

# The Genealogical Adam and Eve: Errata, Typos, and Corrections

January 24, 2021. Acknowledgement and thanks to **Steve Dinkowitz** and **Denis Lamoureux** for identifying these errors.

Location	Original Text	Replacement Text	Notes
p. 47	For example, there are about 160 generations between 10,000 and 5,000 years ago. Naively (and falsely) assuming there is no overlap in our family trees, we can compute the number of ancestors alive 10,000 years ago from the population at 5,000 years ago, 18 million people; we arrive at about $2.6 \times 10^{55}$ ancestors. This is more ancestors than the number of stars in the visible universe. However, there were just 2 million people alive 10,000 years ago. How is this possible? The ratio between these numbers is $1.3 \times 10^{49}$ . This is how many times ancestors at 10,000 years are being double counted in this naive calculation, and it is an astronomical number of times.	For example, there are about <b>200</b> generations between 10,000 and 5,000 years ago. Naively (and falsely) assuming there is no overlap in our family trees, we can compute the number of ancestors alive 10,000 years ago from the population at 5,000 years ago, 18 million people; we arrive at about <b><math>2.9 \times 10^{67}</math></b> ancestors. This is more ancestors than the number of stars in the visible universe. However, there were just 2 million people alive 10,000 years ago. How is this possible? The ratio between the <b>estimated and known population</b> is <b><math>1.5 \times 10^{61}</math></b> . This is how many times ancestors at 10,000 years are being double counted in this naive calculation, and it is an astronomical number of times.	Changes in bold. See discussion here: <a href="https://discourse.peacefulscience.org/t/_/12389">https://discourse.peacefulscience.org/t/_/12389</a> .
p. 64	The brevity of the second error	The brevity of the second era	

May 6, 2020. Acknowledgement and thanks to **Kenneth Kemp**, **Michelle Ols**, **Dennis Jensen**, and **Darren Gedye** for identifying these errors.

Location	Original Text	Replacement Text	Notes
p. iv		[add James Tour endorsement]	
p. 49	At the IAP, everyone across the globe who leaves eventually becomes a universal genealogical ancestor.	At the IAP, everyone across the globe who is ancestor of any of us, is also an ancestor of all of us.	
p. 59	Here, each one that leaves any ancestors is also a universal ancestor.	Here, each one that leaves any descendants is also a universal ancestor.	
p. 59	Between these two dates is the nearly IAP, where <i>nearly</i> everyone alive (95–99 percent) who leaves ancestors is also a universal ancestor.	Between these two dates is the nearly IAP, where <i>nearly</i> everyone alive (95–99 percent) who leaves descendants is also a universal ancestor.	
p. 62	in the Middle East that leaves ancestors is a universal ancestor.	in the Middle East that leaves descendants is a universal ancestor.	
p. 64	For Adam and Eve to be ancestors alive in AD 1	For Adam and Eve to be ancestors of everyone alive in AD 1	
p. 80	do not affirm the de novo creation Adam and Eve,	do not affirm the <i>de novo</i> creation of Adam and Eve,	
p. 80	removing the claim that there is no evidence against the <i>de novo</i> creation of Adam and Eve	removing the claim that there is evidence against the <i>de novo</i> creation of Adam and Eve	
p. 108	There are, however, are better ways	There are, however, better ways	
pp. 112 (text and fn), 231, 243	C. J. Andrew Alexander	Andrew Alexander C. J.	Andrew Alexander was a Josephite priest. His order uses the initials “C.J.” after their names.
p. 123	The Jews are the sons of Adam, and as such constitute a separate species of Gentiles, some of whom were unknown to ancient Jews.	The Jews are the sons of Adam, and as such constitute a separate species of mankind. There are also many species of Gentiles, some of whom were unknown to ancient Jews.	Copy error in quote.

# The Genealogical Adam and Eve: Errata, Typos, and Corrections

p. 143	Seth is given to replace Cain	Seth is given to replace Abel
p. 157	I often speculated about people outside Garden	I often speculated about people outside the Garden
p. 167	a recent Adam and Eve could be in a paleolithic setting	a recent Adam and Eve could be in a Neolithic setting
p. 185	The inherited debt from Adam spreads by genealogical decent	The inherited debt from Adam spreads by genealogical descent
p. 200	the consequences of their sin to their genealogical ancestors.	the consequences of their sin to their genealogical descendants.

**April 13, 2020.** Acknowledgement and thanks to **William Lane Craig** for identifying this error, and to **John Hilber** and **Richard Averbeck** for consulting.

