



## Article

# Early Humans, Adam, and Inspiration

Peter Rüst



Peter Rüst

*Two views of Genesis 1–11 are common. Young-earth creationism claims to take this text literally as inspired by God and interprets it as the history of the first few thousand years of the existence of the universe. Source criticism, on the other hand, takes it as an account of how ancient Hebrews viewed this history, God accommodating to their mythological beliefs derived from contemporary Near Eastern cultures, yet “breaking” these myths by framing them into monotheism. The former view is contradicted by science while the latter produces arbitrary hermeneutics and modifies biblical theology.*

*But if Adam was not the first human created in the image of God, he can be taken as a real person who lived at a Holocene time in Sumer, but who, called to prepare the way for the Messiah to come, became a type representative of fallen humans living both before and after his time.*

*Views of “plenary inspiration” are often misconstrued as proposing some kind of mechanical dictation by God.*

### Inspired by God

What do we mean by considering the Bible to be inspired by God? Views of “plenary inspiration” are often misconstrued as proposing some kind of mechanical dictation by God. This certainly would not be a biblical concept. There is no doubt *that* God wants to reveal himself. But *how* might he be doing it? He can reveal himself directly to the consciousness of any human being whenever he chooses to do so. Normally, such a revelation would hardly be authoritative for others being told about it. God can also commission a prophet to tell his hearers or readers: “Thus says the LORD ...” But are later generations addressed, as well? And there may be false prophets.

The central belief of Christians is that God revealed himself most fundamentally through the incarnation, death, and resurrection of his “only begotten” Son, Jesus Christ, as

presented in the collection of the canonical biblical texts called “the Scriptures.” How did these sixty-six books in our Bible (excluding the Apocrypha) become “canonical” or authoritative? Each one of them was consistently recognized by communities of believers as reflecting divine authority. One crucial aspect of such canonical recognition has always been noncontradiction between a newly received book and the part of the canon already accepted. Thus, as the collection of biblical texts grew over the centuries, the canon grew concomitantly, in practice usually with hardly any delay, although “official” pronouncements of recognition might have appeared later, depending on who these “officials” were.

Paul refers to “the foundation of the apostles and prophets.”<sup>1</sup> With “apostles” he may have designated the whole future canon of the New Testament (NT) and with “prophets” that of the Old Testament (OT). Alternatively, both apostles and prophets may refer to the proclamation of the gospel, with the OT canon included indirectly, as all NT authors presuppose it as canonical. In some cases, the writer of a book, e.g., Hebrews, did not identify himself explicitly. Other authors, like Luke, indicated that some of what they wrote was derived from diverse sources. Some OT books, such as Psalms, obviously represent collections from various authors. Others, like Chronicles

**Peter Rüst** holds a diploma in chemistry and a doctorate in biochemistry from the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zürich. He did post-doctoral research in DNA chemistry at Columbia University in New York (with E. Chargaff) and at Hawaii University, in molecular biology at the California Institute of Technology (with R. L. Sinsheimer), and in virology at the Swiss Institute for Cancer Research in Lausanne. In 1999 he retired from heading the Computer Group at the Swiss Dairy Research Institute in Bern. He is actively engaged in publicity and political efforts in Switzerland designed to stem the spiritual degeneration in free churches driven by their discrimination due to the state church system and religious power politics prevalent throughout Europe. An ASA Fellow, Rüst has had a special interest in the creation/evolution question for many years. He can be contacted by email: [paraske@aneste.ch](mailto:paraske@aneste.ch)

and Genesis, are summaries of anonymous historical records. Such historical sources may not immediately have been considered divinely inspired as a whole when they were written, although they might contain proclamations explicitly attributed to the Lord and accepted as such. But as dealing with the people of God, they certainly were considered very important, requiring utmost respect.

No matter how a biblical text is to be interpreted, any concept of genuine divine inspiration must imply that we have to keep the entire text in the form indicated by the most reliable manuscripts available. We even may assume that God not only inspired the text in its original form—which we do not have at our disposition—but also kept watch over its transmission. It certainly is his intention to give his word not only to the first recipients of a text, but to all humans reached by it throughout his *Heilsgeschichte* (redemptive history).

---

*An inspired text ... must be understandable by people of all times and cultures. [One] must both accept the full extent of the canonical texts as representing God's revelatory will and ... avoid any contradiction to reality ...*

---

An inspired text, therefore, must be understandable by people of all times and cultures. A reasonable interpretation must both accept the full extent of the canonical texts as representing God's revelatory will and, at the same time, avoid any contradiction to reality, which of course includes what modern science knows about it. This is no claim of the Bible "teaching science," because interpretations of both scientific findings and the biblical texts may be deficient or ambiguous. Our knowledge of both science and Scripture will always be less than complete.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, reasonable interpretations of the text will be compatible with reality.

There are biblical texts which not only allow for but require more than a single interpretation. This is most obvious with prophecies having both contemporary and future fulfillments. This ambiguity of prophecies eliminates the possibility of "proving" divine inspiration by revealing facts of modern science—and therefore of "proving God." Genuine prophecy and typological foreshadowing about future events certainly make up an important part of the Bible, as evidenced by many NT quotations of OT texts.<sup>3</sup> Such a prophecy would have conveyed

a message to its first hearers, while its full implications at the time of its final fulfillment may not yet have been obvious to them—or even to the apostles.

## Literary Genre

Different types, or *genres*, of texts have to be read in different ways. If the sun "comes out like a bridegroom leaving his chamber, and, like a strong man, runs its course with joy,"<sup>4</sup> it is clear that this poetical text does not "teach" that the sun has a bride, a chamber, and joy. Nor did Asaf necessarily think that the earth rests on literal pillars, when he reported God as saying, "When the earth totters, and all its inhabitants, it is I who keep steady its pillars."<sup>5</sup> Poetical texts neither give us any reliable information about modern science *nor* about the worldview or cosmogony of the ancients. To understand their meaning, we have to recognize their figurative aspects.

Hebrew poetry is often framed in couplets giving similar or contrary pronouncements in the two parts. It may also use obvious metaphors. By its characteristics, poetical text may even be recognized when contained in otherwise nonpoetical text like narrative. The context has to be taken into account to decide whether a given word or statement is meant to be understood figuratively or literally.

A text which is given in narrative form may be either a historical account or a parable not meant to tell us something that "really happened." Again, the context would indicate the genre. Jesus said, "A man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho ...,"<sup>6</sup> but we can recognize it as a story invented as an illustration, although it was not explicitly called a parable.

In many biblical texts which unmistakably are historical narratives, some expressions cannot be taken literally. When "Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region about the Jordan were going out to" John the Baptist and "were baptized by him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins,"<sup>7</sup> the word "all" is a superlative exaggeration designating emphasis, understood as such by its context. It would be naive to call this an "error" in the text.

There are cases which are more controversial. Is the book of Jonah historical narrative or a made-up story or some hybrid? Any one of these may conceivably be the interpretation intended by divine inspiration, but it must have been understood correctly by the original recipients. Later readers have to find the correct genre from the internal and external context of the book.

