**Historical Adam: Introduction**

1. June 2011 cover story *Christianity Today* 🡪 “The Search for the Historical Adam”
	1. *In a recent pro-evolution book from InterVarsity Press, The Language of Science and Faith, [Francis] Collins and co-author Karl W. Giberson escalate matters, announcing that “unfortunately” the concepts of Adam and Eve as the literal first couple and the ancestors of all humans simply “do not fit the evidence.” (p. 24)*
	2. *To [Peter] Enns, a literal Adam as a special creation without evolutionary forbears is “at odds with everything else we know about the past from the natural sciences and cultural remains.” As he reads the early chapters of Genesis, he says, “The Bible itself invites a symbolic reading by using cosmic battle imagery and by drawing parallels between Adam and Israel.” (p. 26)*
	3. *Another BioLogos writer, Denis Lamoureux of the University of Alberta, the author of Evolutionary Creation (2008), thinks that “Adam never existed, and this fact has no impact whatsoever on the foundational beliefs of Christianity.” (p. 26)*
2. *American Scientific Affiliation* 2009 meeting 🡪 published in *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* vol. 62, no. 3 (Sept. 2010).
	1. Daniel C. Harlow and John R. Schneider (Calvin College—at the time)
3. Peter Enns’ book *The Evolution of Adam: What the Bible Does and Doesn’t Say About Human Origins* (Brazos Press, 2012).
* denies historicity of Adam
1. C. John Collins *Did Adam and Eve Really Exist? Who They Were and Why You Should Care* (Crossway, 2011).
* affirms historicity of Adam
* *My goal in this study is to show why I believe we should retain a version of the traditional view, in spite of any pressures to abandon it. (p. 13)*
1. Recent *LifeWay Research* poll (1000 Protestant pastors)
* “I believe Adam and Eve were literal people.”
	+ 74% “strongly agree”
	+ 8% “somewhat agree”
	+ 6% “somewhat disagree”
	+ 11% “strongly disagree”
1. Paul Bruggink’s chart 🡪 see bibliography for web location
2. Agenda for the evening
	1. Narrowing the domain of iniquiry
		1. Not *directly* dealing with the age of the earth
		2. Not *directly* entering into the polemics of creation vs. evolution
		3. Not *directly* dealing with the all the potential models for the integration of the Bible and science
	* All of these come into play in one manner or another
	1. Flow of presentation
		1. Biblical data on Adam
		2. Current denials or adjustments to the traditional understanding
		3. What does a denial of the historicity of Adam do to other biblical doctrines?
		4. Authority of Scripture and the rationality of belief in Adam

**Historical Adam: Taxonomy of Views**

1. Dean Harlow [[1]](#footnote--1)

*In current Christian thinking about Adam and Eve, five basic scenarios are on offer.*

1. *The traditional view, still held today by young-earth creationists, is that Adam and Eve are recent ancestors of the human race—actual persons specially created by God about 10,000 years ago.*
2. *Another view, held by old-earth creationists, posits that God created humans around 150,000 years ago but then selected a pair of them about 10,000 years ago to represent all of humanity; this would make Adam and Eve recent representations.*
3. *A third view sees Adam and Eve as ancient ancestors—a pair of evolved hominids whom God selected and miraculously modified into the first Homo Sapiens about 150,000 years ago.*
4. *A variant of this scenario envisions Adam and Eve as ancient representatives: God revealed himself to a large group of early humans around 150,000 years ago, and the biblical Adam and Eve are symbolic of this group.*
5. *Over against these four scenarios stands the view of the majority of contemporary biblical scholars, theologians, and Christians working in the sciences, a view that is largely unknown in evangelical circles: Adam and Eve are strictly literary figures—characters in a divinely inspired story about the imagined past that intends to teach primarily theological, not historical, truths about God, creation, and humanity.*
* Note: Number (2) above should be furthered sub-divided:
	+ (2a) Would be that the “pre-Adamites” were perhaps somewhat on a continuum with humans but are not to be considered fully human until God bestows upon them his image. The would make Adam and Eve as “recent ancestors” but having a lineage of homind ancestors.
	+ Marvin Lubenow writes:

*Almost all who hold the old-Earth, pre-Adamite position consider the Biblical Adam to have lived during the Neolithic (New Stone Age), about 10 ka. The human fossils dated before that time, representing humans who lived in the Paleolithic (Old Stone Age), were pre-Adamites. The nature of these pre-Adamites (were they human or animal, having or not having the image of God?) varies with the individual interpreter.[[2]](#footnote-0)*

1. C. John Collins in his book *Did Adam and Eve Really Exist?* lays out four criteria that sound thinking on this issue should embrace and not transgress.
2. *To begin with, we should see that the origin of the human race goes beyond a merely natural process. This follows from how hard it is to get a human being, or, more theologically, how distinctive the image of God is.*
3. *We should see Adam and Eve at the headwaters of the human race. This follows from the unified experience of mankind, as discussed in chapter 4: where else could human beings come to bear God’s image?*
4. *The “fall,” in whatever form it took, was both historical (it happened) and moral (it involved disobeying God), and occurred at the beginning of the human race. The universal sense of loss described in chapter 4 makes no sense without this. Where else could this universality have come from? ….*
5. *If someone should decide that there were, in fact, more human beings than just Adam and Eve at the beginning of mankind, then, in order to maintain good sense, he should envision these humans as a single tribe. Adam would then be the chieftain of this tribe (preferably produced before the others), and Eve would be his wife. The tribe “fell” under the leadership of Adam and Eve. This follows from the notion of solidarity in a representative. Some may call this a form of “polygenesis,” but this is quite distinct from the more conventional, and unacceptable kind.[[3]](#footnote-1)*
* Note: Collins is arguing, in his book, for “mere historical Adam-and-Eve-ism”. He is attempting to hold to a historical Adam while also outlining the various nuances this might take. He offers some various models that he feels stay within his four criteria. He personally believes the following:

*Now, I hold to a scenario that is simple, namely that God formed Adam by scooping up some loose dirt and fashioning it into the very first man, and then God formed Eve using a part of Adam’s body; there are no other humans around when they sin. I also recognize that Genesis 1–11 works by presenting us with both actual events and the divinely-authorized way of picturing its events, but it doesn’t answer all of our questions. Thus it seems reasonable to me to allow for some differences of opinion on some of the details. The late Francis Schaeffer offered an approach that he called “freedoms and limitations”: We have some room to imagine various scenarios, and at the same time we have boundaries on just what sorts of scenarios are worth considering.[[4]](#footnote-2)*

