

Faith and Thought

A Journal devoted to the study of the inter-relation
of the Christian revelation and modern research

Vol. 96

Number 1

Summer, 1967

JAMES O. BUSWELL, III, M.A.

Genesis, the Neolithic Age, and the Antiquity of Adam*

I.

In 1954 Bernard Ramm in the chapter on anthropology in his *The Christian View of Science and Scripture* wrote: 'The chief problem with an origin of man at 500,000 B.C. is the connection of Genesis iii with Genesis iv . . . In the fourth and fifth chapters of Genesis we have lists of names, ages of people, towns, agriculture, metallurgy, and music. This implies the ability to write, to count, to build, to farm, to smelt, and to compose. Further, this is done by the immediate descendants of Adam. Civilization does not reveal any evidence till about 8000 B.C. . . . We can hardly push it back to 500,000 B.C. It is problematic to interpret Adam as having been created 200,000 B.C. or earlier, and civilization not coming into existence till say 8000 B.C.'¹ At the close of the chapter he wrote: 'We have now surveyed Genesis and anthropology and found the problems more severe than Genesis and geology. The most uncomfortable problem is the relationship of the antiquity of man, the Fall of man, to the advanced state of culture in Genesis iv'.²

Four years earlier, Smalley and Fetzer in their anthropology chapter in the American Scientific Affiliation volume *Modern Science and Christian Faith*, had written: 'The Scriptures seem to

* Expanded from a paper read at a Wheaton College Faculty Meeting, 2nd March, 1965. Prepared for the International Conference on Science and Christian Faith held at Regent's Park College, Oxford University, 17-26th July, 1965, sponsored by the Research Scientists' Christian Fellowship. An abridged, popularized version appeared in *Eternity*, Vol. 18, No. 2, February, 1967, under the title 'Adam and Neolithic Man'.

¹ Ramm, 1954, p. 327.

² *Ibid.*, p. 342.

indicate a fairly complex culture for man immediately after the Fall. . . . Cain and Abel are shown with domesticated plants and animals respectively. In the present understanding of culture history such domestication comes relatively very late in time. If it is true that the earliest indications of agriculture are about 8000 B.C. or later in the Mesopotamian Valley we have a major problem that deserves careful study in the light of the age of man'.³

II

The Neolithic age was named by Sir John Lubbock in 1865 to signify the polished stone tools which were of a more refined type than those of the Palaeolithic, or Old Stone Age. But it is not for the type of stone tools that the Neolithic is important. The Neolithic period of prehistory remains as a crucial transition time which saw the rise of the incipient and then full-blown domestication of plants and animals – the dawn of agriculture and herding – the economic bases for the simplest forms of sedentary life. V. Gordon Childe refers to this as the 'Neolithic Revolution'.

Now the earliest Neolithic indications anywhere have been known for some years to be represented by two or three incipient village sites in what Robert Braidwood calls the 'hilly flanks' of the fertile crescent, notably in what today is Iraq and Iran. Generally dates of from 7000 to 8000 B.C. have been given for these earliest indications of domestication.

The earliest horizon of Neolithic or incipient Neolithic culture yet reported comes from an open village site, Zawi Chemi Shanidar in Northern Iraq.⁴ A charcoal sample from layer 'B' of this site which correlates with an early Neolithic layer at nearby Shanidar Cave as well as with similar material from Karim Shahir about 160 km away, was dated by carbon-14 at 10,870 ± 300 before the present, or 8600 to possibly over 9000 B.C.

Now, it is important to remember that, between these two Shanidar sites, the open village, and the cave, in the words of

³ Smalley and Fetzer, 1950, p. 134.

⁴ Solecki and Rubin, 1958, p. 1446.

its chief investigator, Dr. Ralph Solecki, we are given 'a long preface to Mesopotamian history'. 'Thus far,' he continues, 'the cultural sequence for Shanidar Valley is outlined on a relatively firm basis by carbon-14 dates from about 50,000 years ago . . .'⁵ ' . . . The chronology was fixed by sixteen carbon-14 dates from all four layers at Shanidar Cave and by one from Zawi Chemi Shanidar. The samples were dated by four different laboratories in studies of which several were duplicate checks. The dates range from about A.D. 1750 for layer "A" to about 48,000 B.C. for layer "D".'⁶ Six adult Neanderthals have been recovered from Shanidar Cave whose datings range between 44,000 to over 48,000 B.C.