When Jesus said, "For just as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the great fish, so will the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth,"<sup>8</sup> and, "For as Jonah became a sign to the people of Nineveh, so will the Son of Man be to this generation ... The men of Nineveh ... repented at the preaching of Jonah,"<sup>9</sup> he apparently referred to the story as a historical



*If God's redemptive history revealed in the Bible focuses on the incarnation, death, and resurrection of the Son of God, NT quotations of OT texts make it clear that many prophecies have more than one fulfillment, and therefore more than one interpretation may be "correct" with respect to God's revelatory will.*

## Article

### *Early Humans, Adam, and Inspiration*

narrative. He might have talked in this way even if the whole story is a metaphor, but only if his audience recognized it as such. But did they? And if not, did Jesus accommodate himself to their erroneous beliefs? Such accommodation appears unlikely.<sup>10</sup>

Similar considerations apply to the book of Job, with James talking of Job as a real historical person.<sup>11</sup> And if such accommodation is applied to the Torah and later historical books, the consequences are very serious.

### Can Different Interpretations Be Correct?

Some assume that a given biblical text can only have one correct interpretation, namely what the human writer could know and wanted to say. But if God's redemptive history revealed in the Bible focuses on the incarnation, death, and resurrection of the Son of God, NT quotations of OT texts make it clear that many prophecies have more than one fulfillment, and therefore more than one interpretation may be "correct" with respect to God's revelatory will.<sup>12</sup> But does the fact that clearly messianic prophecies may have more than one correct interpretation extend to other statements or text details, as well?

A prophecy is a message, inspired by God, about something unknown or even unknowable by humans at the time it is given. It may relate to the near or far future. Or it may point backwards in time. There are many biblical references to the creation of the universe, the earth, the first humans, etc. As most knowledge about such topics by means of human investigation has surfaced in modern times only, such references would be prophecies, divine messages about things unknowable at the time they were given.

This does not imply that a biblical text can inform us about facts that only became known by modern science. Some references to creation may just express the fact *that* God created, but not *how* he did it. Aspects of the text looking like operational details may be metaphorical ornaments, which the original readers did not take literally. Such metaphorical details, taken literally, need not be compatible with reality, knowable then or today.

Or the same details of a text can legitimately be interpreted *both* as an anthropomorphic description<sup>13</sup> of what the ancients could observe and understand, *and* as compatible with—as distinct from “teaching”—what we know from modern science.<sup>14</sup> God could achieve this by accommodating himself to a prophet who did not understand the second possible interpretation, gently guiding him in selecting a formulation conforming to the prophet's own limited knowledge and vocabulary, yet compatible with reality.

Such a “modern” interpretation would be sufficiently ambiguous to prevent its misuse as a logical proof of God. To safeguard human personality, secondary interpretations compatible with facts unknowable at the time of writing must always be ambiguous. This restraint in divine revelation is necessary because it will leave humans the freedom not to believe<sup>15</sup>—which they clearly must have, as God does not treat the humans he wants to commune with as puppets or robots.

### Early Genesis and Abraham

Now, what is the genre of Genesis 1–11? Is it basically the history it looks like, or is it a collection of “broken” myths of the Ancient Near East, God accommodating himself to the mistaken beliefs the Israelites encountered in Egypt, Canaan, or Babylonia?

From internal and external evidence, much of Exodus through Deuteronomy apparently was written by Moses.<sup>16</sup> But these books presuppose the contents of most of Genesis, the history of the founding fathers. Thus, Genesis certainly looks like the preface to the Torah, the Law. And as far as we can tell, throughout the history of the people of Israel, the Torah was regarded as sacred, as divine revelation, off-limits to any tampering, deleting, or adding. This implies that Genesis was so regarded, as soon as Moses included this collection of older records as the first of the five books constituting the Pentateuch.

Unfortunately, the source-critical hypothesis of the Pentateuch has gained wide acceptance in many theological circles, even evangelical ones. Beginning more than two hundred years ago, the text was split up into many fragments attributed to speculative



“Jahweh” (Yahweh), “Elohim,” “Deuteronomy,” and “Priestly” sources (JEDP), supposedly written much later than the time of Moses. This hypothesis derives Genesis 1–11 from myths current in Babylonia in the sixth century BC. Apparently narrative details are considered to be remnants of a mistaken ancient mythology, in which the writers believed and to which God accommodated himself. In this minimalist understanding of divine inspiration, the only real content of the text would be the replacement of polytheism with monotheism.<sup>17</sup>

The JEDP hypothesis lacks internal consistency, has never reached a consensus among a majority of the fragmenters, arbitrarily manipulates the text, is contradicted by archeology, changes Israel’s history, and deletes much of traditional Jewish and Christian theology, including any concept of inspiration.<sup>18</sup> It certainly is no help in understanding the biblical texts.

---

*Information about Israel’s founding fathers must have been transmitted through Abraham and his descendants, as far as Genesis 12–50 is concerned ... At least the backbone, if not all, of [Genesis 1–11] must have been handed down by Abraham.*

---

Information about Israel’s founding fathers must have been transmitted through Abraham and his descendants, as far as Genesis 12–50 is concerned. Archeological evidence squarely places these narratives in the first half of the second millennium BC.<sup>19</sup> Similarly, Genesis 1–11 is a literary composition typical of times not later than the early second millennium BC.<sup>20</sup> At least the backbone, if not all, of this earlier history must have been handed down by Abraham.

Therefore, real similarities between early Genesis and Babylonian myths must go back to times before God called Abraham from Babylonia, almost 2000 BC. Who borrowed from whom? Genesis is obviously much more realistic, uncontaminated by polytheistic fantasy and corruption, and therefore closer to any possible common sources or events. Using first millennium BC myths as the main key for interpreting Genesis is untenable.

Abraham grew up in Ur in Sumer,<sup>21</sup> or Southern Mesopotamia. He would have been conversant with cuneiform

writing on clay tablets,<sup>22</sup> and we may reasonably assume that he kept the information important to him in such a durable form. In fact, the text of Genesis 1–36 contains remarkable tell-tale indications of having originated as cuneiform records: the concept *toledot* (“generations” or “history”) marks colophons at the ends of Sumerian and Akkadian clay tablets.<sup>23</sup> A colophon contained the name of the owner, the title of the tablet or series of tablets, and sometimes the date of writing. Keywords linking the tablets of a series were placed at the beginning or end.

## An Individual Adam

Even among those who admit that Genesis 2–11 contains some biblical prehistory, the question as to the individuality of Adam remains controversial. Now, a mythological or even merely metaphorical understanding of the Adam story requires Genesis 2–4 to be taken as devoid of any historical reality. This also makes the transition from non-history to history anywhere between chapters 4 and 12 quite arbitrary and unconvincing. A weak understanding of inspiration would then risk being extended to all of Israel’s history, or even effectively to the whole Bible, robbing much of redemptive history of its documentation.

Furthermore, later in the OT and in the NT, there are various quotes from Genesis 2–11. Did the ancient writers and their readers always understand such quotes as metaphorical, or worse as reflecting divine accommodation to error prevalent in Babylonia? Only metaphor could avoid a fully reductionistic interpretation. But as most of Genesis 2–11 looks like historical narrative, it hardly makes sense to take it as metaphorical throughout.