**Historical Adam: The Scriptural Data**

1. Genesis 1-5
	1. 1.26-28 🡪 general statement[[5]](#footnote-3) of creation of man and woman
	2. *In Genesis, the figure named “Adam” appears unambiguously in chapters 2-5. The proper name Adam transliterates the Hebrew word for “human being, mankind,”* ***‘adam****. In Genesis 2:20 (according to the received Hebrew text), “the man” is first called “Adam.”[[6]](#footnote-4) Genesis 2:5 says there was no* ***man*** *to work the ground. In 2:18* ***the man*** *is alone, and the Lord God sets out to make a helper fit for him. Throughout 2:4-4:26, whether he is called* ***the man*** *or Adam, he is presented as one person. The man’s wife is simply called either “the woman” or “his wife” throughout—although when she receives her name Eve in 3:20, that name becomes another option (cf. 4:1, where both are used together). The name Adam appears also in the genealogy of 5:1-5.[[7]](#footnote-5)*
	3. Connecting links between Gen 1-11 and the rest of Genesis
		1. “book of the generations” (*toledot*) in 5.1 about Adam
			1. Phrase used throughout the rest of Genesis as historical marker (6.9; 10.1; 11.10; 11.27; 25.12; 25.19; 36.9; 37.2—also 2.4)
		2. Adam serves as the backdrop for the narrative beginning in chapter 12 with Abram

NOTE: On the rarity of mention of Adam in OT. Peter Enns states:

*[I]t may be surprising to see how relatively absent explicit reference to Adam is in the Old Testament.[[8]](#footnote-6)*

* Two points
1. Need to ***weigh*** the significance of references and not simply count them. Adam is uniquely placed in the storyline of the OT and provides the preconditions for the Abrahamic storyline.[[9]](#footnote-7)
2. C. John Collins takes up this idea of rarity of citation:

*It is often said that references to the fall story are rare, or even nonexistent, in the rest of the Old Testament. … There are several difficulties with this claim: the first is, what exactly constitutes a “citation,” presumption, or echo? A related difficulty is, does an allusion to any part of Genesis 1-5 count as one of these echoes? And there is still more: has this perceived rarity of allusion become part of a circular argument—that is, once we think that there are no allusions, do we then dismiss possible allusions because we “know” that such an allusion is unlikely since it is so rare? Finally, does not the presence or absence of allusions depend on the communicative intentions of the Biblical writers and their perceptions of the needs of their audiences? That is, a later writer may or may not find an echo of this passage useful to what he is trying to do with his later text—which means that the (perceived) rarity of citation hardly implies that his story has no bearing on the rest of the Hebrew Bible.[[10]](#footnote-8)*

1. Hosea 6.7 (disputed passage)[[11]](#footnote-9)

*But like* ***Adam*** *they have transgressed the covenant; there they have dealt treacherously against me.*

* 1. Alternate translations: “like any human beings” or “at (the place called) Adam”[[12]](#footnote-10)
	2. Refers to Adam of Genesis; the first man[[13]](#footnote-11)
1. Job 31.33 (possible allusion; disputed)

*If I have concealed my transgression as others do [margin: as Adam did]—ESV*

*There is no really good way to decide, one way or the other, between the interpretation of the text (“as others do”) or the margin (“as Adam did”); the Hebrew* ***ke’adam****, can go either way. What we must not do is enforce circular reasoning, to the effect that since references to Adam are so rare, therefore one is unlikely here. We will instead leave tis one as an open question.[[14]](#footnote-12)*

1. 1 Chronicles 1.1 (geneaology[[15]](#footnote-13))

*Adam, Seth, Enosh,…*

1. Matthew 19.3-9 (parallel in Mark 10.2-9)

*And he answered and said, “Have you not read that he who created them from the beginning* ***made them male and female*** *(Gen 1.27), and said, ‘****For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh****’?” (Gen 2.24) Matthew 19.4-5*

*He said to them, “Because of your hardness of heart Moses permitted you to divorce your wives; but from the beginning it has not been this way.” Matthew 19.8*

Notes:

1. Jesus’ ties together Gen 1.27 and 2.24 🡪 shows Jesus’ understanding of Gen 1 and 2 as being complementary
2. Dealing with the issues of marriage and divorce. Jesus takes them back to the “beginning” to establish his points. No indicators that he is using Gen 1 and 2 except in a manner which assumes the historicity of the accounts
3. Matthew 23.35 // Luke 11.51 (a passing reference to Abel in Gen 4 as historical figure)

*So that upon you may fall the guilt of all the righteous blood shed on earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah, the son of Berechiah, whom you murdered between the temple and the altar. Matthew 23.35*

1. Hebrews 11.4-7 mentions Abel, Enoch, and Noah in a list of other historical figures.

*If, as seems likely, the author of Hebrews assumes the historicity of these characters from Genesis 4-5, there is no reason to exclude Adam and Eve from the same assumption.[[16]](#footnote-14)*

1. Mark 2.27 🡪 Genesis 2.3

*Jesus said to them, “The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.”*

* Not a specific reference to “Adam” but a clear reference to Genesis 2.3
1. John 8.44 (reference to devil “from the beginning”)

*You are of your father the devil, and you want to do the desires of your father. He was a murderer from the beginning, and does not stand in the truth because there is no truth in him. Whenever he speaks a lie, he speaks from his own nature, for he is a liar and the father of lies.*

* *This is generally held to agree with the reading of the serpent as the mouthpiece of the Evil One that I have argued for above, and with the interpretation found in Wisdom 2:24. The expression “from the beginning” (Greek* ***ap’ arches****) certainly points this way, with its reference to the beginning of creation (see John 1:1; 1 John 3:8).[[17]](#footnote-15)*
1. 1 Corinthians 11.7-12

*7For a man ought not to have his head covered, since he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of man. 8For man does not originate from woman, but woman from man; 9for indeed man was not created for the woman’s sake, but woman for the man’s sake. 10Therefore the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels. 11However, in the Lord neither is woman independent of man, nor is man independent of woman. 12For as the woman originates from the man, so also the man has his birth through the woman; and all things originate from God.*

Notes:

* 1. Paul going back to creation to set policy in the life of the church
	2. Number of allusions/echoes to Genesis 1 and 2
		1. “image and glory of God”
		2. origination of woman from man
		3. woman created for man
1. 2 Corinthians 11.3

*But I am afraid that, as the serpent deceived Eve by his craftiness, your minds will be led astray from the simplicity and purity of devotion to Christ.*

Notes:

1. Paul concerns for the church
2. Serpent deceived Eve and can potentially lead the Corinthians astray (cf. v. 14: “Satan disguises himself as an angel of light)
3. 1 Timothy 2.13-14

*For it was Adam who was first created, and then Eve. And it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression.*

