

6TH & 8TH DAY CREATION FALLACY

It seems there is no end to the conflict between those who contend there was both a 6th and 8th day creation of “man”, and those who comprehend that Genesis 2:4-7 is simply a chronicle **recording the history** of the creation of “man” at Genesis 1:26-27. For a beginning on this composition, I will quote from *Tracing Our White Ancestors*, by Frederick Haberman, pages 10-11:

“A great gulf of difference seems to exist between the findings of science and the orthodox interpretation of the first eleven chapters of Genesis: scientists can find traces of man existing for a period of fifty or one hundred thousand years with reasonable certainty, while faithful readers of Scripture insist that the Bible says that the first man was created about six thousand years ago. The mistake, however, has been with the orthodox interpretation of Genesis. Its first passage reads: ‘In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.’ When that beginning was is not stated; it may have been 100, 500, or 1000 million years ago. There is no conflict here with the findings of science. But it must be noticed that there is a great difference between the three principal races of mankind; between the Mongolian or Turanian race, the Negro race, and the White or Caucasian race; and there exists little relationship between the three. The white race were unquestionably the last comers, being in every way superior to the other two and constituting their leaders and teachers. Moreover, an honest investigation of their origin will show that they appeared suddenly and with a high state of civilization.

“The answer to that question is given in Genesis 1:26, where we read: ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over ... all the earth.’ If the Bible translators had translated the original Hebrew word for man, ‘Adam,’ as Adam instead of as ‘man,’ there would have been no doubt that the Bible deals only with the Adamic race, who were created in the likeness of God to have dominion over all the earth, i.e., over all the other primitive races. An examination of Young’s *Analytical Concordance* will show that in over 500 cases the Hebrew word for man in the Old Testament is ‘Adam,’ making it self-evident that the Old Testament deals only with what its Hebrew says, the Adamites. But unfortunately the translators have read their assumptions into the Book, as most people do.

“Thus, the Old Testament gives us the best, and we may be sure the right, explanation of the existence and superiority of the Adamic or White race. It is also well recognized that the white race was the agricultural race, while in older times the other, primitive races were chiefly nomads and hunters. This also is proven from Genesis 2:5, which states: ‘And there was not an Adamite to till the ground.’ In the second chapter of Genesis, verses 7 and 8 should read: ‘And the Lord formed the Adamite of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the Adamite became a living soul. And the Lord planted a garden in Eden; and there he put the Adamite whom he had formed.’

“However, it also appears that the word ‘man’ is applied only to the Adamic race, according to Max Mueller, the great Oxford scholar, who stated: ‘Man, a derivative root, means to think. From this we have the Sanskrit ‘Manu,’ originally the thinker, then man. The name

Adam, man, a thinker, suggests that the living soul breathed into Adam raised him high above the other existing races’.”

You can see very clearly that Frederick Haberman understands Genesis 1:26-27 to be speaking of Adam-man, and not the other races as the proponents of the 6th and 8th day creation insist. Though Haberman does quite well, we have to disagree with him that we are to be the “leaders and teachers” of the other races in any way, shape or form, as Scripture teaches total segregation. Rather, the Bible teaches that Adam is to have “dominion” over all of Yahweh Elohim’s creation, for which the other races are not a part.

Turning now to the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, volume 2, page 395: “Philo finds his exegetical basis for the distinction in the twofold account of man’s creation in Gen. 1:26 f. and Gen. 2:7. This gives rise to the frequently described or assumed distinction, which characterises all Philo’s theology and anthropology, between the heavenly man who in Gen. 1:26 f. is created as the εἰκὼν θεοῦ and has no part in mortality or earthliness, and the earthly man who according to Gen. 2:7 is fashioned out of dust ...”