Paul mentioned Adam several times.<sup>24</sup> At least in some cases, he specifically quoted, or alluded to, the story of Genesis 2–3.<sup>25</sup> The text seems to indicate that he took Adam as a historical person, although it is conceivable that he just referred to the received Torah text for making a theological point. In other cases, Paul contrasted Adam with Christ, taking both as representatives of humanity.<sup>26</sup> Like the chronicler, Luke and Jude just referenced the name Adam in the received genealogies.<sup>27</sup>

If Adam was a historical person, we have to deal with the record of human evolution already very reliably documented in paleontology and molecular biology. Of course, it may be claimed that God created the first humans independently of any animal precursors, as Fazale Rana and Hugh Ross do.<sup>28</sup> They carefully discuss the highly significant molecular and morphological similarities between modern humans and their evolutionary relatives or precursors, but then they indicate that these similarities reflect the repeated use of functional modules, as is done in computer programming. In very many cases, this judgment is correct. Yet it seems that Rana and Ross just assume that those other highly significant similarities which are *extremely unlikely* to be due to common require-



## Article

### *Early Humans, Adam, and Inspiration*

*An approach which is both theologically and scientifically sound must take natural processes like evolution to be creative tools in God's hand. ... All that happens is done by God, whether or not science can investigate it. In this sense, all "natural" processes are God's doing.*

ments<sup>29</sup> will ultimately be shown to perform some presently unknown functions, and this opinion is very questionable. If there were no common descent, God would have used animal modules, even unnecessary ones,<sup>30</sup> when creating human DNA. Does this not look suspiciously like deliberately misleading those whom he enjoined to subdue the earth<sup>31</sup>—a task which requires scientific investigation?

To frame creation and evolution as incompatible effectively sanctions the tragic myth of warfare between science and theology, which tends to make its adepts discard either Christianity or reason. An approach which is both theologically and scientifically sound must take natural processes like evolution to be creative tools in God's hand.<sup>32</sup> God does not just occasionally "intervene" in his creation. All that happens is done by God, whether or not science can investigate it. In this sense, all "natural" processes are God's doing.<sup>33</sup>

Furthermore, all "natural" processes are composed of elementary quantum events, and on this level God can select any outcome he chooses, thus invisibly guiding processes composed of any number of elementary events. The outcome of a quantum event is indeterminate. Science can only describe it by a random probability distribution. But God has the freedom to imprint his own special probability distribution on this default,<sup>34</sup> even actively producing extremely improbable designed outcomes. By overriding quantum indeterminacy, his guiding of natural processes remains hidden, undetectable by science.<sup>35</sup> In this way, he preserves the freedom humans need to realize their personality and a genuine love relationship to God.

Was Adam the first human, as traditionally believed? Theoretically, as Rana and Ross show, such a belief can be harmonized with the scientific dating of fossils and artifacts, even if human evolution is rejected.<sup>36</sup> But it has also been shown that God's creative activity can be harmonized both with the personal development of individual humans and similarly with evolutionary origins of humanity.<sup>37</sup> In both cases, "supernatural" processes can go hand in hand with "natural" ones.<sup>38</sup> Thus, we may and we must deal with the evolution of modern humanity. But when did Adam live?

### An Early Adam

A biblical definition of the first humans is given in Gen. 1:26–31, particularly in the concept of being created in God's image—which, as such, is of course invisible to science. The image of God, distinguishing humans from animals, however, not only provides us with the possibility of dialog with God, but also with personality, explicitness, conscience, freedom of choice and responsibility, spiritual goals and behavior.<sup>39</sup> Would any of these characteristics show up in the paleontological record? We may look for indicators of behavior presumably presupposing them, such as sacrifices, burials, paintings, figurines, body ornaments, clothing, compound tools and weapons, etc. However, interpreting a possibly spiritual dimension of such archeological finds is notoriously difficult.

Rana and Ross<sup>40</sup> recognize that typically human characteristics go back at least about 50,000 years<sup>41</sup>—which is much earlier than what has traditionally been taken as Adam's time. One also has to verify that all living and historical humans could have descended from first humans as biblically defined. This, as well, probably indicates that these humans lived much earlier than in the Holocene. But Rana and Ross reject human evolution and insist that a first human, Adam, was created *de novo* about 60,000 years ago.

Glenn Morton, on the other hand, accepts evolution of what we call modern humans from earlier forms.<sup>42</sup> He emphasizes that much older archeological finds must be interpreted as indicative of humanity.<sup>43</sup> But believing that the catastrophic filling of the Mediterranean basin five million years ago<sup>44</sup> corresponded to Noah's flood,<sup>45</sup> he places Adam even much earlier than any *Homo* species.

### A Late Adam

A different approach was taken by Dick Fischer. Like Rana and Ross and Morton, he accepts the dates given by science. He interprets the "days" of Genesis 1 as long epochs.<sup>46</sup> But he places Adam squarely into the Holocene, at a few thousand years BC.<sup>47</sup> He emphasizes that, "except in obvious instances," the Bible can be taken literally, but translations and traditional interpreta-

tions are sometimes wrong. Some errors can be detected by comparing the text with modern findings.

One obvious example is Noah's flood, which clearly was restricted to Mesopotamia, as shown by plausible correspondences between the Hebrew text and scientific findings.<sup>48</sup> Eden can be localized at the confluence of the four rivers: Euphrates, Hiddekel (Tigris), Pishon (from Saudi Arabia into Kuwait, now blocked by sand dunes), and Gihon (from Iran).<sup>49</sup> It lies on top of 10 kilometers of sedimentary rock, which therefore cannot have been deposited by Noah's flood. The traditional belief in a global flood is mistaken.<sup>50</sup>

The list of the patriarchs from Adam to Noah displays certain parallels to that of the ten pre-flood Sumerian kings found in Mesopotamian cuneiform texts, which points to a partially common historical basis.<sup>51</sup> There are more or less close parallels between the first two kings or patriarchs, as well as between the last four men on both lists, whereas the third to sixth kings bear Sumerian names and show no relationship to the third to sixth Adamite patriarchs. Apparently, Adam lived less than about 7,000 years ago in southern Mesopotamia, together with the Sumerians. Many archeological and biblical hints fit into this pattern of correspondence. So, there were pre-Adamites.

Nevertheless, Fischer wants to keep Adam as the first genuine human. He equates the Adam of Genesis 2-3 with the first humans of Genesis 1. This is the traditional assumption, shared also by Rana and Ross and Morton, as well as most other interpreters. But for Fischer, it has the consequence of having to claim a fundamental distinction between the descendants of Adam and all other humans. He assumes that only Adam and Eve were created "in God's image," and only Adamites were "capable of achieving God's kingdom," whereas non-Adamites only obtain this accountability through hearing the biblical message, and their participation in God's image depends on faith in the Messiah.

But what exactly does it imply to be created in God's image? Here it is important to distinguish between two different meanings of "spiritual" life: (1) in the sense of the spiritual dimension differentiating humans from animals, i.e. God's image, —German *geistig*, and (2) in the sense of eternal life obtained through faith in the Messiah —German *geistlich*.<sup>52</sup> All humans have dimension (1), God's image, but only believers in the Messiah have dimension (2), eternal life, in addition. James apparently attributes God's image to all humans, not just believers.<sup>53</sup> This would contradict Fischer's definition.