 Notes:

* 1. Paul going back to creation to set policy in the church
	2. Ardel Caneday on Eve:

*Genesis 1-3 provides Paul with the necessary foundations in revealed reality for his teaching concerning the complementary role relationships for males and females. Thus, whenever Paul has occasion to recall the formation of the first woman, her divinely appointed role, or her seduction to sin, he presupposes her real, historic existence (e.g., 1 Cor 11:2-16; 14:34-35; 2 Cor 11:1-3; 1 Tim 2:8-15). Thus, not only does Paul regard the whole narrative of creation but also of human rebellion against God to entail historical events, he takes seriously the historical sequence within the Genesis account when he states, “For man was not made from woman, but woman from man. Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man” (1 Cor 11:8-9).[[18]](#footnote-16)*

1. Acts 17.26 (Paul at Athens with the Stoic and Epicurean philosophers)

*And he made from one man every nation of mankind to live on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed times and the boundaries of their habitation*

Notes:

1. Evangelistic preaching
2. Asserting both the resurrection of Jesus (vv. 18, 31) and creation of one man through whom all others came (v. 26)
3. Jude 14

*It was also about these men that Enoch, in the seventh generation from Adam, prophesied, saying, “Behold, the Lord came with many thousands of his holy ones…*

* 1. Quoting the pseudepigraphical *Book of Enoch* (extra-biblical)
	2. Doesn’t endorse inspiration of this book
		1. Paul can quote pagan poets (Acts 17.28; 1 Cor 15.33; Titus 1.12)
1. Romans 5.12-19

*12Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned—13for until the Law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed when there is no law. 14Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the offense of Adam, who is a type of him who was to come. 15But the free gift is not like the transgression. For if by the transgression of the one the many died, much more did the grace of God and the gift by the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, abound to the many. 16The gift is not like that which came through the one who sinned; for on the one hand the judgment arose from one transgression resulting in condemnation, but on the other hand the free gift arose from many transgressions resulting in justification. 17For if by the transgression of the one, death reigned through the one, much more those who receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness will reign in life through the one, Jesus Christ. 18So then as through one transgression there resulted condemnation to all men, even so through one act of righteousness there resulted justification of life to all men. 19For as through the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one the many will be made righteous.*

* 1. John Murray

*The parallelism and contrast [in these verses] demand for Adam as the first man a historical identity comparable to that of Christ himself. Otherwise the basis of comparison and contrast is lost. Adam and Christ sustain unique relations to the human race, but in order to sustain these relations there must be to both such historical character as will make those relations possible and relevant.[[19]](#footnote-17)*

*“Through one man sin entered into the world.” [v12] The one man is without question Adam (vs. 14). The account given in Genesis 3 is the basis of this statement and the apostle places his imprimatur upon the authenticity of this account. The importance he attached to this incident of Genesis 3 is attested by the fact that the subsequent development of his argument turns on it. That sin entered through one man is an integral element of the comparison or parallel upon which is to b built Paul’s doctrine of justification.[[20]](#footnote-18)*

* 1. D. A. Carson on Romans 5.13-14:

*Paul’s reference to the time period from Adam to Moses (5:13-14) certainly presupposes a historical figure (i.e., Adam) at the beginning of the period, corresponding to a historical figure at the end of the period (Moses). Moreover, this period in world history is not simply an abstract, bounded, temporal entity—we are not dealing with a ‘time’ in the abstract; rather, this period is portrayed as a time during which (a) the ‘law’ (of Moses) had not yet been given; (b) sin was in the world; and (c) death reigned. This threefold description can only refer to the Old Testament period stretching from the fall of Adam to the giving of the law to Moses; and it treats the period as real history inasmuch as all die within it.*

1. 1 Corinthians 15.20-23, 42-49

*20But now Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who are asleep. 21For since by a man came death, by a man also came the resurrection of the dead. 22For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all will be made alive. 23But each in his own order: Christ the first fruits, after that those who are Christ’s at his coming…*

*42So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown a perishable body, it is raised an imperishable body; 43it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; 44it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body. 45So also is it written, “****The first man, Adam, became a living soul****.” (Gen 2.7) The last Adam became a life-giving spirit. 46However, the spiritual is not first, but the natural; then the spiritual. 47The first man is from the earth, earthy; the second man is from heaven. 48As is the earthy, so also are those are earthy; and as is the heavenly, so also are those who are heavenly. 49Just as we have borne the image of the earthy, we will also bear the image of the heavenly.*

* On 1 Cor 15.20-28, 42-49 N. T. Wright states:

*Genesis 1-3 is thus not only a frequent point of allusion, but provides some of the key structural markers in the argument. Even in its own terms, there can be no doubt that Paul intends this entire chapter to be an exposition of the renewal of creation, and the renewal of humankind as its focal point.[[21]](#footnote-19)*

* Regarding v. 21 🡪 parallelism between two individuals at the head of two different lines: the line of death and the line of the resurrection of the dead[[22]](#footnote-20)
* Regarding v. 22 🡪 language of “in Adam” and “in Christ”

*…there is no evidence that one can be covenantally “in” someone who had no historical existence.[[23]](#footnote-21)*

* Regarding v. 45 🡪 Peter Jones has written:

*Moreover, verse 45 contains the broadest, most far-reaching perspective on God’s purposes for the cosmos than any other text in the Pauline corpus, and, indeed, in my judgment, in the whole NT.[[24]](#footnote-22)*

1. Some concluding thoughts:
	1. From the PCA Creation Study Committee:

*There is no doubt then, that the New Testament treats Genesis 1-3 as real history. This is hermeneutically decisive for the church, because we acknowledge the inspiration and inerrancy of Holy Scripture.  But there is more than the historicity of Genesis 1-3 at stake in the New Testament’s interpretation of these texts.  The very structure of the covenant plan of redemption is found in Genesis 1-3.  Bound up with the biblical revelation in the first chapters of Genesis are the New Testament’s teaching on the work of Christ as the eschatological Adam, and its implications for soteriology and the consummation, as well as ethical requirements for the institution of marriage and church order.  History is not only born here but sovereignly determined by the prophetic Word of God.*

*In Genesis 1-3 Moses wrote a faithful, pristine version of the actual facts of history. Genesis 1-11 cannot be historically rejected without destroying Christianity.  These events and persons must be affirmed, whatever other differences we may entertain in the details of the exegesis of the “days” of Genesis 1.[[25]](#footnote-23)*