Thus 'The significance of the Shanidar Valley investigations is that here, in this one locality there is an almost continuous sequence of human history dating from the time of the Neanderthals'.⁷

Neolithic culture was formerly believed to have been disseminated to Europe about 4 or 5 thousand years later than Middle Eastern Neolithic, or about 3000 B.C. Now, the Neolithic picture in Europe is radically changed as a result of reports pushing back the date of the earliest Aegean Neolithic settlements more than 3000 years and those in Central Europe nearly 2000 years.⁸ A date of 6220 ± 150 B.C. is reported for an early Neolithic site in the Plain of Macedonia. An important village site in central Bohemia dates from approximately 4500 to the beginning or first half of the fourth millenium B.C. Harvard archaeologist Marija Gimbutas claims that 'It thus bears eloquent testimony to the long Danubian chronology now established and supports the C-14 dates for this culture, which, in the initial stages of the application of this method, seemed to be incredibly high'.⁹ Regarding these and other discoveries, Gimbutas concludes: 'These new dates seem to accord with the many new strata of Neolithic habitations which have recently been uncovered in the Balkan mounds. Evidence of a long

⁵ Solecki, 1963, p. 179.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 179.

⁸ Summarized from Gimbutas, 1963.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

Neolithic chronology and the constant appearance of new cultures or new chronological phases have made research in the Neolithic period of Europe one of the most exciting fields of archaeological studies'.¹⁰

Now, to bring the statement of our problem to a focus: even with the latest archaeological techniques, and the increase in activity and breadth of range, *the Neolithic is still to this day contained within an order of magnitude of ten thousand years*. Furthermore, disregarding more ancient human remains, we have clear and unequivocal evidence for the existence of man – man who walked completely upright, who had human society and human culture, who buried his dead with ceremony; man who, in the opinion of many must have been the descendants of Adam – at least 50,000 years ago. The Shanidar material seems to present in even clearer light the differential orders of magnitude of Neolithic culture and the age of man. The disparity between them grows increasingly clear from the strides taken by prehistoric archaeology even though, in one sense, based upon negative evidence. The distressing part is that theological opinion regarding the interpretation of the apparent dilemma of the antiquity of Adam on the one hand, and the comparative recency of his culture pattern and that of his immediate descendants on the other hand, does not incorporate the scientific developments uniformly into its interpretations, but rather, ranges itself on quite another level of abstraction, upon a continuum of orthodoxy vs. liberalism. The liberal views most widely held generally discount the necessity of taking Adam seriously as the first man and head of the whole human race. Thereby the dilemma, whatever their particular version of his significance, does not usually exist for them.

* The orthodox, however, do not face the problem. In fact, it is most difficult to find any author of conservative, evangelical stripe who even so much as acknowledges the problem. One either has a recent Adam with no discontinuity between him and the culture of Genesis iv, or else one is found to be sliding down the continuum towards theological liberalism! Of course, there are a few exceptions. We shall attempt to consider the

¹⁰ Summarized from Gimbutas, 1963, p. 72.

problem from the position of biblical orthodoxy which takes seriously the facts of science and the exigent contradictions and interpretative puzzles that inevitably arise for the believer in every age.

III

The fact that a dilemma has been defined at all rests upon certain important assumptions which it is our purpose to examine. A brief consideration of how these assumptions are treated from different points of view will then yield a number of alternative ways in which the components of the problem have been or may be juxtaposed, and will, in turn, allow us, with a choice of conditions, to ascertain which of several interpretations would seem to be the most tenable.

The dilemma, then, rests upon the following assumptions:

1. that, for theological reasons, Adam must be considered the first man, anthropologically and biblically; all men are his progeny.
2. that Cain and Abel were individuals and the immediate offspring of Adam, and that those described in Genesis iv. 17-24 refer to the immediate progeny of Cain.
3. that what is described as 'a keeper of sheep' and 'a tiller of the ground' constitutes the Neolithic complex of domestication, (Genesis iv. 2), and that city building (Genesis iv. 17), tents and cattle (Genesis iv. 20), harp and organ (Genesis iv. 21), artificer in brass and iron (Genesis iv. 22), refer to at least Neolithic level of civilization.
4. that the Neolithic culture complex was developed only after Palaeolithic times.
5. that the function of the Flood of Noah was to inundate all other living mankind.
6. that the data of fossil men and the methodology for ascertaining their antiquity are reliable.

(Other factors implied within these basic assumptions are the initial perfection and the fall of Adam; the unity of the human race as a whole in terms of the fall; and the nature, purpose, and duration of Eden.)