Location	Original Text	Replacement Text	Notes
p. 156	In these stories, the gods create <i>several</i> people, all of humanity, never just one couple to fill the earth, and never people who participate in a narrative dialogue.	In these stories, the gods usually create <i>several</i> people, all of humanity, not just one couple to fill the earth, and not participants in a narrative dialogue.	KAR 4 is one exception to the rule, so “never” is too strong a statement.

**February 5, 2020.** Acknowledgement and thanks to **Devin Gouvêa** and **Richard Buggs** for identifying this error, and to **Kenneth Kemp**, **Alan Love**, and **Jeffery Schloss** for consulting on this question. See more information here: <https://peacefulscience.org/wrong-on-monophyletic/>

Location	Original Text	Replacement Text	Notes
p. 80	monophyletic	conspecific, of the same species,	
p. 84	Monophyletic	Conspecific With Us	
p. 90	monophyletic	conspecific	
p. 120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Monophyletic</i> (and <i>monophylogeny</i>) means a group is all the same biological type. Humans are monophyletic, meaning that we are all the same species and subspecies.</li> <li>▪ <i>Polyphyletic</i> (and <i>polyphylogeny</i>) means that a group is of multiple biological types. It was often, incorrectly, thought that different races were different species or subspecies.</li> <li>▪ <i>Monogenesis</i> means an origin by genealogical descent from one couple. As we have seen, monogenesis is consistent with people breeding into this couple’s lineage.<sup>4</sup> Historically, there have been both polyphyletic and mono- phyletic versions of monogenesis.</li> <li>▪ <i>Polygenesis</i>, literally, means an origin from a large population, not a single couple. Historically, however, the term was always linked to the claim that humans are polyphyletic and that we do not all descend from Adam. The concepts traveled together, to the point now that polygenesis is understood to entail <i>polyphylogeny</i>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Monophylogeny</i> means a group is all the same biological type. Humans are conspecific, meaning that we are all the same species and subspecies.</li> <li>▪ <i>Polyphylogeny</i> means that a group is of multiple biological types. It was often, incorrectly, thought that different races were different species or subspecies.</li> <li>▪ <i>Monogenesis</i> means an origin by genealogical descent from one couple. As we have seen, monogenesis is consistent with people breeding into this couple’s lineage. Historically, monogenesis did not always affirm the biological unity of humankind, consistent with either <i>monophylogeny</i> or <i>polyphylogeny</i>.</li> <li>▪ <i>Polygenesis</i>, literally, means an origin from a large population, not a single couple. Historically, however, the term was always linked to <i>polyphylogeny</i> and the claim that we do not all descend from Adam. The concepts traveled together, to the point now that polygenesis is understood to entail <i>polyphylogeny</i>.</li> </ul>	

# The Genealogical Adam and Eve: Errata, Typos, and Corrections

	History is critical for understanding these terms. Rightly or wrongly, polygenesis was linked inextricably to polyphyletic theories of humanity, which deny the unity of humankind; polyphyletic theories of human origins, in turn, have been linked with racism.	History is critical for understanding these terms. Rightly or wrongly, polygenesis was linked inextricably to polyphyogeny, which deny the unity of humankind; polyphyletic theories of human origins, in turn, have been linked with racism.
p. 124	We are monophyletic...today are monophyletic	We are conspecific...today are the same species
p. 127	We are all monophyletic; we are of the same kind.	We are all the same species; we are of the same kind.
p. 243	as monophyletic	as conspecific

**December 16, 2019.** Acknowledgement and thanks to **Eric Johnson, Marshall Janzen, Glenn Branch, Michael Callen, Mark Moore, and Paul Bruggink.**

Location	Original Text	Replacement Text	Notes
p. iv		[add C. John Collins endorsement]	
p. 11	Table 1.1.	Table 1.1. The letters represent different understandings of Adam and Eve, as detailed in the table.	Several readers confused about letters.
p. 13	This book is about science and theology, but I write with societal concerns in mind and in conversation with history.	This book is a dialogue between science, theology and history, but I write with societal concerns in mind.	
p. 14	anniversary of this book	anniversary of Darwin's book	
p. 23	Nothing in this book is outside mainstream science.	Everything in this book is <i>consistent</i> with mainstream science.	E.g. theology is outside mainstream science.
p. 54, fn 29	universal ancestor point	identical ancestor point	
p. 63	First, population size is much lower in the past than it is.	First, the population size of the world was much lower in the past than it is now.	
p. 66	there would no reason to doubt	there would be no reason to doubt	
p. 68	it seems impossible rule out	it seems impossible to rule out	
p. 87	<i>de novo</i> create a new couple (C, E).	<i>de novo</i> create a new couple (D, E).	
p. 98	Where they human persons?	Were they human persons?	
p. 101	Adam Benton, "Creationist Ministries Provide a Distorted View of Human Evolution," Reports of the National Center for Science Education 34 (1997).	Adam Benton, "Creationist Ministries Provide a Distorted View of Human Evolution," Reports of the National Center for Science Education 34 (2014).	Fix the bibliography too.
p. 102	it appears that the answer is no.	it appears that the answer is a population, not a single couple.	
p. 104	Theologians have autonomy to define the term human on its own terms.	Theologians have autonomy to define the term human on their own terms.	