*All the Committee members join in these affirmations:  The Scriptures, and hence Genesis 1-3, are the inerrant word of God.  That Genesis 1-3 is a coherent account from the hand of Moses.  That history, not myth, is the proper category for describing these chapters; and furthermore that their history is true.  In these chapters we find the record of God’s creation of the heavens and the earth ex nihilo; of the special creation of Adam and Eve as actual human beings, the parents of all humanity (hence they are not the products of evolution from lower forms of life).  We further find the account of an historical fall, that brought all humanity into an estate of sin and misery, and of God’s sure promise of a Redeemer.  Because the Bible is the word of the Creator and Governor of all there is, it is right for us to find it speaking authoritatively to matters studied by historical and scientific research.  We also believe that acceptance of, say, non-geocentric astronomy is consistent with full submission to Biblical authority.  We recognize that a naturalistic worldview and true Christian faith are impossible to reconcile, and gladly take our stand with Biblical supernaturalism.[[26]](#footnote-24)*

**Historical Adam and Doctrines Effected by Denial**

\* Doctrines potentially affected by the historicity of Adam:

1. Authority of Scripture
2. Clarity (perspicuity) of Scripture
3. Inerrancy of Scripture
4. Origin of sin and original sin
5. Abnormality of sin
6. Doctrine of Atonement
7. Transmission of sin
8. Need of a savior 🡪 necessity of incarnation
9. Image of God
10. Male-Female complementarianism
11. Creation and Covenant divorced 🡪 Adam as head of humanity
12. Authority of Scripture
	1. Peter Enns acknowledges that Paul thought of Adam as a historical figure.

*Paul, however, presents Adam as the first human and responsible for the problem of universal sin and death that Jesus came to eradicate.[[27]](#footnote-25)*

*At the outset we should admit that Adam is a vital theological and historical figure for Paul. Without question, Adam plays a significant theological role for Paul. But Adam’s theological significance cannot be distanced from Paul’s assumption that Adam was the first man created by God.[[28]](#footnote-26)*

*But Adam’s theological importance does not exist for Paul independent of Adam’s historical position as the first man, from whom the human race descended and from whom all inherited sin and death—at least according to common Christian understanding. In other words, it is Adam as first man that makes him such a vital theological figure.[[29]](#footnote-27)*

*…Paul’s historical Adam represents an unquestioned historical reality for him.[[30]](#footnote-28)*

* 1. John Schneider acknowledges that Paul thought of Adam as a historical figure.

*We may think that the writer of Genesis deliberately used Adam and Eve as literary types that represented the first human beings symbolically, in which instance, we can simply stretch the symbolism to include the original colonies of our ancestors, to be compatible with polygenism. This hermeneutical strategy will probably require giving up concordism and its principled inerrancy, however, because is seems unlikely that Paul (or Luke) in the New Testament understood biblical Adam in this symbolic way.[[31]](#footnote-29)*

*The mere fact that Paul thought Adam, like Abraham, was a specific person by that name does not necessarily mean that we should have that belief (widely held by first-century Jews) now.[[32]](#footnote-30)*

* 1. Daniel Harlow acknowledges that Paul thought of Adam as a historical figure.

*Paul, like Luke, no doubt regarded Adam as a historical person…[[33]](#footnote-31)*

1. Clarity (perspicuity) of Scripture
	1. James Anderson appropriately sets up this tension:

*If I reject P [belief in the historicity of Adam—RJK], it doesn’t follow that I must abandon biblical inerrancy. Rather than concluding that the Bible mistakenly teaches P, I could conclude that the Bible doesn’t teach P after all. In other words, I could conclude that my present interpretation of Scripture, however compelling, is mistaken.*

*Although this preserves inerrancy, it comes at a price. It may force me to accept a very unnatural reading of Scripture, one that flies in the face of grammatical-historical principles of interpretation. It may also thereby raise doubts about the clarity of Scripture—particularly so if the revised reading has significant theological implications that strike at core Christian doctrines. A “Sophie’s Choice” between denying the inerrancy of Scripture and denying the clarity of Scripture isn’t a pleasant prospect, especially if I have strong rational grounds for both doctrines.[[34]](#footnote-32)*

1. Inerrancy 🡪 see Schneider quotation above
2. Origin of sin and original sin
	1. Daniel Harlow on original sin:

*Can should the Augustinian doctrines of the Fall and original sin be retained with conviction in the age of evolutionary science? I think the answer is yes, as long as we are willing to make some serious modifications.[[35]](#footnote-33)*

*Nonevangelical theologians have been rethinking original sin in light of evolutionary biology for several decades now…They and others have proposed that original sin is a biologically inherited state, a by-product of billions of years of evolution…So understood, original sin is not the result of a single fall but of repeated falls in the life of every human being and of their cumulative, systemic effects in society and culture. And humanity’s constant falling away is not a descent from some primordial state of integrity but a failure to live up to a divinely posed ideal.[[36]](#footnote-34)*

* 1. Enns denies the causal link between Adam and human sinfulness (p. 123). He thinks that all that is needed is affirm universal human sinfulness regardless of the cause of that univeral problem. James K. A. Smith responds:

*But it is in this context that I think Enns either misrepresents or misunderstands the historic, orthodox doctrine of the Fall and original sin.  He speaks as if the doctrine of original sin was just an account of the cause of our universal human sinfulness (124)—and it is just this sort of causal claim that he thinks is untenable in light of evolutionary evidence for human origins.  But Enns thinks we are free to abandon this causal claim associated with original sin and instead simply affirm universal sinful humanness—and hence the need for a Savior, thereby preserving the Gospel.  We “must remain open on the ultimate origins of why all humans are born in sin (original sin) while resting content in the observation that all humans are born in sin (sin of origin)” (125).*

*Unfortunately, that’s just not the case.  Because if we don’t have an account of the origin of sin we will end up making God the author of evil—a thesis that has been persistently and strenuously rejected by the orthodox Christian tradition.  Enns thinks he can save the Gospel by simply affirming universal human sinfulness without taking a stand on the origin of sin; but that is to fail to recognize that what’s at stake is the goodness of God.  If God uses evolutionary processes to create the world and sin is inherent in those processes, then creation is synonymous with fall and God is made the author of sin—which compromises the very goodness of God.  And if the goodness of God isn’t central to the Gospel, I don’t know what is.[[37]](#footnote-35)*

1. Sin as an abnormal intrusion into God’s good creation. Sinful behaviors are seen as the necessary consequent of the evolutionary process.
	1. Daniel Harlow

*Recent studies in primatology, sociobiology, and phylogenetics are also pertinent to the historicity of Adam and Eve and to the doctrines of the Fall and original sin. Here a range of evidence establishes that virtually all of the acts considered “sinful” in humans are part of the natural repertoire of behavior among animals—especially primates, but also birds, insects and other species—behaviors including deception, bullying, theft, rape, murder, infanticide, and warfare, to name but a few.[[38]](#footnote-36)*