IV

Focusing at first upon assumption I we may commence with a consideration of theses expressed in recent issues of *Faith and Thought*, the Journal of the Victoria Institute. J. M. Clark, in a refreshingly original presentation of the problem, is at some pains to accept ancient man but a very recent Adam: 'Thus when Adam was created and placed in Eden, the human race was already long established, and it is possible that quite advanced civilisations were already in being'.¹¹ To arrive at this position Clark makes a distinction between the creation of the first men (Genesis i. 26) and the creation of Adam (Genesis v. 2). His entire thesis rests essentially on this distinction. He examines all of the Genesis references to Adam and reads separate meanings as necessary, 'Adam' as 'man', and 'Adam' as *the* man put into Eden. Both of these meanings he finds in Genesis v. 1-2 holding that since God called the name of the first created men 'Adam' they shared the nature of the 'Adam' of Eden. Clark thus concludes: 'We may therefore take Gen. v. 1-2 as applying to the couple in Eden without in any way committing ourselves to the view that they were the first human beings on earth, from whom all others are descended'.¹² With reference to the first or original man, for Clark, 'The expression "called their name Adam" indicates that original man, like ourselves, was reckoned to share in the nature of Adam, and therefore to share in his sin and in his condemnation to spiritual and physical death'.¹³ Clark must assume, however, that 'the results of Adam's sin may operate backwards in time as well as forwards, in the same way as the saving work of Christ. Thus men who lived long before Adam would be under the same dominion of sin and death as those who have lived since'.¹⁴ After examining the New Testament references to Adam, Clark comes to the conclusion that '... we cannot anywhere find a clear and definite statement to indicate conclusively that Adam was the first man on earth, nor can we find a clear and definite

¹¹ Clark, J. M., 1964, p. 146.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 152.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 153.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

statement that all men now living are descended from him'.¹⁵ The distinction between original man and Adam on these bases seems an artificial method for solving some knotty problems, which, frankly, it would solve, if hermeneutically legitimate. Clark abandons not only the orthodox Protestant view of Adam, but also runs counter to the Encyclical *Humani Generis* which insists that 'No Catholic can hold that after Adam there existed on this earth true men who did not take their origin through natural generation from him . . .'.¹⁶

J. Stafford Wright in 1958 concluded that the evidences of burials, art, and the like in connection with Palaeolithic man, usually interpreted as indications of religion or at least a belief in an after life, do not, in fact, necessarily signify this at all. He concludes that ' . . . there is no evidence of religion in any fair sense of the word, nor of the beginnings of religion, in Palaeolithic times, say down to 10,000 B.C. Indeed it would be safe to come down several more thousand years'.¹⁷ Elsewhere he questions the 'spiritual capacities' of 'man-like creatures' before about 6000 B.C.¹⁸ From his conclusions we may infer that Wright also holds to a very recent Adam, and calls all fossil men before Neolithic times 'pre-Adamic' creatures which 'do not have the status of men in the Biblical sense'.¹⁹ However, he does allow for the possibility of these being 'Adamic' men who 'had the knowledge of the true God, and worshipped Him without any image, picture, or visible means'.²⁰

T. C. Mitchell has reviewed the possibilities and problems of various positions of antiquity for Adam in the framework of our first assumption. He tentatively adopts the position that 'only the fossil remains which have been unequivocally described as *Homo sapiens* (namely the men of the Upper Palaeolithic)' are 'to be called "man" in the Biblical sense'. Non-*sapiens* fossil forms 'would not be pre-Adamite men, for they would not be men'.²¹

¹⁵ Clark, J. M., 1964, p. 151.

¹⁶ Cotter, 1951, p. 43.

¹⁷ Wright, 1958, p. 14.

¹⁸ Wright, 1956, p. 27.

¹⁹ Wright, 1958, p. 14.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Mitchell, 1959, pp. 47, 49.

James Murk holds a view²² very similar to Mitchell's, but preferring to designate the more chronologically precise Late Pleistocene as the time for Adam. Murk's position rests heavily upon a well-documented thesis that previous hominids did not have true language, thus were not true men.

Personally, I, as well as many others, have always held assumption 1, and believe that Adam must be considered to be as early as the unequivocally 'human' remains that are found. Since spiritual criteria do not fossilize, and since morphological criteria are irrelevant, all that the anthropologist has to go on is cultural criteria for the definition of 'man'.

It must also be pointed out that no particular date in antiquity is necessary to quote for this position since, if accurate dating techniques in places like Shanidar Cave take us back at least 50,000 years, those who accept this would not quibble about the difference between this and the hundreds of thousands of years ago for the antiquity of fossil men like Swanscombe, the Pithecanthropoids and others. For the analysis of biblical data and language the difference is not pertinent: if an order of magnitude of 50,000 years for man's creation is allowed, as B. B. Warfield pointed out in 1911,²³ any figure well into the hundreds of thousands or more can also be allowed, as far as scripture is concerned.

We find, then, from the consideration of these expressions that Wright and Mitchell make assumption 1 if we leave out the word 'anthropologically'. Murk makes assumption 1 as it stands, but Clark makes no such assumption. All four put Adam at such a position that pre-existing fossil hominids must be accounted for somehow on the assumption of Adam's relationship to all of mankind in the fall. Clark does this by assuming their humanity and by an exegetical and theological device; Wright by discounting their religious capacity; Murk by discounting their linguistic capacity; and Mitchell by simply assigning them a non-human status. Thus Wright and Mitchell agree that Adam must be the first man biblically but not anthropologically, while Murk would claim that pre-Adamic

²² Murk, 1965.

