

**William Lane Craig, *In Quest of the Historical Adam: A Biblical and Scientific Exploration*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI, 2021**

**Pages:** 421

**Biblical, Logical, and Scientific Trainwreck**

Theistic evolutionist William Lane Craig sets out to discover the real Adam, but begins from a foundation of error assuming 'evolution' is already true. Rather than let the Bible be his guide through which he critiques "the [correct] current scientific consensus" [p. 13], he usurps God to become arbiter of the truth over Adam's origins and aligns with said 'consensus'. As a consequence, he is blind to the vast historical scientific evidence consistent with Genesis 1-11 and only sees "wild implausibility" and "areas of conflict" [pp. 13-14].

Given the above, further errors are expected throughout the book which doesn't fail to disappoint:

**On Hermeneutics and Textual Criticism**

-Ancient Near East (ANE) Sumerian, Akkadian, and Babylonian mythology and religion is elevated as the framework through which to analyse Genesis 1-11 [p. 22]. This is "ipse dixit" and a gross category error that raises pagan and occult literature inspired by devils near to sacred scripture. Craig then concludes Genesis should be read in light of ANE literature [p. 31], which is entirely circular.

A large chunk of the book is devoted to these beliefs which, Biblically, are more likely corruptions and plagiarisms of Genesis, e.g., the final version of the Epic of Gilgamesh having a global flood.

Craig concludes Genesis 1-11 is something called "mytho-history", a jelly phrase which effectively claims scriptural truths can be built on a substrate of lies (i.e., myths) by splitting truth into "literal" and "non-literal" categories. He lays out a standard Hegelian dialectic on p. 154:

\*Thesis: A literal Genesis is implausible so it must be mythological (“Genesis presents a mythological history extremely short by ancient standards”).

\*Antithesis: The ‘real’ history of man excludes a literal interpretation of Genesis (“we know the history of mankind”).

\*Synthesis: Genesis is “mytho-history” or “Proto-history”.

By his logic, one could claim Star Wars is a ‘true’ “mytho-history” of the 20thC religion Jediism which has about 9,000 adherents, for whom ultimate reality truly is some eternal force.

-Craig accepts the false JEDP hypothesis, which Jesus refutes, and doesn’t mention (or hasn’t read) John 5.46 where Moses is explicitly named as author of the Torah. He instead leans on men like the self-confessed failure Julius Wellhausen and form-criticism creator Hermann Gunkel (who imagined Genesis 1.2 was an echo of the Babylonian dragon goddess Tiamat).

-He references something called “protohistory” [p. 48], an oxymoron since there is only history. Mysterious entities “beyond literary sources” are claimed to be able to identify “preliterary oral traditions” [p. 49]. How this is scientific or rational is not explained.

-He blasphemes claiming that as a condition of his incarnation Jesus accepted many false beliefs of his countrymen [p. 12].

-He doesn’t understand how photosynthesis could occur without the sun [p. 109], which was created on Day 4, but ignores Genesis 1.3 where God had already created light, which in the 400-700nm spectrum would enable all vegetation created on Day 3 to photosynthesize.

-He claims an incarnate Satan as the serpent in Genesis 3.1 is eisegetic [p. 112], yet misses Revelation 12.9 which explicitly calls Satan that “old serpent”.

-He claims there is no evidence for a worldwide Flood [p. 121], when geology shows there are global megasequence rock layers.

-He claims, “ancients lacked capacity for speculative thought, they engaged in ‘mythopoeic’ thinking” [pp. 166-7], but conflates mental

capability with spiritual enlightenment; the reason why ancestors made up myths was because God had not given them inspiration like he did to the Jews, not because they were mentally inferior.

-Shockingly, he claims the “humanoid deity” [i.e. Jesus!] of Genesis 2-3 must be different from the “Creator of the heavens and earth in chapter 1” [p. 199]. His non sequitur is since the latter is (arguably) not as “anthropomorphic” as the former, there is no theophany. Craig is so blind he can’t even see John 1.1-3.

-Another howler is on p. 207: “No one imagines that Paul had some secret, independent access to the historical Adam apart from the stories of Genesis.” Craig hasn’t read II Peter 1.21; Paul was inspired by God who knows all and so certainly did have “secret independent access” to the historical Adam.

-It gets worse on p. 226 re: I Corinthians 15: “Paul implies that physical mortality is the natural human condition,” meaning physical death is, when verse 26 calls it an enemy, precisely unnatural.

-Craig even has to correct the Apostle Paul [!] claiming that, “Paul has thus misinterpreted the literary Adam.” [p. 240].

### On Evolutionary 'Science'

-Craig simply assumes evolution, asking the loaded question “...when did human beings first appear in the evolutionary process?” [p. 245]. Likewise, the “geological timescale” of deep time is simply presented (cut off at the “Cambrian” though).

