

Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Alexander, Denis Scientist	Yes, but not the first human	"I am happy to use it (Model C) as a working model" (p. 243). "According to model C, God in his grace chose a couple of Neolithic farmers in the Near East, or maybe a community of farmers, to whom he chose to reveal himself in a special way, calling them into fellowship with himself—so that they might know him as a personal God" (pp. 236).	Denis Alexander, <i>Creation or Evolution: Do We Have to Choose</i> (Oxford & Grand Rapids: Monarch Books, 2008)
Anderson, James (RTS-Charlotte) Theologian & Philosopher	Yes	"Taken together, these twelve points add up to a strong <i>prima facie</i> case for the traditional Christian view that Adam was a real historical individual. Any scholar who holds to the authority and inerrancy of Scripture, but denies this point, surely has a lot of explaining to do. If all we had to deal with were the first few chapters of Genesis, appeals to genre and other literary considerations <i>might</i> provide sufficient wiggle room. But the twelve observations above indicate that the historicity of Adam is a thread woven all the way through the Bible's history, theology, and ethics. Pull out that thread and sooner or later the whole garment will unravel."	"Was Adam a Real Historical Individual?" Analogical Thoughts blog http://proginosko.wordpress.com/2009/09/21/was-adam-a-real-historical-individual/ 21 September 2009
Arnold, Thomas Patrick Pastor	Yes	"The creation narrative is an eyewitness account by the Spirit given directly by God to Adam. The narrative was recorded in permanent tablet form, which was highly valued and passed down to Moses. Finally, Moses transcribed the narrative into the book of Genesis precisely as originally written."	Thomas Patrick Arnold, <i>Two Stage Biblical Creation: Uniting Biblical Insights Uncovered by Ten Notable Creation Theories</i> (Thomas Arnold Publishing, 2008), p. 405
Averbeck, Richard E. Biblical Scholar	Yes	"Yes, there was an original Adam and Eve, who were the progenitors of the human race. I am not sure what else is true about who Adam and Eve were, but at least we should maintain this belief that they were real historical individuals. There is good reason for this belief in the natural reading of the text."	Richard E. Averbeck, 'A Literary, Inter-Textual, and Contextual Reading of Genesis 1-2' in J. Daryl Charles (Ed.), <i>Reading Genesis 1-2: An Evangelical Conversation</i> (Hendrickson Publishers, 2013), p. 30
Ayala, Francisco	No	The doctrine of Adam and Eve, I think, in terms of what we know nowadays, cannot be taken literally in the sense of implying two particular human individuals from which we are all descended. We know that our ancestors were never at any time just two individuals. Modern genetic analysis allows us to conclude that through millions of years of our history, there have been always at any time at the very least several thousand individuals. So we don't descend from a single pair.	http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/evolution/religion/faith/discuss_03.html
Barrick, William D.	Yes	"The biblical account represents Adam as a single individual rather than an archetype or the product of biological evolution, and a number of New Testament texts rely on Adam's historicity. More importantly, without a historical first Adam there is no need for Jesus, the second Adam, to undo the first Adam's sin and its results."	William D. Barrick, "A Historical Adam: Young-Earth Creation View," in <i>Four Views on Historical Adam</i> (Zondervan, 2013), p. 197

Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Barth, Karl Theologian	No	"Karl Barth, the father of Neo-orthodoxy, taught that what we have in Gen. 3 is not history but saga, a term he preferred to the term "myth" because he felt that "myth" still suggested, perhaps, some connection with history, nebulous though it might be; and he wanted to emphasize that Adam is not at all to be thought of as an historical person but rather as a symbol which stands for every person who has ever lived. "We are all Adam," Barth said, which simply means that we are all sinners. In fact, there was never a time when man was not a sinner and therefore guiltless before God."	Robert B. Strimple, "Was Adam Historical?," http://wscal.edu/resource-center/resource/was-adam-historical
Beidler, Mike	No	"While the scientific evidence of our primordial heritage is clearly recorded in our DNA and argues forcefully against a historical Adam and Eve — traditionally understood to be the first pair of human beings created <i>de novo</i> approximately 6000 years ago — our collective observations and human experience argue just as forcefully that we are spiritual victims of our own genes."	Mike Beidler, "A Response to Tim Keller's "Killer Argument" Against a Mythological Adam," from his blog "Rethinking the Alpha and Omega," June 13, 2011
Berry, R. J. Scientist	Yes	"A number of conservative scholars, while not taking the narrative of Genesis 2-3 literally, find grounds in the New Testament for defending the historicity of Adam and Eve. Berry, for example, writes: 'Paul's carefully constructed analogy between Adam and Christ depends on the equal historicity of both (Romans 5:12-19; see also 1 Corinthians 15:21, 45) (R. J. Berry, 'This Cursed Earth: Is "the Fall" Credible?' <i>Science and Christian Belief</i> , 11:1, 29-49)	John J. Bimson, "Doctrines of the Fall and Sin After Darwin," in Michael S. Northcott and R. J. Berry (Eds.), <i>Theology after Darwin</i> (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009), p. 114
Bird, Michael F.	Yes	"Because I am convinced by cosmology and geology that the earth is old and find nothing in Scripture to contradict that. I lean toward progressive creationism as the most biblically and scientifically satisfying option. Even so, I maintain belief in a literal Adam and Eve for several reasons:" [genetics, genre, Paul in NT]	Michael F. Bird, <i>Evangelical Theology: A Biblical and Systematic Introduction</i> (Zondervan, 2013), p. 654
Blocher, Henri	Yes	"Though we feel uncomfortable with all the uncertainties when we try to correlate scientific data and the results of a sensible interpretation of Genesis 1.4, we may maintain as plausible the hypothesis that the biblical Adam and Eve were the first parents of our race, some 40,000 years ago."	Henri Blocher, <i>Original Sin</i> (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), p. 42.
Blomberg, Craig L.	Probably	"I would support an old-earth creationism and opt for a combination of progressive creation and literary-framework approach to Genesis 1. I lean in the direction of [Derek] Kidner's approach to Genesis 2-3 but am open to other proposals."	Craig L. Blomberg, <i>Can We Still Believe the Bible: An Evangelical Engagement with Contemporary Questions</i> (BrazosPress, 2014), p. 177
Boyd, Greg	Maybe	"I am currently inclined to the view that Adam was, in fact, a historical figure.. At the same time, the fact that I say I am "inclined" toward this view indicates that I do <i>not</i> see this belief as central to the orthodox Christian faith."	Gregory A. Boyd, "Whether or Not There was a Historical Adam, Our Faith Is Secure," in <i>Four Views on Historical Adam</i> (Zondervan, 2013), p. 255

Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Burge, Ted	No	"Apart from some general considerations, such as the implication that sin angers God and leads to punishment, sometimes tempered with mercy, there is not much evidence in these [Genesis] stories concerning what Christians should believe today. Some are most unlikely to be based on historical events. . . These stories depend on the deep-seated beliefs of the writers and give evidence of how much more developed is the New Testament understanding of God" (p. 98).	Ted Burge, <i>Science & the Bible: Evidence-Based Christian Belief</i> (Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press, 2005)
Caneday, A. B.	Yes	"They [Christians] know that they cannot believe in the historicity of Christ Jesus without also believing in the historicity of Adam."	B. Caneday, "The Language of God and Adam's Genesis & Historicity in Paul's Gospel," <i>Southern Baptist Journal of Theology</i> , 15.1 (2011), p. 26
Clouser, Roy	No	"Although there is a long theological tradition taking Adam and Eve to be the biological ancestors of all humans, I can find no warrant for it anywhere in the Hebrew Scriptures or in the New Testament. The closest thing to any assertion on the topic is Adam's remark calling Eve 'the mother of all living'; but that is in connection with her being promised that one of her descendants will be the Messiah."	Roy Clouser, "Is Theism Compatible with Evolution?," in <i>Intelligent Design Creationism and Its Critics: Philosophical, Theological, and Scientific Perspectives</i> , edited by Robert T. Pennock (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001), p. 534, fn 7
Collins, C. John	Yes	"Genesis 2 leaves us with a distinct human pair. From Genesis 2-3 we may further infer the following: (1) All humans have this pair, Adam and Eve, as their ultimate ancestors . . ." (p. 254)	C. John Collins, <i>Genesis 1-4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary</i> (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2006)
Collins, Francis S. Scientist	No (?)	"Many sacred texts do indeed carry the clear marks of eyewitness history, and as believers we must hold fast to these truths. Others, such as the stories of Job and Jonah, and of Adam and Eve, frankly do not carry the same historical ring" (p. 209).	Francis S. Collins, <i>The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief</i> (New York: Free Press, 2006)
Collins, Robin Philosopher	Yes	"I would suggest that 'Adam' should also be understood as having a historical reference, as also representing what could be called the 'stem-father' of the human race. In evolutionary terms, such a 'stem-father' would be the first group of evolving hominids who gained moral and spiritual awareness." (p. 486)	Robin Collins, "Evolution and Original Sin," in <i>Perspectives on an Evolving Creation</i> , Keith Miller, Editor (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2003)
Cunningham, Conor Theologian & Philosopher	No	"It is folly to interpret the Fall or the existence of Adam in either positivistic terms or strictly historical terms, in the sense that there is no Fall before Christ." (p. 378)	Conor Cunningham, <i>Darwin's Pious Idea: Why the Ultra-Darwinists and Creationists Both Get It Wrong</i> (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010)

**Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views**

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Davidson, G. R.	Yes	"There was a literal Adam and Eve, a Garden of Eden, and original sin."	G. R. Davidson, <i>When Faith & Science Collide: A Biblical Approach to Evaluating Evolution and the Age of the Earth</i> (Oxford, Mississippi: Malius Press, 2009), p. 14
Day, Allan J.	No	"It is therefore possible to envisage two 'Biblical Adams', the first a generic Adam, humanity, in Gen. 1-3, with a more definitive historic individual Adam taking shape in Gen. 4 and beyond. The generations of historical (Neolithic) Adam link him forward to the subsequent patriarchs, to Noah and to Abraham and on to David and to Christ in the enfolding story of the Old Testament and the New. They are then expressed in terms of the toledoth formula and the Lucan genealogy of Christ (Luke 3:23-38). There is also a backwards link to humanity created in the image of God and sinful, in need of redemption by the second Adam. This is expressed in the story of the toledoth of the heavens and earth in Gen. 2-4 and its prologue, the Genesis 1 creation account. Gen. 2-3 then become the story, the saga of generic Adam, of humanity, bringing out the way he (and we) are. It is our story too, for we are all 'in Adam' and have need to be 'in Christ'." (p. 141)	Allan J. Day, "Adam, Anthropology and the Genesis Record—Taling Genesis Seriously in Light of Contemporary Science," <i>Science & Christian Belief</i> (1998), 10, 115-143
Dembski, William	Yes	"Johnny T. Helms' concerns about my book THE END OF CHRISTIANITY as well as his concerns about my role as a seminary professor in the SBC are unfounded. I subscribe to the Baptist Faith and Message 2000 as well as the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy. I believe Adam and Eve were literal historical persons specially created by God. I am not, as he claims, a theistic evolutionist."	Josh Rosenau, Thoughts from Kansas blog, January 8, 2010, http://scienceblogs.com/tfk/2010/01/bill_dembski_creationist.php
Domning, Daryl P. Scientist	No	"Advances in molecular genetics, however, have now made possible a much stronger statement than these. It turns out that, while a hypothetical human population of the present size might have descended from a single pair, the particular human population that now exists could not have. Our present population includes far more genetic variety of a very ancient sort than could possibly have been transmitted to us by way of a single human couple."	Daryl P. Domning, <i>Original Selfishness: Original Sin and Evil in the Light of Evolution</i> (Ashgate, 2006), p. 71.
Dunn, James	No	"Dunn discusses and rejects the possibility that Adam can be regarded as merely a representative man: 'Paul does not use anthrōpos here to characterize humankind as a whole; the concept of corporate responsibility is more of a hindrance than a help'; he cites H. W. Robinson and F. F. Bruce in support. [James Dunn, <i>Romans 1-8 (Word Biblical Commentary 38A)</i> ; Dallas: Word, 1988, p. 272.] However, <i>contra</i> John Stott, he argues that 'Paul's theological point [in Rom. 5] does not depend on Adam being a "historical" individual or on his disobedience being an historical event as such. Such an implication does not necessarily follow from the fact that a parallel is drawn from Christ's single act: an act in mythic history can be paralleled to an act in living history without the point of the comparison being lost. [Ibid., p. 289]"	R. J. Berry, "Did Darwin Dethrone Humankind?," in R. J. Berry and T. A. Noble (Eds.), <i>Darwin, Creation and the Fall: Theological Challenges</i> , (Nottingham: Apollos, 2009), pp. 63-65].

Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Enns, Peter Biblical Scholar & Theologian	No	<p>“There are two ways of looking at this parallel. You could say that the Adam story came first and then the Israelites just followed that pattern. But there is another way. Maybe Israel’s history happened first, and the Adam story was written to reflect that history. In other words, the Adam story is really an Israel story placed in primeval time. <i>It is not a story of human origins but of Israel’s origins.</i>”</p> <p>“Having said all this let me take a step or two back. I am not saying that this is ALL there is to the Adam story. There are all sorts of angles one can take to get at that extremely rich and deep piece of theology. But the “Adam is Israel” angle is at the very least a very good one—and in my opinion a much better angle than seeing Adam as the first human and all humans are descended from him. Genesis does not support that reading.”</p>	Peter Enns, “Adam is Israel,” <i>Science & the Sacred</i> , March 2, 2010, http://biologos.org/blog/adam-is-israel/
Falk, Darrel Scientist	Maybe	<p>“There is nothing in science which would say that God could not have begun his interaction with humankind by entering into a relationship with a particular couple. After all, Christians believe that God interacted with a whole nation of people a while later, and then after that with all humankind through the coming of Christ. Science, I think we all know, is silent on these issues. Option #2 is a place where many Christians can rest comfortably, both theologically and scientifically. . . Option #2 is still a possibility for Christians who hold to a historical Adam and Eve.”</p>	Darrel Falk, “On Living in the Middle,” <i>Science & the Sacred</i> , http://biologos.org/blog/on-living-in-the-middle/ , June 24, 2010
Fischer, Dick Lay Bible scholar	Yes	<p>“Archaeologists place the beginnings of modern man at 10,000 years ago with the advent of farming techniques. Adam’s placement at roughly 7,000 years ago from the Genesis genealogies, coupled with the mention of farming in the Genesis text, makes this a compatible time frame. This puts Adam in relatively recent history not ancient history” (p. 189).</p> <p>“While not the first human, Adam was the first in God’s covenant line leading to Christ, and began the era of individual accountability.”</p>	Dick Fischer, <i>The Origins Solution: An Answer in the Creation-Evolution Debate</i> (Lima, Ohio: Fairway Press, 1996) Dick Fischer, “Historical Adam?,” <i>Letters, PSCF</i> , Vol. 62, No. 4, December 2010, pp. 304-305.
Frame, John M.	Yes	<p>“Scripture, in a number of ways, affirms the historicity of Adam and Eve, beyond asserting their existence in Genesis 1-5. Later references to them in Scripture always presuppose that they are historical figures. . . . In any case, it does not seem to me that the hypothesis under consideration [genetic evidence of a larger initial population] calls into question the special creation of Adam and Eve in God’s image, their distinctive lordship over creation, or the historicity of the fall.”</p>	John M. Frame, <i>Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Christian Belief</i> (P&R Publishing, 2013), pp. 803-806.
Giberson, Karl Scientist	No	<p>“Clearly, the historicity of Adam and Eve and their fall from grace are hard to reconcile with natural history. The geological and fossil records make this case compelling. Nevertheless, scholars have proposed many convoluted and implausible ways to resolve these tensions in the past couple centuries” (p. 11)</p>	Karl W. Giberson, <i>Saving Darwin: How to Be a Christian and Believe in Evolution</i> (New York: HarperOne, 2008)
Hamilton, Adam Pastor	No	<p>“It is interesting that the elements of the story [Genesis 1-3] clearly point in the direction of an archetypal understanding of the story. The names Adam and Eve, not mentioned in the Creation story in Genesis 1, are representational. In Hebrew, Adam simply means “man” or “human” (though it appears to have originated from a word meaning “of the ground,” thus pointing to God creating Adam from the dust of the earth). Eve means “life” or “bearer of life.” Both names are symbolic. . . .”</p>	Adam Hamilton, <i>Making Sense of the Bible: Rediscovering the Power of Scripture Today</i> (HarperOne, 2014), p. 192)

Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Harlow, Daniel C.	No	Recent research in molecular biology, primatology, sociobiology, and phylogenetics indicates that the species <i>Homo sapiens</i> cannot be traced back to a single pair of individuals . . . It is therefore difficult to read Genesis 1-3 as a factual account of human origins. In current Christian thinking about Adam and Eve, several scenarios are on offer. The most compelling one regards Adam and Eve as strictly literary figures—characters in a divinely inspired story about the imagined past that intends to teach theological, not historical, truths about God, creation, and humanity.	Daniel C. Harlow, “After Adam: Reading Genesis in an Age of Evolutionary Science,” in <i>Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith</i> , Vol. 62, No. 3 (Sept. 2010), p. 179
Harrell, Daniel M.	Yes	“Because the Genesis 2 account of humanity’s appearance is called an <i>account</i> (2:4), it perhaps should be read as more report than poetry; literal rather than literary. Jesus, Paul, and others throughout Scripture all treat Adam and Eve as historical figures. As historical figures, there are basically two options for their existence within the evolutionary rubric. The first is that God created them supernaturally, midstream in evolution’s flow. . . Another option might be to have Adam and Eve exist as first among <i>Homo sapiens</i> , specially chosen by God as representatives for a relationship with him” (pp. 86-87).	Daniel M. Harrell, <i>Nature’s Witness: How Evolution Can Inspire Faith</i> (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2008)
Haught, John F.	No	“Obviously an evolutionary understanding of life cannot be reconciled in a literal sense with the story of a primordial couple, Adam and Eve, rebelling against God in the Garden of Eden and passing down the consequences of their disobedience through our genetic history. The science of evolution cannot and should not be made to conform literally to the mythic biblical accounts, and vice versa.”	John F. Haught, <i>God After Darwin: A Theology of Evolution</i> (Westview Press, 2000), p. 137
Hill, Carol	Yes	“We will now examine the ‘dual nature’ of the Genesis text regarding Adam and Eve and the Garden of Eden. The Garden of Eden is considered to have been a historical place, the four rivers of Eden (Gen. 2:10-14) pinpointing its location at the head of the Persian Gulf in today’s Iraq.14 Adam and Eve and their patriarchal descendents are also considered to have been historical people, as documented by the genealogies of the Bible. They are not considered to be allegorical or fictional persons, as is the common belief today, even among many Christians. However, Adam and Eve were not the first people to exist on planet earth – they were merely the first in the line leading to Christ, which was the only line that the biblical authors were concerned about” (pp. 10-11).	Carol A. Hill, “The Worldview Approach to Biblical Interpretation,” (unpublished paper).
Horton, Michael Theologian	Yes	“Whatever one’s conclusions concerning the process of human origins, Christian theology stands or falls with a historical Adam and an historical fall. On this point, Roman Catholic and Reformation theologies are at one. . . . However, if one does not take Adam (i.e., the human <i>as human</i>) seriously, two serious problems ensue: first, sin must be attributed to creation itself (and therefore ultimately to the Creator); second, there is no longer any historical basis for Christ’s work as the Last Adam, undoing the curse and fulfilling the terms of the covenant of creation.”	Michael Horton, <i>The Christian Faith: A Systematic Theology for Pilgrims On the Way</i> (Zondervan, 2011), pp. 424-425
Jeremiah, David	Yes	Adam was created with apparent age.	http://www.davidjeremiah.org/site/radio_player.aspx?id=1409 , BROADCAST DATE: 7/2/2014

**Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views**

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Joseph, William G.	No	<p>“Is it reasonable, probable, likely that after 3.5 billion years of evolution, during which death is the ultimate fate of all living organisms and a part of the mechanism of evolution, suddenly there evolved a creature which was immune to disease, fatal accident, pain and death? In spite of the fact that it eats food and thus would experience hunger, it appeared as an adult in a garden and was destined to reproduce and multiply, it had no appetite or instinct it could not completely control and found itself in perfect harmony with the only other member of its species, Eve. How reasonable or probable is that? Most scientists are happy to grant that humanity displays a difference of kind from the rest of the animal kingdom, the ability to feel shame for example. But this account of human origin violates every fundamental characteristic of how nature works. It does not seem reasonable that nature would function normally for 3.5 billion years and suddenly everything changes, but only temporarily and for only one species.” (p. 206)</p>	<p>William G. Joseph, <i>In Search of Adam and Eve: A Case for a Theology of Evolution</i> (CreateSpace Publishing, 2011), p.</p>
Kemp, Kenneth W.	Yes	<p>“There is an alternative use of Alexander’s distinction which does the work of reconciliation without entailing the problems that his view faces. That account can begin with a population of about 5,000 hominids, beings which are in many respects like human beings, but which lack the capacity for intellectual thought.</p> <p>Out of this population, God selects two and endows them with intellects by creating for them rational souls, giving them at the same time those preternatural gifts the possession of which constitutes original justice. Only beings with rational souls (with or without the preternatural gifts) are truly human. The first two theologically human beings misuse their free will, however, by choosing to commit a (the original) sin, thereby losing the preternatural gifts, though not the offer of divine friendship by virtue of which they remain theologically (not just philosophically) distinct from their merely biologically human ancestors and cousins. These first true human beings also have descendants, which continue, to some extent, to interbreed with the non-intellectual hominids among whom they live. If God endows each individual that has even a single human ancestor with an intellect of its own, a reasonable rate of reproductive success and a reasonable selective advantage would easily replace a non-intellectual hominid population of 5,000 individuals with a philosophically (and, if the two concepts are extensionally equivalent, theologically) human population within three centuries. Throughout this process, all theologically human beings would be descended from a single original human couple (in the sense of having that human couple among their ancestors) without there ever having been a population bottleneck in the human species.” (pp. 231-232)</p>	<p>Kenneth W. Kemp, “Science, Theology, and Monogenesis,” <i>American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly</i>, Vol. 85, No. 2 (2011), 217-236.</p>

Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Kirk, J. R. Daniel	No	"The gospel need not be compromised if we find ourselves having to part ways with Paul's assumption that there is a historical Adam, because we share Paul's fundamental conviction that the crucified Messiah is the resurrected Lord over all."	J. R. Daniel Kirk, "Does Paul's Christ Require a Historical Adam," Fuller Theology, News & Notes, http://cms.fuller.edu/TNN/Issues/Spring_2013/Does_Paul_s_Christ_Require_a_Historical_Adam/
Keller, Timothy	Yes, but not the first human	"If Adam and Eve were historical figures, could they have been the product of evolutionary biological processes? An older, evangelical commentary on Genesis by Derek Kidner provides a model for how that could have been the case. First, he notes that in Job 10:8-9 God is said to have fashioned Job with his 'hands', like a potter shaping clay out of the dust of the ground, even though God obviously did this through the natural process of formation in the womb. Kidner asks why the same potter terminology in Genesis 2:7 could not denote a natural process like evolution."	Tim Keller, "Creation, Evolution, and Christian Laypeople," http://biologos.org/uploads/projects/Keller_white_paper.pdf , p. 8
Kidner, Derek	Yes, but not the first human	"On this view [Adam and Eve set in a context similar to the Neolithic or first metalworking cultures of about 8,000-10,000 years ago], Adam, the first true man, will have had as contemporaries many creatures of comparable intelligence, widely distributed over the world. . . . what is quite clear . . . is . . . that mankind is a unity, created in God's image, and fallen in Adam by the one act of disobedience; and these things are as strongly asserted on this understanding of God's word as on any other."	Derek Kidner, <i>Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (InterVarsity, 1967)</i> , p. 29, as quoted in Craig L. Blomberg, <i>Can We Still Believe the Bible</i> (BrazosPress, 2014), p. 153
Lamoureux, Denis O.	No	"Adam never actually existed" (p. 319). "Evolutionary creation embraces gradual polygenism. This approach asserts that the Image of God and human sinfulness were gradually and mysteriously manifested through many generations of evolving ancestors. (pp. 290-291) Many features in Genesis 1-11 also point away from the historicity of Adam. These include: literary genre, ancient science, contradictory order of creation events, tribal formation, ancient genealogies, traditional literal interpretation, geology, anthropology, archaeology & history" (pp. 274-276).	Denis O. Lamoureux, <i>Evolutionary Creation: A Christian Approach to Evolution</i> (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2008)
Lennox, John C.	Yes	"Furthermore, in one of the curious ironies of evolutionary theory, [Denis] Alexander argues that human evolution has stopped. Might not the true situation be that it never got started in the first place—that human beings were a direct creation of God?"	John C. Lennox, <i>Seven Days That Divide the World: The Beginning According to Genesis and Science</i> (Zondervan, 2011), p. 73

Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Lewis, C. S.	Maybe	<p>“For long centuries, God perfected the animal from which was to become the vehicle of humanity and the image of Himself. He gave it hands whose thumb could be applied to each of the fingers, and jaws and teeth and throat capable of articulation, and a brain sufficiently complex to execute all of the material motions whereby rational thought is incarnated [. . .] Then, in the fullness of time, God caused to descend upon this organism, both on its psychology and physiology, a new kind of consciousness which could say “I” and “me,” which could look upon itself as an object, which knew God, which could make judgments of truth, beauty and goodness, and which was so far above time that it could perceive time flowing past [. . .] We do not know how many of these creatures God made, nor how long they continued in the Paradisal state. . . . But sooner or later they fell. Someone or something whispered that they could become as gods. We have no idea in what particular act, or series of acts, the self-contradictory, impossible wish found expression. For all I can see, it might have concerned the literal eating of a fruit, but the question is of no consequence.”</p>	<p>C. S. Lewis, <i>The Problem of Pain</i> (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), 72-76. Quoted in Francis S. Collins, <i>Language of God</i> (New York, NY: Free Press, 2006), 208-209</p>
Longman, Tremper, III	Yes, but not the first human	<p>“My understanding of Gen 1-2 as high style literary prose narrative leads me to conclude that it is not necessary that Adam be a historical individual for this text to be without error in what it intends to teach. This statement should not be construed to mean that I have come to a settled conclusion that Adam is not a historical individual, only that it is not necessary that he is historical in order for the text to be true in terms of what it intends to teach.”</p>	<p>Tremper Longman III, ‘What Genesis 1-2 teaches (and What It Doesn’t)’ in J. Daryl Charles (Ed.), <i>Reading Genesis 1-2: An Evangelical Conversation</i> (Hendrickson Publishers, 2013), p. 122]</p>
Lucas, Ernest	Maybe	<p>“Uncertainty about the relationship between Homo sapiens and Homo divinus leaves open a number of possible ways of relating the story in Genesis 2 and 3 to the process of evolution. My own speculation is that first self-consciousness, and then God-consciousness, appeared as what some scientists call ‘emergent properties’ as the central nervous system became increasingly complex. Once God-consciousness was possible, God took the initiative to establish a relationship with humans, and humans were faced with the choice of how they were going to live in relationship with their creator. This may have involved an initial pair of humans. Calvin’s concept of Adam and Eve as ‘federal heads’ of the human race may be helpful. Just as our solidarity in Christ, our new ‘federal head’, and his salvation is something spiritual imparted by God, so human solidarity in Adam and his sin might be something spiritual imparted by God after Adam and Eve’s disobedience.”</p>	<p>Jonathan Langley interviewing Ernest Lucas, “Christians and Evolution: five questions answered,” <i>Mission Catalyst</i>, Issue 3, 2012, http://www.bmsworldmission.org/node/3146</p>
MacArthur, John	Yes	<p>“Adam, as we see from the text [Genesis 1:26-31], was specially and personally created by God. There is no way to do justice to the text and maintain the notion that Adam evolved from some already-existing form of animal life” (p. 158)</p>	<p>John MacArthur, <i>The Battle for the Beginning: Creation, Evolution and the Bible</i> (W Publishing Group, 2001)</p>

Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Madueme, Hans	Yes	We're told that we can't affirm a historical Adam because it's scientifically unbelievable, but why trust Paul on the resurrection when that, too, is scientifically unbelievable? Or, to flip the script, if we believe the resurrection, then a historical Adam is no biggie.	Hans Madueme, "Demythologizing Adam: Case Unproven," July 2015, http://www.booksandculture.com/articles/webexclusives/2015/july/demythologizing-adam-case-unproven.html?paging=off
Mahoney, Jack	No	"A second purpose of the incarnation from an evolutionary point of view . . . is to understand the death of Jesus as saving humanity, not from the original sin of Adam and the consequent fallen state of nature, as in the traditional belief, but from mortality and death, a normal feature of all evolutionary life."	Jack Mahoney, <i>Christianity in Evolution: An Exploration</i> (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2011), p. x
McGrath, Alister	No	"There are those who would say that Adam and Eve designate specific historical figures. That makes <i>some</i> sense, acknowledges McGrath, but it makes even <i>more</i> sense to say that Adam and Eve are stereotypical figures—represent human potential as created by God but also with the capacity to go wrong."	"What Are We to Make of Adam and Eve?", http://biologos.org/blog/what-are-we-to-make-of-adam-and-eve/ , March 31, 2010
McIntyre, John A.	Yes	"Adam's place in history at 4000 BC has been securely established. The scientific discrepancy with this Genesis date, resulting from the discovery of prehistoric humans, has been removed by recognizing that Augustine, not Scripture, asserts that Adam is the ancestor of all humankind. The Big Bang, 15 billion years ago, has been located in Gen. 2:4 with Adam's creation in 4000 BC appearing in Gen. 2:7. Biblical history extends seamlessly from Abraham in 2000BC, back through Adam in 4000 BC and finally, to the creation in 15 billion BC" (p. 152).	John A. McIntyre, "The Historical Adam," <i>Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith</i> , Vol. 54 No. 3, September 2002, 150-157.
McKnight, Scot	No (?)	To synthesize the Adam of the Jewish tradition, I'd say Adam is the paradigm or prototype or archetype of the temptation to choose the path of obedience or of disobedience, the path of Torah observance or of breaking the commandments, the path of Wisdom and Mind and Logos or the path of sensory-perceptions or pleasure or bodily desires. For the Qumran community, Adam, though formed in the image of God (4Q 504 f8r:4), is a prototype who "broke faith" (CD 10:8); Israel, "like Adam, broke the covenant" (4Q 167 f7 9.1). Those who are faithful, however, will inherit the "glory of Adam" (1QS 4:23).	Scot McKnight, "The Wax Adam: Historical, Biographical, Archetypal, or Literary?" May 27, 2015, http://biologos.org/blog/the-wax-adam-historical-biographical-archetypal-or-literary
Mohler, Albert	Yes	The universe looks old because the Creator made it whole. When he made Adam, Adam was not a fetus but a man. By our understanding this would have required time. But for God it did not. He put Adam in the garden, which was not merely seeds, but a fertile, mature garden.	Albert Mohler, "Why Does the Universe Look So Old?", Ligonier Ministries 2010 National Conference
Morton, Glenn	Yes	"What we have seen is that a historical interpretation of the Scripture does not require a recent Adam. Adam can be old if the marks of Adam are. The five marks of Adam, language, religion, pain in childbirth, sweat of the brow, and clothing are found hundreds of thousands of years ago. The same is said about the items invented by Adam's immediate descendents" (p. 82).	Glenn R. Morton, <i>Who Was Adam? Part 2</i> (Spring, TX: DMD Publishing Co., 2006)

Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Murphy, George	No	<p>"I agree that Genesis 2-3 should not be read as history. Adam and Eve are theological representations of all humans, and I will not try to locate the first parents of the human race in the paleontological record." (p. 111)</p> <p>"It is not clear that the writer of Genesis 2-3 thought of 'the man' and 'the woman' as historical persons. The point in Genesis at which <i>'adham</i> becomes a proper name, 'Adam,' is debated. Adam as the first man is listed in the genealogies (Gen. 5:1-5 and 1 Chron. 1:1) and may be referred to in Hos. 6:7. But the fact that Adam is never mentioned in the Old Testament's recitation of God's acts in history suggests that Israel in that period did not see him as a historical figure." (p. 112)</p>	George L. Murphy, "Roads to Paradise and Perdition: Christ, Evolution, and Original Sin," <i>Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith</i> , Vol. 58, No. 2, June 2006, 109-118.
Opderbeck, David	Yes	<p>"It seems to me potentially very significant for our conversation about Adam that people who were not physically descended from Abraham were included in the Biblical genealogy of redemption that derives from <i>"one man,"</i> Abraham. They were grafted into the Abrahamic line by marriage. Is it likewise possible that the universal genealogical line of "Adam" could include the in-grafting of physical lines of descent outside of Adam's direct line, with "Adam" still remaining the progenitor with representative responsibility for the resulting mass of humanity?"</p> <p>"Like many evangelical Christians, my theological presuppositions compel me to look for <i>some</i> "literalism" about the "fall" in the sense of it being a real ontological "event" in space and time. And I don't see any reason <i>not</i> to say that Gen. 2-4 is at <i>least</i> a highly stylized literary portrayal of "real" events."</p>	David Opderbeck, "A 'Historical' Adam?," <i>Science & the Sacred</i> , http://biologos.org/blog/a-historical-adam/ , April 15, 2010
Peacocke, Arthur	No	<p>"Such an interpretation did not take account of the mythical character of the biblical literature ('Adam', of course, means simply 'man', individually and collectively) and appeared to be based on the doubtful proposition that all mankind has originated from one pair of individuals" (p. 190)</p>	A. R. Peacocke, <i>Creation and the World of Science: The Bampton Lectures 1978</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979)
Piper, John	Yes	<p>"I don't believe in evolution as the way that Adam came to be a human. I think God created Adam from the dust of the ground. I think he was unique and that he is the father of all humanity—Adam and Eve—and that he is not the product of a long evolutionary process. I can't make that jive with the way the text reads. And I think that it's very important that Adam be a historical figure, because that's the way he is treated by the other biblical writers. The heart passage in Romans 5 collapses, and the whole nature of God's making with Adam a covenant and then him failing and then Christ being a second Adam comes to naught, if he's not a historical person"</p>	John Piper, "Do you accept 'old earth' and evolution?" <i>Desiring God</i> blog, February 23, 2010, http://www.desiringgod.org/ResourceLibrary/AskPastorJohn/ByTopic/99/4534_Do_you_accept_old_earth_and_evolution/ , accessed July 2, 2010
Polkinghorne, John	No	<p>"Adam is the first true man, not biologically (the Bible clearly implies there were others of the same species) but spiritually—that is, capable of being in communion with God and rejecting his commands. As for the idea that the first spiritually aware human beings were also the first to disobey God's commands, this is sadly all too probable" (Nicholas Beale, pp. 67, 71-72).</p>	John Polkinghorne and Nicholas Beale, <i>Questions of Truth: Fifty-one Responses to Questions about God, Science, and Belief</i> (Louisville: Westminster John Know Press, 2009)

Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Poythress, Vern	Yes	<p>“By contrast, his original creation of Adam and Eve was unique. He did not merely bring into existence one man and one woman but also the human race. He laid once and for all a foundation for the subsequent developments in the human race” (p. 132).</p> <p>“Some theistic evolutionists would allow that God’s creation of Adam and Eve may have been exceptional. This allowance for exceptions seems to me wise, not only because of the particularities that the Bible gives in describing the creation of Eve, but also because the transcendence of God implies that he has the power to act exceptionally, and we as creatures do not know beforehand exactly when he may do so” (p. 253)</p>	Vern S. Poythress, <i>Redeeming Science: A God-Centered Approach</i> (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2006)
Reeves, Michael	Yes	<p>“The historical reality of Adam is an essential means of preserving a Christian account of sin and evil, a Christian understanding of God, and the rationale for the incarnation, cross and resurrection. His physical fatherhood of all humankind preserves God’s justice in condemning us in Adam (and, by inference, God’s justice in redeeming us in Christ) as well as safeguarding the logic of the incarnation. Neither belief can be reinterpreted without the most severe consequences.”</p>	Michael Reeves, “Adam and Eve,” Reformation 21 blog article, May 2010, http://www.reformation21.org/articles/adam-and-eve.php
Ross, Hugh	Yes	<p>“God created the first humans (Adam and Eve) both physically and spiritually through direct intervention. All humanity came from Adam and Eve” (p. 44)</p> <p>“The RTB human origins model treats Adam and Eve as the first human beings in history. A careful reading of Genesis 2, 3, and 4 supports the couple’s historical existence. So does the inclusion of Adam in the Genesis 5 genealogy and in Luke’s genealogy of Jesus” (p. 44).</p>	Fazale Rana with Hugh Ross, <i>Who Was Adam: A Creation Model Approach to the Origin of Man</i> (ColoradoSprings: NavPress, 2005)
Rüst, Peter	Yes	<p>“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. Much later, one of them, Adam, was chosen by God and given the challenge of proclaiming the kingdom too 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” (p. 189)</p>	Peter Rüst, “Early Humans, Adam, and Inspiration,” <i>Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith</i> , Vol. 59, No. 3, September 2007, 182-193.
Ryken, Philip G.	Yes	<p>“Adam’s story explains so many things because it is much more than an illustration of the human condition, such as one might find in the tales of ancient mythology. Adam is a real person of history, and therefore the events of his life are causes that produce genuine effects in the world. His story explains what <i>happens</i> because it tells us what <i>happened</i>.” (p. 268)</p>	Philip G. Ryken, “We Cannot Understand the World or Our Faith Without a Real, Historical Adam,” in <i>Four Views on Historical Adam</i> (Zondervan, 2013)
Sailhamer, John H.	Yes	<p>“As I see it, the author of Genesis and the Pentateuch sees God’s work during that week focused primarily on the ‘promised land.’ He wants his readers to see that the same land God later promised to Abraham (Genesis 15) and then gave to Israel (Exodus 19) had already been prepared for Adam and Eve at the beginning of recorded history” (p. 224).</p>	John H. Sailhamer, <i>Genesis Unbound: A Provocative New Look at the Creation Account</i> (Sisters, Orgeon: Multnomah Books, 1996)

Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Schaeffer, Francis	Yes	"Jesus' treatment of Genesis 1 and 2 also brings to the fore the issue of the historicity of Adam and Eve. It is difficult to get away from the fact that Jesus was treating Adam and Eve as truly the first human pair in space and time. If we have any questions concerning this, surely they are resolved as we consider other New Testament passages" [Romans 5:12-15; 1 Corinthians 15:21-22; Luke 3:38; 1 Timothy 2:13-14; 2 Corinthians 11:3; 1 Corinthians 11:8-9; 1 John 3:12; and Hebrews 11] (pp. 41-43)	Francis A. Schaeffer, <i>Genesis in Space and Time</i> (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1972)
Schneider, John R.	No	"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">	John R. Schneider, "Recent Genetic Science and Christian Theology on Human Origins: An "Aesthetic Supralapsarianism" in <i>Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith</i> , Vol. 62, No. 3 (Sept. 2010), p. 196
Seely, Paul	No	"The perspectives of 20 th century anthropology are incompatible with the acceptance of the literal historicity of Genesis 2 and 3. Anthropology's first man must be dated before Neolithic times: the literal man of Genesis 2 and 3 must be dated in Neolithic times. The legitimate use of anthropology resolves the conflict by leading to the recognition that Adam is a figurative person, who harmonizes with both anthropology and biblical theology" (abstract, p. 88).	Paul H. Seely, "Adam and Anthropology: A Proposed Solution." <i>Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation</i> , Vol. 22, No. 3 (September 1970): 88-90.
Smith, James K. A.	Yes	"If God uses evolutionary processes to create the world <i>and</i> 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."	James K. A. Smith, "Whose Bible? Which Adam?", <i>The Colossian Forum</i> , http://www.colossianforum.org/2012/04/24/book-review-the-evolution-of-adam-what-the-bible-does-and-doesnt-say-about-human-origins/
Snoke, David	Yes	"Adam was one, real, historical man. The parallel of Adam and Jesus in Romans 5 does not allow an interpretation of Adam as merely symbolic. . . There is no reason to doubt the miraculous nature of the creation of Adam and Eve."	David Snoke, <i>A Biblical Case for an Old Earth</i> (Grand Rapids: BakerBooks, 2006), p. 192.
Southgate, Christopher	No	"And just as the Fall account in Genesis reflects a general condition rather than a historical chronology, so the status of believers as being 'in Christ' is a general condition that reverses our fallenness, and makes possible the self-transcending life . . ." (p. 102)	Christopher Southgate, <i>The Groaning of Creation: God, Evolution, and the Problem of Evil</i> (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008)

Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Spencer, Michael (the late Internet Monk)	Yes	Do you believe in a literal Adam and Eve? Yes, though I think the story we have in Genesis 1-3 is not primarily historical, but theological and is not there to be scientifically descriptive. But it is clear that the Bible's story of our salvation begins with our first parents.	http://www.internetmonk.com/articles/C/creation.html , FAQ #4, posted March 1, 2006, accessed June 28, 2010.
R. C. Sproul	Yes	"For the most part, the federal view of the Fall has been the most popular among advocates of the Reformed view of predestination. This view teaches that Adam acted as a representative of the entire human race. With the test that God set before Adam and Eve, he was testing the whole of mankind. Adam's name means "man" or "mankind." Adam was the first human being created. He stands at the head of the human race. He was placed in the garden to act not only for himself but for all of his future descendents. Just as a federal government has a chief spokesman who is the head of the nation, so Adam was the federal head of mankind."	R. C. Sproul, "Adam's Fall and Mine," http://www.the-highway.com/fall_Sproul.html
Stott, John	Yes, but not the first human	"Scripture clearly intends us to accept their [Adam and Eve's] historicity as the original human pair: the biblical genealogies trace the human race back to Adam, Jesus himself taught that 'at the beginning the Creator made them male and female' and then instituted marriage, Paul told the Athenian philosophers that God had made every nation from 'one man', and in particular, Paul's carefully constructed analogy between Adam and Christ depends for its validity on the equal historicity of both. [J. R. W. Stott, <i>The Message of Romans</i> (BST; Leicester: IVP, 1994), p. 163.]"	R. J. Berry, "Did Darwin Dethrone Humankind?," in R. J. Berry and T. A. Noble (Eds.), <i>Darwin, Creation and the Fall: Theological Challenges</i> , (Nottingham: Apollos, 2009), pp. 63-65.
Strimple, Robert B.	Yes	"Our understanding of the reality of Adam affects our understanding of sin, of redemption, and of the Redeemer. The one who rejects the Biblical teaching regarding the historical Adam and the historical Fall will find no firm basis for accepting the Biblical teaching regarding the historical, Incarnate Redeemer."	Robert B. Strimple, "Was Adam Historical?," http://wscal.edu/resource-center/resource/was-adam-historical
Toews, John E.	No	We close with Paul, one of the earliest theologians of the Jesus movement: "all people . . . are under the power of sin" (Rom 3:9), and "all people have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God" (Rom 3:23). The language is volitional and political, not ontological." (p. 108)	John E. Toews, <i>The Story of Original Sin</i> (Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2013)
Waltke, Bruce K.	Yes	"We should assume Adam and Eve to be historical, since the narrator makes no distinction between the narratives of Adam and Eve and the patriarchs. Adam is connected to Abraham by a royal genealogy that extends to David in the book of Ruth and to Jesus in the New Testament. The Chronicler (1 Chron. 1) and the NT (Matt. 19:4-5; Luke 3:23-38; Rom. 5:12-19; 1 Cor. 15:21-22; 1 Tim. 2:13-14) assume the historicity of Adam and Eve." (p. 80, fn 2)	Bruce K. Waltke with Cathi J. Fredricks, <i>Genesis: A Commentary</i> (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001)
VanDoodewaard, William	Yes	The exegetically, hermeneutically, and theologically compelling position is that God created Adam, the first man, and Eve, the first woman, without progenitors, disorder, or sin. It was this Adam and Eve, the only existing humans, who fell into sin in the Garden, bringing the curse on themselves and all creation.	William VanDoodewaard, "No Adam, No Original Sin, No Christ," July 2015, http://www.booksandculture.com/articles/webexclusives/2015/july/no-adam-no-original-sin-no-christ.html?paging=off

Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Walton, John H.	Yes (?)	<p>“Beyond the archetypal names that they bear, Adam and Eve are explicitly offered as archtypes in the text of Genesis.” (p. 166)</p> <p>“Finally, it should be noted that archetypal identification does not resolve the question of historicity because archetypes may also be historical individuals. The biblical authors arguably thought of Adam and Eve as historical individuals and the progenitors of the human race.” (p. 167)</p>	John H. Walton, ‘Reading Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology’ in J. Daryl Charles (Ed.), <i>Reading Genesis 1-2: An Evangelical Conversation</i> (Hendrickson Publishers, 2013)
Ward, Keith	No (?)	<p>“Original sin, from an evolutionary point of view, consists in a natural inclination toward self-centered and destructive behavior, rooted in the genetic code of humans, switched on by repeated inculturation.”</p> <p>“By now we should expect that Adam is not the name of a historical individual who lived a number of years ago. The Hebrew word Adam can mean “man” or “person,” and can be read in the same sense as “human being.” This reading makes the phrase, “In Adam all die” much more comprehensible. It means: insofar as creatures are human beings, and share in human nature, they are cut off from the life of God.”</p>	Keith Ward, <i>The Big Questions in Science and Religion</i> (Templeton Foundation Press, 2008), p. 81; Keith Ward, <i>What the Bible Really Teaches: About Crucifixion, Resurrection, Salvation, the Second Coming, and Eternal Life</i> (New York: Crossroad, 2005), pp. 98-99
Waters, Guy Prentiss	Yes	<p>“[T]he Bible requires us to believe that Adam was an historical person. Some of the clearest testimony about Adam comes from the New Testament. When explaining Genesis 2, Jesus clearly speaks of the first man and the first woman in historical terms, and the institution of marriage in historical terms (Mat. 19:4-6). The Apostle Paul, in referring to Genesis 2, speaks of Adam and Eve in terns equally historical (1 Tim. 2:12-14). In 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5, Paul places Adam and Jesus in parallel relationship. Paul calls Jesus the “Second Adam”-there is none between Adam and Jesus (1 Cor. 15:47). He also calls Jesus the “Last Adam”-there is none after Jesus (v. 45).”</p>	Guy Prentiss Waters, “The Historical Reality of Adam,” <i>Tabletalk</i> , January 2014, p. 74.
Webb, Stephen H.	Yes	<p>“Eden was a real place . . .” (p. 140); “Evil was already present in the world, in the guise of a serpent, when Adam and Eve were created, but evil had to cross into Eden in order to ruin God’s plan” (p. 141)</p>	Stephen H. Webb, <i>The Dome of Eden: A New Solution to the Problem of Creation and Evolution</i> (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2010)
Whorton, Mark S.	Yes	See Chapter 7: A Day in the Life of Adam.	Mark S. Whorton, <i>Perils in Paradise: Theology, Science, and the Age of the Earth</i> (Waynesboro, GA: Authentic Media, 2005), pp. 83-96.
Wilcox, David L.	Maybe	<p>“What then should we think of Adam and Eve, the serpent and the garden, the fall and the curse? These are theological issues. There are many different interpretations of the stories in these passages of Scripture. Some clearly would be very difficult to correlate with the aforementioned ‘scientific’ data, while some would fit comfortably with it. The scientific data may suggest that theologians need to rethink their models of what the Scriptures are saying, but it does not tell them what the correct models should be” (p. 136).</p>	David L. Wilcox, <i>God and Evolution: A Faith-Based Understanding</i> (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 2004).
Williams, Patricia A.	No	<p>“Science has demolished them [the literal and liberal interpretations of the narrative of Adam and Eve] by showing that Adam and Eve are not historical figures. Their historicity conflicts with well-established scientific theories, the same theories that have created the technological revolution we confront each day . . . “</p>	Patricia A. Williams, <i>Doing without Adam and Eve: Socioobiology and Original Sin</i> (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), p. 199

Were Adam and Eve historical? Yes, Maybe, No
A Brief Survey of Views

Writer	View	Discussion	Reference
Wright, N. T.	Probably	"I do think it matters that something like a primal pair getting it wrong did happen. But that doesn't mean I'm saying that, therefore, Genesis is kind of positivist, literal, clunky history over against myth."	N. T. Wright, "Meaning and Myth," video blog, The BioLogos Forum, January 13, 2010, http://biologos.org/blog/meaning-and-myth/

Score:

Yes -	44
Yes, but not the first humans	5
Probably -	2
Maybe -	5
No -	30
Total -	86