You may not fully understand this paper unless you have already studied at length my brochure entitled the *Origin Of The 6th & 8th Day Creation Theory*. I said under the subheading ‘The Inventor Of The 6th & 8th Day Creation Theory’: ‘I believe most would be amazed at the origin of such a concept. It seems to be an invention of Philo, a Jew of Alexandria, Egypt. Philo did not call it a 6th & 8th day creation of man, but he did foster the idea of the creation of two separate Adams. So the theory of a 6th & 8th day creation of ‘man’ is definitely his brainchild and certainly not Biblical.’

We find the following at *Philo*, under “Allegorical Interpretation” 1.12.31: “‘And God created man, taking a lump of clay from the earth, and breathed into his face the breath of life: and man became a living soul.’ The races of men are twofold; for one is the heavenly man, and the other the earthly man. Now the heavenly man, as being born in the image of God, has no participation in any corruptible or earthlike essence. But the earthly man is made of loose material, which he calls a lump of clay. On which account he says, not that the heavenly man was made, but that he was fashioned according to the image of God; but the earthly man he calls a thing made, and not begotten by the maker.”

If the 6th & 8th day creation people want to follow Philo, they will have to make the “image man” at Genesis 1:26-27 the “heavenly man”, and the “man” at Genesis 2:7 the “earthly man.” How absurd! Absurd because the man at Genesis 1:26-27 and 2:7 is the same Adam-man, who was a heavenly man in an “earthen vessel” (2 Cor. 4:7)! Inasmuch as the 6th & 8th day creation people have adopted half of Philo’s theory of two separate creations, why don’t they accept the other half and make the “man” formed at Genesis 2:7 the other races? But it appears they would rather twist their own pretzels! While Philo has some valuable history for his period, his mixture of Greek philosophy with Scripture is appallingly deplorable. Astonishingly, the whole Israel Identity movement appears to be in the process of becoming one giant pretzel factory, with each individual having his own personal twist.

Philo says the following at “Noah’s Work as a Planter”, 5.18-19: “(18) But the others who say that our mind is a portion of the ethereal nature, have by this assertion attributed to man a kindred with the air; but the great Moses has not named the species of the rational soul by a title resembling that of any created being, but has pronounced it an image of the divine and invisible being, making it a coin as it were of sterling metal, stamped and impressed with the seal of God, the impression of which is the eternal word. (19) For, says Moses, ‘God breathed into man’s face the breath of life,’ so that it follows of necessity, that he that received the breath

must be fashioned after the model of him who sent it forth. On which account it is said too, that 'Man was made after the image of God,' and not after the image of any created being.'

It's a little difficult to follow Philo here, but in essence he is saying that the "image-man" at Genesis 1:26-27 is the original prototype, and that the "breath-man" at Genesis 2:7 is but an inferior copy. You'll see what I mean with this next quote from *Philo*.

Philo states further, at "Allegorical Interpretation", 2.4: "But it is not good for any man to be alone. For there are two kinds of men, the one made according to the image of God, the other fashioned out of the earth; for it longs for its own likeness. For the image of God is the antitype of all other things, and every imitation aims at this of which it is the imitation, and is placed in the same class with it. And it is not good for either the man, who was made according to the image of God, to be alone: nor is it any more desirable for the fictitious man to be alone, and indeed it is impossible." Philo alleges here that the "man" at Genesis 2:7 is an "imitation", or a "fictitious man." He means an inferior copy of the "man" at Genesis 1:26-27!

Again, Philo continues his diatribe at "Who Is the Heir of Divine Things", 12.56-57: "...For, says Moses, 'The Creator of the universe breathed into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul,' who also, it is recorded, was fashioned after the image of the Creator. So that the race of mankind also is twofold, the one being the race of those who live by the divine Spirit and reason; the other of those who exist according to blood and the pleasure of the flesh. This species is formed of the earth, but that other is an accurate copy of the divine image ..."

What Philo is saying here is not a lot different from what the 6th & 8th day creationists are advocating, inasmuch as they also promote two separate creations, except in a reversed order! I'm fully convinced that this whole business of a 6th & 8th day creation started from someone in Israel Identity reading *Philo* and putting his own twist on it. Nowhere, but nowhere in Scripture is an eighth day creation alluded to! One should be mindful of the curse for "adding to."