-He claims heavy-to-light oxygen ratios [observed in present ice cores] can be worked backwards to determine many past ice ages. No explanation of this ‘science’ and its many assumptions are provided, including its open conflict with the Milankovitch theory which is the supposed freezing/warming mechanism.

-Imaginary lines joining apes and man are presented as ‘scientific evidence’ [e.g., p. 251]. Conspicuously, on p. 255 this isn’t attempted since transitional fossils between the creatures don’t exist!

-Radiometric Uranium/Thorium ‘dating’ is claimed to accurately be able to ‘date’ cave art in an open aqueous environment across tens of thousands of years.

-Social interaction needs drove human brain evolution [p. 270], a classic post hoc ergo propter hoc evolutionary story tale, since by definition neo-Darwinism is meant to be at base a random and undirected process. He also claims on p. 271 that, “features of behavioural modernity accumulate gradually with time”, and on p. 275, “social selection for cooperative individuals results in new forms of cognition,” which is nothing more than unscientific wishful thinking.

-The 'science' presented from paleoneurological evolution is a gene variant ARHGAP11B “presumed” to have duplicated itself 5 million years ago in an imaginary ancestral creature from a gene ARHGAP11A, which then shuffled 55 nucleotides around plus changed a single nucleotide along the way that supposedly promotes brain cell growth!

-More magical evolutionary euphemisms are found on p. 279 and p. 329 with “genomic reorganisation events” that created three functional NOTCH-related genes only in humans.

-Craig is also a saltationist of sorts: “Modern cognition is a consequence of a genetic mutation.” [p. 283].

-On language he simply informs us again that "the mutations did it" with, "Mutations yielded the species-species specific human speech producing anatomy." [p. 317]

-Population genetics and imagined phylogenetic trees, which are based on assumptions of neo-Darwinism/"evo-devo" plus deep time are claimed to disprove a literal Adam and Eve.

-Adam and Eve may have been "biologically and spiritually renovated by God" [p. 376], GMO [!] children raised by nonhuman primate parents! [p. 377]

The above is a small sample of the mischievous madness one will encounter in this book.

Craig is 100% right about one thing [p. 131], “truly, young earth creationists are living in a different universe than the rest of us.” He and his hold to the metaphysics of the lost, but stand against all Bible Believers.

The free advice for Craig and other Theistic Evolutionists is to repent of unbelief in the scriptures historical account in Genesis. Whether 'good' intentioned or not, they are acting as agents of Satan to undermine the faith once delivered unto the saints (Jude 3), who never conceived of anything other than a real Adam and Eve created on the sixth day of creation as it is written.

\*\*\*

## **Preface (pp. xi-xiii)**

### **I) What Is at Stake (pp. 1-33)**

Origen and Augustine are said to be “Church fathers”.

Jesus as a condition of his incarnation accepted many false beliefs of his countrymen.

Creation science opposes the current scientific consensus.

Concordism is an attempt to extract modern scientific information from scriptural passages and create a synoptic worldview.

The *Etana* is a Sumerian myth. Ancient and Near East (ANE) mythology also includes the *Atrahasis Epic*, the *Eridu Genesis* and the *Epic of Gilgamesh*.

Sumer, Akkad, Assyria and Babylon is the chronological order of ANE empires.

Sumer had Eridu, Uruk, Ur, and Nippur cities.

Old Babylon was 1830-1531 BC with its famous king Hammurabi, and neo 626-539 BC.

Old Assyria was 2025-1522 BC, Middle 1391-1050 BC, and Neo 911-605 BC. King Sargon II conquered Northern Israel in 721 BC.

Enlil was the patron god of Nippur.

Marduk overtook Enlil as the main god in Babylon, who was given fifty exalted names.

ANE religion was monist.

Genesis 1-11 should be read in the wider context of ANE.

Andreas Vesalius was born 31/12/1514 to a druggist.

“The only book to learn about the human body is the human body itself.”

Galen had assumed humans’ breastbone has seven segments based on ape dissections.

Vesalius discovered over 200 mistakes in Galen’s books.

Artists of the 1500s knew more about anatomy than the best doctors.

Vesalius published *On the Fabric of the Human Body* in 1543.

## **II) The Nature of Myth (pp. 34-46)**

“Myth” is categorised as romantic, ideological, folkloristic, and constitutive, with folklore being the scholarly consensus.

“Legends” are regarded as true but are more often secular having protagonists as human and less remote timespans.

## **III) Are the Primaeval Narratives of Genesis 1-11 Myth? (I) (pp. 47-64)**

Julian Wellhausen (1844-1918) created the JEDP Documentary Hypothesis with J was written around King Solomon (950 B C) and P after the return from Babylon (550-450 BC) .