John McIntyre, like Morton, accepts both the evolution of humans, defined as being created in God's image, from earlier forms of *Homo sapiens* and the fact that these are much older than the traditional dating of Adam at about 5000 BC.<sup>54</sup> Yet, he also wants to retain Adam as the first

human created in God's image. But because Adam's environment depicted in Genesis 2-4 is a Holocene one, he still places him after 9000 BC.<sup>55</sup> According to McIntyre, Adam and Eve became sinners when they acquired the "knowledge of good and evil" by eating of the forbidden tree. This moral knowledge made them responsible, and therefore guilty. All other humans also are sinners, "but sin is not counted where there is no law."<sup>56</sup> He is right in pointing out, as Calvin and others did, that sin cannot be inherited. McIntyre claims that this moral law made possible the organization required for building cities, and that therefore cities are a marker for the propagation of moral knowledge, and therefore of sin, into all continents.

---

*A main motivation for equating Adam and Eve with the first humans of Genesis 1 seems to be the belief in "original sin" (understood in the sense of Erbsünde, "inherited sin").*

---

Robert Schneider accepts all archeological indications for early humans and their dating, and that these evolved from earlier forms.<sup>57</sup> Yet, like Rana and Ross, he proposes that God may have "intervened" in a scientifically undetectable way by creating humans in God's image. For Schneider, these were a single pair, Adam and Eve. But like McIntyre, and unlike Rana and Ross, he places them at the beginning of the Holocene, at around 10,000 BC. He claims that those Adamites would have replaced all non-Adamites. He speculates that the Adamites constituted a new species, so that hybrid incompatibility prevented them from having mixed progeny with any non-Adamites.

Both McIntyre and Schneider indicate that Adamites may have reached all continents before the corresponding aboriginals were first contacted by missionaries, eliminating the problem of humans who may not know God's law and would therefore be neither accountable nor in need of a Savior. Unlike Rana and Ross and Morton, McIntyre and Schneider apparently do not judge the archeological indications for self-consciousness and for (possibly degenerated) religion going back to at least 50,000 years ago to be sufficiently relevant for the image of God.

A main motivation for equating Adam and Eve with the first humans of Genesis 1 seems to be the belief in "original sin" (understood in the sense of *Erbsünde*, "inherited sin"). Romans 5:12, "... sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men ...," is interpreted as teaching the





Apparently  
each proposal,  
Adam early  
and Adam late,  
solves some  
problems, but  
each runs into  
others. ...  
I shall now  
propose a fully  
harmonious  
interpretation.  
Three  
requirements  
have to be met:  
(1) Unique  
focus on God's  
redemptive  
plan ...;  
(2) Plenary  
inspiration ...;  
(3) Reliable  
scientific  
results ...

## Article

### *Early Humans, Adam, and Inspiration*

doctrine that sin and death came into the (human) world by Adam and that all his descendants inherited sin and death from him. Fischer claims that both Adamites and non-Adamites inherited death from their animal ancestors, but Adam's descendants inherited accountability, and therefore sin, from him.

### Full Harmonization

Apparently each proposal, Adam early and Adam late, solves some problems, but each runs into others. Placing Adam early either ignores the biblical environment and Sumerian allusions of the Adam story or assumes unreasonably large genealogical gaps. Placing Adam (taken as the "first man") late ignores the specifically human characteristics of many earlier humans. Even more seriously, the humanity of living humans who did not descend from Adam (also according to Genesis 4–10) is called into question.<sup>58</sup>

I shall now propose a fully harmonious interpretation. Three requirements have to be met:

(1) *Unique focus on God's redemptive plan:* The Bible represents God's revelatory will. Redemption was not an afterthought prompted by someone's fall, but designed from eternity. All of Scripture points to the incarnation of the Son of God, his substitutionary sacrifice on the cross, and his bodily resurrection.<sup>59</sup> All of the OT, from creation to the last prophet, has to be interpreted as God preparing the way for his becoming man. As George Murphy rightly emphasizes,<sup>60</sup> there never were any pre-Fall, sinless and immortal humans, no *Erbsünde* in the sense of inheritance of sin and death from Adam. No created human can have the freedom required for a personal relationship with God and remain sinless. Therefore, the necessity for the Creator himself becoming man to accomplish redemption has been clear from eternity, "before the foundation of the world."<sup>61</sup> Thus, redemption history cannot have two poles, like fall and restoration, but can only have a single focus, the redemption wrought once for all by the Messiah.<sup>62</sup> Adam cannot have any fundamental importance, and there can be no further canonical revelation after the NT.<sup>63</sup>

(2) *Plenary inspiration:* The text has to be interpreted in its full canonical context,<sup>64</sup>

assuming a divine inspiration which respects both God's and the prophet's freedom, and excluding mythologizing presuppositions rooted in reductionism. All Scripture, in every detail of the originals, has to be taken as inspired by God. Of course, this does not imply any kind of mechanical dictation view, nor can the fact be ignored that we do not dispose of any of the originals. Therefore, sound text and genre criticism is essential. Details in the original are there because God wants them to be there. He used fallible prophets who may have entertained erroneous views of reality. He did not force them, but gently guided their thinking to formulate, despite their limitations, text which is compatible with his design for revelation. It would be a "literal mistake"<sup>65</sup> for hermeneutics to just consider what the writer himself would have thought, whether the result is young-earth creationism or accommodation to mythology.<sup>66</sup> Placing Adam earlier than a few thousand years BC leads to forced interpretations in early Genesis, and therefore violates Scripture.

(3) *Reliable scientific results:* God's revelation is given not only for the original recipients, but also for humans of all other cultures and all later times, so he is expected to have directed the prophets to use language compatible with reality, avoiding unnecessary offense of later readers. There is sufficient unavoidable offense in the cross of Christ.<sup>67</sup> The biblical concept of genuine prophecy regarding past or future events beyond the ken of the prophet makes it possible that an ancient biblical text is compatible with a reality unknown before the advent of modern science. Language is sufficiently flexible to allow for such compatibility providentially designed by God. Placing the first humans at just a few thousand years BC is incompatible with very reliable scientific results. It violates biblical theology by presenting either God's revelation or his creative maintenance as deceptive.

Thus, (2) requires a late Adam, whereas (3) requires early first humans. These two requirements cannot be brought together — as long as the unbiblical tradition of original sin inherited from Adam is held. Therefore the way out of the seeming deadlock between (2) and (3) is clear: the first humans were early, and Adam has to be placed late. Adam was not the first human created in

God's image. Genesis 1:26–31 does *not* refer to the same events as Gen. 2:5–25.<sup>68</sup>

Humans are three-dimensional, body-soul-spirit beings. As to their bodies and souls (in the sense of sentiency), the first humans arose by “natural” evolution from ancestral primate forms. Then, at a specific point in time, God created them in his image, as far as the (human) spirit is concerned.<sup>69</sup> Much later, one of them, Adam, was chosen by God and given the challenge of proclaiming the kingdom to come, just as Abraham was chosen later. Adam failed, and God changed his covenant with him, in accordance with his eternal preknowledge and predetermined redemptive plan of incarnation and cross.

