

ORIGIN OF THE 6TH & 8TH DAY CREATION THEORY

Many may be unaware that some hold to the idea of both a 6th and an 8th day creation of man. They insist with resolute determination that the non-white races were “created” by the Almighty on the 6th day, and that Adam-man was “formed” on the 8th day, though nowhere in Scripture is an 8th day creation alluded to. Some go so far as to advocate that not only were there two separate creations of man, but also two distinctly different creators, (1) Elohim and (2) Yahweh. They go to great lengths to dispute that the other races were “created” rather than “formed” as Adam was at Genesis 2:7. They also contend the “man” at Genesis 1:26-27 was created male and female simultaneously, and that the “woman” at Genesis 2:22 was made separately from the “formed man” at Genesis 2:7. By all this, they hope in vain to account for the creation of the non-Adamic races.

Actually, Genesis 2:4-7 is the **first chronicle** in the Bible, and is only giving an historical recapitulation of the entire creation of Genesis 1. What it all boils down to is that the other races are not even on Yahweh’s radar map. But to show evidence that the “man” at Genesis 1:26-27 is the same “man” at Genesis 2:7 (“man” being the same *Strong’s* #120, the same as “Adam”), I will quote *Josephus’ Antiquities* 1:1:1-2, for he definitely states that **Adam was “formed” on the sixth day**:

Josephus’ Antiquities 1:1:1-2: “**1.** In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; but when the earth did not come into sight, but was covered with thick darkness, and a wind moved upon its surface, God commanded that there should be light; and when that was made, he considered the whole mass, and separated the light and the darkness; and the name he gave to one was *Night*, and the other he called *Day*; and he named the beginning of light and the time of rest, *the Evening* and *the Morning*; and this was indeed the first day: but Moses said it was one day, — the cause of which I am able to give even now; but because I have promised to give such reasons for all things in a treatise by itself, I shall put off its exposition till that time. After this, on the second day, he placed the heaven over the whole world, and separated it from the other parts; and he determined it should stand by itself. He also placed a crystalline [firmament] round it, and put it together in a manner agreeable to the earth, and fitted it for giving moisture and rain, and for affording the advantage of dews. On the third day he appointed the dry land to appear, with the sea itself round about it; and on the very same day he made the plants and the seeds to spring out of the earth. On the fourth day he adorned the heaven with the sun, the moon, and the other stars; and appointed them their motions and courses, that the vicissitudes of the seasons might be clearly signified. And on the fifth day he produced the living creatures, both those that swim and those that fly; the former in the sea, the latter in the air: he also sorted them as to society and mixture, for procreation, and that their kinds might increase and multiply. On the sixth day he created the **four-footed beasts**, and made them male and female: on the same day he also **FORMED** man. Accordingly Moses says, That in just six days the world and all that is therein was made; and that the seventh day was a rest, and a release from the labor of such operations; — whence it is that we celebrate a rest from our labors on that day, and call it the Sabbath; which word denotes rest in the Hebrew tongue. [*emphasis mine*]

0“2. Moreover, Moses, after the seventh day was over, begins to talk philosophically; and concerning the formation of man, says thus: That God took dust from the ground, and formed man, and inserted in him a spirit and a soul. This man was called Adam, which in the Hebrew tongue signifies *one that is red*, because he was formed out of red earth, compounded together; for of that kind is virgin and true earth. God also presented the living creatures, when he had made them, according to their kinds, both male and female, to Adam, who gave them those names by which they are still called. But when he saw that Adam had no female companion, no society, for there was no such created, and that he wondered at the other animals which were male and female, he laid him asleep, and took away one of his ribs, and out of it formed the woman; whereupon Adam knew her when she was brought to him, and acknowledged that she was made out of himself. Now a woman is called in the Hebrew tongue *Issa*; but the name of this woman was Eve, which signifies *the mother of all living*.”

You will notice that Josephus in no way supports the theory of an 8th day creation of man, but states, “On the sixth day he created the four-footed beasts, and made them male and female: on the same day he also formed man.” Notice that Josephus uses the term “formed” as stated in Genesis 2:7 for the “man” created on the sixth day. So the “created” vs. “formed” argument is invalid, as it is also invalidated by language found at Genesis 5:1-2, 6:7, Deut. 4:32, Job 33:6, Psalm 102:18, 104:30, Ecc. 12:1, Isaiah 43:1, 7, 15, 45:12, Mal. 2:10 etc.

Further, some try to include the so-called “creation” of non-Adamic races under “the beast of the earth after his kind”, but Josephus blows holes in that theory also by stating “four-footed beasts.”

