

ALL KINDS *of* FLESH NOT *the* SAME, 1 Cor. 15:39, (#1):

Clifton A. Emahiser's
Non-Universal Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

What Paul proclaims at this passage conflicts with the erroneous position that some hold claiming that Gen. 1:24-27 & 3:1 is proof that Yahweh created the nonwhite races where the word "beast" is used.

1 Cor. 15:39 in the KJV states: "**All flesh is not the same flesh: but *there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds.***"

1 Cor. 15:39 in the *E-sword* program, with the Strong's numbers, reads: "All³⁹⁵⁶ flesh⁴⁵⁶¹ is not³⁷⁵⁶ the³⁵⁸⁸ same⁸⁴⁶ flesh⁴⁵⁶¹: but²³⁵ *there is one*²⁴³ *kind*⁽³³⁰³⁾ *of flesh*⁴⁵⁶¹ of men⁴⁴⁴ ⁽¹¹⁶¹⁾, another²⁴³ flesh⁴⁵⁶¹ of beast²⁹³⁴ ⁽¹¹⁶¹⁾, another²⁴³ of fishes²⁴⁸⁶, *and*⁽¹¹⁶¹⁾ another²⁴³ of birds⁴⁴²¹."

It is categorically clear here that the flesh of "men" (i.e., Adam-man⁴⁴⁴) is distinctly different than the flesh of "beast"²⁹³⁴ (i.e., animal, wild or domesticated). All that one need to do to establish that 1 Cor. 15:39 is addressing Adam-man, as opposed to non-Adamic-man, is to read the entire chapter. Paul, in writing on this subject, was not contradicting what is recorded in Genesis chapters 1 through 5, for Yahweh never created a living being to appear similar to Adam, other than Adam himself, nor from the flesh of beasts! However, this is what those holding the pseudo "6th and 8th day creation" theory insist upon!

The Complete Bible by Smith & Goodspeed does an excellent job of translating 1 Cor. 15:39 thusly: "**Flesh is not all alike; men have one kind, animals another, birds another, and fishes another.**" Hence, should such beasts have ever existed, past, present or future, it had to have happened by a process other than by Yahweh's creation! Had such "beasts" ever been created by the Almighty, surely Paul would have included them in this passage!

Next, let's compare William Finck's *Christogenea New Testament* on 1 Cor. 15:39, with that of Smith & Goodspeed above: "**Not all flesh is the same flesh, but one flesh of man, and another flesh of beasts, and another of birds, and another of fish.**"

To give the reader an example of how the 6th & 8th day creation people go wrong, I will cite excerpts of *Racial and National Identity*, by Rev. William P. Gale, pp. 2-4, noting his errant conclusion concerning the creation of "man" at Gen. 1:26-27 & 2:7-8. I would point out, though, I am in agreement with Gale on almost everything that he teaches along this line, but I take issue with him when he does not take into account the

original language they are written in! The absolute undeniable fact is: the “man” at Gen. 1:27 is the same exact Hebrew word “man” that is used at Gen. 2:7-8! Here is what William P. Gale stated:

“... Understanding that Jesus Christ is the One we call ‘God,’ and that He has children on the earth, we should learn who those children are. We should also believe the Scripture when it tells us that there are people on the earth who are **not** the children of God. The Bible is clear that there was a ‘creation.’ There were ages or cycles of time during the ages of the creation. In order to understand the ‘creation,’ we must understand the Book of Genesis and that Genesis, in the first Chapter, is a synopsis to cover possibly millions of years in one little chapter. We read that there were people created during the ages or cycles of the creation and these people were all living on earth prior to the arrival of Adam and Eve on this planet. Note in Chapter 2, vs. 4 of Genesis, that ‘these are the generations (races) of the heavens and of the earth **when they were created**, in the day (age) that the Lord God **made** the earth and the heavens. Notice in verse 5 of this same chapter that there was **not a man** to till the ground. The word ‘man’ is translated from the word **Adam**. Also notice here that Adam is brought into the Bible story **after** God had rested the 7th day (age) of the **Creations** and that Adam was **not** of the creation ages, and he was **not** created. In verse 7 of Chapter 2 of Genesis we read, ‘And the Lord God **formed man** (Adam) of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man (Adam) became a living soul.’ The translators used the words ‘dust of the ground’ when they should have used the words ‘in the terrestrial plane.’ We use the word terra-firma or terrestrial to refer to the earth in many other usages. Why not here? ...”