It is based on language style, different names for God, ‘contradictions’, doublets and repetitions, and theological differences.

Hermann Gunkel (1862-1932) pioneered “form criticism”. He thought that Gn 1.2 (*tahom*) was a reference to the Babylonian dragon goddess Tiamat and that the form critic must imagine the original story in its own setting (*Sitz im Leben*).

The Babylonian texts were first discovered in the 19<sup>th</sup>C creating the Babel-Bible controversy.

“For a story of the gods at least two gods are essential.”

Gerhard Hasel held that Israel's aversion to polytheism is an aversion to myths and that Genesis 1 was an anti-mythical polemic.

#### **IV) Are the Primaeval Narratives of Genesis 1-11 Myth? (II) (pp. 65-131)**

“Parallelomania” is finding too many links between ANE and Genesis.

The aquatic plant in the Gilgamesh story is one of “rejuvenation”, not eternal life.

“Adapa” was one of the Anunnaki gods.

The flood version of the Epic of Gilgamesh is only seen from 750 BC.

A dove would be better suited for finding habitable land than a raven.

“The most significant myths of a given culture are usually the cosmogonic ones”.

In the *Atrahasis Epic*, the gods created man to take over labour from them.

The idea of a seven day week ending in the Sabbath is foreign to ANE literature.

Craig doesn't understand how photosynthesis could occur without the sun, which was created on Day 4), but missed Genesis 1.3 where God had already created photons, which in the right UV spectrum enabled vegetation created on Day 3 to photosynthesise.

Craig claims an incarnate Satan as the snake in Genesis 3.1 is eisegetic (p. 112) but ignored Revelation 12.9

Craig claims there is no evidence for a worldwide Flood (p. 121).

Several months' time would have been sufficient for the sprouting of new olive trees during the recessionary period of Noah's Flood.

#### **V) Is Genesis 1-11 Mytho-History? (pp. 132-157)**

A chiasmus is a set of matching but reflective lines, like a palindrome, e.g., “heaven to earth, earth to heaven.”

*Apkallu* were Babylonian fish-men said to have given technology to mankind.

Gaps in Sumerian, Assyrian and Babylonian king list are common.

Benford’s Law holds the first digit in many naturally occurring numbers is probably small.

Assyriologist Thorkild Jacobsen coined “mytho-history” (MH). Greek myths provide an example.

Narration is a key component of MH.

However subtle, this charges God with bearing false witness as Craig lays out a standard Hegelian dialectic, on p. 154:

Thesis: A literal Genesis is implausible so it must be mythological (“Genesis presents a mythological history extremely short by ancient standards”).

Antithesis: The ‘real’ history of man excludes a literal interpretation of Genesis (“we know the history of mankind”).

Synthesis: Genesis is “mytho-history” or “Proto-history”.

## **VI) Are Myths Believed to Be True? (pp. 158-203)**

The Dayak of Borneo did human sacrifice after construction for a new building, a practice which the colonial Dutch banned.

Plasticity and flexibility of myths lend support to the notion that myth is not literal truth.

Writing made myths become more “permanent”.

Since ancients lacked capacity for speculative thought, they engaged in “mythopoeic” thinking (i.e., “mythmaking”) (pp. 166-7).

Myths functioned as primitive philosophy.

Gilgamesh and Enkidu killed the Bull of Heaven (i.e., Taurus).

Anu, Enlil and Ea constructed the heavens to serve as omens,



Ashurbanipal's library was 48% astrology, 14% extispicy (entrail analysis) and 10% terrestrial omens.

Qingu was executed for inciting Tiamat's rebellion and from his blood Ea (mankind) was created.

In KAR IV, Alla and Illa are slaughtered to grow humanity.

Marduk is the moon god Sin who illuminates night.

The three theological centres of Egypt were Thebes, Heliopolis, and Memphis.

Amun-Re was at the peak of creation.

Mereological fusion combines two diverse objects into a new without any blending.

-Shockingly (p. 199), he claims the "humanoid deity" [i.e. Jesus!] of Genesis 2-3 must be different from the "Creator of the heavens and earth in chapter 1". He makes a non sequitur that since the latter is (arguably) not as "anthropomorphic" as the former, there is no theophany. Craig is so blind he can't even see John 1.1-3.

## **VII) Adam in the New Testament (pp. 204-243)**

Scholars attempt to distinguish between the "literary" and "historical" Adam.

"No one imagines that Paul had some secret, independent access to the historical Adam apart from the stories of Genesis (p. 207)."

ΔΕΣΜΟΙ are chains.

ΖΟΦΟΣ is the netherworld.

ΤΑΡΤΑΡΟΥΣ was a "gloomy, misty, unpleasant, and mouldy place" where Zeus imprisoned the Titans.