---

*The first humans were early, and Adam has to be placed late. Adam was not the first human created in God's image. Genesis 1:26–31 does not refer to the same events as Gen. 2:5–25.*

---

Various objections have been raised against the idea of pre-Adamites. If there were other humans around, from whom Adam arose, why could he not find a suitable wife? Why did he have to name the animals to search for a suitable partner? Why did God have to “build” one for him out of his rib or side? Why did he call Eve the “mother of all living”?<sup>70</sup>

All this depends on the question of what happened to Adam in Gen. 2:7. He was “formed,” not “created.” Whereas “forming” implies a preexisting entity, “creating” implies the origin of something out of nothing. Even if the “breath of life” given Adam would imply that he was miraculously created without having parents, it would not necessarily follow that he was the first biblically genuine human created in the image of God. On the other hand, Adam may have had parents and was now given spiritual life in the sense of John 3:16 and 8:56.<sup>71</sup>

Now, if Adam lived among other people when God placed him into the garden and filled him with the “spirit of life,” he would quite naturally yearn for a wife who would share this new spiritual life, and when he finally was given one (whether we interpret this event literally or metaphorically), he would joyfully recognize her as a suitable mate. After their fall, God told Satan (the snake) that the “seed” of the “woman” would “crush his head.” Adam and Eve appear to have appreciated by faith some of this wonderful messianic prophecy, formulated in quite

an unusual way—intimating even Jesus' birth from a virgin. So Adam recognized that Eve would be the typical mother of all who would be spiritually alive, namely “in Christ.” When she gave birth to Cain, she may have thought God's promise would already be fulfilled.

Adam's naming the animals has to do with God's charge of having “dominion” over the other creatures, a charge given much earlier to the first humans. But now, Adam is to be able to “take care” of the creation, which implies much more than dominating it and presumably requires, in practice, his intimate spiritual relationship with God. Yet, at the same time, he has to learn that his very personal spiritual yearning for a believing wife cannot be replaced even by his mission of loving the creation and caring for it.

## Adam in the New Testament

There is a hermeneutical difficulty with biblical texts about Adam.<sup>72</sup> The designation ‘*adam*’ occurs almost six hundred times in the OT. The Greek translation<sup>73</sup> of the OT usually renders it as *anthrôpos* (“human”), and only about forty times as *Adam*, referring to the particular man of this name, a distinction based on the respective contexts. There are a few ambiguous occurrences. In its OT quotations, the NT deals in a similar manner with this word. Are the choices made by the NT authors reliable? The canonicity of the NT would argue at least for a greater reliability than that of our non-inspired judgments regarding the OT text. Furthermore, a prophetic ambiguity may, in particular cases, have been intended by God.

It may be that the NT authors believed Adam to be the first man. Yet none of the NT references to *Adam* requires it. These may be cases of providential compatibility with reality unknown to the writers.

Genealogies containing Adam's name need not concern us, as they just represent quotations of received texts. They do not argue that Adam was the first human. Luke 3:23–38 gives a genealogy, going backwards from Jesus to Adam, who is then linked to God. In Jude 14, Enoch is “the seventh from Adam,” referring to the genealogy in Genesis 5. Some genealogies are demonstrably incomplete. Their purpose was to show a significant derivation, but not necessarily a complete line of descent. Even biological descent may not be given, as in the first and the last links in Luke 3: “Jesus ..., being the son (as was supposed) of Joseph, of Heli ..., of Seth, of Adam, of God.” Nor does the use of the term “fathered” guarantee biological fatherhood, as shown in 1 Chron. 4:8: “Koz fathered ... the clans of Aharhel, the son of Harum.” There is a striking analogy between some biblical genealogies and phylogenetic trees in biology.

In 1 Tim. 2:8–15, Paul deals with the proper behavior of men and women in worship services. He refers to the story





*Sin became possible when humans were created in God's image and therefore God-conscious, self-conscious, and correspondingly responsible to God. So "sin came into the world through one man," namely the first one of those created in God's image who sinned, long before Adam.*

## Article

### *Early Humans, Adam, and Inspiration*

of Adam and Eve,<sup>74</sup> writing: "I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet. For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor." Apparently, his argument here is typological, Adam and Eve standing for men and women. Although Paul seems to have taken them as historical persons,<sup>75</sup> the text does not imply that Adam was the first human, just that he was formed before Eve, and that Eve was deceived and transgressed before Adam did. Creation is not in view: according to both Gen. 2:7 and 1 Tim. 2:13, Adam was "formed," not "created."<sup>76</sup> Of course, by whatever means Adam was formed, his origin, like that of any other individual human, implies God's creative activity.<sup>77</sup> But in any case, if Paul thought Adam was the first human, God kept him from saying so.

Apart from Luke, Jude, and 1 Timothy, the only NT mentions of Adam (at least in an explicit way) are the ones in Romans and 1 Corinthians, which we now shall consider in detail.

### In Adam—In Christ

Romans 5 is not about human origins. Paul dealt with the origin of sin in chapters 1–3. In chapter 5, the focus is on the eternal security of the believer in Christ.<sup>78</sup> Romans 5:12–21 compares the old, fallen humanity with the new, redeemed humanity. Adam, the head of fallen humanity, is a contrasting "type," foreshadowing Christ, the head of redeemed humanity. Adam, the one whose history is given in Genesis 2–3, is a representative of all fallen humans. Similarly, Christ is the real typical man, the representative of all those redeemed by him. Christ represents the redeemed before God's throne in heaven, making intercession for them.<sup>79</sup> God sees all redeemed humans "in Christ," all the unredeemed "in Adam." Just as the redeemed humanity includes all OT and NT saints, so all humans before and after Adam are included in the fallen humanity.

Paul may or may not have thought Adam was the historically first man, but if he did so, God kept him from putting such an opinion down in writing. Eight times in verses 12–21, Paul wrote of the first man

through whom sin and death came to all humans:

... sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men ... many died through one man's trespass ... the free gift is not like the result of that one man's sin ... the judgment following one trespass ... because of one man's trespass, death reigned through that one man ... as one trespass led to condemnation for all men ... as by the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners ...

There was first a (possibly rather small) population of humans created in God's image, and of course one of these was the first to sin. This was the "one man," through whom "sin came into the world." And all other humans after him trespassed, as well. In none of the eight times Paul here referred to this first man did he explicitly identify him with Adam.

Only verse 14 mentions Adam: "... death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sinning was not like the transgression of Adam." This can be applied to pre-Adamites, as well. Sin became possible when humans were created in God's image and therefore God-conscious, self-conscious, and correspondingly responsible to God. So "sin came into the world through one man," namely the first one of those created in God's image who sinned, long before Adam. "Sin indeed was in the world before the law was given"—and similarly before God gave Adam the particular law of the Garden of Eden. But "... sin is not counted where there is no law."

Humans varied and increased in their knowledge of God during the course of time, and so did their responsibility. This increase in God-consciousness, of course, is not just "natural" psychological evolution. It is a part of God's revelatory and redemptive history in the "supernatural" spiritual realm. God deals intimately and creatively with each human individual's personal development and opportunities.<sup>80</sup>

Adam received a special calling and law, so his fall was special. He had already been mortal; the death he reaped was spiritual.<sup>81</sup>

And the spiritual death which the first sinner reaped, long before Adam, “spread to all men,” not because of Adam, but emphatically “because all sinned” (Rom. 5:12).