Then on page 4, Gale contradicts himself by writing:

“... While there are histories and scientific records concerning the earlier races, there is no record of the White race prior to 5,500 B.C., and this is in agreement with Bible chronology for the arrival of Adam and Eve upon the earth. The Bible is not the history of **all** races. It is the history and guidebook of the **White Race** and begins with Adam. See Genesis 5:1, ‘This is the book of the generation (race) of Adam.’ Therefore, since Adam was the first White man, the Asiatic and black races could not have come from him. One cannot be older than his father. It is sheer folly to claim that God would violate His Own Law that kind begets like kind, and bring forth black and yellow people from white parents (*[i.e.,]* Adam and Eve).”

I agree with Gale where he said: “Christ is the One we call ‘God,’ and that He has children on the earth, we should learn who those children are.” I also agree with him where he stated: “We should also believe the Scripture when it tells us that there are people on the earth who are **not** the children of God.” In addition, I am in accord with him, where he declared “(but ‘millions’ may be an exaggeration for hundreds of thousands): ‘There were ages or cycles of time during the ages of the creation. In order to understand the ‘creation,’ we must understand the Book of Genesis and that Genesis, in the first Chapter, is a synopsis to cover possibly millions of years in one little chapter.”

However, I do not fully agree with Gale where he stated: “We read that there were people created during the ages or cycles of the creation and these people were all

living on earth prior to the arrival of Adam and Eve on this planet.” Like Gale, I also believe that there were other races existing on the earth before Adam and Eve, but I wouldn’t categorize them as “created”, but rather a bastard mixture of angel-kind with animal-kind.

I have to point out, had Gale had the archaeological evidence from *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A New Translation* by Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr. and Edward Cook, on page 247, a translation of 1Q23, fragments 1 and 6: “¹ [... two hundred] ² donkeys, two hundred asses, two hund[red ... rams of the] ³ flock, two hundred goats, two hundred [... beast of the] ⁴ field from every animal, from every [bird ...] ⁵ [...] for miscegenation [...]”. And in the same source, 4Q531, fragment 2: “¹ [...] they defiled [...] ² [... they begot] giants and monsters [...] ³ [...] they begot, and, behold, all [the earth was corrupted ...] ⁴ [...] with its blood and by the hand of [...] ⁵ [giants] which did not suffice for them and [...] ⁶ [...] and they were seeking to devour many [...] ⁷ [...] ⁸ the monsters attacked it.” Again, 4Q532, Col. 2 fragments 1-6: “² [...] flesh [...] ³ al[...] monsters [...] will be [...] ⁴ [...] they would arise [...] lacking in true knowledge [...] because [...] ⁵ [...] the earth [grew corrupt ...] mighty [...] ⁶ [...] they were considering [...] ⁷ [...] from the angels upon [...] ⁸ [...] in the end it will perish and die [...] ⁹ [...] they caused great corruption in the [earth ...] ¹⁰ [... this did not] suffice to [...] ¹¹ they will be [...]’.”

While quite fragmentary, the general theme of these fragments from what is known as the *Book of Giants* is readily evident to those who are observant. But a pertinent question must be asked to the unwary (i.e., easily fooled) reader: “What is there about the term “miscegenation” that the Dead Sea Scroll translator used that we don’t seem to understand?” If you didn’t catch the use of it, go back and read it again! I underlined it to make it easy to find.

As this evidence wasn’t available before 1996, William P. Gale, along with Wesley A. Swift and Bertrand L. Compere would not have had access to this important data! Had it been revealed during their lifetimes, surely they would have revised their flawed premise on this issue! However, now that it is available to the rest of us today, we have no excuse!

INVESTIGATING THE GREEK AT 1 COR. 15:39

There are four English words in this passage that have only one Greek meaning, and they are: “one”, “another”, “another” and “another” thusly:

“All flesh *is* not the same flesh: but *there is one kind of* flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds.”

This is the Strong’s Greek #243, ἄλλος, with the English equivalent *allos*. After checking all of my lexicons, W.E. Vine seemed to give the best definition in his *An Expository Dictionary of The New Testament*:

“ANOTHER

“ALLOS (ἄλλος) and HETEROS (ἕτερος) have a difference in meaning, which despite a tendency to be lost, is to be observed in numerous passages. *Allos* expresses a numerical difference and denotes another of the same sort; *heteros* expresses a qualitative difference and denotes another of a different sort. Christ promised to send ‘another Comforter’ (*allos*, another like Himself, not *heteros*), John 14:16. Paul says ‘I

see a different (A.V., 'another') law,' *heteros*, a law different from that of the spirit of life (not *allos*, a law of the same sort), Rom. 7:23. After Joseph's death 'another king arose,' *heteros*, one of quite a different character, Acts 7:18. Paul speaks of 'a different gospel (*heteros*), which is not another' (*allos*, another like the one he preached), Gal. 1:6, 7. See *heteros* (not *allos*) in Matt. 11:3, and Acts 27:1; in Luke 23:32 *heteroi* is used of the two malefactors crucified with Christ. The two words are only apparently interchanged in 1 Cor. 1:16 and 6:1; 12:8-10; 14:17 and 19, e.g., the difference being present, though not so readily discernible.

