in error. Humans tended to fear the gods and sought to appease them.] In the Bible story—as Walton's elaboration shows so beautifully—God wants to be with his creation and has a plan for building his tabernacle which he gives to his people to construct, to dedicate, to inaugurate, and to care for, and in which to worship their living Lord.

Walton has done some solid work, bringing his readers back into that ancient time, by using the number of creation texts now available to throw light on a possible way of understanding Genesis 1 and its implications for Old Testament studies and for science-faith questions. I hope my few suggestions will stimulate further discussion.

William W. Paul
Retired Professor of Philosophy of Science
Central College
Pella, IA 50219
paulw@wpmcrc.org

## Eisegesis Denies Inerrancy

C. John Collins, "Adam and Eve as Historical People, and Why It Matters," (*PSCF* 62, no. 3 [2010]: 147) practices eisegesis in his approach to Genesis 2 f. and ignores the first chapter. Both reports in Hebrew are clear that a pair of individuals are described. In Gen. 1:29, "male" and "female" are singular nouns, whereas "them," involving both, is plural. Genesis 2:5 refers to "the man" plus a negation. Verse 7 has "the man" formed and vivified. The reference is singular throughout. The succeeding passage is clear that this is one individual. The reference to building the woman is also clearly singular. But Collins references a tribe as supported by Scripture and history (p. 151).

To argue that the children of Adam and Eve were less civilized than depicted because they were much more ancient (p. 158), living at least 40,000 years ago rather than about 6,000 (p. 159), has no basis in the text. That there were contemporaries (pp. 158, 160) is clearly not in the text.

Here we run into a theological problem. If Adam's federal headship of the thousands of contemporary human beings involved their receiving the divine image and likeness and being subjected to his disobedience (p. 160; cf. p. 159), then the righteousness of Jesus Christ should apply to all human beings alive since the resurrection. Consequently, Collins should adopt at least some version of Universalism.

Of course, Collins could argue that Adam, Eve, and the talking, walking serpent either organized the tribe to march past the tree and to partake, or arranged distribution to all. On this view, a pregnant woman's eating would affect the fetus, but even newborns would have to consume a little juice.

Note may also be taken that my commendation of McGrath (p. 165, n. 73) was limited to his matching interpretation of the biblical chronology. Collins, in contrast, expands his chronology without biblical warrant.

David F. Siemens Jr.
ASA Fellow
2703 E. Kenwood Ave.
Mesa, AZ 85213-2384

## Historical Adam?

The historicity of Adam was the theme of the September 2010 issue of *PSCF*. An article by John Collins stated in the abstract, "that Adam and Eve were real persons, and the forebears of all other human beings" (p. 147). Although entirely wrong anthropologically, it was a well-articulated article. Dennis Venema authored a thought-provoking article that showed "evidence of human-ape common ancestry" (pp. 166–78). Brachiators swinging on the family tree, eh, Dennis? Good article.

Daniel Harlow read Genesis "in an age of evolutionary science" (pp. 179–95). "Modern science has amply demonstrated that phenomena such as predation, death, and the extinction of species have been intrinsic and even necessary aspects of life on earth for billions of years, long before the arrival of *Homo sapiens*. For this reason, many Bible-believing Christians have long found it difficult to read Genesis 1–3 as a factual account of human origins" (p. 179). True, but what about reading Genesis as a "factual account" of Jewish origins? Did Harlow think of that? No, Adam is a "type of Christ" (p. 181), a "literary figure" (p. 181), according to him. And thus Adam is erased from the line of biblical patriarchs who once breathed air.

John Schneider volleyed, "… in the event that conflict between science and Scripture *seems* to exist, it follows that at least one of the two—the *science* or the *reading* of Scripture—is mistaken" (p. 197). Right on! Here succinctly stated is the heart of the problem.

Sometime in the first century AD a funny thing happened. The beginning history of the Israelite nation contained in Genesis 2–11, which Moses had handed down to the children of Israel, began being interpreted by early Christians as the start of the entire human race. When they received the canon of the Hebrew Old Testament, due to their ignorance, they read themselves into what they should have, or at least could have realized, was a Jewish history book. A simple mistake in thinking Jewish history was human history is a common misunderstanding that has endured for 2,000 years and even left its stamp on this issue of *PSCF*.

Here is what the authors Collins and Harlow apparently did not know and certainly did not recognize. The likely existence of Adam as a legitimate, historical personality has already been substantiated with archaeological and historical evidence. This evidence was first presented in a series of articles that appeared in the December 1993 and March 1994 issues of *PSCF* entitled, "In Search of the Historical Adam, Parts 1 and 2."[1] A book was published in 2008 entitled, *Historical Genesis: From Adam to Abraham* (www.HistoricalGenesis.com).[2] A whole school of thought and a movement has sprung up in recent months focused on the historicity of Adam in full recognition of the antiquity of the human race—the Historical Adam Society.