²³ Warfield, 1911, p. 247.

hominids were not even 'man' anthropologically without true language. Clark does not maintain that Adam need be the first man on any count.

We move on to a consideration of assumptions 2 and 3 before concluding our evaluation of the previous positions.

V

First concerning 2, it has been suggested that references to Cain might have been to more than one man, possibly to one much later than Adam. F. K. Farr, for example, in his article on Cain in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* writes: 'The indications in [Gen.] iv:1-16 of a developed state of society and a considerable population may go to show that the narrative of the murder was not originally associated with the sons of the first man. Thus there is room to suppose that in the process of condensation and arrangement Cain, son of Adam; Cain, the murderer; and Cain, city builder and head of a line of patriarchs, have been made one'.²⁴

The crux of the problem, as far as the available literature by those who assume the historicity of Genesis is concerned, seems to be with assumptions 2 and 3, namely, (a) that Cain and the people of Genesis iv all lived within the lifetime of Adam, and (b) the unquestioned assigning of the cultural indications in Genesis iv to the Neolithic, *thus acquiring its archaeological limitations in time*. With few exceptions the treatment of this problem has been fragmentary and has suffered from either theological or scientific inconsistencies. Most works on Genesis make at least the tacit assumption, as plainly stated by Mitchell, 'that Adam and his descendants were farmers'. The restrictions of this assumption clearly exercised Clark as well as Mitchell, and with its implications, plagued Ramm, and Smalley and Fetzer as indicated at the beginning of this paper. The suggestion is made, however, that perhaps Cain and Abel were not really *domesticators* of plants and animals but rather in the language of Moses, and particularly our translations, would only appear to be such when their respective concerns with vegetable and

²⁴ Farr, 1915, p. 539.

animal provision might have been vastly more primitive and like the economies of remote peoples of today. Suggestive is my father's insistence that Moses' description of Cain and Abel is comparatively meagre and does not demand any Neolithic connotations. This view is reflected in his handling of the subject of antiquity in his recent *Systematic Theology*.²⁵

Suggestive also is Mitchell's discussion of an alternative consideration of the references in Genesis ii. 5 which may be applied elsewhere. He points out that 'The word "field", *sadeh*, which is frequently used elsewhere to refer to arable land, occurs here for the first time, and may indicate that the *siah* [plant] and *eseb* [herb] were particular types of plant suitable for human use. The general use of these two words suggests that in the present context they may perhaps be understood as indicating respectively low bushes bearing berries, and the natural grasses from which cereals might be obtained'.²⁶

Regarding the interpretation of the status of culture indicated in Genesis iv, Mitchell's observations are pertinent enough to quote at length: 'The passage in chapter iv telling of Cain's descendants is usually treated as an account of the origins of the arts of civilisation, but an examination of each of the component elements shows that these features could be interpreted as appropriate to almost any period from the Upper Palaeolithic to the Iron Age. Each point can only be mentioned very briefly here. Enoch's "city", *ir*, need not be more than a small settlement, and could suggest equally a village farming settlement of the Near East, or one of the Upper Palaeolithic mammoth-hunter type, and the lot of Cain as a wanderer would seem to bear this out. Jabal is described as the "father" or "originator" of those who dwell in tents and have cattle, but *migne* need not mean more than "possessions", or even possibly, if the Masoretic vocalisation is ignored, it might be a form of *qaneh*, "reed", [*sic*] with a prefixed *mem* local, and have some such meaning as "who dwell in tents and places of reeds", that is reed, or wattle huts. This situation could relate to nomads in the hinterland of civilisation, or Upper Palaeolithic hut dwellers.

²⁵ Buswell, Jr., 1963, Vol. 1.

²⁶ Mitchell, 1959, p. 41.

The same could be said for the other four elements. *Kinnor*, could mean basically, "a stringed instrument", and the presence, now generally accepted of the archer's bow in the Upper Palaeolithic opens up the possibility of the simple musical bow in that period. Simple wind instruments mostly of hollowed bones, which could come within the meaning of *ugab*, are known from the same period. The statement in iv. 22 can legitimately be translated to mean "the sharpener of every cutter (or cutting implement) of copper and iron". Since both native copper and meteoric iron have presumably occurred on the surface from Palaeolithic times, and both can be worked by grinding (being softer than stone), it seems unnecessary to regard this as evidence of metallurgy'.²⁷ Regarding the 'city' of Enoch, Davidson, Stibbs, and Kevan likewise suggest that 'The place itself was probably no more than a defended centre of organized social life'.²⁸

Regarding assumption 4, another element of potential importance is simply that the earliest domestication of plants and animals might be much more remote in time but just has not yet come to light. Mitchell, arguing against viewing archaeology always 'in the light of an evolutionary hypothesis' suggests the possibility of agriculture 'in existence at times much earlier than we have supposed'.²⁹ Of course archaeological discoveries have surprised us before, but from the present outlook it seems very unlikely that the Neolithic culture pattern will turn up on any horizon whose antiquity is radically different in order of magnitude.

