch as we have taken up the matter of error, let's next take up the problem of idioms. Let's take a couple of examples of modern day idioms. We might say that we had a good time over the weekend, we went out and painted the town red. We really didn't take a bucket of red paint along with a paint brush and try to paint the houses or whatever around town. It is just a modern day idiom saying, we had a good time. Then sometimes when we know a person that seems to have prospered all of their life, we say, they were born with a silver spoon in their mouth. Now when they were born and came out of the womb, they really didn't have a silver spoon in their mouth.

Now let us consider a couple of the idioms of the Bible. Numbers 14:9 says: *They are bread for us*, which means, *We can easily conquer them with little effort*. Matthew 8:21 says: *Bury my father*, which means, *Take care of my father until he dies*. Now the Bible is just loaded with idioms in all of its languages. It is obvious, then, that an extended study needs to be made to understand the meanings of these idioms. Many times what you are reading is not what it really meant!

Now that we understand how the various translations can be in, or lead to, error, and how the **idioms** can be misleading, let's take up the matter of **parables**. A Bible parable is like an allegory or symbolism, a story or narrative in which a moral principle or abstract truth is presented. Parable in Greek means a proverb, adage, similitude, or to throw along side. In Hebrew, and probably more correctly, it means a metaphor or simile, a figure of speech in which one object is likened to another by speaking of it as if it were the other. Now let's see how the Bible uses the word, parable. In Matthew 13:34 it says, *"All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without parables spake he not unto them."* It was a fulfillment of Psalm 78:2 which says, *"I will open my mouth in a parable: I will utter dark sayings of old."* It is interesting to notice why the Redeemer spoke in parables. Matthew 13:13,14 says, *"Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophesy of Esaias, which saith, By*

hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive." Also Mark 4:11,12 says, '11 And he said unto them, Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of Yahweh: but unto them that are without, all *these* things are done in parables: 12 That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; **lest** at any time they should be converted, and *their* sins should be forgiven them." Well so much for John 3:16, the Golden Text of the Bible as it is generally **mistakenly** understood to mean everybody. Many may not be aware of it, but John 3:16 was never in the original text. It was originally a side note, and was later added to the text. But that is entirely another story. **From Mark 4:12 it is apparent that Yahshua didn't want everyone!** Here, too, it is important to know to whom Yahshua was addressing this message because it has everything to do with Genesis 4:1! Actually the Bible is written in parables on purpose as it is not intended for everyone to understand. It is as though it were written in a secret code. **If we are to understand the Bible, it is going to be necessary to research to find out what these parables, allegories, symbols, proverbs, adages, similitudes and metaphors mean!!!** If you are having a hard time understanding the Bible, the Bible says "ask". It needs be that the Spirit guide us, and I am not talking about the Charismatics either. It is hoped, at this point, that we can see what it is going to take to understand Yahweh's word! Now we shall go on to further develop Genesis 4:1.

Now that we see that, in order to understand the Bible, we must take **error, idioms** and **parables** into account so we can approach our subject objectively (treating facts without distortion). Probably the most important thing we have to do is look at the Bible as a whole. If we look at the big picture, and we see something out of place (like water running uphill), we know something is wrong. So, too, when we take the whole story of the Bible into account, and we read something that doesn't fit, chances are it doesn't. There are many who get hung up on one verse in the Bible and don't seem to be able to get around it. Genesis 4:1 is one of those verses that doesn't seem to fit. So we are going to have to avoid having a myopic view of the Bible! We are going to have to evade the tunnel vision syndrome! Basically what we have is a verse in Genesis 4:1 that doesn't appear to fit with Genesis 3:15.

Inasmuch as Genesis 3:15 is the main theme of the Bible, let's establish that story next. In the King James Version of the Bible, it reads like this: "**And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; and it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.**" The entire Bible revolves around this verse! This fact cannot be emphasized enough. There is a literal war being waged between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent and it has been going on for a long time. It is important, here, to realize that the serpent has just as literal seed (children) as the woman. Let's check in the *Strong's Concordance* and see what this word, seed, means. It is important to note that the word seed applies the same for the serpent as it does for the woman. In the *Strong's Concordance* the word seed is #2233 in the Hebrew, **zera** , zer'-rah; from 2232; **seed**; figuratively *fruit, plant, sowing-time, posterity*:— X carnally, child, fruitful, seed (-time), sowing-time. The one seedliners usually try to promote that the seed mentioned in this verse is in the singular and means "Jesus Christ" only. One source which suggest such a definition is *An Expository Dictionary Of The New Testament Words* by W. E. Vine, pages 338-339. He got such an idea from reading the Septuagint. Again, can the Septuagint be trusted in all cases? After all, the

word in Greek means **SPERMA**. Would we be so foolish as to consider sperma to mean one individual seed? Scripture says one seed out of many, Galatians 3:16. Again, the one seedliners promote that the woman didn't have any seed. If they understood genetics they wouldn't say such a thing. Science knows today that each single cell of the human body has two sets of 23 chromosomes, or a total of 46. I will now quote *The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 9, page 192d: "Every human body cell contains two sets of 23 chromosomes. These two sets look very much alike. Each chromosome in one set can be matched with a particular chromosome in the other set. Egg cells and sperm cells have only one set of 23 chromosomes. These cells are formed in a special way, and end up with only half the number of chromosomes found in body cells. As a result, when an egg and a sperm come together, the fertilized egg cell will contain the 46 chromosomes of a normal body cell. Half of the chromosomes come from the mother, and half from the father". It is absurd, then, to say the woman doesn't have any seed. The woman, then, contributes just as much genetic makeup to the offspring as the man! The question, at this point, if the serpent has seed or (children); Who fathered and mothered them??? For this, it is imperative that we go first to Genesis 3:13 which says: "And the Yahweh said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." You will notice that Eve told Yahweh, "The serpent **beguiled** me." Let's see what this word "**beguiled**" means in the *Strong's Concordance* in Hebrew. It is #5377; nâshâ , *naw-shaw'*; a primitive root; to lead astray, i.e. (mentally) to *delude*, or **(morally) to seduce**: beguile, deceive, X greatly, X utterly. Here the word beguile can mean seduce, which in turn means, to induce (a woman) to surrender her chastity ... entice to unlawful sexual intercourse. It can also mean to be mentally seduced. We have to be wise enough to know the difference. Now that we have covered the word beguiled, let's now take up the word eat. **Eat** in the *Strong's Concordance* is #398, and means: akal, 'aw-kal; a primitive root; to eat (literally or figuratively): -X at all, burn up, consume, devour (er, up), dine, eat (-er, up), *feed* (with), food, X freely, X in... wise (-deed, plenty), **(lay)** meat, X quite. In this particular verse eat could mean what it says, but it is better rendered lay. Now that we have consulted with the *Strong's Concordance* as to the meanings of these two words, let's try to determine what Eve really said: "**The serpent seduced me, and I did lay.**"

At this point you might say that we are stretching the Hebrew meaning of the word eat, but read the following. If you can understand the Hebrew idioms, you know that the word eat can have many connotations. Proverbs 9:17, for example, reads: "*Stolen waters are sweet, and bread eaten in secret is pleasant.*" The Hebrew idiom here is according to *Idioms In The Bible Explained* by George M. Lamsa, page 27: Also, Proverbs 30:20 is referring to sexual connotations when it uses the word **eat**: "*Such is the way of an adulterous woman; she **eateth**, and wipeth her mouth, and saith, I have done no wickedness.*" This is what Lamsa interprets the meaning, "*The tree of good and evil*", Genesis 2:17: *Metaphorically — sexual relationship*. Also "*the tree of life in the midst of the garden*", Genesis 2:9: *Sex: posterity, progeny*, (page 1), and I don't think Lamsa has an ax to grind on this subject. Some people are so goody good and above it all that they don't want to think in sexual terms concerning Eve's temptation. Now the "trees" spoken of in Genesis, Hebrew #6086, does mean wooden trees, but idiomatically a tree can mean many things like in Proverbs 11:30, "*The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life.*" You can see from this, if you don't understand the **idioms** of the language, you will not understand

the meanings. From all of this, you should now understand that **Eve didn't eat an apple from a wooden tree and that the serpent wasn't a scaly snake!!!**

Not only is it hoped that we understand what the nature of the episode which happened in Eden was, but also a fact we have to be aware of is the machinations of the **scribes**. Jeremiah 8:8 says, "*How do ye say, We are wise, and the law of Yahweh is with us? Lo, certainly in vain made he it; the pen of the scribes is in vain.*" According to Lamsa (underlined here), this has an idiomatic meaning: "*Scribes forged some of the passages in the Scriptures.*" If this is true, and it apparently is, then we can understand why there is a problem with Genesis 4:1 and some other passages we have to deal with in Holy Writ.

JUST WHY THEN IS GENESIS 4:1 SO IMPORTANT?

Genesis 4:1 in the KJV falsely makes it appear that Adam was the father of Cain while in reality Satan was. Whether or not this passage has been altered by the scribes, or whether some error has been made in the translation is not known. What we do know is, Genesis 4:1 doesn't fit with the rest of the story. We really don't have to go out of the fourth chapter of Genesis to find more on this story. Genesis 4:25 says, "*And Adam knew his wife again; and she bare a son, and called his name Seth: For God said she, hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew.*"

It appears here, in this verse, that Seth was a replacement for Abel. Why was not Seth a replacement for Cain??? It is obvious, Cain being fathered by Satan, Seth could only be "appointed" a replacement for Abel. In the *Stong's Exhaustive Concordance Of The Bible*, #8352 Hebrew, the name Seth means "substitute." In the Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon Of The Old Testament, Seth means "in stead of another." We can't just pass over this passage without answering "instead of who"? It is obvious Seth has to be instead of somebody. Who was it? All you one seedliners out there, we need an answer to this question. Why is not Seth a substitute for Cain? If Cain, Abel and Seth were all full brothers, why would there have to be a substitute for anyone of them? Being that Abel was dead, he was the only one that Seth could be a substitute for! It is stated in Jasher 2:1 that Seth was in Adam's likeness, and that Yahweh had appointed another seed in the place of Abel. It doesn't say anything about Cain being in Adam's likeness, Why? You will notice here that Cain was left totally out of the picture, and for good reason. Genesis 4:7 says, "*If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.*" In Genesis chapter 4, verses 1 and 2, you will notice after the births of Cain and Abel, the order is reversed to Abel and Cain. At first this may not seem important, but when you consider the patriarchal position, it makes all the difference in the world. It appears that Cain, when he killed Abel, was going for all the marbles. The stakes were high. According to the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Ninth Edition, 1894, the name of Cain means "*to obtain*" (get, acquire, annex, compass, gain, procure), and that is what the descendants of Cain are doing today. In *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia Of The Bible* (in five volumes) by Merrill C. Tinney, the name of Cain is "*related to the word to forge in metal, hence, a smith. ... also from the Hebrew word, to aquire.*" There will be more said on this later.

At this juncture it would be well to point out the fingerprints or characteristics of Cain and his seed line. There are three primary distinctive things mentioned in Genesis which should identify or determine who the descendants of Cain are: #1- The ground will not yield its strength, Genesis 4:12, therefore they will not be farmers. #2- They have a physical mark on their body, Genesis 4:15, it is that large long hook nose. Cain may have other marks too. #3- They shall make their living from the "dust" (rust from the junk yards, refuse from landfills) and deal in leftovers like a pawnshop, These mentioned here are the primary marks of the descendants of Cain. Now we shall consider the secondary marks of Cain and we shall get a pretty well rounded out picture of the people we are speaking of. Genesis 4:17 indicates they are to be city dwellers. Genesis 4:20 indicates they would be tent dwellers having cattle. (If this one doesn't seem to fit, think of Armand Hammer who is big in feeding lots and has an airplane outfitted like a travel trailer inside.) Genesis 4:21 indicates they would be masters of musical instruments. Genesis 4:23 indicates they would be people of violence. A better picture of the "Jews" of today, or in the past, would be hard to find. The reason, then, to get Genesis 4:1 cleared up is so we can understand the implications of Genesis 3:15. Genesis 3:15 indicates a war between Satan's seed and the woman's seed. That war started in Eden and it is still going on today. It could be said, We have put the fox ("Jew" devils) in charge of the hen house.

The reason Genesis 4:1 is so important to understand is because the "Jews" of today are the descendants of Cain who was fathered by Satan. Yes, the "Jews" are literal children of the devil and they are in charge of the great conspiracy today economically, politically, religiously, and racially. As a matter of fact, the whole conspiracy revolves around the racial issue. **Satan's plan is to destroy, in any way, the white race of Adam!!!** If you cannot see it happening, you have to be blind!!!

A lot of Bible so-called experts try to indicate there is no mention made of the descendants of Cain beyond Genesis chapter 4, and this is not true! If you check the #7014 in the Hebrew section of *Strong's Concordance* (the same number used for Cain in Genesis), you will notice that the descendants of Cain were called Kenites. We find the Kenites mentioned in 1st Chronicles 2:55, which says, *"And the family of the scribes which dwell at Jabez; the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, and Suchathites. These are the Kenites that came of Hemath, the father of the house of Rechab."* So we find they were called Kenites and Rechabites. By studying these two words, it will lead to a better understanding of the descendants of Cain. You have to be careful, though, because in Judges 1:16 and 4:11 Moses' in-laws are wrongly called Kenites. Also in Judges 4:17, Jael is wrongly called a Kenite. The reason for this error can only be speculated on, it may be the work of the "scribes". Also it could be because they lived in the same area with the Kenites. The 35th chapter of Jeremiah pretty well describes the Rechabite descendants of Cain as they would drink no wine, build no houses but dwell in tents, have no field or vineyard nor sow seed. *The Pictorial Bible Dictionary* by The Southwestern Company under Rechab, item 2 says, *"An early ancestor of the Kenite Tribe which later became identified with the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. 2:55). Rechab was the founder of the order of the Rechabites. It was Jehonadab who rode with Jehu on the penal mission against the house of Ahab (2 Kings 10:15ff). Jeremiah utilized the example of the Rechabites and their obedience to their father to drink no wine as a method of sharply berating the nation for their lack of obedience to God."* Do

you suppose the Rechabites could remember the offering of Abel, that it was a blood offering which the wine represents? Could it be that the Rechabites lived in tents because they were vagabonds? Could it be the Rechabites didn't plant seed because of the curse that the ground wouldn't yield of its strength? Do you notice that these Rechabites, these Kenites, these descendants of Cain made it well past Noah's flood? It appears that we have more problems.