I have personally often found Josephus more accurate than either the Masoretic text or the *Septuagint*, though he often agrees more with the *LXX*. But in the creation of Adam-kind at Genesis 1:26-27 and 2:7 there is no disagreement between these three sources. It’s all a matter of what some men have read into these passages that is really not there. Once one understands that Genesis 2:4-7 is the first historical chronicle in the Bible, all confusion disappears. Those who hold to the idea of two creations of man could also claim there was a second creation of animals at Genesis 2:19-20, which is only a recapitulation of Genesis 1:24-25. It is ridiculous to the point of blasphemy to claim that the races, (other than Adam), are in the “image” and “likeness” of the Almighty!

For anyone who doesn’t have a copy of the *Works of Josephus*, I would recommend the translation by William Whiston, by either the Kregel or the Hendrickson publishers. One might have to find a copy through a used book store.

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. The question at once arises, how did that hypothesis gain credence in the Israel Identity Message? No doubt, by someone who had read Philo’s ridiculous allegories and had taken them literally. But before we view the evidence, let’s consider what is known of this man. The 1980 *Collier’s Encyclopedia*, vol. 18, page 700, has the following to say:

“PHILO JUDAEUS ... born about 20 B.C. and died about A.D. 40, was a Jewish thinker and leader of the Jewish community in Alexandria, Egypt. He left many writings, mostly

preserved in the original Greek, but some in Armenian translations. Philo was a contemporary of both Jesus and Paul. In his writings, Philo bequeathed a rich repository of information about Judaism in the Greek dispersion. Moreover, the external form of these writings, that is, a broad use of allegory, contributes an additional element of interest. Allegory is a way of interpreting an ancient text (whether Homer or the Bible) whereby a commentator assigns arbitrary and fanciful meanings so as to convert the literal sense into a meaning congenial to himself. Philo in his allegory interpreted the proper names of Scripture as abstract concepts drawn from Greek philosophy, principally Pythagoreanism (which includes Platonism) and Stoicism. For example, Adam is an ordinary mind, Eve is sense perception, Canaan is adolescence, and Egypt is sensuality; Cain is fluent speech in unsound argumentation, while Abel is sound argumentation haltingly expressed. The result of such allegory is that Philo represents a blending of Jewish revelation and Greek philosophy, thereby creating a precedent for subsequent Christian and Jewish theology.

“Philo’s treatises are customarily divided into categories. *The Exposition* is the group in which a topic is treated, while *The Allegory of the Laws* consists of essays built on a sequence of Biblical verses. In both categories each essay carries a specific title. The theory is advanced, and properly contended against, that *The Exposition* was written for Gentiles, *The Allegory* for Jews. The third group, *Questions and Answers to Genesis and Exodus*, is piecemeal allegory and amounts to preliminary notes rather than worked-out essays. The fourth is a miscellany; it includes *Against Flaccus*, a denunciation of the Roman governor of Alexandria during anti-Jewish riots in A.D. 38 or 39; *Legation* is an account of Philo’s participation in a Jewish committee sent to Rome to protest against Flaccus. *That Every Good Man Is Free* is nowadays often consulted for its gilded description of the Essenes, while *On the Contemplative Life* portrays a somewhat similar monastic order of Egyptian Jews, the Therapeutae.

“Philo was not so much a philosopher as a preaching essayist who utilized philosophy in great abundance. Repetitions and tangents describe his manner; systematic organization of ideas is foreign to him.

“Most notable is his view of the Logos, the immanent (‘in this world’) intelligence of the transcendent (‘beyond this world’) God. Affinities exist to the Logos of the Gospel According to John, and also to various early Christologies.

“Both in allegorical method and in many aspects of his content Philo influenced Christian writers such as Clement and Origen, though perhaps indirectly. He is unknown in ancient rabbinic literature.”

It is difficult to determine whether or not Philo was a good or bad fig. *Philo* is one of the publications listed by the Loeb Classical Library. From the forward, page xii, of *Philo* translated by C. D. Yonge (forward by David. M. Scholer), we read of Philo’s brother:

“Philo’s brother, Alexander, held various offices for Rome in Egypt and used his money to plate the gates of the temple in Jerusalem with silver and gold and to make a loan to Herod Agrippa I (see Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 18.159-160 [18:6:3]; *Jewish War* 5.205 [5:5:3]). Alexander’s two sons, Marcus and Tiberius Iulius Alexander, Philo’s nephews, were also involved in Roman affairs. Marcus married Bernice, the daughter of Herod Agrippa I (Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 19.276-277 [19:5:1]; this is the Bernice mentioned in Acts 25:13, 23; 26:30). Tiberius Alexander became an apostate from Judaism, held the office of procurator of Judaea (A.D. 46-48), and was a prefect in Egypt (A.D. 66-70).”