VI

On assumption 6 regarding the reliability of the scientific evidence for fossil man and the dating techniques, much time could be wasted. It should not be necessary to go into the geochemical technicalities nor into the palaeontological details for purposes of validation in this paper any more than it should be necessary to argue down the past or current expressions of

²⁷ Mitchell, 1959, pp. 41-42.

²⁸ Davidson, Stibbs and Kevan, 1954, p. 82.

²⁹ Mitchell, 1959, p. 49.

the hyper-traditionalist views of the Bible-science 'radical right'. Of interest, however, is one viewpoint which is stated in one of the most recent and thorough works in the ultra-conservative Flood-geology tradition, even though it is patently impossible for its authors to operate within it consistently. John Whitcomb and Henry Morris claim to provide a 'system of historical geology' which 'finds its basic rationale in a frank recognition of the uniquely revelatory character of the Judaeo-Christian Scriptures'. However, for early geophysical and biological history they insist that conventional scientific method 'not only has not but *cannot* provide a scientifically correct explanation...' The proposition to which I wish to call attention is then stated: ' . . . we recognize that any *genuine knowledge* of these matters must necessarily come by way of some form of divine revelation'.³⁰ Again, they state: 'After all, special revelation supersedes natural revelation, for it is only by means of special revelation that we can interpret aright the world about us'.³¹ Elsewhere Morris has stated that 'revelation is absolutely required for any genuine knowledge. Science can only deal, really, with the present and with the historic past'.³² Thus one of the most widely heralded works in creationist circles since the days of Harry Rimmer would seem to eliminate for itself any further consideration of prehistoric matters not revealed in the Bible. The entire extra-biblical picture of human prehistory is automatically beyond the powers of human analysis and understanding for those who hold this position. We may only look with tolerant regret at such unnecessary obscurantism which cloaks an obviously sincere labour for the preservation of the Faith we share.

VII

At this point we shall consider what I believe to be the most important but most neglected aspect of the whole problem area under consideration, namely, the antiquity of man in the Western Hemisphere. There are five important elements in the

³⁰ Whitcomb and Morris, 1961, p. 331.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 458.

³² Morris, Henry, personal communication, April 5, 1963.

picture: (a) how long ago man entered North America, (b) how long it took to populate the two continents and differentiate linguistically and racially, (c) the antiquity of individual sites, (d) the continuity of cultural sequence, and (e) the significance of the modern physical type.

Professor Mischa Titiev states that 'nearly everyone accepts an entrance date of around 20,000 B.P.'.³³ There are those who would push it far beyond that, but we shall work with the consensus which will serve adequately for our purposes. Most of the reasoning for such estimates are based upon the scattered C-14 dates which are plentiful this side of 20,000 years. There are a number of sites dated near the 10,000 year range taking a New World antiquity of that magnitude completely out of controversy. R. J. Mason states that 'Human occupation of parts of North America has been conclusively demonstrated for as early as 13,000 years ago'.³⁴ Grahame Clark, after examining various estimates, writes: 'What we do know for certain is that Paleoindian hunters were active on the High Plains of North America by a period assessed by radio-carbon analysis at the tenth millenium B.C.: immediately prior, that is, to the final glacial episode of major importance'.³⁵ Jacquetta Hawkes describes an important site indicating that the age of Paleo-Indian western tradition is 'now realized to be earlier than was once thought. Danger Cave, Utah, for example, was probably first occupied by 9000 B.C. At this site basketry was already being practised at this time, the oldest known example of it in the world'.³⁶

Inferential evidence is about as persuasive in estimating how long ago man entered North America as carbon-14 dates. Again Jacquetta Hawkes points out that 'the extremity of South America was reached by 6000 B.C.'.³⁷ Some have reported this as 7000 B.C. In other words, to have populated the extremities of the two continents, assuming that entrance was via the Bering Straits from the Old World, by 6 or 7 thousand years B.C.

³³ Titiev, 1963, p. 331.

³⁴ Mason, 1962, p. 228.

³⁵ Clark, G., 1961, p. 212-213.

³⁶ Hawkes, 1963, p. 94.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

and by normal population expansion, requires the postulation of an immense amount of time from the starting point. Furthermore it has been estimated that to differentiate into the 160 linguistic stocks and 1,200 or more dialectic subdivisions that the Indians had when Europeans arrived, would have taken 'at least 20,000 years, perhaps three times that';³⁸ and to adapt physically to as many environmental extremes with as much racial variety as the American Indians exhibit, one authority believes 25,000 years hardly long enough.³⁹

Crucial to our whole analysis are the fourth and fifth elements of the picture mentioned above. The continuity of culture revealed by series of archaeological sequences, continuous dwelling sites in some places, and general patterning of regional expressions of Paleo-Indian life testify to but a single, sustained indigenous population from early to recent times. The significance of the last element is that as far back as there are any skeletal evidences in the Western Hemisphere at all, we find only the recent *Homo sapiens* type.