It seems that Jesus (Yahshua) didn't have any problem identifying these "Jew" devils as He said to them, John 8:44, "*Ye are of your father the devil*", and that isn't all He said. He also identified them when He said, Matthew 23:34,35, "*Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barchias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.*" No one else who has ever lived could fit this description except the descendants of Cain!, **NO ONE. Cain was the only one who ever killed Abel!** The one seedliners can jabber forever, but they cannot change Yahshua's words on this passage. Yahshua said in Matthew 13:35: "*I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.*" Then the one seedliners have the audacity to proclaim the Redeemer didn't know what He was talking about. By taking a stand against the Two Seedline teaching that the "Jews" are the descendants of Cain, and this is what the one seedliners in substance are saying.

ADAM OR THAT MAN?

We are now going to approach this subject from a different angle. In *The Interlinear Bible, Hebrew-Greek-English by Hendrickson* (Jay P. Green Sr.) we would like to discuss Genesis 4:1 in more detail. Now this is coming straight from the Hebrew text by the Masoretes (if you think you can trust a devil). Between the Septuagint and the Masorah, we don't have anything else and they have both been in the hands of the enemy. That is why we have to scrutinize what we have so carefully. The truth is probably there except we have to examine it with a fine toothed comb to find it! Genesis 4:1 reads according to *The Interlinear Bible*, "*And the man knew his wife Eve. And she conceived and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man *with the help of Jehovah.* 2 And she continued to bear his brother, Abel."* We purposely went over into the second verse as it shows that Cain and Abel were fraternal twins developed from separately fertilized ova and thus having hereditary characteristics not the same. The main interesting thing to note here, however, is the fact that this passage is interpreted to mean "the man" and not necessarily "Adam". Now in *The Interlinear Bible* Genesis 4:25 reads: "And Adam knew his wife again, and she bare a son." Now in both the 1st and 25th verses here, it uses the Hebrew word #120 in the *Strong's Concordance*. We have to ask the question at this point: Can the Hebrew word #120 in the *Strong's Concordance* have more than one meaning? We know that in English sometimes there are many meanings of a single word. This is also true in Hebrew and Greek. It appears that a more detailed study of this word is in order. *Strong's Concordance* in the Hebrew dictionary #120 reads like this: *âdâm, aw-dawn'*; from 119; ruddy; i.e. *a human being* (an individual or the species, *mankind*, etc.):- X another, + hypocrite, + common sort, X low, man (meaning, of low degree), person.

First of all, it designates that the word is from #119 which means to show blood in the face, flush, turn rosy or to dye red. From this we will have no trouble identifying this with the white race as they are the only race that can blush. We can also see here that Adam was the first white man. Secondly, it appears that it can mean an individual and it doesn't seem to specify whether of the white race or not. Thirdly, a species, a biological grouping of closely related organisms (like kind, Adamic people). Fourthly, it can mean white mankind in general. Fifthly, it can mean another. Another means, any or some other or one different ... in other words, someone of another race. Sixthly, it can mean hypocrite, a pretender to what one is not. Seventhly, it can mean hypocrite, a pretender to what one is not. Eighthly, it can mean a common sort or ordinary person. Ninthly, it can mean just a person (probably of any race). Now it is important to point out that the words "another" and "low, man" (meaning of low degree) can be idiomatic. Whenever there is a X mark in front of a word in *Strong's Concordance* it means: X (*multiplication*) denotes a rendering in the A. V. that results from an idiom peculiar to the Hebrew. You can see here, again, that we are dealing with idioms. Then, also, we should note what a + sign means in front of a word: + (*addition*) denotes a rendering in the A. V. of one or more Hebrew words in connection with the one under consideration. You will find these definitions at the front of the Hebrew dictionary in your *Strong's Concordance*. I have noticed a inherent tendency on the part of the one seedliners to completely avoid the possibility of idioms! If you will but search the Hebrew and Greek dictionaries of the Strong's Concordance, you will find there are multi-thousands of X's and +'s to resolve the meaning of. This idea of taking the English versions as gospel is ludicrous!

Now having said all of this, let us see if we can make a rendering for "The man" in *The Interlinear Bible*. We feel that the translator had a good reason for not using "Adam" in this instance. Under these circumstances the best rendering could be and probably is: **"And another lesser man, hypocritical and of low degree, knew his (Adam's) wife. And she conceived and bare Cain."** A better rendering of this verse is not likely to be made. Just when, where, how, by whom and under what circumstances this verse became twisted from its correct meaning can only be conjectured. We do know, however, that with the Scriptures being in the hands of Yahweh's enemy makes them highly suspect!

THE CASE OF THE CAINITES

An interesting paragraph in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Ninth Edition, 1894, under the topic "Cain" reads: "A Gnostic sect of the 2nd century were known by the name of Cainites. They are first mentioned by Irenaeus, who connects them with the Valentinians. They believed that Cain derived his existence from the superior power, and Abel from the inferior power, and that in this respect he was the first of a line which included Esau, Korah, the Sodomites and Judas Iscariot." Now this is quite a revealing statement, for it includes Esau, Korah, the Sodomites and Judas Iscariot among the Satanic seed line! Not only this, but the descendants of Cain evidently know who they are. We could go into a long discussion about the Satanic nature of the line of Esau, but that will have to wait for another time. We will have to limit this discussion to the Satanic seed line of Cain.

An article in the *Dictionary Of The New Testament by Hastings* has this to say about the Cainites: "According to the scanty information we possess about the Cainites, they seem to have formed one of the Gnostic sects which are classed together under the somewhat inadequate and perhaps misleading name 'Ophites,' though the serpent, from which the name 'Ophite' is derived, seems to have played no part in their system. Our oldest source is to be found in Irenaeus ... He tells us that the Cainites regarded Cain as derived from the higher principle. They claimed fellowship with Esau, Korah, the men of Sodom, and all such people, and regarded themselves as on that account persecuted by the Creator. But they escaped injury from Him, for Sophia used to carry away from them to herself that which belonged to her. They regarded Judas the traitor as having full cognizance of the truth. He therefore, rather than the other disciples, was able to accomplish the mystery of the betrayal, and so bring about the dissolution of all things both celestial and terrestrial. The Cainites possessed a fictitious work entitled 'The Gospel of Judas' and Irenaeus says that he had himself collected writings of theirs, where they advocated that the work of Hystera should be dissolved. By Hystera they meant the Maker of Heaven and Earth ... Epiphanius ... characteristically gives a much longer account, in substantial harmony with what Irenaeus says. He appears to have had some source of information independent of Irenaeus. He speaks of Abel as derived from a weaker principle — a statement which bears the marks of authenticity. He also says that Judas forced Archons, or rulers against their will to slay Christ, and thus assisted us to the salvation of the Cross. Philaster, on the other hand, assigns the action of Judas to his knowledge that Christ intended to destroy the truth — a purpose which he frustrated by the betrayal ... Like other Gnostics, the Cainites drew a distinction between the Creator and the Supreme God ... They viewed Him and those whom He favored with undisguised hostility; redemption had for its end the dissolution of His work. They claimed kinship with those to whom He showed antagonism in His book, the Old Testament, and shared themselves in the same hostility. Nevertheless He was the weaker power, who could do them no permanent harm, for Sophia, the Heavenly Wisdom, drew back to herself those elements in their nature which they had derived from her. Presumably, then, they thought of a division of mankind into two classes — the spiritual and the material, the latter belonging to the realm of the Creator and deriving their being from Him, but doomed to dissolution, while the former class contained the spiritual men, imprisoned, it is true, in bodies of flesh, but yet deriving their essential being from the highest Power, opposed by the Creator and His minions, but winning the victory over them as Cain did over Abel ... There is no doubt that they applauded the action of Judas in the betrayal, but our authorities differ as to the motive which prompted him. The view that Judas through his more perfect ... penetrated the wish of Jesus more successfully than the others, and accomplished it by bringing Him to the Cross through which He effected redemption, is intrinsically the more probable ... So far as the moral character and conduct of the Cainites is concerned, there is no doubt that Irenaeus intended to represent them as shrinking from no vileness, but rather as deliberately practicing it ... It is held by several scholars that some Ophite sects date back into the pre-Christian era".

CAIN IN THE AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION

The American Standard Version of the Bible has had a lot of criticism, and maybe much of it rightly so, but there is one passage where they have it correct! That passage is Numbers 24:21,22. The numbers for Cain in the Hebrew Dictionary section of the *Strong's Concordance*

are 7014 or 7017, and whenever you find the word Kenite in the Bible, the numbers are identical to Cain. Now the *American Standard Version* spells it out quite well except it spells Cain with a K, or Kain. It should be noted that the Kenites, in this passage, made it safely well past Noah's flood. That will present a very big problem with many because of the way the flood account is taught today. Evidently everybody wasn't drowned in that flood. This passage, Numbers 24:21,22 reads: "21 *And he looked on the Kenite, and took up his parable, and said, Strong is thy dwelling-place, And thy nest is set in the rock. 22 Nevertheless **Kain** shall be wasted, Until Asshur shall carry thee away captive.*"

CAIN IN THE GOD'S WORD VERSION

GOD'S WORD is a copyrighted work of God's Word to the Nations Bible Society. Quotations are used by permission. Copyright 1995 by God's Word to the National Bible Society. All rights reserved. This version, Numbers 24:21,22 says: 21 *Then he saw the Kenite and delivered this message: 'You have a permanent place to live. Your nest is built in a rock. 22 But it is destined to be burned, you descendants of Cain, when Assyria takes you as prisoners of war.'* It is interesting to note that this version uses the word Cain instead of Kenite. Genesis chapter 3 is not very good in this version as it uses the word "snake." It is obvious, though, the translators had some working knowledge of the Hebrew as they used the correct transliteration for Cain. They would probably have done a better job on Genesis chapter 3 if they understood the Hebrew idioms better.

1ST JOHN 3:10-12 ON CAIN

This next passage, 1st John 3:10-12, is going to open up on this subject of Cain, and we are going to understand this war that is going on between the **seed** of the serpent and the **seed** of the woman. There may be some who will apply this passage in a spiritual way, but that is not correct. Satan has just as literal seed as the woman. Knowing that these descendants of Cain, or "Jews", are the children of the devil, we should expect them to act, look and think like devils. Just like a rattlesnake will naturally have all the characteristics of a rattlesnake, so a "Jew" will naturally have the characteristics of Satan. Now as we read this passage, we will see why Genesis 4:1 is so important, "*In this the children of Yahweh are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of Yahweh, neither he that loveth not his brother. 11 For this is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another. 12 Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his (1/2) brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were (naturally) evil, and his brother's (naturally) righteous.*"

At this point, don't let the term "children of God" confuse you. The children of God is the same as the seed of the woman! This is why it is so important to understand Genesis 4:1. The seed of the woman being the White race (including Yahshua Himself), and the seed of the serpent being the descendants of Cain who was fathered by Satan himself (which are known as "Jews" today). From all of this, we have a better idea just who the devil is.

This has completed the first part of this research which I wrote in 1995. The following is research which I put together later. I was attending some Identity meetings in Perrysburg, Ohio where I was loaned a ten tape series on audio cassette tapes entitled *Eve, Did She or Didn't She* by Ted R. Weiland. The more I listened to these tapes, the more disgusted I got. I decided right then and there to do a Bible study into the subject as I had never done before. The following materials are a product of this intensive research. This is a research which I will never complete, as I will continue to add more information to it as I discover new evidence which is related.

I was allowed to speak at one of meetings in Perrysburg, and the following are the notes I typed out as a guide to speak by. I cannot fill-in every thing which I said on this occasion, but from these notes will give you a general view of my presentation. You will have to remember that I put this together because of Ted R. Weiland's opposing views on the subject.

PRESENTATION ON THE TREES OF GENESIS

By: Clifton A. Emahiser

- ❖ Review how the subject of the idea of a sex connection with “Christ” (Yahshua) came about.
- ❖ Speaker was talking about the Ted R. Weiland series of audio tapes about *Eve, Did She, or Didn't She?*
- ❖ It was concluded that there had to be two seed lines, but there was a doubt whether there was a sex act committed on the part of Eve with Satan.
- ❖ The reason for such a conclusion was based on: if Eve eating of the “tree of knowledge of good and evil” was interpreted as Eve having sex with Satan, then, it would also mean that it would imply that it would be necessary to have the sex act with “the tree of life” which represents “Christ” (Yahshua), which would be ridiculous, ludicrous, absurd, unreasonable, preposterous and idiotic.
- ❖ Actually, this conclusion is absolutely correct **if** you are thinking in this vein, but that's the problem. That is thinking in the wrong vein.
- ❖ If we are to understand what the “tree of knowledge of good and evil” and “the tree of life” are, we are going to have to understand the Hebrew idioms.
- ❖ Explain what an idiom is:
 - Paint the town red.
 - Born with a silver spoon in mouth.
- ❖ Let's go to George M. Lamsa's *Idioms In The Bible Explained*.
- ❖ Who is George M. Lamsa? — read bottom of back cover.
- ❖ Read paragraph 1 of page ix of the Lamsa booklet.
- ❖ This is why we have 666 denominations of “Churches” today (each one with its own favorite idiom — some painting the town red and the others with a silver spoon in their mouth.)
- ❖ Explain how to find the idioms in the Strong's Concordance.
- ❖ Let's see what Lamsa has to say about “the tree of knowledge of good and evil” and “the tree of life”
 - Genesis 2:17, “The tree of good and evil”, *Metaphorically — sexual relationship*.
 - Genesis 2:9, “The tree of Life”, *Sex; posterity, progeny*.