In *The Assumption of Moses*, the serpent seduces Eve.

Samma'el is said to have opposed Michael in Jude over Moses' body.

*Enoch* is dated 400-200BC.

Janne and Jambres Jewish tradition goes back to 2 BC.

“Paul implies that physical mortality is the natural human condition.”  
p. 226

There is a difference between death as a consequence and a penalty for sin re: the doctrine of Original Sin.

“Paul has thus misinterpreted the literary Adam.” (p. 240).

### **VIII) Scientific and Philosophical Preliminaries (pp. 244-264)**

He simply assumes evolution, asking the loaded question “...when did human beings first appear in the evolutionary process?” (p. 245)

Oldowan (Early Stone Age) tools are chopping, blades Upper Paleolithic.

Hominins are defined by bipedalism.

The ‘earliest’ *H. sapiens* fossils are from Jebel Irhoud in Morocco. Age is said to be determined using thermoluminescence.

*H. habilis* is associated with Oldowan tools.

### **IX) The Evidence of Paleoneurology (pp. 265-279)**

Encephalization quotient is brain size divided by a comparable mammal.

Arterial foramina are skull openings through which arteries supplying the brain pass, and which indicate brain metabolic rate (MR).

Social interaction needs drove human brain evolution (p. 270); post hoc ergo propter hoc evolutionary story telling since neo-Darwinism is meant to be at base a random, undirected process. He also claims (p. 271) that, “features of behavioural modernity accumulate gradually with time” which is nothing more than magical thinking.

Enamel cross-striations of a few teeth are used to split *Neanderthals* from *sapiens*.

The “science” presented (p. 278) of paleoneurological evolution is that a gene ARHGAP11B “presumed” to have duplicated itself 5 million years ago in an imaginary ancestral creature from a gene ARHGAP11A, which shuffled 55 nucleotides around then changed one nucleotide along the way that supposedly promotes brain cell growth.

NOTCH2NL genes amplify neuron progenitors.

“Genomic reorganisation events” created three functional NOTCH-related genes only in humans. (p. 279)

### **X) The Evidence of Archaeology (I) (pp. 280-301)**

Human behaviour is characterised by:

- Abstract thinking.
- Planning depth.
- Technological innovation (e.g. microblades).
- Symbolic behaviour.

“Modern cognition is a consequence of a genetic mutation.” (p. 283)

Oldowan tools are associated with *Australopithecus afarensis* and *Homo habilis*.

Acheulean tools (e.g, hand axes) are thought to be 800 kyo.

*Sapiens* and Neanderthals both made blades. The latter also made three-ply thread with an S-twist and the combined thread counter-clockwise as a Z-twist, and they used pigments.

“It is difficult to see how we can regard Neanderthals as anything other than the cognitive equal of modern humans.”

Stone points were hafted onto wooden spears.

Neanderthals bones evidence high fracture rates indicating big-game hunting activity.

The Schoningen wooden spears were on par with Olympic javelins, the largest 2.2m and weighing 0.5kg. These could travel 77m.

*Homo heidelbergensis* was determined from the Mauer mandible found 1907 in a gravel quarry in Mauer, Germany near Heidelberg.

### **XI) The Evidence of Archaeology (II) (pp. 302-329)**

Cave painting is 'dated' by U-Th testing of CaCO<sub>3</sub> deposits overlying the art.

The only three burial sites discovered for Neanderthals were Nazlet, Khater, and Taramsa in Egypt. Twenty full skeletons of 500 exist.

Chimpanzees lack the ability to read intentions.

*The Miracle Worker* (United Artists, 1962) tells Helen Keller's story.

The concept of functional reference in language evolution is now considered a red herring.

Fossil endocasts can show little about hominin language development.

Human hearing ranges from 20-20,000Hz.

SVT is the supralaryngeal vocal tract.

In 1989 at Kebara, Israel it was found that the Neanderthal hyoid bone was identical to modern humans.

Harmonic peaks are formant frequencies.

The hyoid of *A. afarensis* is basically apelike.

The human oral cavity is 57 +/- 5.1mm.

Louis-Jean Boe et al., "The Potential Neanderthal Vowel Space Was as Large as That of Modern Humans."

"Mutations yielded the species-species specific human speech producing anatomy." (p. 317)

Nerves controlling the tongue pass through the hypoglossal canals.

Fine respiratory control is thoracically innervated.

*Homo ergaster* is said to be early *Homo erectus*.

Human Accelerated Regions (HARs) are 'static' DNA sequences.

## **XII) Locating the Historical Adam (pp. 330ff)**

In 1921, a *H. hiedelbergensis* skull and shin bone was found at a Broken Hill mine in Rhodesia, which was initially classed as *H. rhodesiensis*. The skull measured 800-1,300cc.

It's origin is "shrouded in mystery".