*The source of the human inclination toward self-aggrandizement, then, is to be found in animal nature itself. Far from infecting the rest of the animal creation with selfish behaviors, we humans inherited these tendencies from our animal past.[[39]](#footnote-37)*

*We must trust that God created the kind of world that he did because an evolutionary process involving selfishness, suffering, and death was the only way to bring about such creaturely values as novelty, complexity, and freedom.[[40]](#footnote-38)*

* 1. John Schneider

*Among other things, these studies show that “practically all of the overt acts regarded as ‘sinful’ in humans are part of the normal, natural repertoire of behavior in other species.”… Animals engage in deception, murder (even serial killings), infanticide, bullying, and so forth. Insects come into play, too. It seems that even ants—widely known for their cooperation as colonies—on closer inspection, also engage in a litany of antisocial actions: family quarrels, theft, street muggings, premeditated murder, and slavery, to name a selected few.*

He goes on to write:

*As for deliberative human altruism (if there really is such a thing), it requires writes Domning, “an intellect and will of a caliber that does not and cannot exist in the simplest life forms.” The clear implication of the science is that, at the dawn of human consciousness and its moral awareness and capacities for such virtue, altruism was the challenge for humanity in the future, not the original primal condition of human beings in the past.*

*The bottom line is that if the first human beings evolved genetically this way, then it is very hard to see how they could have originated in conditions of original righteousness, as required by Augustinian theology, for they would have inherited powerful natural dispositions toward selfish actions.[[41]](#footnote-39)*

1. Transmission of sin
2. Atonement of Christ Jesus
	1. Daniel Harlow

*Once the doctrine of original sin is reformulated, the doctrine of the atonement may likewise be deepened. But the new understanding of sin requires that we now favor theories of the atonement like the Christus Victor model or the moral influence theory, instead of the theory of a ransom paid to the Devil or a satisfaction paid to God’s honor.[[42]](#footnote-40)*

1. Need of a savior and the necessity of the incarnation
	1. Marvin Lubenow

*If the Fall is not an historic reality, if physical death is ‘natural’, it implies that we are not fallen creatures and that it was not necessary for Christ to die to purchase our salvation. In this sense, the doctrine of the imputation of Adam’s sin to the human family is one of the most important doctrines of the Scriptures.[[43]](#footnote-41)*

* + - * Once sin and the atonement are touched upon (“reformulated”) then these revised notions may impinge upon Christ and the incarnation.
1. Image of God in humanity
	1. C. John Collins outlines views on the image of God
		1. *Resemblance*: human beings like God in some aspect(s) such as intellect, moral sense, will, rationality, etc.
		2. *Representative*: humans commanded by God to rule creation on God’s behalf
		3. *Relational*: humans as male/female and in community as they manifest the “image of God”
			* *Scholars commonly speak as if these categories are mutually exclusive. My view is that the linguistic and exegetical details favor the idea that “in our image, after our likeness” implies that humans were made with some kind of resemblance to God, which was to enable them to represent God as benevolent rulers, and to find their fulfillment in their relationships with each other and with God. That is, I have combined all three views,…[[44]](#footnote-42)*
	2. Issue of pre-Adamites and the image of God
2. Male-female complementarity
	1. Mike Reeves, in responding to Denis Alexander’s view[[45]](#footnote-43):

*If Eve had a physical origin independent of Adam, then while God might for his own inscrutable reasons want to affirm male-female complementarity, he would have no ontological basis for doing so.*

*In other words, his affirmation here (and, one must assume, at least some of his other affirmations) float independent of reality. God, in effect, pulls his theology out of thin air. But a God who is forced to graft meaning onto events (or non-events) that do no themselves carry any such meaning does not look like a sovereign creator.[[46]](#footnote-44)*

* 1. Ardel Caneday discusses the fact that Paul appeals to the sequence of creation (i.e., Adam before Eve) to teach the church:

*Again, Paul’s appeal to such fine detail as historical sequence reinforces the fact that he believed in the historicity of the persons and events of Genesis 1-3. If Paul believed wrongly that Genesis 1-3 portray real people and places, actual events, and historical sequences, then his gospel and his teaching concerning how men and women ought to conduct themselves in relation to one another in the church is dubious and should be rejected. For Paul roots his beliefs and his teachings in history, written in Scripture.[[47]](#footnote-45)*

1. Creation and Covenant divorced 🡪 Adam as head of humanity
	1. Mike Reeves, in responding to Denis Alexander’s views (see footnote #18):

*However, by divorcing Adam’s federal headship from his natural, physical headship, Alexander runs into what are now familiar problems. The first is that, once again, God is making theological affirmations that have no ontological basis. Adam is being declared to be something (the head of humanity) that he is, in physical reality, not. As a result, God’s imputation of sin to the unsuspecting Australian aborigines just looks arbitrary. There is here no basis for a connection between Adam and the* Homo sapiens *at the other end of the earth from him, and so God’s declaration that they should share the guilt of Adam rests on nothing other than divine whim.[[48]](#footnote-46)*

**Historical Adam: Authority and Epistemology**

1. As we’ve seen, Peter Enns (and others) acknowledge that Paul (and others—Jesus, Luke) believed in the historicity of Adam. For Enns this is not determinative. Paul is man of his time and the understanding of his time. Enns seems to think that on this issue Paul was simply another second-temple Judaism interpreter who is bounded by the same constraints as any other first-century person.

*With respect to the Adam story, Paul was hardly the first Jewish interpreter to try to come to terms with it, and there was considerable diversity in how the story was read…When viewed in the context of the larger Jewish world of which Paul was a part, his interpretation is one among several, with nothing to commend it as being necessarily more faithful to the original.[[49]](#footnote-47)*

Mark D. Thompson affirms Paul’s authority. An important essay: Mark D. Thompson “The Missionary Apostle and Modern Systematic Affirmation” in *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul’s Mission* edited by Peter Bolt and Mark D. Thompson (IVP, 2000).