- ❖ We can see here, then, both of these trees have an idiomatic connotation with sex. (And Lamsa didn't have an ax to grind here — he is just an expert on Bible idioms — he is not trying to prove anything.)
- ❖ The next thing we are going to do here is: explain about “the tree of life” and what it has to do with sex.
 - ⇒ We know that this “tree of life” represents Yahshua the Messiah. All agree on this one.
 - ⇒ We are going to use the backdoor approach on this one.
 - ⇒ We know that Yahshua was our kinsman Redeemer.
 - ⇒ We know that He was not only our brother kinsman, but He was also Yahweh (God) Himself. (All through the Bible, they call Him the “son of man” which means son of Adam.) Son of God and son of Adam, right?
 - ⇒ We know that when He died on the Cross (whatever kind of cross it was), it was “God's” own blood that He shed). The child does not get his blood from the mother, but makes his its own.
 - ⇒ To have shed “God's” blood, He would have had to be fathered by Yahweh Himself for He was Yahweh in the flesh of Adam man — the 2nd Adam.
 - ⇒ How do you think Mary's egg, with its 23 chromosomes was fertilized by Yahweh's own DNA and His 23 chromosomes if not for the fact that Mary's reproductive organs were affected — maybe not conventionally; nevertheless it did happen? (I have written on this subject recently as of 4-28-2000) **This is one of the major tenets of the “Christian” faith** — and there is nothing dirty about it! — and it was some type of reproductive organ contact, at least on Mary's part. If you are offended by this, complain to Lamsa. **Now we can understand the Hebrew idiom of Genesis 2:9!** Now we can understand what Lamsa's explained “sexual” connotations of the “tree of life” are all about! Now that we have strong evidence of it, let's consider the matter of the “tree of good and evil”, Genesis 2:17. The Hebrew meaning for the word “tree” in these instances means something firm or substantial. Its not talking about a fruit tree here!
 - ☆ **The serpent wasn't a snake!**
 - ☆ **The tree wasn't a wooden tree!**
- ❖ We know that the “tree of life” is a person or family member — so, also, is “the tree of the knowledge of good and evil” a person or family tree, (but not of our family). We have to consider the possible position that the “tree of knowledge” of good was Eve's sexual union with her husband, Adam. And the “tree of knowledge” of evil , was Eve's sexual union with Nachash (Satan), [Comment by W. E. T.].
- ❖ The Hebrew idiom here indicates that there was sexual contact with this family tree also.
- ❖ The “tree of knowledge of good and evil” is Satan and his family. He was practicing deceiving in the “garden” and he is still practicing deceiving today. His methods haven't changed since the “garden.” He is still calling evil good and good evil — he is still calling darkness light and light darkness — he is still calling bitter sweet and sweet bitter. Satan's lie was that eating of this forbidden “tree” would have a positive result while Yahweh warned that it would be deadly. Is this not calling evil good? This is Satan's M.O. (method of operation). Every criminal has his particular M.O. We can tell who Satan is today by his M.O.
- ❖ Let's take a look at Isaiah 5:20:

Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter.

- ❖ We don't have any trouble recognizing these people today because they are doing the same thing as in Genesis — they are “Jews.”
- ❖ We can recognize the serpents seed (children) today from the markings Yahweh put on them. One of these marks is this misrepresenting of good and evil, darkness and light, and bitter and sweet. Another two marks go back to Cain which identify him, while another one goes back to the serpent, Satan himself.
 - It is said of Cain, Genesis 4:12, *“the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength”*, so therefore you will never see a “Jewish” farmer — you never have and you never will.
 - It is said of Cain, Genesis 4:12, *“a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth”* and they have lived up to that one, too, with their tinkering trade, pawn shops, and gypsy life style.
 - It is said of the serpent, Genesis 3:14, *“dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.”* We know that an ordinary snake does not eat dust. It will eat insects or small animals, but not dust. The “Jew” started out selling what other people threw in the trash to amass his fortune. Today the “Jews” are still in the junkyard and landfill business. This is a mark that has been placed on the serpent “Jew” so we can recognize him — eating dust — the rust and oxidation of the junkyard would be the “dust.”
 - If we were to study the descendants of Cain as recorded in the Bible, we could recognize more items of identification that the “Jews” are the offspring of Cain — we really don't have to guess as to who these people are!
- ❖ Yes, both “the tree of knowledge of good and evil” and “the tree of life” have sexual connotations in the Hebrew idiom!
- ❖ Yes, the “Jews” of today are the descendants of Cain who was fathered by the sperm Satan!
- ❖ For further proof that the “Jews” of today are a Satanic seed line let's go to *The Lost Books Of The Bible and The Forgotten Books Of Eden*, The Protevangelion 10:1-10, and this is where Joseph becomes aware that Mary is pregnant with child (and this reference author doesn't have an ax to grind):

1 And when her sixth month was come, Joseph returned from his building houses abroad, which was his trade, and entering into the house, found the Virgin grown big: 2 Then smiting upon his face, he said, With what face can I look up to the Lord my God? or, what shall I say concerning this young woman? 3 For I received her a Virgin out of the temple of the Lord my God! and have not preserved her such! 4 Who has thus deceived me? Who has committed this evil in my house, and seducing the Virgin from me, hath defiled her? 5 Is not the history of Adam exactly accomplished in me? 6 For in the very instant of his glory, the serpent came and found Eve alone, and seduced her. 7 Just after the same manner it has happened to me. Then Joseph arising from the ground, called her, and said, O thou who hast been so much favoured by God, why hast thou done this? 9 Why hast thou thus debased thy soul, who wast educated in the Holy of Holies, and

received thy food from the hand of angels? 10 But she, with a flood of tears, replied, I am innocent, and have known no man.

- ❖ But you may say, “this book was not canonized.” — canonized by whom? — the Roman Catholic Church? Well what do they have to with it? Where or when does Yahweh give pagans the authority to “canonize” anything? And what does the Council of Nicaea have to do with it? By what authority did the Council of Nicaea have anything to say about what books were to be in the Bible and which ones were not? You have to understand that the Roman Catholic Church has never been a part of Yahshua’s Ekklesia. They have never been a part of the true “Church” even for one day — they have never been a part of the true “Church” for one hour — they have never been a part of the true “Church” for one minute — they have never been a part of the true “Church” for one second.
- ❖ Where was the true Ekklesia then? They were called Ebionites, Albigenses and Waldenses and they had their meetings in the catacombs, in the forest and in mountain caves and the Roman Catholic Church hunted them down like wild animals ready for the kill. They suffered many hardships. They were branded as heretics, their motives impugned, their characters maligned, their writings suppressed, misrepresented, or mutilated, yet they stood firm. Rome had nothing good to say about these people just as the media has nothing good to say about the Identity people of today!
- ❖ With all of this, if Eve indeed was seduced physically by Satan, then we have a mistranslation with Genesis 4:1. There just has to be something wrong with this passage. (Later on we will be getting into just what is amiss with it.) Let’s take a look at it:

And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Yahweh.

The word for Adam here is the word number 121 in the Strong’s Concordance. It says in the *Strong’s Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary* that number 121 is the same as 120. Let’s take a look at it and see if we can find anything:

*120 ... ’**ādām**, aw-dawm’ ; from 119, ruddy, i.e. a human being (an individual or the species, mankind, etc.): — X another, + hypocrite, + common sort, X low, man (meaning, of low degree), person.*

*121 ... ’**Ādām**, aw-dawm’ ; the same as 120; *Adam*, the name of the first man, also of a place in Palestine:— Adam.*

- ❖ Notice the two X’s here. This is telling you (by the Strong’s Concordance) that we are dealing with Hebrew idioms and we can not take it as it says — it can have an idiomatic hidden meaning in some cases. It can mean Adam — another — hypocrite — low — a low degree man.
- ❖ Could a scribe or translator, not knowing the Hebrew idiom, have translated it “Adam” instead of “another man (other than Adam) of low degree knew Eve and she conceived? I

believe possibly this is what we are dealing with! Or could it have been: Another in the place of Adam knew Eve his wife and she conceived?

- ❖ This study would not be complete if we did not check out what the rest of the Bible might have to say on these “trees” in “Eden.” Unless we take the time to understand these idioms, we are going to miss the entire message the Bible has to convey.
- ❖ If you have a King James Authorized Version of the Bible with the center column references, you will notice that for Genesis 2:9, it refers you to Ezekiel 31:8. I think you will find that this reference in Ezekiel will clear up what the trees in Genesis are all about. What we have here, in this reference, is Yahweh through the prophet, comparing Egypt with the Assyrian Empire. In doing so, the prophet uses several Hebrew idioms. The prophet refers to Assyria as a “cedar of Lebanon.” This “Assyrian” is described in idiomatic language as having “fair branches.” Further, the prophet speaks in idiomatic language of the “shadowing shroud” and the “high stature” of this cedar tree. Then, he again speaks in idiomatic language of the “waters” and “rivers” surrounding this cedar tree of Assyria. He speaks also idiomatically of the cedar having “an high stature” and “thick boughs”. Ezekiel further speaks idiomatically of “the fowls of heaven.” Also he uses a term idiomatically, “the beast of the field.” Also he speaks idiomatically of the “root” of this cedar. He also speaks idiomatically of “fir trees” and “chesnut trees.” **All these terms are idiomatic and cannot be understood unless we understand the Hebrew idiom, and this applies also to the “trees” of Genesis.** Now that we understand these terms are idiomatic, let’s read this passage from verses 3 to 12:

3 Behold, the Assyrian *was* a **cedar in Lebanon** with **fair branches**, and with a **shadowing shroud**, and of an **high stature**; and his top was among the **thick boughs**.
4 The **waters** made him great, the **deep** set him on high with her **rivers** running round about his **plants**, and sent out her **little rivers** unto all the **trees of the field**. 5 Therefore his height was exalted above all the **trees of the field**, and his **boughs** were multiplied, and his **branches** became long because of the **multitude of waters**, when he shot forth.
6 All the **fowls of heaven** made their nest in his boughs, and under his **branches** did all the **beast of the field** bring forth their young, and under his **shadow** dwelt all great nations. 7 Thus was he **fair** in his greatness, in the **length of his branches**: for his **root** was by **great waters**. 8 The **cedars** in **the garden of God** could not hide him: the **fir trees** were not like his boughs, and the **chesnut trees** were not like his **branches**; nor any **tree in the garden of God** was like unto him in his beauty. 9 I have made him fair by **the multitude of his branches**: so that all the **trees of Eden**, that *were* in **the garden of God** envied him. 10 Therefore thus saith the Yahweh; Because thou hast lifted up thyself in height, and he hath shot up his top among **the thick boughs**, and in his heart is lifted up to his height; 11 I have therefore delivered him into the hand of the mighty one of the heathen; he shall surely deal with him: I have driven him out for his wickedness. 12 And strangers, **the terrible of the nations**, have cut him off, and have left him: **upon the mountains** and in all **the valleys** his **branches** are fallen, and his **boughs** are broken by the **rivers of the land**; and all the people of the earth are gone down from his **shadow**, and have left him. (And the Hebrew idiom continues for the rest of the chapter.)

- ❖ All the above passage in bold type are Hebrew idioms. When we compare the “trees” of this passage, we can recognize that the trees of Genesis are also idioms.
- ❖ Let’s see here, then, what these idioms can mean:
 - Cedar — according to Lamsa, page 50, “Assyrian a cedar. *Ezk. 30:3. A great and tall people.*” (The following from my understanding, but based on the Bible.)
 - Branches — extensions of government.
 - Shadow — power of government.
 - Waters — people.
 - Rivers — racial streams (four flowing out of Eden?)
 - Thick boughs — might be highly populated areas.
 - Fowls of the heavens — the serpent seed line, Jews.
 - The beast of the field — possibly Negroids.

(In other words, the trees of the garden may have been racial trees, and the rivers were racial streams.) Question: How do you eat of a racial tree?

- ❖ Let’s check out the Hebrew meaning of the word “cedar.” It is the number 730 in the Strong’s Hebrew Dictionary:

730 'erez, ch '-rez; from 729; a cedar tree (from the tenacity of the roots): — cedar (trees).

- ❖ **It is important, here, to notice the word “cedar” in Hebrew means a wooden cedar tree!!! — so also are the trees of Eden!!! It is also important to notice that in the Hebrew idiom it means a people!!! It is important to understand that the Hebrew cannot always be taken literally as to what is actually being said in the Hebrew language!!! If you take the languages of the Bible simply in their linguistic meanings, not taking the idioms into account, you are not going to understand very much of the Bible!!!**
- ❖ Now we should take a look at the Hebrew word 729 as the word 730 above refers to it. I think you will be surprised as to its meaning:

729 'âraz, aw-raz”; a prime root; to be firm; used only in the passive particle as a denominative from 730; of cedar; — made of cedar.

- ❖ **“To be firm” — this is exactly what the word for “trees” means in the “garden” account of Genesis!!! It is obvious, we are talking about the same thing here in Ezekiel as in Genesis!!!**
- ❖ I looked into some various reference books and this is what I could find about the cedar tree as mentioned in the Bible:
 - The cedar tree grows to about 120 foot high.
 - The cedar tree was about 40 foot in girth (measured around the trunk).
 - They were called in the Bible “cedars of Lebanon.”
 - When young, the cedar tree is almost pyramid-shaped.
 - There are cedar trees today over 2,000 years old.

- The cedar tree has a very strong root system.
 - The branches and roots of the cedar tree have a tendency to spread out well.
 - The cedar tree is considered scientifically as a *Juniperus oxycedrus*, a magnificent evergreen tree.
 - Because the cedar tree was an evergreen tree, ever-bearing and life giving in that they produce food and medicine, they are considered a juxtaposition (to put side by side — meaning compare to) of the “tree of life.”
 - The cedar tree is a solid tree free from knots which is why it was a good material for construction of the Temple.
 - The cedar was used in purification in connection with the scarlet and hyssop.
- ❖ **From all of this, we can have a better idea of what the “tree of life” and the “tree of knowledge of good and evil” are all about!!!**
- ❖ **And here we have this Ted R. Weiland saying that the “tree of life” was the law, and when Eve ate of it, it brought on death!!! — that the “enmity” between “thy seed and her seed” of Genesis 3:15 is the enmity between the “flesh and the spirit.” In other words, the flesh represents a seed line. What Ted R. Weiland is doing is separating verse 15 from 14 as if it didn’t exist. Yahweh is directing His message to the “serpent” not the “flesh.” Let’s read it all Ted:**

14 And Yahweh said to the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: 15 And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

Let’s read it now as Ted R. Weiland would have us to read it:

And the LORD God said to Eve’s flesh, Because thou hast done this, thy flesh is cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; and thy flesh shall go upon its belly, and dust shalt thy belly eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between the flesh of the woman and the spirit of the woman, and between the offspring of her flesh and the offspring of her spirit, and the offspring of her spirit shall bruise the head of the offspring of her flesh, and the offspring of her flesh will bruise the heel of the offspring of her spirit. (The Gospel according to Ted R. Weiland.)