A good example of this continuity of a regional expression of Paleo-Indian culture is the so-called Desert Culture. R. J. Mason's account will give some idea of the extent to which it is known: 'The area occupied by Desert Culture peoples is enormous and ecologically varied, extending from at least Oregon to the Valley of Mexico and from the Pacific coast of California to the eastern foothills of the Rocky Mountains . . . The range of the Desert Culture is as great in time as in space. Radiocarbon dates show it had developed *in situ* by about 11,000 years ago; *in some areas, it persisted virtually unchanged into the ethnographic present as witnessed in southern California and the Great Basin*'.⁴⁰

VIII

By now, no doubt, the implications of the New World picture are coming into focus. Stating the point directly, were Adam to be assigned an antiquity of merely Neolithic times, this would

³⁸ Harrington, John, quoted in Macgowan and Hester, 1962, pp. 5, 6.

³⁹ Macgowan and Hester, 1962, p. 6.

⁴⁰ Mason, 1962, p. 231, emphasis added.

leave the entire aboriginal population of the Western Hemisphere, and probably large portions of eastern Asia and Oceania, out of the Adamic line and out of the judgment of the Flood of Noah. Bernard Ramm reminds us: 'Adam must be as old as the migrations of the Indians'.⁴¹ And also that 'Any thought about the origin of man must keep in mind the date of the arrival of the American Indian in America . . .'⁴² I would go a step further and say that *Noah* must be as old as the migration of the Indians, and that any thought about the date of the Flood must keep in mind the arrival in America. Of course, if our assumption (5) that the function of the Flood was to be a punishment upon all mankind is not taken, then the Indians might be considered excluded. Ramm does seem to leave room for this possibility since he recognizes that a universal destruction of man would have to be before the American entry, but he is not willing to consider the flood that early. He simply states that 'there is hardly an evangelical scholar who wishes to put the flood as early as 8000 B.C. to 10,000 B.C.'.⁴³ Nevertheless, if the American Indians were to be included it would have had to be a long time before that to allow time for population dispersion to reach eastern Asia by 20,000 years ago.

It need hardly be pointed out that the lack of any marked or widely correlated hiatus or discontinuity in racial type or cultural sequences in the Americas would seem to preclude the possibility that the Flood had inundated a human population in the Western Hemisphere after which the continents were repopulated. If such a thing happened the evidence is totally lacking.

IX

We now have a problem of some complexity which may be clarified somewhat by isolating its components. There appear to be ten:

1. The theological significance of Adam: the fall, and his relation to the rest of mankind.

⁴¹ Ramm, 1954, p. 317.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 327.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 336.

2. The antiquity of Adam.
3. Adam's relationship and temporal connection with the people and culture of Genesis iv.
4. Cain and Abel, their culture, and the culture of Genesis iv.
5. The antiquity of No. 4.
6. The archaeological Neolithic.
7. The antiquity of No. 6.
8. The nature of the fossil hominids as 'man'.
9. The antiquity and distribution of No. 8.
10. The purpose of the Flood of Noah.

Perhaps clarity can be further achieved by itemizing some of the alternative ways in which the components may be put together, specifying certain theological or interpretative conditions, and ascertaining which positions seem to be tenable.

For the purposes of simplifying the process we shall set the following conditions upon our concluding discussion: (*a*) that the data and dating techniques for fossil man are considered reliable, (*b*) that we assume the orthodox position regarding the historicity of Adam, and the consequences of the fall upon the whole human race, and (*c*) the judgment of the Flood upon all mankind except Noah's family. Anyone not wishing to have these special conditions imposed upon his interpretation may, of course, work out for himself whatever interpretation the data permits.

Under these conditions we may eliminate a late or Neolithic date for Adam, unless, of course we are willing to adopt the rare position of J. M. Clark with reference to the sinful nature of man before Adam. If the position of J. M. Clark is theologically tenable, I see no problems with the anthropological data. If not, then we will have to push Adam back or we would find the condition already stated, of excluding the American aboriginal population from not only Adam's line but the Flood as well.

In my view, Adam would have to be well back into Palaeolithic times at least as early as 40-50 thousand years ago, and the Flood put well before the dispersion of *Homo sapiens* to eastern Asia.