*Paul’s apostolic commission demands that we recognize that his letters derive ultimately from the risen Lord and are thus eschatologically positioned, not just historically located. As Paul wrote or dictated his epistles, he was doing much more than simply sharing his experiences or even using the Old Testament to construct ‘an argument in support of what on the basis of his missionary experience he thought was right’. He was fulfilling his commission as a spokesman for the risen Christ, conveying the address of God to men and women in the last days. His epistles to individuals and congregations caught up in the great eschatological ingathering of the nations are part of the final act of divine self-revelation before the end. This is why, for all the incidental and occasional remarks, his words, arguments, and overall theological perspective cannot be confined to the immediate situations he faced in the mid-first century Mediterranean region. The continuing relevance and authority of Paul’s epistles are tied to his particular role in the purposes of God.[[50]](#footnote-48)*

*It is Paul’s apostolic commission which sets his epistles apart from other letters in the first century. As letters of an apostle, indeed the apostle to the nations, they are placed alongside the other apostolic documents and continue to exercise a unique and normative role in the church of Jesus Christ. The Pauline epistles should not be viewed as simply as some of the earliest ‘unchallengeable instances’ of gospel-speaking. In and through their undoubted particularity the risen Christ continues to address his people.[[51]](#footnote-49)*

*What is more, Paul himself did not see a qualitative difference between his personal teaching ministry and his letters (2 Thess. 2:15). His words, whether spoken or written, carry the authority of the one who had commissioned him, an authority that later theological reflection does not share. Paul’s letters have an eschatological context and not simply an historical one. These are the words by which the divinely appointed apostle to the nations addresses men and women in the last days concerning the gospel and its implications. Whatever other particularity may attach to them, they have a unique role in the eschatological ingathering of the nations.*

*Herein lies a second inadequacy in modern theologies. They frequently fail to realize that Paul writes to our situation. We too are people of the last days, and our common eschatological position with his first readers underlines the truth that these words of Paul are the word of God to us. Of course, the twenty-first century is significantly different from the first. The cultural and intellectual challenges to the gospel in our own time comes from quarters our forbears could hardly have imagined. Conversely, the earliest Christians faced particular struggles that were later resolved in one way or another. Nevertheless, in the later terms of God’s eternal purposes we, like they, stand between the ascension and the promised return of the Lord. The context of our Christian thought and life is similarly the eschatological ingathering of the nations. Among other things this means we must test our proclamation of the gospel, our reflection upon its implications, and our lives lived as gospel people against a responsible reading of the words of Scripture, not least among them the words of Christ’s apostle.[[52]](#footnote-50)*

*The apostle Paul did not see himself as providing merely human commentary on the events of Jesus’ life in the light of the Hebrew Scriptures. Nor was this the understanding of the other apostles who have contributed to the New Testament (2 Peter 3:14-16; 1 John 4:4-6). Their unique commission invested their writing—as is did their preaching—with a particular authority tied to their distinctive role in the eternal purposes of God. In fact, their writing even enabled the Old Testament to be seen in its proper light as preparation for and predictive of the Christ who has now been identified as Jesus of Nazareth. The eschatological framework into which both Testaments are now properly set ensures that the genuine particularity of each component is respected without insisting that the relevance of each part of Scripture be confined to its original audience. Furthermore, such a perspective will not allow the Scriptures to be treated as simply one early voice among many others.[[53]](#footnote-51)*

* Brings up the issue of the authority of the authority of Scripture—the authority of the apostle Paul.
* The apostle Paul is not simply one more second-temple-Judaism interpreter. He is an apostle commissioned by the risen Christ to speak within the eschatological time between Christ’s ascension and his return.
1. Scriptural Authority and Accommodation to Error
	1. Enns’ argument 🡪 Paul is just a man of his times but God was working through him, accommodating Himself to the errors of the age.
	2. Ardel Caneday describes this accommodating process:

*In other words, as God reveals himself and his deeds through Scriptures inscribed by humans with faith in him, he conforms his word-revelation to their ignorance of the facts concerning the origins of the earth and of humanity concealed in fossil records and in the human genome for long ages but now revealed to humans who can affirm with confidence, unlike Paul, that God did not directly form Adam from the dust of the earth or breathe life into him.[[54]](#footnote-52)*

* 1. Enns’ quotations:

*As a child of Israel’s traditions, Paul uses the theological vocabulary available to him and so names the root cause of that universal dilemma [death] as Adam and his disobedience.*

*By saying that Paul’s Adam is not the historical first man, we are leaving behind Paul’s understanding of the cause of the universal plight of sin and death. But this is the burden of anyone who wishes to bring evolution and Christianity together—the only question is how that will be done.[[55]](#footnote-53)*

*…Paul’s culturally assumed explanation for what a primordial man had to do with causing the reign of death and sin in the world. Paul’s understanding of Adam as the cause reflects his time and place.[[56]](#footnote-54)*

*Paul, as a first-century Jew, bore witness to God’s act in Christ in the only way that he could have been expected to do so, through ancient idioms and categories known to him and his religious tradition for century upon century. One can believe that Paul is correct theologically and historically about the problem of sin and death and the solution that God provides in Christ without also needing to believe that his assumptions about human origins are accurate. The need for a savior does not require a historical Adam.[[57]](#footnote-55)*

*Thesis 7: A proper view of inspiration will embrace the fact that God speaks by means of the cultural idiom of the authors—whether it be the author of Genesis in describing origins or how Paul would later come to understand Genesis. Both reflect the setting and limitations of the cultural moment.[[58]](#footnote-56)*

* 1. Ardel Caneday distinguishes between two different types of “accommodation” in the history of theology.[[59]](#footnote-57)
		1. Conception flowing from Augustine and Calvin
		2. Later conception that blossomed in the 18th century higher critical schools

*Many have shown that the classical doctrine of divine accommodation refers to the manner of communication, using human words and concepts, not to the integrity or quality of revelation itself. Accuracy does not require precision. Imprecision is not to be confused with inaccuracy or error. Scripture’s account of creation which is geocentrically referential is not accommodative of ancient erroneous cosmology nor contrary to science’s heliocentricity. Phenomenological description hardly betrays myth. Rather, it accents the Creator’s revelatory condescension to the realm of reference his creatures inhabit.[[60]](#footnote-58)*

* 1. How far to go with “accommodation to error”? Leads to denial of other crucial Christian beliefs

Enns’ methodology as analogous (on a continuum with?) to those who argue against the reality of NT events—***including the resurrection of Jesus***  (\*cf. Ardel Caneday’s insights from Acts 17 in his essay)

* + 1. Gerd Ludemann

*If Jesus was raised as the Gospels tell us, where did he go afterward? As all of us know, Acts of the Apostles tells us that he went to heaven. But I would like to ask my opponent whether he really thinks Jesus went to heaven. That is to say, what we are dealing with in the New Testament texts are images of people of a specific time that cannot be equated with facts. And if you take one of the elements out of the sequence—resurrection, ascent to heaven and then heavenly return—the whole thing will collapse.[[61]](#footnote-59)*