POSTSCRIPT TO “PRESENTATION ON THE TREES OF GENESIS”

By: Clifton A. Emahiser

On June 22, 1997 I gave a presentation on the “Trees of Genesis.” In this presentation, I tried to prove the Satanic seedline by the Hebrew idiom. That the Hebrew wording does in fact indicate a wooden tree, but the Hebrew idiom suggest a sexual connotation. That, in fact, Satan seduced Eve and the product of that seduction was Cain, the father of the present day “Jews.” I

used George M. Lamsa's booklet, *"Idioms In The Bible Explained"*, as evidence that the "trees" of Genesis did have a sexual meaning in the Hebrew idiom. I used several illustrations of the Bible that help identify the Satanic seedline. I quoted from *The Lost Books Of The Bible and The Forgotten Books Of Eden*, The Protevangelion 10:1-10, that it was understood by Joseph (husband of Mary) that Satan did indeed physically seduce Eve. I further stated that I believed that Genesis 4:1 was a mistranslation (The date is now 4-28-2000, and I am updating this information. I wrote this postscript and presented it in printed form to the people at the meeting in Perrysburg, Ohio June 29, 1997. By this time, I was wearing out my welcome, so I didn't ask to speak again, but I didn't drop the subject!):

And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from Yahweh.

I based this on the meanings of the Hebrew words 120 and 121 in the Strong's Concordance which are two of the three Hebrew words for Adam. I explained that when you see an "X" used in the definition of a word that Strong's Concordance is indicating you are dealing with an idiomatic usage. Let's look at it again:

120 '**âdâm**, aw-dawm' ; from 119, *ruddy*, i.e. a *human being* (an individual or the species, *mankind*, etc.): — X another, + hypocrite, + common sort, X low, man (meaning, of low degree), person.

121 '**Âdâm**, aw-dawm' ; the same as 120; *Adam*, the name of the first man, also of a place in Palestine:— Adam.

Notice the two X's here. This is telling you that we might be dealing with Hebrew idioms and we cannot necessarily take it as it says literally — it has a possible idiomatic hidden meaning in some cases. It can mean Adam — another — hypocrite — low — a low degree man. Could a scribe or translator, not knowing the Hebrew idiom, have translated it "Adam" instead of "another" man other than Adam of low degree knew Eve and she conceived? I believe that this is what we are possibly dealing with! Or could it have been: Another in the place of Adam knew Eve his wife and she conceived?

When I was presenting this scenario of this passage, the thought came to me, Wouldn't it be great if I could find another passage of Scripture where the number 120 or 121 meant another man other than Adam? Later, while looking through my Hebrew reference books, I found such a Scripture (in fact, I found two). I found them in the *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament* by H. W. F. Gesenius on page 13. It is short, but this is what it says:

(a) for other men, the rest of mankind, as opposed to those in question; Jer. 32:20.

Let's take a look here at this passage which uses the word Strong's number 120, *aw-dawm'*, as "another" rather than an Adamite, Jeremiah 32:20. This passage is not about the same subject, but is an example of how Genesis 4:1 could read with an alternative idiomatic meaning:

*Which hast set signs and wonders in the land of Egypt, even unto this day, and in Israel, and **among other men**; and hast made thee a name as at this day.*

You will notice here that it is definitely not talking about Israelite “men”, but yet it is the number 120. It would have been very easy for some scribe or translator, not knowing the Hebrew idiom, to have made a mistake here. You will also notice that the King James translators were aware that it was not talking about Israelites or Adamic men as they specified **other** in italics in this case.

The *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament* makes another reference in which “men” #120 is speaking of **other “men”** rather than Israelites. This passage is Isaiah 43:4:

*Since thou (Israel) wast precious in my sight, thou hast been honourable, and I have loved thee: therefore will I give **men** for thee, and people for thy life.*

Here, again, #120 is used for someone other than Israelite men. Inasmuch as the word 120 is used in these two examples for **another man/men**, there is no reason that the same thing could not have been done in Genesis 4:1. As a matter of fact, for the Bible to be consistent in all other references on this topic, **it must be translated as “another man.”** [Comment by W. E. T.: Since in both of the above cites the contrast was to Israel, not to Adamites. I still agree with your basic premise.]

THE GENEALOGY OF ADAM

Here are a couple of more provoking afterthoughts which I should have pointed out in my presentation. (1) Why did Eve indicate, Genesis 4:25, that Yahweh appointed another seed in Abel's place? — Why was not Seth appointed as "another seed" in place of Cain? Let's read this passage:

*And Adam knew his wife again; and she bare a son, and called his name Seth:
For God, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead of (in place of) Abel,
whom Cain slew.*

This verse should at once alert us there is something wrong with Genesis 4:1, — an alarm should be going off in your brain! Cain, as a seed, is totally left out of the picture here except in the fact that he was the one who murdered "righteous" Abel. **Seth was a replacement for Abel, not Cain!!! — this should be telling you something!!!** This does not square with Genesis 4:1! (2) Genesis, chapter 5, gives the Genealogy of Adam from him to Shem, Ham and Japheth, and Cain is not mentioned once! — **Why???** Other genealogies in the Bible go into great detail and never leave out a son! — **Why is Cain left out???** **Cain's descendants are mentioned separately in Genesis 4:17-24 and it doesn't list Adam as the father of Cain!!! — WHY???**

POSTSCRIPT #2, TO "PRESENTATION ON THE TREES OF GENESIS"

By: Clifton A. Emahiser

SUMMARIZATION

(Before I get started with this postscript presentation, I should give you an update as to when I presented this material. It was sometime in July 1997 to the same group in Perrysburg, Ohio. If I remember correctly, it was the very next week. I knew they were tiring of the Two Seedline message, so I didn't ask to speak again. I printed up the material pretty much as presented here and passed it out to each one attending. Not only did I present this material to them, but I passed out several cassette tapes by Bertrand L. Comparet and Wesley A. Swift (mainly on Two Seedline). Some of the group appreciated this very much.)

Up to this point I have written or presented:

- ❖ "The Problem With Genesis 4:1."
- ❖ "Presentation On The Trees Of Genesis."
- ❖ Postscript To "Presentation On The Trees Of Genesis."

The items I covered in these written articles and presentations are as follows:

- In the article, “The Problem With Genesis 4:1”, I broke down every word to its Hebrew and Greek meanings.
- I showed how the Septuagint (LXX) could not necessarily be trusted. (I gave a short history of it from the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and the *Dictionary Of The New Testament* by Hastings.)
- I showed how the enemies of Yahweh could have forged both the Septuagint and Masoretic text.
- I further showed how the Bible is written purposely in parables, allegories, symbols, proverbs, adages, similtudes and metaphors, and how, if we didn’t understand them, we can not understand what the Bible is saying.
- I went into detail on Genesis 3:13 and showed how on the breakdown of the Hebrew — that it actually meant that Eve was physically seduced and she did lay with Satan.
- I showed further how the Hebrew idiom of “The Tree Of Knowledge Of Good And Evil” and “The Tree Of Life” had sexual idiomatic meanings.
- I showed the importance of understanding Genesis 4:25 — that Seth was appointed as a seed to replace Abel rather than Cain.
- I pointed out (and I am going to say more on this here) how the names of Cain and Abel were reversed in Scripture.
- I pointed out some of the fingerprints of Cain and how we can recognize him today.
- I pointed out how the Scriptures continued to speak of the descendants of Cain as Kenites and Rechabites and gave some examples.
- I showed how the Hebrew word Adam, #120, can mean “another” man in some cases and showed how this could affect translation.
- I gave the history with some interesting remarks of a sect called “Cainites” which seem to be the descendants of Cain.
- I showed how the *American Standard Version* and The *God’s Word* version of the Bible had translated correctly the “Kenite” as Kain or Cain.
- I concluded that the seed of the woman was the White race and the seed of the serpent were the “Jews” and the enmity between the two was still here today in a race war.

On my presentation of June 22, 1997, I talked on the following subjects:

- I reviewed how the subject of the Two Seedline, with Satan seducing Eve came up and its attempted refutation by Ted R. Weiland.
- I explained how it was necessary to understand the Hebrew idioms in order to understand the Two Seedline truth.
- I explained what the idioms of “ The Tree Of Knowledge Of Good And Evil” and “The Tree Of Life” meant according to an expert, George M. Lamsa.
- I went on to show how the “Tree Of Life” had sexual connotations with the union of “God” and “man” in the Virgin birth, (a major tenet of the “Christian faith”).
- I went on to show that these “trees” were family trees and not wooden trees.
- I pointed out that Satan’s lie was the misrepresentation of good as evil and evil as good which he is still doing today.

- I pointed out that you can know a “Jew” by the fact that he is not a farmer but a vagabond who deals in trash and junk which the Bible calls “dust.”
- I read from *The Lost Books Of The Bible and The Forgotten Books Of Eden*, The Protevangelion chapter 10, verses 1 through 10 where it describes Mary’s pregnancy with that of Eve’s seduction, Joseph accusing the blessed Virgin of infidelity.
- Then I showed how Genesis 4:1 may be a mistranslation in that the Hebrew number 120 can sometimes mean “another” man other than Adamic.
- I further pointed out how to recognize idioms in the Strong’s Concordance.
- I referred to Ezekiel 38:3-12 as it is a good example of how the Bible uses the term “tree.” The King James center reference even points to this passage from Genesis 2:9 as it speaks of “the cedars in the garden of God” and “the trees of Eden.” (If you have a King James Version Bible with the proper center reference, you can very readily prove Two Seedline teaching with it, for it will take you from one supporting verse of Scripture to another almost endlessly on the subject. Not that the KJV is an especially advisable Bible to use for study, as it is alleged to contain approximately 27,000 translation mistakes. This KJV center reference system I am referring to was produced by the opinions of many contributing scholars and theologians. Most of the older Bibles have this proper center reference system. I have a KJV published by The World Publishing Company during the mid 50’s which has the proper center reference system. I checked a World Bible recently at a Christian book store, and it had been changed from the one which I have. I also have a large Southwestern Bible which has the correct center reference system. I understand some of the Bibles printed by Dove Inc., Nashville, TN have the correct center reference also. Today you can purchase a KJV *Zondervan Classic Reference Bible* with the correct center reference system. If you already have a KJV with a center reference, you can check the following passages to see if you have the right one: See (1) if Rev. 12:9 takes you to Gen. 3:1, 4; Rev. 20:2; Rev. 20:3; Rev. 9:1, (2) if Gen. 3:1 takes you to Rev. 12:9; 2 Cor. 11:3 or (3) if Jude 6 takes you to John 8:44; 2 Pet. 2:4; Rev. 20:10. If you find these center references in your present KJV, chances are you have the correct center reference system. Beware of Nelson, Universal or Scofield.
- Then I went on to describe that the word “cedar” in Hebrew means “firm” like the “trees” in Eden.

In my “Postscript To “Presentation On The Trees Of Genesis”, I brought up the following:

- I reviewed generally the “Presentation On The Trees Of Genesis.”
- I quoted Genesis 4:1 again.
- I reviewed the Hebrew meanings of the word “Adam”, #120 and #121 again.
- I pointed out that when you see an “X” in the Strong’s Hebrew Dictionary, you are dealing with an idiomatic usage.
- I showed some instances where the word for Adam can mean someone other than an Adamic-Israelite (and showed two examples).
- I ask the question: Why did Eve indicate that Seth was a replacement for Abel and not Cain?

- I ask the question: Why was Cain left out of Adam's genealogy if he had fathered him?

Now that we have reviewed all of this forgone material, let's get on with "Postscript #2, To "Presentation On The Trees Of Genesis."

CAIN DISQUALIFIED AS FIRSTBORN

Hardly had Cain been born than he was put in second place. Many writers and commentators point out the fact that in Genesis 4:2, the order is changed from "Cain and Abel" to "Abel and Cain." We have to ask the question, then, Why would this be? Cain had not murdered Abel yet, so we can't say that was the cause. Moses was writing this, and why would he change the order of the names? You will remember that Reuben was disqualified from being the firstborn for an impropriety with his one of Jacob's wives and was replaced with Joseph. The order of Esau and Jacob was reversed to Jacob and Esau, Genesis 25:23. Being that Cain was fathered by Satan would be enough to disqualify him for the position of firstborn, or priest of the family! Let's read Genesis 4:1-2 to see how this reads:

*1 And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and **bare Cain**, and said, I have gotten a man from Yahweh. 2 And she again **bare his brother Abel**. And **Abel** was a keeper of sheep, but **Cain** was a tiller of the ground.*

WHY, THEN, WAS CAIN DISQUALIFIED AS FIRSTBORN?

In verse 7 of this same chapter, the subject of the birthright is brought up. Let's read verses 6 and 7 to see it:

*6 And Yahweh said unto Cain, Why art thou wrath? and why is thy countenance fallen? 7. If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. **And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.***

You can see here it is speaking about the birthright quite plainly! As Cain was the firstborn, he would be in line for the family priesthood as well as the inheritance. We are talking about big stakes here! There is more to this than just the acceptance of the sacrifices. Cain evidently wanted to kill Abel all along for losing his position as firstborn and used the rejected sacrifice for an excuse to justify it.

Secondly, there is something here that should stand out conspicuously to everyone who reads it, and that is: "*If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door.*" What does this mean, "**and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door???**" A lot of people try to read this as if Cain had a choice in the matter. That is not at all what it is saying! What is it saying then? Yahweh through Moses is speaking of Cain's conception and birth here — his natural tendency toward sin as a result of the character of his father. Cain's conception was therefore his "door." Yahweh knew that he couldn't "do well" and wasn't fit for

the birthright and He told him as much!!! Let's see what the words "sin", "lieth" and "door" mean in the Hebrew:

Sin — #2403 **chattâ'âh**, khat-taw-aw ' ; or **chattâ'th**, khat-tawth' ; from 2398; an *offence* (sometimes habitual *sinfulness*), and its penalty, occasion, sacrifice, or expiation; also (concretely) an *offender*: — punishment (of sin), purifying (-fication for sin), sin (-er, offering).

Lieth — #7257 **râbats**, raw-bats': a prime root; to crouch (on all four legs folded, like a recumbent animal); by implication to *recline, repose, brood, lurk, imbed*: — crouch (down), fall down, make a fold, lay, (cause to, make to) lie (down), make to rest, sit. (This probably is the root of our English word, rabbits.)

Door — #6607 **pethach**, peh'-thakh; from 6605; an *opening* (literally), i.e. door (gate) or *entrance way*: door, entering (in), entrance (ry), gate, opening, place.