## Man of Dust—Man of Heaven

Paul’s great resurrection chapter, 1 Corinthians 15, is a pointed defense of a real, bodily resurrection<sup>82</sup> against all opponents: “... how can some of you say that there is no resurrection of the dead? ... If in this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all people most to be pitied.” Adam is named in verse 22: “... as by a man came death, by a man has come also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive.” The first sinner is not called “Adam,” but “a man.”<sup>83</sup> Then Paul contrasts the old, fallen humanity, the representative of which is Adam (“in Adam”), with the new, redeemed humanity “in Christ,” as he did in Romans 5. Again, if Paul thought Adam was the first man, God kept him from saying so.

Verses 35–53 explain what a bodily resurrection means, quite practically: “How are the dead raised? With what kind of body do they come?” Again, the human origin is not in view here, but the contrast between the old, “natural” humanity, represented by Adam, and the new, spiritual humanity represented by Christ. Verses 44–49 read, in part:

It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body. Thus it is written, “The first man Adam became a living being”; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit ... The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven. As was the man of dust, so also are those who are of the dust, and as is the man of heaven, so also are those who are of heaven. Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the man of heaven.

Paul quotes Gen. 2:7, “the man became a living creature” (literally “a living soul”<sup>84</sup>), and correctly identifies this man with Adam (the passage quoted does not talk about “creating” Adam, but about “forming” him). Paul contrasts him with the “last Adam,” who obviously is Christ. Christ is the typical “man,” as God meant man to be. The qualification “last” clearly indicates that no historical consideration is in view here at all, but a theological, typological comparison of the two human collectives represented by Adam, the “man of dust,” and by Christ, the “man of heaven.” Similarly, Christ being called “the second man” shows that Adam is not called the “first man” in a historical sense. If there is a temporal sequence, it is only in the sense that the collective of fallen humanity logically precedes the collective of redeemed humanity, just as redemption presupposes fallenness. But obviously, the two collectives overlap in time.

## Evolved—Then Created

In conclusion, this article demonstrates a possibility of harmonizing a plenary inspiration of the Bible with the findings of science, including the evolution of Adam from earlier humans, as follows:

*Inspired by God:* God’s central revelation is the incarnation, death, and resurrection of his Son. This is the basis of biblical Christianity. A corollary is the plenary inspiration of the sixty-six canonical biblical books (excluding the Apocrypha), as shown by the NT use of the OT.

*Literary Genre:* Every text has to be interpreted in its full biblical and extrabiblical context, requiring nondestructive text criticism, seeking the original divine revelatory intent in the available text, and respecting the principle that the original and later readers must understand the genre.

*Can Different Interpretations be Correct?* Genuine, divinely inspired prophecy, as seen in the NT use of the OT, demonstrates that a text can have more than one correct interpretation, including, in principle, compatibility with modern science.

*Early Genesis and Abraham:* The source-critical hypothesis of the Pentateuch destroys biblical revelation, but is contradicted by its own inconsistency and by more recent archeology. Genesis consists of basically historical traditions transmitted through Abraham and his descendants.

*An Individual Adam:* Any transition from mythology to history in Genesis is arbitrary. The NT use indicates an individual Adam. This has to harmonize with paleontology and genetics which virtually prove early humans. To forego this requirement of harmony means to question even the theology of Genesis and its sequel.

*An Early Adam:* The creation of the first humans in the biblical sense is defined by the image of God. Indirect indicators of spiritual, self-conscious behavior, and therefore of humans created in God’s image, date back at least 50,000 years.

*A Late Adam:* Genesis 2–4 places Adam firmly into the Holocene in Sumer. Genesis 6–9 is compatible with a flood restricted to Sumer-Akkad. But the unbiblical doctrine of inherited original sin causes problems for a Holocene Adam as a progenitor of all humans living in historical times.

*Full Harmonization:* Required conditions are: (1) God’s redemptive plan, (2) plenary inspiration, (3) reliable science. Genuinely human pre-Adamites are the solution. God created the spiritual dimension in *Homo sapiens* who inherited the psychological and corporeal dimensions from evolutionary precursors.

*Adam in the New Testament:* Adam also means “human,” but the NT judiciously distinguishes the two meanings. The writers may have believed Adam was the first human, but God kept them from explicitly saying so, even where

# Article

## Early Humans, Adam, and Inspiration

they refer to Adam and the first humans in the same context.

*In Adam – in Christ:* Romans 5:12–21 has been improperly used to fashion the inherited-sin dogma. But neither inheritance of sin and death nor a time sequence is in view, but rather the contrast between two humanities in the context of the security of the believer in Jesus.

*Man of Dust – Man of Heaven:* 1 Corinthians 15 deals with the glorious resurrection hope of the believers in Christ, not with sin or time sequence. Christ being the “last Adam” and the “second man” would be nonsensical in a context of genetic inheritance or genealogies.

*Evolved – Then Created:* Biological evolution of humans and historicity of Adam and Eve may be compatible. God’s creating humans in his image is placed at whatever time most plausibly fits the paleontological and genetic data, but Adam and Eve lived only a few thousand years BC in Sumer.

This is not claimed to be the only possible interpretation of early Genesis, but a reasonable one if both the Bible and the creation (“nature”) are taken to be reliable revelations—different in type and scope, but coming from the hand of the same absolutely truthful Author. He has charged us to take care of the planet on which he has placed us and given us the possibility and ability to do the science required to fulfill this charge. He will therefore not deceive us with apparent properties of his creation which do not correspond with reality. Harmony between his word and his work is not only reasonably to be expected, but it is a theological requirement. ■

### Acknowledgment

I am grateful for the very careful critical remarks and suggestions of four anonymous referees and of the editor. They have helped me to substantially improve my original manuscript. Any possibly remaining errors and lack of clarity are my responsibility.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup>Eph. 2:20.

<sup>2</sup>1 Cor. 13:9, 12.

<sup>3</sup>There are about 260 explicit quotations and several times as many allusions.

<sup>4</sup>Ps. 19:6.

<sup>5</sup>Ps. 75:3.

<sup>6</sup>Luke 10:30.

<sup>7</sup>Matt. 3:5–6.

<sup>8</sup>Matt. 12:40; by the way, in biblical languages, a fish was not distinguished from a whale.

<sup>9</sup>Luke 11:30, 32.

<sup>10</sup>P. Rüst, “Accommodationism’s Illusion of Solving Biblical Problems,” *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* [PSCF hereafter] 56 (2004): 235–6; [www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/2004/PSCF9-04Ruest.pdf](http://www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/2004/PSCF9-04Ruest.pdf).

<sup>11</sup>James 5:11.

<sup>12</sup>An outstanding example is Isa. 7:14, as quoted in Matt. 1:23; a sign given to King Ahaz is one correct interpretation, but the incarna-

tion of the “God with us” is a second correct interpretation. The charge that some NT quotations of the OT misinterpret what the original author “intended,” has been convincingly refuted by G. K. Beale, “Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?” *Themelios* 14 (1998): 89–96; —, “Right Doctrine from Wrong Texts?” *Themelios* 32 (2006): 18–43.