*I think that if we can’t say where Jesus went after he was on earth and if we have to exclude that he went to heaven, we have to look for the clearest hypothesis to explain all the texts. Anybody who says that he rose from the dead is faced with another problem that I shall address later—namely, if you say that Jesus rose from the dead biologically, you would have to presuppose that a decaying corpse—which is already cold and without blood in its brain—could be made alive again. I think that is nonsense.[[62]](#footnote-60)*

*In other words, belief in his resurrection, ascension to heaven and immediate return are mythological elements of the faith of the first-century Christians, which we cannot take as simple descriptions of fact.[[63]](#footnote-61)*

* + 1. Roy Hoover

*The first thing one comes to recognize is that the credibility of the idea of resurrection is dependent on two basic concepts that prevailed in Hellenistic Judaism and in early Christianity, two concepts that were assumed to be true by religious Jews and by the first generations of Christians. One is a certain concept of God. The idea of the resurrection of the dead is dependent on faith in a God who is believed to be the Creator and Ruler of the whole cosmos and faith that this God created human beings in God’s own image and likeness. The logic of a resurrection faith, both in first-century Judaism and in first-century Christianity, is that if this God has the power to create the world and human life in the first place, then this God has the power to re-create the world and human life as well. Further, the God who created the world is also the God who rules the world with goodness and justice. This sovereign God will raise the dead in order to demonstrate the reality of divine sovereignty. In the end, goodness and justice must prevail in this world, if this God really is the world’s ruling power. The idea of the resurrection of the dead is dependent on this understanding of God. If this God really is God, then the resurrection of the dead is a reasonable hope. That is the logic of ancient resurrection faith.*

*The idea of the resurrection of the dead is also dependent on a certain view of the cosmos, namely that the cosmos has a three-level structure: the earth is the middle part; above the earth is heaven or the heavens, the space occupied by God and the angels; below the earth is Hades, the realm of death and the powers of evil. Given this map or picture of the cosmos, it seemed plausible to virtually all ancient peoples that divine powers could and did intervene in the affairs of human beings.*

*Indeed, such interventions were to be expected. They were special manifestations of the divine power responsible for the everyday order and life of the world (compare the relationship between Odysseus and Athena in Homer’s Odyssey, as well as the relationship between Aeneas and Jupiter in Virgil’s Aeneid). Resurrection was understood by both Jews and Christians in the first century C.E. as such divine intervention, one in which God would end the anarchy of human history and inaugurate a new world order in which God’s will would be done on earth as it is in heaven.*

*If the idea of resurrection both in Hellenistic Judaism and in early Christianity is dependent on a particular concept of God and a particular picture of the cosmos, it is credible as long as that concept of God and that picture of the world are credible. If that concept of God and that worldview lose their credibility, ideas and beliefs that are dependent on them lose their credibility as well.*

*And that, in fact, is what happened with the coming of modern scientific knowledge about the physical and natural world. Thanks to Copernicus and Galileo, sunrise and sunset have become merely figures of speech for us rather than literal descriptions of the sun’s movements, as those terms were for all peoples in antiquity. And thanks to Darwin and his successors, we have come to see ourselves as the offspring of a long, evolutionary process who occupy a particular and highly significant place in the process, namely the point at which the evolutionary process has become conscious of itself, as the Jesuit paleontologist Pierre Teilhard de Chardin put it in The Phenomenon of Man.*

*In short, the ancient worldview on which the idea of resurrection is dependent has been replaced by a modern worldview based on the findings of modern science. And with that profound change in worldview, the literal statements about the resurrection of the dead and the resurrection of Jesus have lost their literal meaning, as Ludemann has said.[[64]](#footnote-62)*

iii. Noel Weeks speaks about this issue:

*Another of the attempts to solve the problem is that which claims that God expressed himself in the thought-forms of the day. It would therefore be wrong to attempt to make these categories authoritative for scientifically sophisticated age. … Parenthetically it should be noted that this argument is formally identical with that used by Bultmann in his appeal for the demythologization of the resurrection narratives. He similarly argues that the resurrection narratives are expressed in terms of concepts held in that day which cannot be taken literally today. Here evangelicals typically maintain a great inconsistency, being ready to accept a form-critical method when it applies to the Old Testament but not to the New Testament.[[65]](#footnote-63)*

1. Bible reading revised by science 🡪 thoughts of James Anderson

*Given the difficulties presented by rejecting P (on the assumption that the exegetical basis for P is very strong) it makes sense to ask what influence (if any) scientific evidences should have on our interpretation of Scripture. I believe that all truth is God’s truth, that God reveals truths in both general (natural) revelation and special revelation, and that there can be no final contradiction between general revelation and special revelation. Any apparent conflict must be merely apparent, and we should look for ways to resolve the apparent conflict that honor both forms of revelation.*

*It ought to be uncontroversial that our interpretation of Scripture is influenced in large measure by extra-biblical knowledge: linguistic knowledge, historical knowledge, cultural knowledge, etc. Moreover, I think there are relatively uncontroversial cases where our reading of the Bible can be (and has been) revised by scientific knowledge. For example, in* [*Mark 4:31*](http://www.gnpcb.org/esv/search/?q=Mark+4%3A31) *Jesus says that the mustard seed is “the smallest of all seeds on earth”. Scientists tell us that there are, as a matter of fact, smaller seeds than the mustard seed. Such being the case, it doesn’t seem unreasonable to adjust our interpretation of Jesus’ words accordingly (e.g., Jesus had in mind those seeds planted by people for crops in first-century Palestine, a contextual qualification that was probably taken for granted by his audience).*

*So there doesn’t seem to be anything objectionable in principle about scientific knowledge informing our interpretations of Scripture. The problem arises, however, when scientific knowledge is given “veto power” over our best historical-grammatical interpretations of Scripture, forcing us to accept very contrived readings of the text.[[66]](#footnote-64)*

* Same principle used for Mark 4.31 can be used for Leviticus 11.6 (rabbit chewing cud)[[67]](#footnote-65)
* This use of science is a far cry from what is happening with Enns and others. They are very clearly using science to overall and overthrow an understanding of God’s word that is far more pervasive and important in its entailments for theology.
1. Science revised by Scripture 🡪 scientifically legitimate?
	1. J. P. Moreland’s discussion in “Conceptual Problems and the Scientific Status of Creation Science” *Perspectives on Science & Christian Faith* vol. 46, no. 1 (March 1994), pp. 2-13.