"They are not interchangeable in 1 Cor. 15:39-41; here *heteros* is used to distinguish the heavenly glory from the earthly, for these differ in genus, and *allos* to distinguish the flesh of men, birds, and fishes, which in each case is flesh differing not in genus but in species"

To understand Vine's definition of the Greek word *allos* in its most basic meaning in English, we have to determine the difference between "genus" and "species". The following concise definitions are taken from my electronic *Franklin Dictionary & Thesaurus*:

"genus: category of biological classification."

"species: biological groupings of closely related organisms."

In other words, "genus" includes both vegetation living directly from the soil, and animated creatures living indirectly from the soil, whereas (for our purpose) "species" comprise only animated creatures living indirectly from the soil. So Paul, at 1 Cor. 15:39, is addressing four distinct groups of animated species in the categories of "men", "beasts", "birds" and "fishes". Notice, there is no distinct category left over in which to place the nonwhite races, unless it would be the "bastard" (i.e., "mamzer") category! A "mamzer" could only be produced by the mixing of two of the above Paul named "species"!

FROM WHENCE CAME THE 6th & 8th DAY CREATION HYPOTHESIS?

Long before the ministries of Wesley A. Swift; Bertrand L. Compatriet; and William P. Gale, there existed in Great Britain a man identified as Rev. William Pascoe Goard who wrote a 46 page booklet entitled *Our Heritage: The Bible*, containing chapters subtitled: "The Bible"; "The Eliminations From The Bible"; "Restatements Of The Bible"; "The Bible Under Attack"; "Biblical Factors"; and "The Bible Divinely Confirmed". The first edition was dated in 1926. In 1941, E. Raymond Capt reprinted and circulated it in America. This book contains the oldest extant writing I have found on this un-biblical premise.

Page 5: "The Bible gives to us an archaic creation including [*non-Adamic*] man. It then proceeds to give to us the history of the family of Adam and his seed. ... The Bible must be true to history. From the formation of Adam and the birth of Seth (or appointed seed) down to the time of our Lord the Bible tells a continuous and connected historical story elsewhere unparalleled" [brackets mine]

Critical Note: You will notice that Goard uses the same play-on-words of "creation" vs. "formed" as those who promote the 6th & 8th day creations today. Also, to be noticed is that Goard believes that Genesis chapter 2 is a "continuation" of Genesis

chapter 1, whereas, chapter 2 is, in fact, a recapitulation of chapter 1 in greater detail. Whenever Scripture states: "... These are the generations ...", as it does in Gen. 2:4, what follows is the first "chronicle" in the Bible!

Goard, pp. 11-12: "... and finally of the appearance of [*nonwhite*] man and the beginning of the human era. ... Then comes the Sabbath of rest from creative activity. ... Now comes another and evidently later chapter in the creation story. ... This time the narrative is confined to the earth and to man upon it, with the lower forms of life which were associated with him. It takes up the story where the former chapter [1] ended. ... The formation of Adam, the dust of the earth! ... What a wonderful statement of the physiology of man. The elements of which he is composed are taken from the earth. ... The earth supplied the original materials; the earth sustains them to the end of individual life and to the last of the generations of mankind. ... 'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the earth ...' The Divine breathing into the senseless chemical compound which has been formed into the body of the man is thus stated. 'And God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man become a living soul.' ..."

Critical Note: This evidence again shows that Goard believed that the man at Gen. 2:7 is a different man than at Gen. 1:27, but the Hebrew simply does not support such a supposition, as in both chapters, the Hebrew is the same identical word character for character:

Gen. 1:27: אֶת־הָאָדָם Gen. 2:7: אֶת־הָאָדָם

Goard, page 29: "They [*Wellhausen, and his followers*] have represented that there is more than one story of creation, and that these do not agree with each other. It was a fatal move for the wing of the enemy of the Bible when he entered into this citadel. *There are not two or more accounts of the creation.* There is one sequent [*i.e., continuous*] account dealing with progressive stages of creation history. From this position modern scholarship will have to withdraw."