<sup>13</sup>P. Rüst, “Phenomenological Language in Ancient Revealed Narrative,” *PSCF* 58 (2006): 164–5; [www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/2006/PSCF6-06Ruest.pdf](http://www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/2006/PSCF6-06Ruest.pdf).

<sup>14</sup>A. Held and P. Rüst, “Genesis Reconsidered,” *PSCF* 51 (1999): 231–43; [www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/1999/PSCF12-99Held.html](http://www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/1999/PSCF12-99Held.html); —, “Taking Genesis as Inspired,” *PSCF* 52 (2000): 212–4; [www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/2000/PSCF9-00Held.html](http://www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/2000/PSCF9-00Held.html); P. Rüst and A. Held, “Der Genesisbericht und die Evolution,” *Texte aus dem VBG-Institut* 1/03 (2003): 28 S.; [www.vbginstitut.ch/uploads/media/INS\\_TE\\_03\\_1\\_Evolution\\_und\\_Genesis.pdf](http://www.vbginstitut.ch/uploads/media/INS_TE_03_1_Evolution_und_Genesis.pdf).

<sup>15</sup>P. Rüst, “How Has Life and Its Diversity Been Produced,” *PSCF* 44 (1992): 80–94; [www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/1992/PSCF6-92Rust.html](http://www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/1992/PSCF6-92Rust.html); J. Polkinghorne, “Where Is Natural Theology Today?” *Science and Christian Belief* 18 (2006): 169–79.

<sup>16</sup>O. T. Allis, *The Five Books of Moses* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reform Publishing Company, 1949); E. J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989); A. A. MacRae, *JEDP: Lectures on the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch* (Hatfield, PA: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1994); K. A. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 241–312.

<sup>17</sup>Or even just the supposedly more “primitive” henotheism, addressing the highest among other gods.

<sup>18</sup>Allis, *The Five Books of Moses*; G. L. Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1964); G. Maier, *Das Ende der historisch-kritischen Methode* (Wuppertal, Germany: Brockhaus, 1975); R. C. Newman, *Evolution-Religion and the Genesis Account*, Res. Report No. 23 (Hatfield, PA: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1984); E. J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989); MacRae, *JEDP: Lectures on the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*; R. C. Newman, “Scientific and Religious Aspects of the Origins Debate,” *PSCF* 47 (1995): 164–75; A. Rofé, *Introduction to the Composition of the Pentateuch* (Sheffield Academy Press, 1999); Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*.

<sup>19</sup>Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*, 313–72.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, 421–47: “Later generations might recopy such works ..., but nobody composed them afresh anymore after about 1500” (p. 447).

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*, 316.

<sup>22</sup>To claim that Abraham would not have been literate is implausible, as he apparently was highly regarded as a “prince of God” by his contemporaries, Gen. 23:6, even in adjacent countries, cf. Gen. 14:17–21; 21:22–23.

<sup>23</sup>P. J. Wiseman, *New Discoveries in Babylonia About Genesis* (London: 1936); —, *Clues to Creation in Genesis* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1977); —, *Ancient Records and the Structure of Genesis: A Case for Literary Unity* (Nashville, TN: Nelson, 1985). The eleven occurrences of *toledot* are in Gen. 2:4; 5:1; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10; 11:27; 25:12; 25:19; 36:1; 36:9; and 37:2. There is no twelfth *toledot* for Joseph’s history, as he would have written it in the manner customary in Egypt, on papyrus.

<sup>24</sup>All his references are Rom. 5:14; 1 Cor. 15:22, 45; 1 Tim. 2:14, 15.

<sup>25</sup>First mention in Rom. 5:14; first mention in 1 Cor. 15:45; 1 Tim. 2:14, 15.

<sup>26</sup>Second mention in Rom. 5:14; 1 Cor. 15:22; second mention in 1 Cor. 15:45.

<sup>27</sup>1 Chron. 1:1; Luke 3:38; Jude 14.

<sup>28</sup>F. Rana and H. Ross, *Who was Adam? A Creation Model Approach to the Origin of Man* (Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress, 2005).

<sup>29</sup>E. E. Max, “Plagiarized Errors and Molecular Genetics: Another Argument in the Evolution-Creation Controversy,” (2002), [www.talkorigins.org/faqs/molgen/](http://www.talkorigins.org/faqs/molgen/), updating of an article in *Creation/Evolution* XIX (1986): 34; P. Rüst, “Dimensions of the Human Being and of Divine Action,” *PSCF* 57 (2005): 191–201; [www.asa3.org/](http://www.asa3.org/)