But what about the eighth component, or the nature of still earlier or Lower Palaeolithic fossil men? It seems to me that whatever solution of the Neolithic-Genesis iv dilemma suits an

Adam of 50,000 years ago would also allow an Adam early enough to include the men of these remoter times. It would seem to be a matter of one's judgment as to what objective criteria to use for biblical 'man'; not a matter of theological concern as to his antiquity. B. B. Warfield pointed out that 'The question of the antiquity of man is accordingly a purely scientific one, in which the theologian as such has no concern'.⁴⁴ So much for his antiquity. Nevertheless, Adam could not be the head of a race that did not have human language nor religious capacities. If James Murk's and J. Stafford Wright's theses are reliable then Adam could not be before *Homo sapiens*. Wright's claim must be revised, however, in view of the necessity to extend Adam certainly beyond 10,000 years. Both views, of course, would be contingent upon the antiquity of *Homo sapiens*. This picture is currently in a state of quite extensive re-examination in anthropology. With consideration of tool-making and its relation to brain capacity, language, and truly cultural man is the area of keenest focus for an opinion as to how early the creation of Adam could be reasonably supposed to have occurred.

A consideration of our third through the seventh components would be somewhat as follows: Adam would be quite separated from the archaeological Neolithic. I would guess that he would have to be somewhat earlier than either Mitchell or Murk are willing to go, to even antedate the Neanderthals, in fact. This seems warranted upon the basis of the continuity at Shanidar, as well as the American entrance date.

How to settle with the third, fourth, and fifth components is a question contingent upon further discovery and study. My feeling is that Cain and Abel were not Neolithic, and that probably there was considerable time between Adam's day and the generations described in Genesis iv. 17-24. However, the theologians will have to sort out the positions reviewed above and tell us which interpretations are warranted in this area.

If Adam *must* be early enough to allow for man in America, and if Genesis iv. 17-24 *must* be interpreted as Neolithic or later we need a new interpretation of Genesis iv. 1-16. However, if

⁴⁴ Warfield, *loc. cit.*

Genesis iv. 17-24 can be referred to a Palaeolithic date, or at least, be legitimately interpreted as disassociated with any specific temporal or chronological signification, our dilemma is resolved in much the same fashion as the resolution of the genealogies of Genesis v. and xi. That is, it would be resolved upon the same *principles* as set forth by William Henry Green in his famous 'Primeval Chronology' in 1890, if not supported by the same conclusive detail.

Assigning Genesis iv. with Adam back into the Palaeolithic would not only resolve our dilemma but would cause no consequent difficulty with what follows in Scripture. With reference to the precariousness of assuming 'that any Biblical genealogy is designed to be strictly continuous . . .' Green writes: 'The creation, the Flood, the call of Abraham, are great facts which stand out distinctly in primeval sacred history. A few incidents respecting our first parents and their sons Cain and Abel are recorded. Then there is almost a total blank until the Flood, with nothing whatever to fill the gap, and nothing to suggest the length of time intervening but what is found in the genealogy stretching between these two points . . . So far as the Biblical records go, we are left not only without adequate data, but without any data whatever, which can be brought into comparison with these genealogies for the sake of testing their continuity and completeness'.⁴⁵ Green then enunciates the principle which I would like to emphasize for this enquiry: 'If, therefore, any *really trustworthy data* can be gathered from any source whatever, from any realm of science or antiquarian research, which can be brought into comparison with these genealogies for the sake of determining the question . . . such data should be welcomed and the comparison fearlessly made. Science would simply perform the office, in this instance, which information from other parts of Scripture is unhesitatingly allowed to do in regard to those genealogies previously examined'.⁴⁶

X

This has been an exploratory excursion among the biblical and scientific elements of a problem which may be viewed most

⁴⁵ Green, 1890, p. 295.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

profitably from a number of focal distances. Individual problems may be pin-pointed, such as the definition of 'man', specific Hebrew meanings or usages, or the exact nature of the archaeological evidences for domestication. Enlarging our focus we may concentrate upon the relation of these to each other, with broader concerns such as the interpretation of Genesis iv. by itself. Enlarging our focus still more we gain further perspective upon the significance of the antiquity of man's creation in relation to Genesis iv.

In a still larger sense, we may find a study of this kind implicitly directing itself to the broader consideration of the canons of interpretation, both of Scripture and of scientific data.

The purpose of this paper, then, has been not to discover or hand down a solution to any problem, but rather to examine the relevant factors involved, some basic assumptions implied, and some alternative viewpoints in light of the data at hand. It is hoped that this method of presentation will offer enough leads, suggest enough alternatives and stimulate enough ideas, within as well as tangential to the chosen problem area, that others will be able to improve upon and reformulate these questions, clarifying the aspects which remain obscure, providing a foundation for greater precision of thought and increased areas of consensus among Christian scholars.

Addendum

As this paper was about to be mailed off, Brian S. Mawhinney's important article, 'Man - His Origin, His Nature and His God' (*Faith and Thought* 95:2 (1966) pp. 54-71) came to my notice. Although he does not develop precisely the same problem, there is sufficient common ground to make it worthy of mention here.