In other words, Cain's opening passage into the entrance of life was his conception and birth — the word here refers to #6605 which means to *open wide* or *break forth*. Thus we can see the implication here of conception and birth. The word here for sin means *habitual sinfulness* like in Isaiah 3:9:

*The shew of their countenance doth witness against them; and they declare **their sin** as Sodom, they hide it not. Woe unto their soul! for they have rewarded evil unto themselves.*

The word sin here is the same as used in "**sin lieth at the door.**" There is another word which will illustrate just what Cain's "door" was and we will key on the word "bare" in Genesis 4:1 "*and she conceived, and **bare** Cain.*" The Hebrew definition for the word "bare" sheds some light on the term "door." The Strong's number for the word "**bare**" is #3205. **BARE** #3205 Hebrew, to bear young; causative to beget; medically to act as midwife; specifically to show lineage:— bear, beget, birth ([-day]), born, (make to) bring forth (children, young), bring up, calve, child, come, be delivered (of a child), time of delivery, gender, **hatch**, labor, (do the office of a) midwife, declare pedigrees, be the son of, (woman in, woman that) travail (-eth, -ing woman). I will not dwell on the entire definition, but just to say that one of the words used to define "bare" is the word "**hatch.**" The word "**hatch**" in English means "**to emerge from an egg.**" In other words, Yahweh is indicating to Cain that if he didn't do well, it was because of his satanic birth (or sin lieth in Cain's genetics). Cain did indeed **emerge from Satan's fertilized egg of Eve** and that was his "**door**", his **door to life**. What other kind of door did you expect it was?

If we understand the sin of Sodom, then we understand the sin of the serpent and his offspring, Cain!!! The word "*lieth*" means to crouch (sin is lurking in a resting position ready to lurch out) — *the Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament* says, page 755, (a) *used of a beast of prey lying in wait*, and also, *Gen. 4:7 (and indulgest in secret hatred) ... i.e. sin will always be a liar in wait at the door for thee, like a wild beast, lying at thy door.* All "Jews" have

this secret hatred lying in a crouched position ready to spring like a roaring lion at an unsuspecting victim.

The Wycliff Bible Commentary, Editors: Charles F. Pfeiffer & Everett F. Harrison has this to say on page 8, and this quote will cover Genesis 3:14-15:

14. Cursed (*arûr*) art thou. *The Lord singled out the originator and instigator of the temptation for special condemnation and degradation. From that moment he must crawl in the dust and even feed on it. He would slither his way along in disgrace, and hatred would be directed against him from all directions. Man would always regard him as a symbol of the degradation of the one who had slandered God (cf. Isa 65:25). He was to represent not merely the serpent race, but the power of the evil kingdom. As long as life continued, men would hate him and seek to destroy him.* **15. I will put enmity.** *The word 'êbâ denotes the blood-feud that runs deepest in the heart of man (cf. Num 35:19,20; Ezk 25:15-17; 35:5,6). **Thou shalt bruise** (*shûp*). A prophecy of continuing struggle between the descendants of woman and of the serpent to destroy each other. The verb *shûp* is rare (cf. Job 9:17; Ps 139:11). It is the same in both clauses. When translated crush, it seems appropriate to the reference concerning the head of the serpent, but not quite so accurate in describing the attack of the serpent on man's heel. It is also rendered lie in wait for, aim at or (LXX) watch for. The Vulgate renders it conteret, "bruise" in the first instance and insidiaberis, "lie in wait," in the other clause. Thus, we have in this famous passage, called the protevangelium, "first gospel," the announcement of a prolonged struggle perpetual antagonism, wounds on both sides, and eventual victory for the seed of woman. God's promise that the head of the serpent was to be crushed pointed forward to the coming of Messiah and guaranteed victory. This assurance fell upon the ears of God's earliest creatures as a blessed hope of redemption.*

You can see here, by these comments, that I was not using the Hebrew incorrectly with the words "sin", "lieth" and "door." Sin was not something Cain chose but sin chose Cain — he got it from his father, Satan. It just came natural to him.

Now let's pick up on the reference of Isaiah 65:25 which was mentioned by *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary* above:

The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock: and dust shall be the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith Yahweh.

This is all idiom. Lamsa says this of the "serpent" here: "*The oppressor shall be reduced to poverty; humbled.* Lamsa says the "wolf" and "lamb" means: *A dictatorship and a meek nation trading and living together in peace.* It becomes quite apparent here that it is important to understand what these Hebrew idioms mean. I believe, though, the "serpent" will not only be reduced to poverty, but completely destroyed as there are Scriptures to indicate that this will happen. The "serpent" here in the King James Version center reference column (noted before)

takes us back to Genesis 3:14 on this one, so we know who this serpent is. We don't have to guess.

THE CENTER REFERENCE OF THE KJV ON GENESIS 3:15

For those who think that the King James Version of the Bible is the only inspired word of "God", let's take a look at it here. Some believe that every single word in the King James Version is inspired and has come down to us without error. While I have a high regard for the KJV, I do not look upon it in such a way for there are errors. I do believe, though, its coming to us was the work of the Almighty. I believe that there is inspiration in it. I also believe there is inspiration in the center reference column if you have the right one, which I mentioned before. So, at this point, I am going to use this center reference column to see what Scriptures are referred to by Genesis 3:15 and we will quote them here:

John 8:44

Ye are of your father the devil, and the lust of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there was no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.

Acts 13:10

And said, O full of all subtilty and mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Yahweh?

1 John 3:8

He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose Yahshua was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.

Isaiah 7:14

Therefore Yahshua himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.

Luke 1:31,33, 35

31 And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Yahshua. ... 33 And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end. ... 35 And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.

Romans 16:20

And Yahshua of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly. The grace of our Yahshua Anointed be with you. Amen.

Revelation 12:7

And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels.

A couple of these references didn't apply but the others did. Notice here Acts 13:10 in particular. Notice the words, "O full of all subtilty", as this is giving the very nature of Satan himself — as the father so the child — that is, the "child of the devil." How much plainer do you want it to be? Now these are the reference Scriptures found in center column the (proper) King James Version of the Bible on Genesis 3:15. If you have a quarrel with them, take it up with who ever put them there — it wasn't me, but I think they are right! It should be quite evident that Genesis 3:15 is the main theme of the Bible — that there is a war going on between the seed of the woman and the seed of Satan — that it is Yahweh and His seed against Satan and his seed — that it is the family "tree" of Yahweh against the family "tree" of Satan. You are personally involved in this very war every day of you life.

Another Scripture found in the KJV is Revelation 12:9 which identifies the Satanic seed of Genesis 3:15. It uses the terms "great dragon", "old serpent", "the Devil" and "Satan." John of Revelation uses all of these names so we won't get mixed up in identifying who it is talking about. He is called by all these names and two more, "vipers" and "Lucifer." It is interesting, here in this verse 9 of the 12th chapter of Revelation, as in the center reference it takes you to is Genesis 3:1,4. Let's read Revelation 12:9 and compare it with Genesis 3:1,4:

Revelation 12:9

*And the great **dragon** was cast out, the old **serpent**, called the **Devil**, and **Satan**, which deceived the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him.*

Genesis 3:1, 4

*Now the **serpent** was more subtil than any beast of the field which Yahweh had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath Yahweh said, Ye shall not eat of every **tree** of the garden? ... 4 And the **serpent** said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die.*

So, at this point, we have a direct connection between the "serpent", "dragon", "Devil" and "Satan" of Revelation 12:9 and the "serpent" of Genesis 3:1, 4. Now let's take up the word "viper." We will read Matthew 3:7-10:

*7 But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, **O generation of vipers**, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? 8 Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: 9 And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to *our* father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. 10 **And now also the ax is laid unto the root of the trees:** ("Jew's" family tree) **therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.***

It is interesting to note here that one of the “trees” spoken of in Matthew 3:10 takes you to “the tree of knowledge of good and evil, in Genesis as *The Treasury of Scripture Knowledge* (which is also a very good reference guide book) takes you to Genesis 3:13, and we will read it:

*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.*

Now we know that John the Baptist was speaking of laying the ax to the root of “the tree of knowledge of good and evil” representing the Pharisees and Sadducees which were “Jews”, descendants of Cain fathered by Satan!

SETH KEEPS LEVIRATE LAW

We read in Genesis 4:25 the following:

*And Adam knew his wife again; and she bare a son, and called his name Seth: For Yahweh, *said she*, hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew.*

We should see right away, here, that Cain is left totally out of the picture — he is not even considered! Yes, Cain was born first and was in line for the birthright, but he was disqualified because he was a mamzer (a bastard). This is why the names of Cain and Abel are reversed in Genesis 4:2! This made Abel officially the firstborn **of Adam**. Then Abel was murdered by Cain leaving no official children. It is the Law that a younger brother is to raise up seed to his childless brother. That is why Genesis 4:25 says: *God hath appointed another seed instead of (or in place of) Abel*. Rousas John Rushdoony in his book, *The Institute Of Biblical Law* has this to say about the levirate Law, page 375-377:

***The Levirate**, Mace observed, concerning “the true cause of Hebrew polygamy”, that “There can be no doubt that this was the desire for an heir.” This is true if we realize that the desire for an heir was more than simply a love of a son. The family was basic to Biblical society and culture; the godly family had to be perpetuated, and the ungodly family cut off. The bastard was cut off from church, and state, insofar as any legal status was concerned, to the tenth generation (Deut. 23:2). He might be a godly man, but he was not a citizen. In cannon law, “the church” [sic] barred bastards from church orders, although exceptions were made by papal dispensations. The purpose of Hebrew polygamy, which was usually bigamy, to be accurate, was thus the perpetuation of the family. Moreover, in terms of the facts, as Mace pointed out, “we are bound to envisage the community as being in general almost entirely monogamous.” ... The one exception permitted is the law of the levirate (Deut. 25:5-10). According to the law, if a man died childless, his next of kin had the duty to take the widow as wife and rear up a family bearing the name of the dead man. This law was older than Moses, and was applied in Judah’s household (Gen. 38:8).*

We can see here that it was not only the honorable thing for Seth to raise up seed for Abel, but it was his duty as next of kin to do so. Cain was not next of kin, therefore all you would have gotten would have been more bastards.

LEGAL STATUS

I believe that some of the confusion over Genesis 4:1 is a misunderstanding of legal status! Have you ever read a legal contract where they would use the terms, “party of the first part”, “party of the second part”, “party of the third part” etc.? This is done so someone in the contract doesn’t get mixed up with another person which could be disastrous for all other parties in the contract. Let’s apply this same method with the Bible. Let’s apply it this way:

- ⇒ Satan, party of the first part.
- ⇒ Eve, party of the second part.
- ⇒ Adam, party of the third part.
- ⇒ Cain, party of the fourth part.
- ⇒ Abel, party of the fifth part.
- ⇒ Seth, party of the sixth part.

Genesis 3:13, *And the woman said (party of the second part) The serpent (party of the first part) beguiled me (party of the second part), and I (party of the second part) did eat.* Genesis 4:1, *And Adam (party of the third part) knew Eve his wife (party of the second part); and she (party of the second part) conceived, and bare Cain (party of the fourth part); and said, I have gotten a man (party of the fourth part) from the LORD.* Genesis 4:2 *And she (party of the second part) bare his brother Abel (party of the fifth part).* Genesis 4:25 *And Adam (party of the third part) knew Eve his wife again (party of the second part); and she (party of the second part) bare a son (party of the sixth part), and called his name Seth (party of the sixth part): for God, said she (party of the second part), hath appointed me another seed (party of the sixth part) instead of Abel (party of the fifth part), whom Cain (party of the fourth part) slew.*

If we understand that Eve was already pregnant by Satan when Adam knew her, Genesis 4:1 would be correct in saying that “Adam knew Eve his wife.”, and then, “she conceived [Abel] and bare Cain.” You will notice that it doesn’t say that Abel was conceived! This is important! The sequence of events are like this: Satan seduced Eve and got her pregnant. Then Adam knew Eve and fertilized an extra egg that didn’t get fertilized by Satan. Then Eve bare Cain fathered by Satan firstly. Then Eve bare Abel fathered by Adam secondly. If we can understand this chain of events, then we can understand the reading of Genesis 4:1!

HOW DID ADAM EAT OF THE TREE?

This is a much asked question. We are told that Adam was not deceived as Eve was. I found an interesting statement in a book entitled *The Works Of Philo*, translated by C. D. Yonge, page 57:

But take notice that the man says that the woman gave it to him; but that the woman does not say that the serpent gave it to her, but that he beguiled her; for it is the especial property of the outward sense to give, but it is the attribute of pleasure which is of a diversified and serpent-like nature to deceive and to beguile.

I believe we are going to have to take a legal look at this thing if we are going to understand it. When Adam learned that Eve had been unfaithful to him, his legal responsibility would have been to put Eve away as Joseph thought to do in Mary's case. In this case, Eve would have had a trial and probably have been stoned to death whereupon Yahweh would have had to have made provisions for another wife for Adam. Evidently Adam loved Eve so much that he decided to keep Eve as his wife in spite of the outcome. I am sure that there has been many a husband that has made a similar decision, (and wives for that matter). Adam, then, partook of the tree by "knowing" Eve after Satan had defiled her! This is not lawful. Adam rightly should have divorced her. I think though, if I were in Adam's place, I would probably have done that same thing as Adam did.

WHAT KIND OF A SEDUCTION?

There are some who try to indicate that the "seduction" of Eve was only a matter of mere "mental deception" on Satan's part. While it is true that Eve was deceived in word, it is also true that Eve was physically sexually violated, and I am going to show evidence of it. We can read the account of this in 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.

Now the word "eat" here is from the Hebrew word #398, and one of its meanings is "lay." In other words, Eve was telling Yahweh, here, that "*The serpent beguiled me, and I did lay.*" At this point you may still not believe me. Well, in the proper center reference system of the KJV it refers us to 2 Corinthians 11:3 and 1 Timothy 2:14. Now both of these shed light on the situation, but 2 Corinthians 11:3 is simply outstanding! In order to understand verse 3, we are going to have to read from verse 1 through 3. Before we read it though, let's preview it just a little. We find Paul here in a state that he wishes to brag about his ministry — we all like to do that occasionally. Paul was probably a little proud of himself for doing such a good job of presenting the gospel to these Corinthians, but at the same time, he warns them that someone might come along to undo all that he had done. Now Paul is concerned about someone subverting their minds such as Eve's was, but the way it is stated there can be no doubt that Eve was also physically seduced. Let's read it:

*1 Would to God Ye could bear with me a little in ~~my~~ folly: and indeed bear with me.
2 For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: **for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as as chaste virgin to Yahshua** 3 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.*

Now I know Paul is speaking of mental seduction here, but at the same time he is comparing this mental seduction to Eve's physical seduction or why even bring up the idea of a "chaste virgin"? In other words, Eve was a "chaste virgin" until Satan physically seduced her. **There is no possible way Satan could have taken away Eve's virginity through mental seduction alone!!!!!!** Of course, if you don't understand that Israel was divorced by Yahweh, and that the

only way He could remarry her was by his dying according to the Law, you will not understand why it is important that we become as “chaste virgins” so He can remarry us — but Redemption is another story. The other center reference of the KJV on Genesis 3:13 is 1 Timothy 2:14:

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

You will notice what I said previously — that his part was in accepting Eve and consummating his marriage to her in her defiled condition. Now two of the center references of 2 Corinthians 11:3 leads to Genesis 3:4 and John 8:44. Maybe Ted R. Weiland doesn't have a center reference in his Bible, or maybe he has the wrong center reference system. Now John 8:44 is a **direct connection** between the **serpent** and his **children**, the **Pharisees** and **Sadducees!!!**

John 8:44

*Ye are of *your* father the devil, and the lust of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there was no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.*

Genesis 3:4

And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die.