Critical Note: Goard got some things right, but other things wrong. Also Wellhausen, to whom Goard is referring, did likewise, and if Wellhausen wasn't a Canaanite-jew, he missed a good chance. To his credit, Goard trusted neither Jesuit nor jew. It appears that this Jesuit was trying to claim that there were three creations. One in Genesis chapter 1 and one in chapter 2, plus another one in Gen. 5:1-3. On the other hand, Goard was claiming two; one in Genesis chapter one of the nonwhite races, and the other one in Genesis chapter 2 of the creation of the race of Adam. The truth of the matter is, there was only one creation of Adam-kind in Genesis chapter 1, and Genesis chapters 2 and 5 are recapitulation accounts in greater detail of chapter 1. So what it amounts to is, both Goard and Wellhausen were wrong!

But we will have to forgive William Pascoe Goard, as he was one of the early followers of British Israel, and didn't have both of his eyes fully open. If one has some of Goard's works, I surely wouldn't throw them away, but be a little more critical of what he teaches. Howard B. Rand, in his *Destiny Magazine*, often used Goard's writings from 1946 through 1968, which I have in my library bound in yearbooks. While I have not perused all of Rand's *Destiny Magazines*, yet I have read a considerable amount of the articles published in them, including Goard's contributions.

Any good writer, when composing their discoveries on serious Biblical subjects, such as we are critiquing, will usually substantiate their position by exploring the original language it is written in, as in many cases, something is lost in translation. This is something I have noticed that Goard had failed to do time and again!

As a result of his failure, other men, not familiar with the original language, will pick up Goard's ball and start running with it, to their own detriment. This, I am sure, is what has happened in this case. So, as Scripture confirms, we have the blind leading the blind in epidemic proportions. As for myself, I was aware of this so-called 6th and 8th day creation nearly thirty years ago, but when I read Gen. 1:26 where it says, "**Let us make man in our image, after our likeness ...**", I cringed to believe that our Almighty was the "image" and "likeness" of a negroid or a mongolian! As a matter of fact, I considered such a premise to be blasphemy! Secondly, I questioned that if Gen. ch. 1 is the record of the so-called "creation of the other races", which one of the two (negroid or mongolian) did Gen. 1:26-27 refer to? Surely, if the "6th and 8th day creation" is true (which it isn't), it is a very serious oversight on the part of Holy Writ. So, with these reservations in mind, I put the theory of the "6th and 8th day creation" on the back-burner until I could find more information on the matter, which lasted for about twenty-five years. So, no one can accuse me of jumping to a conclusion! And it wasn't until I finally did a serious study on the Hebrew of the matter in question that the Hebrew didn't support such a supposition. So the moral of the story is: be careful that you don't become a lemming!

After twenty-five years of having the subject of the "6th and 8th day creation" on the back-burner, I finally decided to break my silence on the subject, and gather all the legitimate evidence I could find to reinforce the truth of the matter. Since that time I have written extensively, composing such papers as: • *The Chronicles Of Genesis*; • *Origin Of The 6th & 8th Day Creation Theory*; • *Controversy Over The 6th & 8th Day Creation*; • *6th & 8th Day Creation Fallacy*; • *The Two Creations Theory*; • *Lies Masquerading As "The Truth", A Critical Review Of The Book, The Two Creations, #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7*. • *Adam In The Hebrew At Genesis*; • *Context On The Hebrew Term "ADM" Without The "Eth" Or Article*; • *Don't Blunder On The Word "Chay"*; • *Study On The Word Chay, #2416*; • *The Only True Adam Of Genesis 1:26-29, #1, #2*. I have also addressed this subject in many of my *Watchman's Teaching Letters*.

I have wondered for a long time as to whom it might have been that started this 6th and 8th day creation theory, and it is appearing more and more to be the endeavor of Rev. William Pascoe Goard. I electronically searched Edward Hine's 296 page book *The British Nation Identified With Lost Israel*, and he didn't once suggest such a position, so it wasn't his baby. Of course, Goard might have been parroting some other deluded soul before him, but for now the finger is pointing at Goard as "a person of interest".

THE ONLY CONCEIVABLE CONCLUSION:

With Paul's witness added to the body of evidence at 1 Cor. 15:39, it eliminates any category for a non-white species of man, therefore the "man" at Gen. 1:26-27 can be only Adam-man, which a true reading of the Hebrew confirms! I know that alias "Eli James" (real name Joseph November), has made "recapitulation"* a swearword, but the

Adam-man at Gen. 2:7-8 is the same Adam-man at Gen. 1:26-27! What it amounts to is: alias "Eli" is following Rev. William Pascoe Goard rather than the written Word. However, there are truly beast-people, but they are a mixture of more than one species rather than a creation. So don't join the lemmings, who teach otherwise. (*"recapitulation" = "summarization".)