Again in *Philo* we find at "Concerning Noah's Work as a Planter", 11.44 "And Moses also speaks very carefully, not representing the man who was made after God's own image, but the man who was formed of clay, as the one who was placed in the paradise. For the one who was made after the image of God, and stamped with the truth of God, does, as it appears to me, in no respect differ from the tree which bore as its fruit everlasting life ..."

Although Philo lived during the First Advent of Yahshua the Messiah, he was completely unaware of anything Christian. Therefore, Philo was ignorant of the fact that he was contemporary with Yahweh who had come in the flesh, and **He** being both in the "image" at Genesis 1:26-27 and with the "breath of life" at Genesis 2:7. That brings up the very serious question: which one of these two attributes are we going to withhold from our Redeemer, the "image" or the "breath"? This should give one some idea of what happens when one attempts to twist Scripture like a pretzel! The complications become compounded!

We find in *Philo*, at "Allegorical Interpretation", 1.53: "Must not this man who was created according to the image and idea of God have been a different man from the other, so that two men must have been introduced into the Paradise together, the one a fictitious man, and the other modelled after the image of God?" What a foolish question to ask! But it is no more foolish than the theory the 6th & 8th day creationists pose! If there was an 8th day creation, as they so vigorously claim, why don't they quote book, chapter and verse? They can't and they don't!

From *A Commentary And Critical Notes*, by Adam Clarke, volume 1, from his "General Preface", page 4, we read the following about Philo: "Among the *Jews*, several eminent

commentators appeared at different times, besides the *Targumists* already mentioned, who endeavoured to illustrate different parts of the Law and the Prophets.— PHILO JUDÆUS, may be reckoned among these; his works contain several curious treatises in explication of different parts of the Hebrew Scriptures. He flourished about A. D. 40.” If you’ve ever read much of *Philo*, you’ll understand what Adam Clarke means, for Clarke was a master of several languages and was in a unique position to appraise Philo’s works!

The only appropriate conclusion one can arrive at from this is that Scripture doesn’t record the origin of the other races, and that they are not in the category of “good”!

We find all kinds of ideas on what the “image of God” might be. But of whatever that image consists, Yahshua the Anointed was born in it. There is one thing we can be sure of, and that is He took upon Himself the flesh of Adam-man. Today we know that a woman contributes 23 chromosomes of the 46 needed to form a normal person. Now we are told that if one makes the claim that He didn’t come in the flesh, that one is an “antichrist.”

In the *Peake’s Commentary on the Bible*, page 191, under the subtitle “The Covenant Ritual” (158a) we read: “The original intention in man’s creation was that he should be in God’s image, after his likeness. By his act of disobedience the image was defaced, the likeness destroyed; now the work of restoration has begun; God has found the response of faith and obedience; he has found a man in whom his own character begins to be formed. Then Abraham asks for an assurance of the fulfilment of the promise that his seed should inherit the land, and receives in answer the instructions for the covenant ritual.”

If then “the image was defaced, the likeness destroyed”, so also, was the “image” and “likeness” that the Christ came in! Therefore, we have to reject this interpretation by the *Peake’s Commentary on the Bible*! It is necessary we do so, as Adam-kind has the same DNA as Yahweh! Otherwise, the conception of the Christ would have been a genetic mismatch. In other words, Mary supplied 23 chromosomes, and Yahweh, without sexual intercourse, supplies the other 23. It appears we should be cautious before we disclaim His Image, or give that image to someone unworthy of it. That’s why only pureblooded kinsmen are worthy of taking Communion, for He is a kinsman Redeemer! Today we see genetic mismatches running rampant all over the place! Not only that, but some so-called Israel Identity ministers are inviting those genetic misfits into our midst to take Communion under the guise of “universalism”! In fact, the promotion of the 6th & 8th day creation theory is a way of aiding and abetting that crime, as it gives dignity to the unworthy who are not kinsmen!