*In sum, various types of internal and external problems have been part of scientific theory assessment throughout the history of science, and the same can be said for creationist and evolutionary theories. Science is not an airtight set of disciplines completely isolated from other fields, and problems which originate in other disciplines can enter into the very fabric of science itself as part of the assessment of a scientific theory. To claim this much is to simply observe the fact that other fields interact with science in various and complicated ways, and sometimes they become part of science itself.[[68]](#footnote-66)*

*Suppose someone held to the following two propositons:*

1. *The Bible is the Word of God and it teaches the truth on all matters of which it speaks.*
2. *The Bible properly interpreted, teaches (among other things) certain truths that run counter to evolutionary theory and which are consistent with creationist theories.*

*Suppose further that this person had a list of good, rational arguments for these two propositions. In support of (1), he or she lists arguments from prophecy, history, archeology, and other areas of science for the contention that the Bible is a divinely inspired book and it is rational to trust it when it speaks on any matter, science included. In support of (2), he or she offers detailed arguments from hermeneutical theory, linguistics, comparative ancient Near Eastern studies, and so forth.*

*In the case just cited, such an individual would have reasons, perhaps good reasons, for believing that the general theory of evolution, in its current or recognizably future forms, is false and that creationism will be vindicated.[[69]](#footnote-67)*

1. Rationality of Belief in Historical Adam
	1. Concept of “noetic structure” 🡪 sum total of everything a person believes; all the propositions a person believes
	2. “depth of ingression” 🡪 concept utilized by Alvin Plantinga

*Some of my beliefs are, we might say, on the periphery of my noetic structure. I accept them, and may even accept them firmly, but I could give them up without much change elsewhere in my noetic structure. I believe there are some large boulders on the top of the Grand Teton. If I came to give up this belief (say by climbing it and not finding any), that change need not have extensive reverberations throughout the rest of my noetic structure, it could be accommodated with minimal alteration elsewhere. So its depth of ingression into my noetic structure is not great. On the other hand, if I were to come to believe that there simply is no such thing as the Grand Teton, or no mountains at all, or no such thing as the state of Wyoming, that would have much greater reverberations. And suppose I were to come to think there had not been much of a past (that the world was created just five minutes ago, complete with all its apparent memories and traces of the past) or that there were not any other persons: these changes would have even greater reverberations; these beliefs of mine have great depth of ingression into my noetic structure.[[70]](#footnote-68)*

J. P. Moreland develops this concept in relation to the rationality of belief in inerrancy:

*One can think of a noetic structure as a web of beliefs. The more depth of ingression a belief has in one’s noetic structure, the more it exhibits two important features. First, it is more closely and completely interrelated with other beliefs in my noetic structure. It is less independent than a belief on the periphery. Second, it is an epistemically important belief in my noetic structure. It provides mutual support for other important beliefs deeply ingressed, and it provides epistemic support for a number of beliefs closer to the periphery.*

*The concept of depth ingression has important consequences for a theory of rationality. The deeper a belief is ingressed, the greater the evidence required to justify giving up that belief. One should not give up a deeply ingressed belief without requiring a greater number and quality of defeaters than one would require of a less ingressed belief. The doctrine of inerrancy is unquestionably a belief that should be deeply ingressed in one’s noetic structure. If belief in inerrancy is given up, a number of other beliefs are weakened or need to be given up as well.[[71]](#footnote-69)*

* + This would seem to work as well for the doctrine of the historicity of Adam
	+ Historicity of Adam is a deeply ingressed belief.
	+ It is more central than, say, a belief in geocentrism

*This [belief in the historicity of Adam] isn’t an incidental, tangential belief on the part of the biblical writers, like the belief that (say) the sun orbits the earth; it’s an issue that had profound theological implications for human nature, for the origin of sin, for the role of Christ in salvation, and for family ethics, to name a few areas of relevance.[[72]](#footnote-70)*

* + It is provides mutual support for other deeply ingressed beliefs

*Many of the points I mentioned imply rather more than that the writer personally believed in the historicity of Adam. In a number of cases, the historicity of Adam functions as a crucial presupposition of their claim or argument. In other words, if there was in fact no such individual then their claim turns out to be untrue or their argument turns out to be unsound.[[73]](#footnote-71)*

* 1. Nature of the “science” that influences our biblical interpretation
		1. ***Operation science*** *is the basic science done in laboratories. It is concerned with repeatable events. This concerns most of physics, chemistry and biology, as well as observational geology, astronomy and the like. It gives us all the science needed for technology. It is concerned with the present material reality and how it normally functions. This part of science is largely worldview-neutral. It is not under dispute.*
		2. ***Historical science****, on the other hand, is concerned with extrapolating from present observations to the distant, unobserved past. This includes various theories and explanations in geology, astronomy, paleontology, and so on. In particular, it includes the evolutionary theory of origins. This type of science is highly worldview-dependent.[[74]](#footnote-72)*
		+ Notice that when science revises or clarifies such things as mustard seed (Mark 4.31) or geocentricism the science involved is “operation science”.
		+ The science being held up to overthrow the historicity of Adam is of the “historical science” kind. Worldview assumptions tend to play a much more decisive role in this kind of iniquiry.
		+ Enns simply takes the modern evolutionary “consensus” as true. This is not even challenged at any level. The authority of Paul can be questioned but not, seemingly, the modern “consensus” regarding evolution.
	2. Rational to believe in the historical Adam
		1. Evangelical view of the authority of God’s word
		2. This Word teaches a historical Adam which is connected to a number of other deeply ingressed beliefs
		3. The major reasons for denying this belief come from a highly worldview-dependent approach to science
		4. What about those areas that cannot, at this time, be reconciled with a historical Adam?
			1. We are justified in suspending judgment on how to reconcile a historical Adam with this seeming inconsistent evidence

*Since the New Testament clearly teaches that the fall of man was an event in history, and that there was indeed a first human pair whose sin affected all subsequent history, we must continue to maintain the historic doctrine of original sin. The difficulties that recent scientific research has placed before us in connection with the Genesis narrative must therefore be considered problems with which we must live, in the hope that some day adequate solutions will be found, rather than information that overthrows what the Bible clearly teaches.[[75]](#footnote-73)*

* + - 1. Vern Poythress on “limited inerrancy” in 1975 *JETS* article:

*It is helpful sometimes to remember that questions of inerrancy can be seen as a spiritual battle as well as a scholarly nicety. Those who hold for ordinary inerrancy do not have a more difficult trial than Abraham had when he was commanded to sacrifice Isaac. Abraham was faced with a seeming conflict in God’s word. According to Heb 11:19, he arrived at a tentative explanation for it in God’s power to raise the dead. One wonders what the limited inerrantist of Abraham’s day would have said. Would he have been tempted to say that Abraham’s resurrection explanation was incredibly improbable and farfetched and that in view of the possibility of muck Abraham had best call the whole project off? Perhaps, when we meet difficulties in the Bible, we ought to rejoice that in some small way we can demonstrate that we are followers of Abraham rather than his detractors.[[76]](#footnote-74)*
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