# The Genealogical Adam and Eve: Errata, Typos, and Corrections

p. 107	Each understanding locates the essential features of being human in different realms: the attributes of individuals, our actions according to a calling, or our relationships with each other and with God.	Noreen Herzfeld observes that each understanding locates the essential features of being human in different realms: respectively, the attributes of individuals, our actions according to a calling, or our relationships with each other and with God.	Missing attribution.
p. 107	philosophers tend to emphasize <i>substance</i> understanding	philosophers tend to emphasize the <i>substance</i> understanding	
p. 112	Where they human persons?	Were they human persons?	
p. 116	What precise traits makes us human?	What precise traits make us human?	
p. 117	Denisovans, into our world	Denisovans into our world	
p. 118	it will be clear the genealogical	it will be clear that the genealogical	
p. 118	the science regarding genealogical	the science regarding the genealogical	
p. 119	the genealogical hypothesis flows out of the exact theological tradition that rejected polygenesis in the first place.	the genealogical hypothesis flows out of the exact monogenesis tradition that rejected polygenesis in the first place.	
p. 123	denied the universal descent from Adam and Eve in present day.	denied universal descent from Adam and Eve in the present day.	
p. 125	instead asserted that humans arise as a population.	instead asserted that humans arose as a population.	
p. 127	how polygenesis is historically defined as both (1) humans arise from multiple disconnected sources, and also (2) humans today are of distinct biological types.	how polygenesis is historically claimed that humans across the globe in present day both (1) do not all descend from Adam, and also (2) are of are several distinct biological types	Critical edit for clarity of primary point.
p. 127	Scientists rejected polygenesis by rejecting the second premise, affirming monophylogeny.	Scientists rejected polygenesis by rejecting the second premise as they affirmed monophylogeny.	
p. 137	Another understanding that might also make sense.	Another understanding might also make sense.	
p. 139	is no longer not merely	is no longer merely	
p. 155	In the last two parts of this book,	In the previous two parts of this book,	
p. 160	a non-racist version La Peyrère's proposal,	a non-racist version of La Peyrère's proposal,	
p. 169	There is no longer reason any reason not to affirm monogenesis.	If Adam and Eve are real people, even if they are recent, we can affirm monogenesis.	
p. 169, fn 19	See n15 above.	See fn. 16 above.	Check fn. abbreviation style.
p. 184	sin of Adam sin affects us all	sin of Adam affects us all	
p. 192, fn 1	This question is asked my many,	This question is asked by many,	
p. 220, fn 12	He includes four more points, but these are not related to Adam and Eve, and even most of his coauthors would dispute them. These extra four points, nonetheless, are easily reconciled by keeping the contextual bounds of Scripture in mind.	Theistic Evolution: A Scientific, Philosophical, and Theological Critique, ed. J. P. Moreland and others (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2017), 785-837.	

# The Genealogical Adam and Eve: Errata, Typos, and Corrections

---

p. 220, fn 13	Wayne Grudem, "Theistic Evolution Undermines Twelve Creation Events and Several Crucial Christian Doctrines," in <i>Theistic Evolution: A Scientific, Philosophical, and Theological Critique</i> , ed. J. P. Moreland and others (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2017), 785-837.	Grudem includes four more points, but these are not related to Adam and Eve, and even most of his coauthors would dispute them. These extra four points, nonetheless, are easily reconciled by keeping the contextual bounds of Scripture in mind.	
p. 221	One person's fact might be another's fiction, but they both can enter the same narrative, at a crossroads of many questions.	One person's fact might be another's fiction. Either way, both can enter the same narrative, at a crossroads of many questions.	
p. 222	Hundreds of bodies later, are they even human? Is death a gift or a curse in a fallen world? Quellcrist warns us, "Death was the ultimate safeguard against the darkest angels of our nature. Now the monsters among us will own everything, consume everything, control everything." Hundreds of bodies later, are they even human?	Quellcrist warns us, "Death was the ultimate safeguard against the darkest angels of our nature. Now the monsters among us will own everything, consume everything, control everything." Hundreds of bodies later, are they even human? Is death a gift or a curse in a fallen world?	Copyedit duplication.

---