EXCERPTS FROM ADAM CLARKE’S COMMENTARY ON GEN. 1:26-28

Before quoting Clarke, it should be pointed out that many commentaries are wanting in many areas. While Clarke falls into that category, still he is better than most. The outstanding quality of Clarke is the fact he understands the languages, and when he points out the meaning of a certain word, we can have at least some degree of confidence in his definitions. Clarke did particularly well on his comments of Genesis 1:26-28, as follows:

“In our image, after our likeness: What is said above refers only to the *body* of man, what is here said refers to his soul. This was made in the *image* and *likeness* of God. Now, as the Divine Being is infinite, he is neither limited by parts, nor definable by passions; therefore he can have no *corporeal image* after which he made the body of man. The image and likeness must necessarily be intellectual; his mind, his soul, must have been formed after the nature and

perfections of his God. The human mind is still endowed with most extraordinary capacities; it was more so when issuing out of the hands of its Creator. God was now producing a spirit, and a spirit, too, formed after the perfections of his own nature. God is the fountain whence this spirit issued, hence the stream must resemble the spring which produced it. God is holy, just, wise, good, and perfect; so must the soul be that sprang from him: there could be in it nothing impure, unjust, ignorant, evil, low, base, mean, or vile. It was created after the image of God; and that image, St. Paul tells us, consisted in *righteousness, true holiness, and knowledge*, Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10. Hence man was *wise* in his *mind*, *holy* in his *heart*, and *righteous* in his *actions*. Were even the word of God silent on this subject, we could not infer less from the lights held out to us by reason and common sense. The text tells us he was the work of ELOHIM, the Divine Plurality, marked here more distinctly by the plural pronouns US and OUR; and to show that he was the masterpiece of God's creation, all the persons in the Godhead are represented as united in counsel and effort to produce this astonishing creature.

"Gregory Nyssen has very properly observed that the superiority of man to all other parts of creation is seen in this, that all other creatures are represented as the effect of God's *word*, but man is represented as the *work* of God, according to plan and consideration: *Let us make MAN in our IMAGE, after our LIKENESS ...*

"*And let them have dominion*: Hence we see that the *dominion* was not the *image*. God created man capable of governing the world, and when fitted for the office, he fixed him in it. We see God's tender care and parental solicitude for the comfort and well-being of this masterpiece of his workmanship, in creating the world previously to the creation of man. He prepared every thing for his subsistence, convenience, and pleasure, before he brought him into being; so that, comparing little with great things, the house was built, furnished, and amply stored, by the time the destined tenant was ready to occupy it."

Inasmuch as Clarke refers to Eph. 4:24 and Col. 3:10, let's read them:

Eph. 4:24: "**And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.**"

Col. 3:10: "**And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him.**"

So we see very clearly that Adam Clarke had no **allusion**, nor **illusion**, nor **delusion** of an 8th day creation of "man"! At the beginning of Genesis chapter 2, Clarke subdivides the verses by topics thusly: "*The seventh day is consecrated for a Sabbath, and the reasons assigned, 1-3. A recapitulation, of the six days' work of creation, 4-7. The garden of Eden planted, 8. Its trees, 9. Its rivers, and the countries watered by them, 10-14. Adam placed in the garden, and the command given not to eat of the tree of knowledge on pain of death, 15-17. God purposes to form a companion for the man, 18. The different animals brought to Adam that he might assign them their names, 19, 20. The creation of the woman, 21, 22. The institution of marriage, 23, 24. The purity and innocence of our first parents, 25.*"

You will notice that I underlined Genesis 2:4-7, for it is nothing more than the **first chronicle** in the Bible! (See my brochure *The Chronicles Of Genesis*.) It is an error of the greatest magnitude to make more of Genesis 2:4-7 than what it really is! **Therefore, Yahweh created one Adam only**, and Scripture doesn't give the origin of the other races!

Clifton A. Emahiser's Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
emahiser.christogenea.org