From this it would appear that Alexander, Philo’s brother, married into the Edomite family of Herods, although this would not necessarily make him an Edomite though, his sons and

nephews surely were. Also, Alexander having that much money makes one wonder where and how he got it, and who the people are that usually possess it? Just after the forward, there is a "Preface To The Original Edition" from which we will take excerpts on pages xix & xx:

"... His chief residence was at Alexandria, which at that period was, next to Athens, the most celebrated seat of philosophy in the world, and which had long been a favourite abode of the learned Jews. On one occasion he mentions having visited Jerusalem; and this is all we know of his personal history. In his religious opinions he appears to have been a Pharisee, to the principles of which sect some portion of his fondness for allegorical interpretation may perhaps be owing ... The attempt to reconcile the heathen philosophy with the Bible was not altogether new. As early as the time of Ptolemy Lagus, many Jews had been settled in Alexandria; and, at the period when Philo flourished, they are supposed to have formed half the population of that city – the splendid library of which opened to the learned men of their nation those stores of Greek wisdom and eloquence ... Of all the writers of this school the most eminent was Philo, and his works are highly interesting as showing us the manner in which the Sophists of his age and nation sought to appropriate the Greek philosophy by an allegorical interpretation of the works of Moses ..."

What all this boils down to is the mixing of Holy Scripture with heathenism. This is the same thing that our Redeemer rebuked Peter for when He addressed him as "Satan", (Matthew 16:23): **"But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men."**

While Philo is valuable for some of the history during his time, his writings, for the most part, are outrageous. Actually, some of Philo's history interlocks with Josephus, though Josephus is of a later date. Outside of the word "logos", Philo has little Biblical inspiration to offer. In fact, he does quite the opposite. The idea of the two creations of Adam is one of them found under "On The Creation", page 19:

"XLVI. (134) After this, Moses says that 'God made man, having taken clay from the earth, and he breathed into his face the breath of life.' And by this expression he shows most clearly that there is a vast difference between man as generated now, and the first man who was made according to the image of God. For man as formed now is perceptible to the external senses, partaking of qualities, consisting of body and soul, man or woman, by nature mortal. But man, made according to the image of God, was an idea, or a genus, or a seal, perceptible only by the intellect, incorporeal, neither male nor female, imperishable by nature. (135) But he asserts that the formation of the individual man, perceptible by the external senses is a composition of earthy substance, and divine spirit. For that the body was created by the Creator taking a lump of clay, and fashioning the human form out of it; but that the soul proceeds from no created thing at all, but from the Father and Ruler of all things. For when he uses the expression, "he breathed into," etc., he means nothing else than the divine spirit proceeding from that happy and blessed nature, sent to take up its habitation here on earth, for the advantage of our race, in order that, even if man is mortal according to that portion of him which is visible, he may at all events be immortal according to that portion which is invisible; and for this reason, one may properly say that man is on the boundaries of a better and an immortal nature, partaking of each as far as it is necessary for him; and that he was born at the same time, both mortal and the immortal. Mortal as to his body, but immortal as to his intellect."

The offending conjecture at this passage of Philo is: "After this, Moses says that 'God made man, having taken clay from the earth, and he breathed into his face the breath of life.'

And by this expression he shows most clearly that there is a vast difference between man as generated now, and the first man who was made according to the image of God.” While much of what Philo says about the “spirit” of Adam-kind is true, he failed to recognize that Genesis 2:4-7 was the first chronicle in Scripture and that the “man” at Genesis 2:7 was the same “man” at Genesis 1:26-27. Are we not told at Luke 3:38 the following?: “... **Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God.**” Therefore, only Adam, being the Son of Yahweh, could have His “image” and “likeness.” Surely the other races don’t have Yahweh’s Image or Spirit! Note: Philo’s “first man” has the Image, and the “man generated now” has the breath of life (Spirit)!

By this, I’m fully persuaded that Philo is responsible for today’s “6th & 8th day creation theory”! But let’s take a look at another one of Philo’s absurd allegories on page 19:

“XLIX. (140) The first man, therefore, appears to me to have been such both in his body and in his soul, being very far superior to all those who live in the present day, and to all those who have gone before us. For our generation has been from men: but he was created by God. And in the same proportion as the one Author of being is superior to the other, so too is the being that is produced. For as that which is in its prime is superior to that the beauty of which is gone by, whether it be an animal, or a plant, or fruit, or anything else whatever of the productions of nature; so also the first man who was ever formed appears to have been the height of perfection of our entire race, and subsequent generations appear never to have reached an equal state of perfection, but to have at all times been inferior both in their appearance and in their power, and to have been constantly degenerating, (141) which same thing I have also seen to be the case in the instance of the sculptors’ and painters’ art. For the imitations always fall short of the original models. And those works which are painted or fashioned from models must be much more inferior, as being still further removed from the original. And the stone which is called the magnet is subject to a similar deterioration. For any iron ring which touches it is held by it as firmly as possible, but another which only touches that ring is held less firmly. And the third ring hangs from the second, and the fourth from the third, and the fifth from the fourth, and so on one from another in a long chain, being all held together by one attractive power, but still they are not all supported in the same degree. For those which are suspended at a distance from the original attraction, are held more loosely, because the attractive power is weakened, and is no longer able to bind them in an equal degree.