1. Generally we agree on the proper position to take with regard to the relevant chapters in Genesis, as expressed by Mawhinney on page 67.
2. We disagree on the necessary interpretation of the Old Testament genealogies in view of his statement that they place Adam between 6 and 10 thousand years ago (page 67). Thus in connection with his four possible solutions to the problem which is precipitated by such an interpretation of

the genealogies, our positions are contrasted with reference to number 2 in which 'we can say the genealogies are wrong and place man, with science 5×10^5 years ago'. Mawhinney rejects this position because he believes such an age 'contravenes scripture'. I don't believe the genealogies are wrong, nor that their interpretation need conflict with the indicated age of man, for reasons mentioned above. Mawhinney perhaps now holds this position, too, if one may read into his footnote 39 an acceptance of Professor Wiseman's communication to the same point.

3. I should have great difficulty accepting Mawhinney's interpretation of Adam as discussed on pages 68-69 in which he expresses a liking for the idea of J. M. Clark regarding the retroactive function of the fall. Perhaps I am inclined to be a bit more conservative regarding Adam's theological relationship to sin and the whole human race. Furthermore these seem to me to be wholly theological considerations which encounter no conflict with anthropological data whatever.
4. Perhaps Mawhinney tends to over-estimate, at one point, the significance of the fossil finds as 'powerful evidence for a physical link' between non-man and man (page 63). When we examine the tremendous discontinuities in the fossil patterns between even the earliest of the East and South African forms attributed to man, and the presumably ancestral forms plotted sparsely throughout the rest of the Tertiary period the evidence for the assumed derivation of man from any line of non-human hominoids or primates is anything but powerful.

Mawhinney has raised many thought-provoking matters upon which there is no present time or space to comment. I feel a kindred spirit with much of what he writes. We both desire a sharing of views on these problems from readers who care to comment, I'm sure.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Buswell, J. Oliver, Jr., 1963, *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion*. Two volumes. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Clark, Grahame, 1961, *World Prehistory: An Outline*. London: Cambridge University Press.

- Clark, J. M., 1964, 'Genesis and Its Underlying Realities', *Faith and Thought*, Vol. 93, No. 3, pp. 146-158.
- Cotter, A. C., 1951, *The Encyclical 'Humani Generis' with a Commentary*. Weston: Weston College Press.
- Davidson, F., A. M. Stubbs, and E. F. Kevan, 1954, *The New Bible Commentary*. 2nd Edition, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Farr, F. K., 1915, 'Cain' in *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Vol. 1, pp. 538-539.
- Gimbutas, Marija, 1963, 'European Prehistory: Neolithic to the Iron Age' in Siegel, B. J., (Ed.) *Biennial Review of Anthropology*, 1963. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 69-106.
- Green, William Henry, 1890, 'Primeval Chronology', *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. XLVII, pp. 285-303.
- Hawkes, Jacquetta, 1963, 'Prehistory', Part One in Hawkes and Sir Leonard Woolley, *Prehistory and the Beginnings of Civilization*, Vol. 1 of *History of Mankind*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Macgowan, Kenneth, and J. A. Hester, Jr., 1962, *Early Man in the New World*. Revised edition. New York: Doubleday and Co.
- Mason, Ronald J., 1962, 'The Paleo-Indian Tradition in Eastern North America', *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 227-246.
- Mitchell, T. C., 1959, 'Archaeology and Genesis I-XI', *Faith and Thought*, Vol. 91, No. 1, pp. 28-49.
- Murk, James, 1965, 'Evidence for a late Pleistocene Creation of Man'. *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, Vol. 17, No. 2, (June), pp. 37-49.
- Ramm, Bernard, 1954, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Smalley, W. A., and M. Fetzner, 1950, 'The Christian View of Anthropology' in *Modern Science and Christian Faith*, Second edition. American Scientific Affiliation. Wheaton: Van Kampen Press.
- Solecki, Ralph, 1963, 'Prehistory in Shanidar Valley, Northern Iraq'. *Science*, Vol. 139, No. 3551 (18 Jan.), pp. 179-193.
- Solecki, Ralph and Meyer Rubin, 1958, 'Dating Zawi Chemi, An Early Village Site at Shanidar, Northern Iraq', *Science*, Vol. 127 (June) p. 1446.
- Titiev, Mischa, 1963, *The Science of Man*. Revised edition, New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Warfield, B. B., 1911, 'On the Antiquity and the Unity of the Human Race', *The Princeton Theological Review*, Vol. IX, pp. 1-25. Reprinted in his *Biblical and Theological Studies*, edited by S. G. Craig. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1952, pp. 238-261.
- Whitcomb, J. C. and H. M. Morris, 1961, *The Genesis Flood: The Biblical Record and Its Scientific Implications*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company.
- Wright, J. Stafford, 1956, 'The Place of Myth in the Interpretation of the Bible', *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, Vol. LXXXVIII, pp. 18-30.
- 1958, 'An Examination of Evidence For Religious Beliefs of Palaeolithic Man', *Faith and Thought*, Vol. 90, No. 1, pp. 4-15.