- ASA/PSCF/2005/PSCF9-05Ruest.pdf; —, “Dimensionen der menschlichen Natur und des göttlichen Wirkens” (2006): 16 S.; www.vbginstitut.ch/uploads/media/INS\_TE\_06\_1\_Dimensionen.k.pdf.
- <sup>30</sup>As our knowledge of complex biological systems is still very far from complete, it is often difficult to be sure a given feature is unnecessary. But an increasingly sophisticated analysis of large numbers of similar cases decreases the importance of this caveat.
- <sup>31</sup>Gen. 1:28.
- <sup>32</sup>Held and Rüst, “Genesis Reconsidered”; K. B. Miller, ed., *Perspectives on an Evolving Creation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003).
- <sup>33</sup>Isa. 45:7.
- <sup>34</sup>P. Rüst, “Dimensions of the Human Being and of Divine Action,” *PSCF* 57 (2005): 191–201.
- <sup>35</sup>P. Rüst, “Creative Providence in Biology,” *PSCF* 53 (2001): 179–83; www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/2001/PSCF9-01Ruest.pdf; —, “God’s Sovereignty in Creation – A Reply to Howard Van Till,” *PSCF* 54 (2002): 216–17; www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/2002/PSCF9-02Ruest.pdf.
- <sup>36</sup>E.g., Rana and Ross, *Who was Adam?*
- <sup>37</sup>P. Rüst, “Dimensions of the Human Being and of Divine Action,” *PSCF* 57 (2005): 191–201.
- <sup>38</sup>R. J. Russell, “Special Providence and Genetic Mutation: A New Defense of Theistic Evolution,” in Miller, ed., *Perspectives on an Evolving Creation*, 335–69.
- <sup>39</sup>Rüst, “Dimensions of the Human Being and of Divine Action.”
- <sup>40</sup>Rana and Ross, *Who was Adam?*
- <sup>41</sup>H. Bächler, *Die ersten Bewohner der Schweiz* (Bern, Switzerland: Francke Verlag, 1947), 75–6, 141–54; H. Müller-Beck, “Das Altpaläolithikum,” in *Ur- und frühgeschichtliche Archäologie der Schweiz* Vol. I (Verlag Schweiz.Ges.Ur-u.Frühgesch., 1968), 89–106; G. R. Morton, *Adam, Apes and Anthropology: Finding the Soul of Fossil Man* (Dallas, TX: DMD Publishing Company, 1997); P. Yoder, “Will the Real Adam Please Stand Up!” *PSCF* 58 (2006): 99–101; J. P. Hurd, “Reply to the Real Adam and Original Sin,” *PSCF* 58 (2006): 102–3; D. Wilcox, “The Original Adam and the Reality of Sin,” *PSCF* 58 (2006): 104–5.
- <sup>42</sup>Morton, *Adam, Apes and Anthropology*.
- <sup>43</sup>G. R. Morton, “Dating Adam,” *PSCF* 51 (1999): 87–97; —, “Language at the Dawn of Humanity,” *PSCF* 54 (2002): 193–4.
- <sup>44</sup>K. Hsü, *The Mediterranean Was a Desert* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983).
- <sup>45</sup>G. R. Morton, “The Mediterranean Flood,” *PSCF* 49 (1997): 238–51; —, “Noah, From Whence Art Thou?” *PSCF* 53 (2001): 137.
- <sup>46</sup>D. Fischer, “The Days of Creation: Hours or Eons?” *PSCF* 42 (1990): 15–22; —, “Young-Earth Creationism: A Literal Mistake,” *PSCF* 55 (2003): 222–31.
- <sup>47</sup>D. Fischer, “In Search of the Historical Adam: Part 1,” *PSCF* 45 (1993): 241–51; —, “In Search of the Historical Adam: Part 2,” *PSCF* 46 (1994): 47–57; —, *The Origins Solution: An Answer in the Creation-Evolution Debate* (Lima, OH: Fairway Press, 1996); J. A. McIntyre, “The Real Adam and Original Sin,” *PSCF* 58 (2006): 90–8.
- <sup>48</sup>Fischer, *The Origins Solution*; C. A. Hill, “The Garden of Eden: A Modern Landscape,” *PSCF* 52 (2000): 31–46; —, “A Time and a Place for Noah,” *PSCF* 53 (2001): 24–41; —, “The Noachian Flood: Universal or Local?” *PSCF* 54 (2002): 170–183; —, “Qualitative Hydrology of Noah’s Flood,” *PSCF* 58 (2006): 120–9; A. E. Hill, “Quantitative Hydrology of Noah’s Flood,” *PSCF* 58 (2006): 130–41.
- <sup>49</sup>Gen. 2:10–14; Hill, “The Garden of Eden.”
- <sup>50</sup>Hill, “The Garden of Eden.”
- <sup>51</sup>Fischer, *The Origins Solution*.
- <sup>52</sup>Rüst, “Dimensions of the Human Being and of Divine Action.”
- <sup>53</sup>James 3:9.
- <sup>54</sup>J. A. McIntyre, “The Historical Adam,” *PSCF* 54 (2002): 150–7; —, “The Real Adam,” *PSCF* 56 (2004): 162–70; —, “The Real Adam and Original Sin.”
- <sup>55</sup>The Younger Dryas stadial, after the last glaciation, was a brief, cold climate period at the end of the Pleistocene between about 10,700 and 9,500 BC ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Younger\\_Dryas](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Younger_Dryas)).
- <sup>56</sup>Rom. 5:13.
- <sup>57</sup>R. C. Schneider, “Seeking the Emergence of Created Man and Woman,” *PSCF* 58 (2006): 196–215.
- <sup>58</sup>However, if inheriting just some of Adam’s genes would be sufficient, the possibility of a recent Adam being the ancestor of all living humans cannot be excluded, cf. D. L. T. Rohde, S. Olson, J. T. Chang, “Modelling the Recent Common Ancestry of All Living Humans,” *Nature* 431 (2004): 562–6.
- <sup>59</sup>R. Liebi, *Der Messias im Tempel* (Bielefeld, Germany: Christliche Literatur-Verbreitung, 2003); G. L. Murphy, “Christology, Evolution, and the Cross,” in Miller, ed., *Perspectives on an Evolving Creation*, 370–89.
- <sup>60</sup>G. L. Murphy, “Roads to Paradise and Perdition: Christ, Evolution, and Original Sin,” *PSCF* 58 (2006): 109–18.
- <sup>61</sup>1 Pet. 1:18–21.
- <sup>62</sup>E.g., Heb. 9:12.
- <sup>63</sup>Both would compromise the unique focus on the cross, which was preplanned from eternity and which ushered in the “last days” (Acts 2:17; James 5:3).
- <sup>64</sup>G. K. Beale, “Right Doctrine from Wrong Texts?” *Themelios* 32 (2006): 18–43.
- <sup>65</sup>D. Fischer, “Young-Earth Creationism: A Literal Mistake,” *PSCF* 55 (2003): 222–31.
- <sup>66</sup>P. Rüst, “Accommodationism’s Illusion of Solving Biblical Problems,” *PSCF* 56 (2004): 235–6.
- <sup>67</sup>Isa. 8:14; Rom. 9:33; Gal. 5:11; 1 Pet. 2:8; Rüst, “Accommodationism’s Illusion of Solving Biblical Problems.”
- <sup>68</sup>Held and Rüst, “Genesis Reconsidered.”
- <sup>69</sup>P. Rüst, “Dimensions of the Human Being and of Divine Action.”
- <sup>70</sup>Gen. 2:18–23; 3:15, 20; 4:1.
- <sup>71</sup>Held and Rüst, “Genesis Reconsidered.”
- <sup>72</sup>The Hebrew ‘adam means “man,” in the sense of “human.”
- <sup>73</sup>The Septuaginta, or LXX, the Greek version of the OT translated between the third and first centuries BC in Alexandria, Egypt, by about seventy Jewish scholars, often used in NT quotations of the OT.
- <sup>74</sup>Genesis 2–3, the source Paul quotes, by the way, makes it clear that it would be wrong to accuse him of discriminating against women. The woman’s submission under her husband is linked with the fall of both. It may be a remedial help for both. No intrinsic superiority of man is even hinted at. It may even be argued that Paul appears to attribute to Adam a greater misuse of what had been given him (and therefore a greater guilt) than to Eve. At least Adam’s was a conscious transgression.
- <sup>75</sup>It might be argued that Paul was just referring to Genesis 2–3 as a story written in the Torah, without committing himself as to its historicity, just as the parable of the Good Samaritan was a story invented by Jesus to make a theological point.
- <sup>76</sup>Held and Rüst, “Genesis Reconsidered”; Rüst, “Dimensions of the Human Being and of Divine Action.”
- <sup>77</sup>Rüst, “Dimensions of the Human Being and of Divine Action.”
- <sup>78</sup>Cf. J. G. Fijnvandraat, *Wiedergeboren in Ewigkeit?* (Schwelm: Heijkoop-Verlag, 1980).
- <sup>79</sup>Make intercession, approach, appeal, plead (*entygchanō*), cf. Rom. 8:27, 34; 11:2; Heb. 7:25.
- <sup>80</sup>Rüst, “Dimensions of the Human Being and of Divine Action.”
- <sup>81</sup>He is reported to have lived for a long time after the “day” in which he “shall surely die” (Gen. 2:17).
- <sup>82</sup>N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2003).
- <sup>83</sup>“For” in verse 22 does not introduce an argument equating Adam of verse 22 with the man of verse 21. It translates the Greek *ōsper gar*, literally “namely [gar] exactly like [ōsper],” indicating that the comparison being made between verses 22 and 21 is centered on “death” and “resurrection,” not on “Adam.”
- <sup>84</sup>Both Gen. 2:7 and 1 Cor. 15:45 have “living soul.”