“And the race of mankind appears to be subject to an influence of the same kind, since in men the faculties and distinctive qualities of both body and soul are less vivid and strongly marked in each succeeding generation.”

I guess we would have to call this one “Philo’s constantly degenerating theory.” This would imply that Yahweh really didn’t make kind after kind! Anyway, I thought everyone would find it interesting from where the creations of two different Adams came, or what in Israel Identity is called “the 6th & 8th day creations.” What I have presented here on Philo is only a fraction of his convoluted gibberish. He is not to be likened to historians such as Herodotus, Josephus and many of the other classical writers. While the Bible uses allegorical language, it is not to be compared to the hodgepodge nonsense dreamed up by Philo. It is remarkable why anyone would want to repeat his absurdities. It now becomes the responsibility of everyone who has read this data to check it out for its accuracy. Again, I will repeat, the *Works of Philo* are of limited value, but I wouldn’t advise throwing them away.

Let me here repeat Philo’s theory of the creation of two separate Adams: “After this, Moses says that ‘God made man, having taken clay from the earth, and he breathed into his

face the breath of life.' And by this expression he shows most clearly that there is a vast difference between man as generated now, and the first man who was made according to the image of God ..." The implications are, if Philo is correct, we as White Adamites cannot have both (1) Yahweh's Spirit Breath and (2) His "Image-Likeness" simultaneously. **Which of these two very important inherent attributes shall we sacrifice?** Philo implies one man is **Spirit-man** and the other is **Image-man** which is the same **absurd theory** that the 6th & 8th day creationists promote. It's about time we discard this **relic** which belongs lock, stock and barrel to Philo. **It is absurd to suggest the Spirit without the Image, or the Image without the Spirit!**

So, contrary to Josephus' distinguished writings, much of Philo is nothing more than twisted logic! Josephus is not without fault in many respects, however an honest and straightforward man, while holding many errors of the Pharisees, as did Paul of Tarsus, until he spent three years relearning the true meaning of Scripture. Phariseism, though not as highly multicultural as today, was also tainted with universalism. Furthermore, Josephus was blind to the differences of Kenite-Canaanite- Edomite stock from the pure Adamite, even at times being quite complementary of Herod and his family, and seldom mentions differences along racial lines, except in a few isolated instances. For this reason his interpretation of early Scripture, as with other manuscripts, is not without error.

Aside from all of this, it may be said that it is good to compare Josephus' view of the creation of Adam with that of Philo's, and it shows that from a Hebrew reader's perspective (Josephus), one certainly need not distinguish the repetition of the story of Adam's creation as two different stories. The difference is, Josephus was interpreting Scripture from a strictly Hebrew standpoint, while Philo was attempting to pervert Scripture into something more agreeable to Greek philosophy. Thus, unwittingly the 6th and 8th day creation theorists have fallen into Philo's diabolical trap. Like hybrid people, hybrid animals, hybrid fruit and vegetables, hybrid fish, hybrid birds, Philo's is a hybrid religion. Therefore, those today who are teaching a 6th and 8th day creation of two different #120 Adams are promoting a (Philo inspired) hybrid doctrine. This is tantamount to race/species-mixing. Today, scientists (like *the angels which kept not their first estate*) are species-mixing in the laboratory. Again, I will repeat, Scripture does not record the creation of the non-Adamic races.

AN ANTICHRIST DOCTRINE

Significantly, the idea of a 6th & 8th day creation theory gets even more serious. By proclaiming that the non-Adamic races were created at Genesis 1:26-27 suggests that they are in the Image of the Almighty, not us. Since Yahshua the Redeemer was called "son of Adam", those propounding this theory deny that our Savior was in the Image of Yahweh. And if our Messiah has not that Image, then He is not our Kinsman Redeemer. If He came in the Image of the non-Adamic races, He is their Kinsman Redeemer, not ours! Further, if He came in the Image of the non-Adamic races, He didn't come in our flesh, and anyone who declares He didn't come in the flesh is "antichrist" (1 John 4:3; 2 John 7). As I have stated before, when He came He was born in the flesh, He was bruised in the flesh, He died in the flesh, He arose in the flesh, He ascended in the flesh, and He will return at His Second Advent in the flesh!

But in the end, it's each individual's responsibility to prove these things for himself (1 Thess. 5:21; 1 John 4:1; Phil. 4:8)!

1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Phone (419)435-2836

Please Feel Free To Copy, Or Order:
10 for 2.00; 25 for 3.00; 50 for 5.00 or 8.00 per 100