It is interesting here with Genesis 3:4 for the center reference takes us right back to 2 Corinthians 11:3, so this verse is the mental seduction of Eve leading up to her physical seduction. Now we are presented with another interesting situation as the center reference of the KJV on John 8:44 takes us to Jude 6:

And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.

1

We know from this that Satan is an angel who left his own habitation and seduced Eve and produced what we know today as “Jews”!!! Satan cohabited with Eve!!! Cain and the “Jews” are mutations of this union!!!

“TREE OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND EVIL” AND THE “SERPENT” THE SAME THING

The center reference of the KJV for the verse Genesis 2:17 takes us to Genesis 3:1. Let's take a look and see how it fits:

Genesis 2:17

But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

1

Genesis 3:1

Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which Yahweh had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath Yahweh said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?

Now these two scriptures are referred to each other by the center reference of the KJV. I didn't put them there, so if you don't like them, don't come to me. I did some other writing on this subject so I will insert it at this point:

There are three Scriptures to support the idea that Satan sexually seduced Eve:

- ❖ 2nd Corinthians 11:3
- ❖ 1st Timothy 2:13-14
- ❖ 1st John 3:12

I will now quote these with changes to help understand the Greek wording and other implications:

2nd Corinthians 11:3:

*But I fear, lest by any means, as Satan beguiled (#1818 Greek, wholly seduced) Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the purity which is *due* Christ.*

1st Timothy 2:13-14:

For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived (#538 Greek, seduced into error completely), but the woman being deceived (#538 Greek, seduced into error completely) was in the transgression (of the Law).

1st John 3:12:

*Not as Cain, *who* was of that wicked one (#4190 Greek, devil or evil one) and slew his (half) brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were (naturally) evil, and his (half) brother's (naturally) righteous.*

You will notice I have included the Strong's numbers for the Greek words. The words 1818 and 538 can mean, to deceive or seduce mentally or sexually, but here the meaning is to "fully seduce" which would mean both mentally and sexually.

Then there is the Greek word #4190. This is one of those words that can mean many things. There are several levels of meaning. You will notice that I have highlighted the important meanings especially the meanings found in *The Complete Word Study Dictionary, New Testament* by Spiros Zodhiates, TH.D., pages 207; 600, 1198-1199.

#538 Greek, (p. 207) "... from *apate* (539), deceit. To deceive, bring, or seduce into error ... as a device to mislead another ... When it comes to Eve, the woman, it is *exapatetheisa*, the aorist (an "aorist" is used to develop the nucleus or backbone of the story) passive participle, feminine of *exapatao* (1818) to deceive completely ... speaking of the serpent deceiving Eve, it is the compound verb that is used, *exepatesen*, thoroughly deceived. In the mind of Paul, when Satan directly deals with man[kind], he endeavors to thoroughly deceive. This Satan did to Eve while she simply deceived (*epaitsen*) her husband in persuading him to eat ..."

#1818 Greek, (p. 600) "... *exapatao*; contracted *exapato*, future *exapateso*, from *ek* (1537), an intensive, and *apatao* (538), to seduce, deceive. To deceive completely, beguile, seduce, meaning to lead out of the right way into error ..."

#1490 Greek, (p. 1198) "*poneros* ... Evil in a **moral** or spiritual sense, wicked, malicious, mischievous ..."

The basic thing we should know from the above is that Adam was not deceived in the same sense as Eve. It was Satan who deceived Eve. It was Eve who deceived Adam and the Greek words used are different. Now we come to something interesting as the word "wicked", #4190, is used similarly in the parable of the sower to mean the "evil one", "Satan" or "wicked" in Matthew chapter 13:

- Matthew 13:4,19.
- Matthew 13:25,38 & part of 39.

4 And when he sowed, some seeds fell by the way side, and the fowls (Jews) came and devoured them up ... 19 When any one heareth the word of the Kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one (4190), and catcheth away that which was sown in the heart. This is he which received seed by the way side.

25 But while men slept, his (Yahweh's) enemy (Satan) came and sowed tares among the wheat (Adamites) and went away. (symbolic of Satan seducing Eve)

38 The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the Kingdom (Israelites); but the tares are the children of the wicked one (Cain and his progeny #4190). 39 The enemy that sowed (fathered) them is the devil (Satan) etc.

It is interesting here because in the center reference of the KJV, the "wicked one" in Matthew 13:38, leads us to Genesis 3:15; John 8:44; Acts 13:10; 1 John 3:8:

Genesis 3:15:

And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

John 8:44:

Ye are of your father the devil, and the lust of your father ye will do. He was a murderer (Cain) from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there was no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.

Acts 13:10:

And said, O full of all subtilty and mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Yahweh?

1 John 3:8

He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Yahshua the Anointed was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.

We can see here that this “wicked one” is the same as the “seed of the serpent”, “devil”, “child of the devil”, “enemy of righteousness”, and again in the last verse, the “devil.”

JUDAS ISCARIOT, A “DEVIL”, “SEED OF THE SERPENT”

Another interesting offspring of Satan is Judas Iscariot. We can tell that he is a descendant of Cain from both his actions and from where he came. In order to get started on Judas, let's read John 6:70-71:

70 Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? 71 He spake of Judas Iscariot the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve.

If there were ever anyone who could recognize a devil it would be Yahshua. If you check out the Greek word 1228, it means devil! Its not talking about the “seeds of the spirit” as Ted R. Weiland would like you to think! Yahshua knows who are His and who are of Satan! He predestined and choose Judas to be a “vessel of wrath” to betray Him — Judas had no choice in the matter — Judas, as a devil, descendant of Cain, would only do what came natural to him in the betrayal! I really don't understand how people, when “Yahshua” Himself points Judas out as a devil, will say “its only spiritual.” To be sure, we are dealing with a real “devil”, and it is the same “devil” as in Genesis 3:15 where it says, “thou (a descendant of Satan through Cain) shalt bruise his (Messiah's) heel.”

YAHSHUA'S HEEL BRUISED BY JUDAS!!!

We have a direct connection here with Judas and the “serpent” of Genesis 3:14-15! We can see the connection between Judas and the “serpent” if we read John 13:18:

I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen: but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his HEEL against me.

The scripture spoken of here, which was fulfilled in Judas, was Genesis 3:15!!!!!! Does that sound “spiritual”?????? Judas was a Canaanite “Jew-devil”, a descendant of Cain fathered by Satan! There is a problem here, though, because it says that “he” (Judas) “hath lifted up his heel against me” whereas Genesis 3:15 says that “thou (the seed of the serpent) shalt bruise his (Yahshua’s) heel.” Is it the “heel” of Judas or Yahshua that is affected? I am quite certain that John 13:18 is referring to Genesis 3:15, as it is indicating that it is a fulfillment of Scripture. Tell me, What other Scripture could it be? — there isn’t any other. There is another Scripture, Psalm 41:9, that reads similarly to John 13:18, but John 13:18 is not a fulfillment of Psalm 41:9 — as a matter of fact, Psalm 41:9 is not a prophecy about anything. The prophecy then can only be Genesis 3:15! — and Genesis 3:15 is definitely a prophecy. Therefore, there has to be a slight mistranslation in Genesis 3:15! Let’s try to render it so it makes some sense here:

And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it (her seed) shall bruise thy head and thy heel shall (rise up and) bruise him (her seed).

Its not that the seed of the serpent will bruise the heel of Yahshua, but the seed of the serpent will lift up his heel and bruise Yahshua (the seed of the woman). Now Yahshua is not the only seed of the woman. All of Eve’s descendants are the seed of the woman. Now that we understand that it is the seed of the serpent (in the person of Judas) that was to lift up his heel against the Messiah, we can better understand Isaiah 53:5:

*But he ~~was~~ wounded for our transgressions, ~~he~~ **was bruised** for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.*

I have only found one good comment on John 13:18, and that is from the Jamieson, Fausset & Brown *Commentary On The Whole Bible*, page 1058:

***I speak not of you all** — the “happy *are ye*,” of vs. 17, being on no supposition applicable to Judas. **I know whom I have chosen** —in the *higher* sense. **But that the scripture may be fulfilled** —i.e., one has been added to your number, by no accident or mistake, who is none of Mine, but just that he might fulfil his predicted destiny. **He that eateth bread with me** — “did eat of *my bread*.”*

It was Judas that raised up his heel against Him and bruised Him. It probably should be pointed out here what is meant by “lifting up the heel.” It is described as someone who kicks out at the person who is feeding him. Judas planing to betray Yahshua while eating of the sacrificial supper did just this, and it is known as “lifting up the heel.” This “heel” here in John 13:18 is the same “heel” as in Genesis 3:15. This type of action was considered one of the most insulting things a man could do. Of course, what else would you expect of a devil?

Just before this “lifting up the heel” on the part of Judas by partaking of the last supper, some interesting statements are made. They were having a foot washing lesson from Yahshua. Verse

10 says, "Yahshua saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash *his* feet, but is clean (pure) every whit: and ye are clean (pure), but not all." Yahshua is indicating that all the disciples are clean (pure) racially, but no amount of washing would make Judas clean (pure).

A second statement in this 18th verse is also interesting. It says, "I speak not of you all." Again Yahshua is excluding Judas from the others. *I know whom I have chosen.* I am not deceived in My choice. I knew what was going to happen from the very beginning of the enmity of the serpent. I have chosen Judas as a "serpent" and I plainly foresaw that he would raise up the heel and deliver Me. Did not I foretell this at the time of the curse upon the "serpent"?

Matthew 26:14-16

14 Then one of the twelve, called Judas Iscariot, went unto the chief priest, 15 And said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver. 16 And from that time he sought opportunity to betray him.

If you can't see "Jew" written all over this action on the part of this "serpent", Judas, you have to be blind. He was only doing his father's bidding.

John 12:4-6

4 Then saith one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, which should betray him, 5 Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor? 6 This he said, not that he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief and had the bag, and bare what was put therein.

Not only was this "serpent-Jew" a traitor, he was a thief — just like the "Jewish" IRS and Federal Reserve of today. Here is more evidence that Judas was the offspring of Satan.

Now Judas was a Canaanite "Jew", and the Bible says he was. The problem is, whoever put the punctuation in the Bible put a comma in the wrong place. The way it is written in Matthew 10:2-4 and Mark 3:19 it makes it appear that Simon was the Canaanite — but this is not true. I will rewrite it as it should be, and I will use Matthew 10:2-4 as the example:

*2 Now the names of the twelve apostles are these; The first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James *the son* of Zebedee, and John his brother; 3 Philip, and Bartholomew; Thomas, and Matthew the publican; James *the son* of Alphaeus, and Lebbaeus whose surname was Thaddaeus; 4 Simon, and the Canaanite Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him.*

John 13:2

The supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son (a different Simon from above in verse 4), to betray him.

Like the Spirit that is within Yahweh's children (seed of the woman) so there is a counter spirit within the "serpent's" children. That is why it just came natural to Judas to betray Yahshua. It

says here that the devil put it into the heart of Judas to betray the Messiah. The children of Satan have a certain nature about them, and under various circumstances, they will react in predictable behavior patterns. The Messiah understood exactly what the behavior pattern of the "serpent", Judas, would be. This behavior pattern is just another proof that the "Jews" are a Satanic seedline. You cannot change the nature of a rattlesnake, nor can you change the nature of a "Jew." So much for "Jews for Jesus"!

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

By: Clifton A. Emahiser

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, and saith, I have done no wickedness.* **Another Supporting Scripture** — Proverbs 9:17, *Stolen waters are sweet, and bread [eaten] in secret is pleasant.* **Note: The word "eat" of Genesis 3:13 is the same word for "eateth" and "eaten" of Proverbs 30:20 and Proverbs 9:17!!!**

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 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.* **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, Geneses 20:6 and Proverbs 6:29!!!**

Conclusion: Both the words "eat" and "touch" have sexual connotations!

POSTSCRIPT #3, TO "PRESENTATION ON THE TREES OF GENESIS"

By: Clifton A. Emahiser

(It was July and August of 1997, and I was still not making much headway teaching the Two Seedline doctrine to the people attending the Identity meetings at Perrysburg, Ohio. Later some of them did start to respond favorably to the Two Seedline Message. I could tell, though, the people in charge were unresponsive, and were not about to change their position. As before, I continued to give out cassette tapes and the printed material, much of what you are reading here. By this time, I had really worn out my welcome. Since then, though, I have been able to refine these research papers to a higher degree. This is a project which I probably will never finish, as I will continue to add to it from time to time.)