"Historical Adam" is a Christian apologetic that embraces the Genesis narrative concerning Adam and his descendants, and operates completely within the bounds of scientific discovery and historical evidence. This position considers Adam to have been a real historical person,

but not to have been the biological progenitor of the entire human race since our species, *Homo sapiens*, is known from the fossil record to have been living 200,000 years ago. As evidenced by both Genesis and archeological discovery, Adam lived around 5000 to 4000 BC in southern Mesopotamia, present-day Iraq, near the confluence of the four rivers of Eden.

The Bible links Christ with Adam biologically through its genealogies and theologically in Romans, and therefore a historical Adam is important in preserving the integrity of Scripture. While not the first human, Adam was the first in God's covenant line leading to Christ, and began the era of individual accountability. The knowledge of God for all humanity started with the Adamic covenant. It was through one man, Adam, that sin was imputed to the human race, just as grace is dispensationally given by God to followers of Christ.

The rationale for "Historical Adam" and the foundation for this belief are based fully upon the integrity of Scripture, the history of the ancient Near East as recorded in Sumerian and Akkadian literature, and upon related archaeological evidence. We have a movement. All we need are more members. Join at www.HistoricalAdam.org.

Notes

[1]Dick Fischer, "In Search of the Historical Adam: Part 1," *PSCF* 45, no. 4 (1993): 241–51; ____, "In Search of the Historical Adam: Part 2," *PSCF* 46, no. 1 (1994): 47–57.
[2]Richard James Fischer, *Historical Genesis: From Adam to Abraham* (New York: University Press of America, 2008).

Dick Fischer
ASA Member
PO Box 2245
Centreville, VA 20122
dickfischer@verizon.net

## Cultural Development and Adam

A series of cultural events, initiated in approximately 5000 BCE, might shed some light on the creation of Adam. Evolution theory holds that modern man has evolved over millions of years. The Bible teaches that Adam was the first [modern] man created on the sixth day in the likeness of God.[1] This appears to be a conflict. Cultural development may be helpful in resolving this conflict.

Historian Will Durant describes five categories of artifacts that reflect cultural development: language, government, religion, engineering, and architecture. Using these five categories, he describes the first nineteen significant cultural achievements, all of which occurred between 5000 and 3000 BCE.[2]

At about four million years ago in the evolutionary process, *Australeopithicus aferensis* had the same body plan as modern man, but was somewhat smaller with a proportionate brain size. Modern man has a larger brain, particularly the neocortex, where calculations, comparisons, judgments, and planning take place.[3] Without networks, the brain is more likely to provide a linear output (e.g., danger in; flee or fight out). On the other hand, neural networks can produce an iterative response to stimuli with an output based on learning, experience, culture, and judgments.[4] The neocortex contains several billion nerve cells which are highly networked by branching. It seems reasonable that the cultural achievements of modern man are facilitated by this neural network. Of course, we know very little about the function of the brain of *A. aferensis*, or to what degree it was networked, but without question modern man is more culturally sophisticated.

The cited 2,000-year window of cultural expansion represents only 0.05% of the period from four million years ago to the present. Thus, the question is raised as to what could have generated this almost explosive cultural expansion around 5000 BCE. How did the brain change?

In 1986 Rita Levi-Montalcini and Stanley Cohen received the Nobel Prize for the discovery and study of the Nerve Growth Factor (NGF).[5] NGF results from cleavage of a relatively simple peptide of 307 amino acid residues located on the proximal arm of human chromosome one. They showed that NGF was critical to the generation of neural networks within hours, while neuronal cells failed to survive unless NGF was added daily to the culture medium. Specific life molecules such as a protein take a long time to evolve. However, for every such molecule derived from a precursor, there would be a very short period when the final side group (using hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, etc.) is put into place. One moment this new side group is absent, the next moment it is present, and the new molecule can begin its work. In the case of Adam, the final side group may have been put in place in his nuclear genome, or into an existing molecule to allow his brain's neural branching to proceed. Thus, a final step allowing for the production of NGF could have been very fast. If the cultural explosion took place early in the hypothesized time frame, that is, around 5000 BCE, then this timing is relatively consistent with the often-criticized creation date of 4004 BCE.

Notes

[1]Gen. 1:27, Gen. 2:7, Gen. 5:1.
[2]Will Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, vol. 1, *Our Oriental Heritage* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954). Events are described on pp. 98–329.
[3]Dean Hamer and Peter Copeland, *Living With Our Genes* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 16.
[4]Francis Crick, *The Astonishing Hypothesis* (New York: Scribner and Sons, 1994). Chapter 13 deals entirely with neural networks.
[5]Rita Levi-Montalcini, "The Nerve Growth Factor 35 Years Later," *Science*, 237 (1987): 1154–62. Paper presented at the Nobel Award Conference in Stockholm.

Jon W. Martin
Retired Industrial Scientist
Loudon, TN 37774
Mjonandjan@bellsouth.net ★