REVIEW

Thus far we have covered “The Problem With Genesis 4:1” and some of its translation problems. I covered a short history of the Septuagint showing how it cannot always be trusted. I showed how the enemies of Yahweh could have forged or altered both the Septuagint and the Masoretic text. I covered how the Bible is purposely written in parables, allegories, symbols, proverbs, adages, similtudes and metaphors, and how, if we don’t understand **them**, we cannot understand what the Bible is saying. I went into detail on Genesis 3:13 and demonstrated how the breakdown of the Hebrew that it actually meant that Eve was physically seduced and she did lay with Satan. I showed further how the Hebrew idiom of “The Tree Of Knowledge Of Good And Evil” and “The Tree Of Life” had sexual idiomatic meanings. I conveyed the importance of understanding Genesis 4:25 that Seth was appointed as a seed to replace Abel rather than Cain. I pointed out the significance of the reversal of the order of names from Cain and Abel to Abel and Cain. I pointed out some of the fingerprints of Cain and how we can recognize him today (and we are going to go into that a little more in this postscript). I made mention of how the Scriptures continued to speak of the descendants of Cain as Kenites and Rechabites and gave some examples. With this postscript we are going to develop more on this. We are going to trace the descendants of Cain up until they attached themselves to the Tribe Of Judah in 1st Chronicles 2:55 and even up into chapter 35 of Jeremiah. I expressed how the Hebrew word Adam, #120, can mean “another” man in some cases and showed how this could affect translation. I have come believe that this is not the problem with Genesis 4:1 though. I believe it is a case of cause and effect. Everybody assumes that because it says Adam knew his wife and she bare Cain that Adam was the father of Cain. I could say that one night I went to the movie theater and the next morning the sun rose. You can see that the sun didn’t rise because I went to a movie theater. So, too, just because Adam knew Eve and she bare Cain doesn’t **necessarily** make Adam the father of Cain. If Eve was already pregnant with Cain when Adam knew her, it would be an entirely different story. You see, we must always know cause and effect to understand the true story. I gave the history with some interesting remarks about a sect called “Cainites” which seem to be the descendants of Cain. I concluded that the seed of the woman was the White race and the seed of the serpent was the “Jews” and the enmity between the two was still going on today. I showed how the “trees” in Eden were family trees and not wooden trees. I pointed out that Satan’s lie was the misrepresentation of good as evil and evil as good which he is still doing today. I made mention of and pointed out the Protevangelion in the *Lost Books of the Bible and The Forgotten Books Of Eden* which compares Mary’s pregnancy to Eve’s seduction, Joseph accusing the blessed Virgin of infidelity.

In my postscript #2, I cited how the quarrel between Cain and Abel was a quarrel for the birthright and not the sacrifices. I mentioned how Cain’s “door” was his conception and birth, and when it says, “sin lieth at the door” it means that Cain was born with an evil nature from his father. I demonstrated how the center references in the King James Version of the Bible (if you have the right system) on Genesis 3:15 points to John 8:44; Acts 13:10; 1st John 3:8; Romans 16:20; Revelation 12:7. It confirms whoever put the center references in the KJV understood the Satanic connection between the Pharisees, Sadducees and scribes of Yahshua’s day and Cain. I pointed out how Seth kept a law similar to the Levirate law by raising up seed to Abel. I pointed out that Seth was a seed appointed to replace Abel and not Cain. I further depicted the legal status as the chain of these events continued. I showed the true meaning of 2nd

Corinthians 11:3 how the mental seduction of the Corinthians is compared to the physical seduction of Eve. I cited how the word “beguiled”, #1818, means “fully seduced.” I showed how, in the parable of the sower, that the Jews were sowed (or fathered) by Satan. I pointed out that the “heel” of John 13:18 was the same as the “heel” of Genesis 3:15 — that Judas (a Satanic seed) fulfilled the prophecy of Genesis 3:15.

Then I wrote a one page article, “What Was It That Eve Did “Eat”? and What Did Eve “Touch”? With this article, I proved beyond all doubt that the Bible does use the words “eat” and “touch” to mean sexual intercourse not only in Genesis 3:3, but in Genesis 3:13; Proverbs 20:30; Proverbs 9:17; Genesis 26:10-11; Genesis 20:6, 29. Next we are going to trace Cain and his Satanic seed through the Bible.

TRACING CAIN THROUGH THE BIBLE

Before we trace Cain through the Bible, we are going to Genesis chapter 4 to find out the fingerprints of Cain. Certain characteristics and behavior patterns are mentioned in this chapter so we can recognize Cain’s descendants today. We will also find that these characteristics show up and identify him in the Bible. I will not read this passage, but only point out Cain’s fingerprints:

- ❖ v12, non-farmer.
- ❖ v12, fugitive.
- ❖ v12, vagabond.
- ❖ v14, a hated person (men wanting to kill him).
- ❖ v15, a marked man.
- ❖ v17, a city dweller.
- ❖ v20, tent dweller.
- ❖ v21, handlers of musical instruments.
- ❖ v22, artful metal workers.
- ❖ v24, avengers.

The next place we find Cain is in Genesis 15:19 and we will have to read verses 18 through 21:

*18 In the same day Yahweh made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates: 19 **The Kenites**, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, 20 And the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaims, 21 And the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites.*

It is important to understand that Yahweh was going to keep Israel in Egypt for four hundred years until the “iniquity” of these people came to the “full”, verse 16. These people are generally termed as Amorites probably because they were the dominate group. But, anyway, here we have the Kenites #7017, or the descendants of Cain. We are going to have to look into this thing further here to see the significance of what this passage is all about and how Cain fits into it. We are simply told in Genesis 15:16 that Yahweh was going to leave these nations

generally called Canaanites, which included the Amorites, until their iniquity (#5771) came to the “full.” This process was to continue for four hundred years to come to completion. The term “iniquity” here means perversity (*willfully deviating from acceptable or conventional behavior*). We are going to see soon what kind of behavior this might have been.

Well one of these nations among the Canaanites was the Kenites (#7017) which were descendants of Cain. Now being that Cain was of the Satanic seed line, he would infect his Satanic blood among all these nations. This is what it would take four hundred years to accomplish. Many of the tribes listed as living in that land were the descendants of Ham, and their lines would become polluted by Cain’s seed. The history of that area is a history of infiltration of many diverse people. It is too long to present in this article. The main thing to comprehend, at this point, is how the descendants of Cain moved in the area and mixed their blood among the various tribes.

There are two other nations among these ten nations worth mentioning, the Kenizzites and Rephaim. Here is what Matthew Poole’s *Commentary On The Holy Bible*, volume 1, page 38 has to say about the Kenizzites:

The Kenizzites, thought to be the Idumeans, who sprung from Kenaz of Esau’s race. But it seems not to agree with Deut. ii. 5, where God expressly said to the Israelites concerning the Idumeans, I will give you none of their lands, &c.

As Kenaz was only one of the fourteen dukes of Edom, this statement about agreeing with Deuteronomy 2:5 is superfluous. The Kenizzites are indeed of Esau. *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 3, page 782, has this to say of Kenaz and the Kenizzites:

KENAZ Singular form of the clan name Kenizzite, son of Eliphaz and grandson of Esau (Gen. 36:11; 1 Chron. 1:36), one of the chieftains of Edom (KJV Dukes) (Gen. 36:15,42; 1 Chron. 1:53).

Well, this is interesting, it seems that Esau has mixed his blood with this group of nations too!!! Now it sure gets exciting when we find out what these names mean, Doesn’t it? Now let’s talk about these “Rephaim.” *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 5, page 64, says this in part:

REPHAIM. ... *The inhabitants of Trans-Jordan in pre-Israelite times whom the Moabites and Ammonites called respectively “Emim” and “Zamzummim” ... “giants” ... Their land is one of ten ethnic groups promised to Abraham (Gen. 15:20). ... Deuteronomy 2:10, 11 says that they were great, many and tall like the Anakim. Og, king of Bashan, for example possessed a king size iron bed, nine cubits long and four cubits broad. ... Giants among the Philistines who fought against David and his mighty men along their disputed border both at Gezer ... and at Gath ... These giants were the descendants of Rapha, the eponymous ancestor of these Rephaim.*

Now that we know this, let's analyze what we have here:

**Emim-Zanzummim Giants Mixed With Edomite And Cainite Satanic Seed.
NOW THAT'S THE DAMNEDEST JEW MIXTURE I EVER HEARD OF !!!**

TEN NATIONS BECOME SEVEN

Now in Genesis 15:19-21 are listed ten nations and they race-mixed so much that in Deuteronomy 7:1-2 there are only seven. The Kenites, Kenizzites and Rephaims were completely absorbed by the other nations of this group from which the "Jews" are extracted. The Adam Clarke's *Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 38, has this to say:

***The Kenites.** Here are ten nations mentioned, though afterwards reckoned but seven; see Deut. vii. 1; Acts xiii. 19. Probably some of them which existed in Abram's time had been **blended** with others before the time of Moses, so that seven only out of the ten, then remained.*

In the Peake's *Commentary on the Bible*, page 116 we find this about this mixed group of nations spoken of in Genesis 15:19-21:

*When the Israelites entered Canaan they found there a **very mixed** population generally designated by the term Amorite or Canaanite.*

How, then, do we know that this is what happened? Well, we can know this because we know the lifestyles of what kind of people they were. It is recorded in the 18th chapter of Leviticus and we will read verses 24 and 25:

Leviticus 18:24-25

24 Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: 25 And the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants.

We are not going to read the whole chapter here, but just point out what kind of people they were according to this chapter:

- The sons were having incest with their mothers.
- The fathers were having incest with their daughters.
- The brothers were having incest with their sisters.
- The fathers-in-law were having incest with their daughters-in-law.
- The nephews were having incest with their aunts.
- The uncles were having incest with their nieces.
- The brothers-in-law were having incest with their sisters-in-law.
- The sons-in-law were having incest with their mothers-in-law.
- The grandfathers were having incest with their granddaughters.

- The grandsons were having incest with their grandmothers.
- They were laying every man carnally with their neighbor's wife.
- They were also committing homosexuality.

Now if they were doing all of this, you know damn well (and I really don't like to use this kind of language) they were breeding interracially. Now in this four hundred years, this Satanic seed spread throughout Canaan. Not only was the Satanic seed of Cain involved here, but there was also the Satanic seed of the Rephaim and later the Edomites. The Rephaim were the children of the mixture of fallen angels (who left their first estate) and the daughters of men, and it is recorded that there were giants among them (mutants with six toes on each foot and six fingers on each hand). This is why Yahweh gave Israel the commission to kill every damn man, woman and child among them and He has never rescinded that commission — He has just put it on hold.

The next mention of the descendants of Cain is found in 1st Chronicles 2:55:

*And the **families of the scribes** which dwelt at Jabez; the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, and Suchathites. These are the Kenites that came of Hemath, the father of the house of Rechab.*

Now the whole 2nd chapter of 1st Chronicles, from verse 3 on, is the lineage of Judah. Then tacked on at the end of the chapter (verse 55) is this group of people who are actually descendants of Cain known as Kenites and have no blood connection at all with Judah. A footnote in *The Complete Word Study King James Bible*, by Spiros Zodhiates, page 1055 says, "They became incorporated into the tribe of Judah." The word Kenite here is 7017 in the Strong's Concordance. Actually the numbers for Cain are both 7014 and 7017. You will notice here in 1st Chronicles 2:55, they are called, "*the families of the scribes.*" They were scribes at this time and they were scribes in Yahshua's time — they are the same people.

At this time I am going to quote from *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 3, page 782:

*KENITES ... meaning (metalworkers, smiths). Clan or tribal name of semi-nomadic peoples of South Palestine and Sinai. The Aramaic and Arabic etymologies of the root *gym* show that it has to do with metal and metal work (thus the Hebrew word from this root, "lance"). This probably indicates that the Kenites were metal workers, especially since Sinai and Wadi 'Arabah were rich in highgrade copper ore. W. F. Albright has pointed to the Beni Hassan mural in Egypt (19th century B.C.) as an illustration of such a **wandering group of smiths**. This mural depicts thirty-six men, women and children in characteristic Semitic dress leading along with other **animals**, donkeys laden with **musical instruments**, weapons and an item which Albright has identified as a **bellows**. He has further noted that Lemech's three children (Genesis 4:19-22) were responsible for **herds** (Jabal), **musical instruments** (Jubal), and **metal work** (Tubal-Cain, or Tubal, **the smith**), the three occupations which seem most evident in the mural.*

2nd quote from the same article:

The early monarchy. During this period a significant concentration of Kenites was located in the southern Judean territory. This is clear from 1 Samuel 15:6 cited above and also from David's relations with them.

3rd quote from the same article:

Postexilic references. In 1 Chronicles 2:55 the **families of the scribes** living at Jabaz are said to be Kenites. Apparently, during the kingdom and exile periods, certain Kenites had given up **nomadic smithing** and had taken on a more sedentary, but equally honorable **profession of scribe**.

Peake's Commentary on the Bible, page 114, has this to say about the name of the Kenites:

The etymology of the name suggest **that they were smiths or artificers**, a theory which is supported by their association with the Wadi 'Arabah, where there were copper deposits which had been worked by the Egyptians since the middle of the 3rd millennium.

Again in the Peake's Commentary on the Bible, page 181, we have more on the name of the Kenites:

The name **Cain** is generally taken by Semitic philologists to mean 'smith', and regarded as the patronymic of the **Kenite clan of smiths**.

The Jamieson, Fausset & Brown Commentary On The Whole Bible has this to say on Kenite, page 293:

The families of the scribes — either civil or ecclesiastical officers of the Kenite origin, who are here classified with the tribe of Judah, not as being descended from it, but as dwellers within its territory, and in a measure incorporated with its people.

The Matthew Pool's Commentary On The Holy Bible has this to say on the Kenites, volume 1, page 778:

The Scribes; either civil, who were public notaries, who wrote and signed legal instruments; or ecclesiastical ... and are here mentioned not as if they were of the tribe of Judah, but because they dwelt among them, and probably were allied to them by marriages, and so in a manner incorporated with them. *Which dwelt, or rather, dwelt; Hebrew, were dwellers.* For the other translation, *which dwelt, may seem to insinuate that these were descendants of Judah, which they were not; but this translation only signifies cohabitation with them, for which cause they are here named with them.*

Here is where these Pharisees, Sadducees and **SCRIBES** which Yahshua pointed out as being of their father the devil came from. When He said to them Matthew 23:35:

That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zachariah son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.

Yahshua was stating a scientific fact. Not only was all of the blood from Abel up to this point on their head, but the blood of Yahshua Himself would fall upon them. Matthew 27:25 says:

Then answered all the people, and said, His blood be on us, and on our children.

Not only is the blood of Yahshua upon their head, but all of the blood shed since that time in all their murders. That means every Adamic man woman and child that has died in their planned wars and whatever other murder they have committed. Here is where this one seedline (or maybe no seedline) doctrine gets serious: When you deny the Cain Satanic seedline you put the "Jew" on the same level as anyone else. What you are actually doing, in essence, is forgiving the "Jews" for the murder of Yahshua. What the one seedliners are saying, in essence, is that the enmity is in the flesh and therefore we are the murderers of Yahweh. You can see here, once you take a false position, all kinds of problems start to arise. I know that Yahshua died for my sins, but I didn't murder Him! Now if the one seedliners want to continue the position of one seedline or no seedline, and be responsible for the death of our Savior, then go right ahead.

From 1st Chronicles 2:55, we pick up another name for Cain. Let's review it again to see what it is:

1st Chronicles 2:55

*And the families of the scribes which dwelt at Jabez; the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, and Suchathites. These are the Kenites that came of Hemath, the father of the house of **Rechab**.*

Here we pick up the word "Rechab" or "Rechabite." In *The Complete Word Study, Old Testament*, King James Version by Dr. Spiros Zodhiates, page 1055, there is a note to go to Jeremiah 35:1-19. If you have a King James Bible with the center reference it will take you from Jeremiah 35:2 back to 1st Chronicles 2:55. Now let's go to the 35th chapter of Jeremiah, verse 2:

*Go unto the house of the **Rechabites**. and speak unto them, and bring them into the house of Yahweh, into one of the chambers, and give them wine to drink.*

Now I am not going to go into detail on this passage, but point out the fingerprints of Cain. In verse 7 it says the Rechabites would not plant seeds nor plant vineyards. If the ground is cursed for their sake, the seed wouldn't grow anyway. In this same 7th verse it says they shall dwell in tents. Well vagabonds do live in tents. You will also notice in several verses here that they won't drink wine. Could it be that they didn't want to take the wine of Communion? We can see here that the fingerprints of Cain are consistent. Yes, Yahshua, when he pointed out that they were serpents, devils and vipers, knew to whom he was talking.

SMITH & GOODSPEED ON JOHN 8:44

The devil is the father you are sprung from, and you want to carry out your father's wishes. He was a murderer from the first, and he has nothing to do with truth, for there is no truth in him. When he tells a lie, he speaks in his true character, for he is a liar and the father of them.

You can see, then, this verse is not speaking in a spiritual sense as most one seedliners would have you to believe. If so, how would one murder someone spiritually? It would be absurd to interpret this verse in a spiritual manner. When it is speaking of murder in this verse, it is speaking of Cain murdering Abel. It is not speaking of Cain murdering Abel spiritually, but physically. I am not the only one who understands this verse in such a way. *The New Treasury of Scripture Knowledge*, Edited by Jerome H. Smith, published by the Thomas Nelson Publishers, page 1203, understands John 8:44 to be speaking of the murder of Abel by Cain, for it makes reference to Genesis 4:8. This is an entire book of cross-references. As far as I know, this book is in no way promoting the Two Seedline doctrine, nor does it have an ax to grind on this subject. Let's take a look at Genesis 4:8 to which this book makes reference from John 8:44:

And Cain talked with Abel his brother: and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him.

For evidence to help prove that John 8:44 is speaking of the "Jews" as being descendants of Cain, and that Smith & Goodspeed has translated this passage correctly, we will check on the word "of", like in "Ye are OF your father the devil." The Strong's number in the Greek is 1537. The *New Testament Word Study Dictionary* by Dr. Spiros Zodhiates devotes five pages to interpret the word "of" as used in the Greek, pages 529-534. Obviously I cannot quote this entire document here, but cite only that which is relevant to John 8:44:

1537. "... Preposition governing the genitive, primarily meaning out of, from, of, as spoken of such objects which were before another ... Of the origin or source of anything, i.e., the primary, direct, immediate source ... Of persons, of the place, stock, family, condition, meaning out of which one is derived or to which he belongs ... Of the source, i.e., the person or thing, out of or from which anything proceeds, is derived, or to which it pertains ..."

MORE ON THE WORD "OF" IN JOHN 8:44

We really need to examine the word "OF" in John 8:44, for it is very critical in understanding that the "Jews" are the descendants of Cain. The word "OF" is the Greek word #1537 in the *Strong's Concordance*. Most one seedliners will claim John 8:44 should be taken spiritually only, that it is not speaking of a literal genetic offspring of Satan through Cain. Jeffrey A. Weakley (a one seedliner) in his 1994 booklet *The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History*, page 24, in his attempt to discredit the Two Seedline teaching says this of John 8:44 (this is an

“Argument” and “Answer” debate conducted solely by him in his booklet): *“This does not show that Cain was of that wicked one physically, but rather he was of that wicked one spiritually. Let’s look at part of 1 John 3:8: ‘He that committeth sin is of the devil ...’ When one studies out 1 John 3:8-12 the meaning becomes crystal clear. It must be talking about who we are serving spiritually. If it is talking about physical descendants, then all of us are physical descendants of Satan because we all have sinned. ‘For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God ...’ (Rom 3:23) ... So if we have all sinned and if he that committeth sin is of the devil, we must conclude that all of us are of the devil ... So what is it saying? Are you of the devil by physical descent or are you of the devil because you serve him (or have served him in the past)?” ... “ARGUMENT [of the two seedliners]: John 8:44 says, ‘Ye are of your father the devil ... This shows that the devil is their physical father” ... “ANSWER [by Jeffrey A. Weakley]: “Wrong. This once again shows that the devil is their spiritual father (the one that they serve).”*

We then must determine whether John 8:44 is speaking of a spiritual devil or a physical devil. The word **“OF”** is critical in John 8:44 for determining this. The word in the Greek is #1537. In John 8:44 the Greek form is: ἐκ which sometimes ἐξ. You can check this out in most any of the Greek interlinears. The *New Testament Greek Study Aids* by Walter Jerry Clark says on page 230 about the Greek word ἐκ: *“out of ... with the genitive: by means of, out of.”* The *Intermediate New Testament Greek* by Richard A. Young, page 95 says the following about the Greek word ἐκ: *“ἐκ often conveys special extensions ‘out of’ or ‘from.’ For example, the prophet said that God would call His Son out of Egypt (Matthew 2:15).”* From the *Greek to English Interlinear* by George Ricker Berry, page 31 of his “Greek-English New Testament Lexicon”, we have this on ἐκ: *“ἐκ or before a vowel, ἐξ, a preposition governing genitive, from, out of.”* The *Thayer Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, page 189 expresses ἐκ this way: *“ ... out of, as separation from, something with which there has been close connection ...”* In other words, the “Pharisees” in John 8:44 had a close genetic connection out of or from “the devil.”

There are 32 other places in the New Testament where this Greek word (1537) ἐκ is used in the same sense. Let’s see if these other passages are speaking of physical or spiritual beings: In Matthew 1:3 it speaks of “Phares” and “Zara” being **“OF”** “Thamar.” Does that sound “spiritual”? Again in Matthew 1:5 it says “Booz” begat Obed **“OF”** Ruth. Again, does that sound “spiritual”? In Matthew 1:18 it speaks of the “child” being **“OF”** the Holy Ghost. Again, does that sound “spiritual”? In Matthew 1:20 it again speaks of the “child” being **“OF”** the Holy Ghost. Again, does that sound “spiritual”? In Mark 5:8 the Redeemer commanded an unclean spirit to “come out **‘OF’** the man.” Does the “man”, from which the spirit was cast, sound “spiritual”? In Luke 2:36 it speaks of one “Phanuel” **“OF”** the tribe of Aser. Does this sound like a real person or a spirit? In Acts 13:21 it speaks of “a man **“OF”** the tribe of Benjamin.” Again, are we talking “spiritually” here? In Romans 1:3 it speaks of Yahshua being “made **‘OF’** the seed of David according to the flesh.” How do the one seedliners claim this one to be “spiritual” when it states outright, “flesh”? After all, it’s the same word **“OF”** as used in John 8:44?!?! In Romans 16:10 it speaks of “them which are **‘OF’** Aristobulus’ [household].” Can we ask again if this is someone who is a real person or something strangely “spiritual”? In Romans 16:11 it speaks of “them that be **‘OF’** the [household] of Narcissus.” Does the word **“OF”** here apply to some real person or do we have to relegate it to something “spiritual”? In 1 Corinthians 11:12, it says “the woman [is] **‘OF’** the man.” I can just imagine some ardent one seedliner explaining to his wife she is not

a real person! In Philippians 4:22 it speaks of “they that are **‘OF’** Caesar’s household.” I guess that we Two Seedliners are now supposed to believe that Caesar was something spiritual! In Hebrews 7:5 it speaks of “the sons **‘OF’** Levi ...” and “out **‘OF’** the loins of Abraham.” I guess the one seedliners would now have us Two Seedliners to believe that Levi and Abraham were some kind of a “spiritual” mirage! In 1 John 3:8 we are told: “He that committeth sin is **‘OF’** the devil.” The devil (Satan) was the original lawbreaker, and that is what sin is all about! In 1 John 3:12 it further describes “Cain [who] was **‘OF’** that wicked one.” The one seedliners really do some rhetorical gymnastics with this passage. Jeffrey A. Weakley said this passage was also “spiritual”. In Revelation 3:9 it states: “I will make them **‘OF’** the synagogue of Satan.” A synagogue is a worship house of Satan. The “Jews” truly do worship Satan their father and they admit with their own words that they are descended from Cain. I have in my possession a quotation from a publication *Liberal Judaism* published January, 1949 by a Rabbi Dr. Abba Hillel Silver who states in part speaking of the then new State of Israel “... *the concept of the wandering Jew ... For the curse of Cain, the curse of being an outcast and a ‘wanderer’ over the face of the earth has been removed ...*” It is only the one seedliners who do not understand that Cain was to be a “vagabond”, a “wanderer” and having the “curse of Cain” upon him. Name one other group today that fits this category. In Revelation 5:5 it speaks of “the Lion of the tribe **‘OF’** Judah” Are we also supposed to believe that this is something “spiritual”, and deny that Yahshua came in the flesh? In Revelation 7:5-8 we have: “**‘OF’** the tribe of Judah ... **‘OF’** the tribe of Reuben ... **‘OF’** the tribe of Gad ... **‘OF’** the tribe of Aser ... **‘OF’** the tribe of Nephthalim ... **‘OF’** the tribe of Manasses ... **‘OF’** the tribe of Simeon ... **‘OF’** the tribe Levi ... **‘OF’** the tribe of Issachar ... **‘OF’** the tribe of Zabulon ... **‘OF’** the tribe of Joseph ... **‘OF’** the tribe of Benjamin.” If we are to be consistent, (a word which the one seedliners like to use), if the same Greek word that is used in all these references is physical in nature, so, too, is the word “**OF**” in John 8:44!!!! Very convenient to throw up the word “spiritual” whenever you want to forge a barrier and not accept the truth which Yahshua spoke: “Ye are **OF** your father the devil.” Yahshua was simply saying to the “Jews” that they were chips off the old block!

Also, I suggest that most people who use the word “spiritual” in this way don’t even know what the word means. The dictionary might lead to the idea of a disembodied soul or a ghost, something mysterious or mystic. The Bible meaning for “spiritual” is: life as opposed to death. How does such a description of the word “spiritual” fit John 8:44? It’s obvious, it doesn’t!

EUPHEMISM CONCERNING FLESH

A good example of an idiom or euphemism is the term “flesh.” Although this term is not directly connected with the seduction of Eve, it is closely related, and it will serve to demonstrate the quaint language of many Bible translations. “Flesh” is the Hebrew word #1320 in the *Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance Of The Bible* and is described as follows:

#1320 ... *bâsâr, baw-sawr’; from 1319; flesh (from its freshness); by extension body, person; also (by euphemism) the pudenda of a man: — body, [fat, lean] flesh [-ed], kin, [man-] kind, + nakedness, self, skin.*

Now let's check in *The Reader's Digest Great Encyclopedic Dictionary* to see the meaning of the English word "pudenda." You will find it spelled "pudendum" in most dictionaries:

Pudendum ... (1) The external genital parts of the female; vulva. (2) The external genitals of either sex ... [Latin neuter of pudendus, gerundive of pudere to be ashamed] ...

I know this is sort of graphic, but I believe from all of this, we can better understand what was involved concerning the episode when it says, Genesis 2:25 "And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed." Its the Hebrew way of saying, Adam and Eve were of one flesh. To give evidence that the word flesh can mean "pudenda" or the genitals of both a male or female, I will cite the 2nd, 3rd, 7th, 13th and 19th verses of the 15th chapter of Leviticus (truly, you need to read the entire chapter):

Verse 2: When any man hath a running issue out of his pudenda ... Verse 3: And this shall be his uncleanness in his issue: whether his pudenda run with his issue, or his pudenda be stopped from his issue ... Verse 7: And he that toucheth the pudenda of him that hath the issue ... Verse 13 ... and bathe his pudenda in running water ... Verse 19 And if a woman have an issue, and her issue in her pudenda be blood ...

You can see very clearly that we have to learn to read the scriptures in the correct context of their true setting, as the words being used may be only a substitution of a genteel expression for an unpleasant or offensive one. This is called a euphemism, or genteelism. In other words, the word "flesh" is a euphemism, and in the case above literally means "the pudenda" of a man or a woman. Many times we miss the entire meaning of passages, lacking understanding of a euphemism when we encounter it. If we understand these euphemisms, then we can understand why Adam and Eve were naked and were not ashamed. And later, we can also understand what kind of "aprons" they made, and what part of their body they were trying to hide. It's one thing to find the various Hebrew and Greek meanings of the words, but it is quite another thing to put them in their proper context with the Scripture involved. In order to understand the context, one must have a working understanding of how any one passage fits with the rest of the scriptures. If one finds a conflict with other passages, his mental context has to be wrong. The above application is a good case in point.

APRONS AND SKINS

Genesis 3:7 tells us that Adam and Eve became aware of their nakedness, after the seduction, and made themselves aprons. "Aprons" is the Hebrew word # 2290, and means, a belt (for the waist):— apron, armour, gird (-le). The first among several English meanings is: *A garment or cloth, leather, etc., worn to protect or adorn the front of a person's clothes.* A belt is usually worn to encompass the waist, so it is obvious an apron is to cover the front part of the body from the waist down which would cover the **pudenda**. The question arises, then, if this were mental seduction, as the one seedliners shout so loudly, why would Adam and Eve have made aprons to cover this part of the body. If it was mental seduction, then, why didn't Adam and Eve try to cover the brain area? Or if it was an apple, as many put forward, why didn't Adam and Eve put something over their mouth? If it were mental, why didn't Yahweh attempt to change

their minds and correct it. After all, we all make errors in judgment and have to change our minds. It is obvious that this breaking of Yahweh's commandment was something they had done that couldn't be reversed. Today, Eve could simply have gone down to the local abortion mill! If you think it is terrible that Eve could have been seduced, look at all the Eves who are being seduced today. It is not an unthinkable situation.

Yahweh was aware that the fig-leaf aprons were not adequate, so He made Adam and Eve "coats of skins", Genesis 3:21. "Skins" is #5785, and in the *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance Of The Bible*, it can mean: "*from 5783 (as naked); by implication hide, leather: — hide, leather, skin.*" It is obvious from this description, the "skins" were more extensive, covering more of the body, and undoubtedly especially for the woman.

THIS WORK TO BE CONTINUALLY EXPANDED AND ENLARGED