

# **Brought Forth in Iniquity:**

## Original Sin in Evolutionary Perspective

Dale Campbell  
Humanity & Hope – MB724  
Myk Habets  
Due Date: 11 June 2010  
Word Count: 4198

## Introduction

Though they have had a less-than-amicable relationship with evolutionary biology, Christians are increasingly reaching a point of being able to affirm essential Christian Doctrine whilst affirming evolution.<sup>1</sup> The current essay will present an evolutionary account of Original Sin; a doctrine that has not often been well-expressed in view of modern evolutionary biology.<sup>2</sup> It will be argued that an evolutionary restatement of the doctrine of Original Sin remains faithful to 1) the *central intent* of the Christian Doctrine, 2) the *message* of Christian Scripture, 3) the *orthodoxy* of Christian Theology, and 4) the *task* of Christian Mission.<sup>3</sup>

## Evolutionary Biology and Christian Doctrine

Evolutionary biology challenges two particular aspects of the traditional doctrine of Original Sin. First, though not a central aspect of the doctrine, there is an assumed picture of a 'perfect' and paradisiacal pre-fall state of both humanity and creation, which is fundamentally disrupted as a result of the actions of one human.<sup>4</sup> Evolutionary biology, together with geology and cosmology, paints a contradictory picture of chaos and death existing before humans.<sup>5</sup>

Also part of the traditional articulation, and a far more key aspect of the doctrine, is the transmission of sin and guilt occasioned by a singular, primal, Fall event, particularly as expressed by Augustine.<sup>6</sup> Evolutionary biology, particularly the field of genetics, challenges

---

<sup>1</sup> The term 'evolution' here is used in the most broad and general sense – inclusive of change both *within* and *between* species (a.k.a. 'micro-evolution' and 'macro-evolution').

<sup>2</sup> The argument of this essay will assume the general, basic, scientific credibility of modern evolutionary biology. Rather than engaging in the so-called "scientific debate" or "controversy" over 'evolution' (in the sense noted in the footnote above), this essay will focus on how an account of the Doctrine of Original Sin that is both evolutionary and Christian should be understood. There are countless places to investigate the scientific evidence for evolution – this essay is not one of them.

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted, that Christian attitudes to evolutionary biology have long been a mixture of both patient accommodation as well as total rejection. A century-old example of the former is E. Griffith-Jones, *The Ascent Through Christ: A Study of the Doctrine of Redemption in the Light of the Theory of Evolution* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1901); of particular relevance to this essay is chapter IV, 'Anthropology and the Fall'; also reconciling evolution and the Fall a century ago is Charles Reed Zahniser, "Evolution and the Fall", *The Biblical World* 29.1 (1907): 41-44.

<sup>4</sup> Henry L. Carrigan, Jr., "The Fall" in *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, Ed. David Noel Freedman (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 454.

<sup>5</sup> Though as we shall see, one encounters pre-human chaos, death and evil even on a 'literal' reading of the creation account in Genesis 1-3.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*, 454; see also T.A. Noble, "Original Sin and the Fall: Definitions and a Proposal" in *Darwin, Creation and the Fall: Theological Challenges*, Eds. R.J. Berry & T.A. Noble (Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 2009), 104-5;

*monogenism* (one common genetic ancestor), and thus also challenges the transmission of the sin or guilt of any singular, primal human.<sup>7</sup>

How then should the doctrine of Original Sin be restated in order to both remain orthodox and account for modern evolutionary biology?<sup>8</sup> The definition of Original Sin to be proposed and defended here is as follows: *the covenantal and relational state of sinfulness, enacted with the first humans who fell into sin, and shared by all of humanity descended from them*. This restatement will presently be shown to be faithful to the central intent of the traditional conception, and will subsequently be considered in relationship to the Scriptural message, Theological coherence and the Missional task of the Church.

First, it should be noted that this proposal retains both an historical aspect ('enacted with the first humans') and the notion of a shared condition ('shared by all of humanity').<sup>9</sup> Both *Peccatum originale originans* (original event or catastrophe) and *Peccatum originale originatum* (shared condition or state) are retained in some form.<sup>10</sup> The dual conviction of the doctrine is that humanity has been *covenantally* sinful for as long as they have existed and that all subsequent humanity has shared this state.

Domning describes original and subsequent humanity (the first humans as well as every human since) as inheriting an 'original selfishness' inherent in all living organisms from

---

and Russ P. Reeves, "Fall of Humankind", in *Encyclopedia of Fundamentalism*, Ed Brenda E. Brasher (New York: Routledge, 2001), 169.

<sup>7</sup> For genetic case against monogenism, see "No More Adam and Eve: Science Refutes Monogenism" by Catholic palaeontologist Daryl P. Domning in Daryl P. Domning & Monika K. Hellwig, *Original Selfishness: Original Sin and Evil in the Light of Evolution* (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006), 71-74; However, as discussed below, there is sufficient biblical evidence to warrant a critique of both monogenism and the transmission of guilt on the basis of *Scripture*, not only modern biology.

<sup>8</sup> There are, of course, other reasons to review and/or restate a doctrine. For example Myk Habets builds upon the work of Henri Blocher in restating the Reformed conception of Original Sin, "Reforming the Doctrine of Original Sin" (unpublished article), 1-4.

<sup>9</sup> Cf the interesting notion of a non-temporal Fall in Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, Trans. Edwyn C. Hoskyns (London: Oxford University Press, 1953, Third Edition), 170-2; "...the Adam who did this is not Adam in his historical unrelatedness, but Adam in his non-historical relation to Christ."; "...it is clear that the sin which Adam brought into the world precedes death, just as the righteousness which Christ brought follows it."; "...the entrance of sin into the world through Adam is in no strict sense an historical or psychological happening. The Doctrine of Original Sin... would not have been to Paul an 'attractive hypothesis' (Lietzmann); it would have been just one of the many historical and psychological falsifications of his meaning. The sin which entered the world in Adam is, like the righteousness manifested to the world in Christ, timeless and transcendental. It is *the disposition and relation to God of men who stand facing the old with their backs to the new*. Sin is, moreover, meaningless and incomprehensible except as the negation of the righteousness which is in Christ, and apart from its being surmounted by the 'Yes' of that righteousness."; "The Fall is not occasioned by the transgression of Adam; but the transgression was presumably its first manifest operation (emphasis mine)."

<sup>10</sup> Henri Blocher, "Original Sin", in *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*, Ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer (Grand Rapids: Baker; London: SPCK, 2005), 553; cf Ted Peters, *God – The World's Future: Systematic Theology for a Postmodern Era* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992), 168.

amoebas to *anthropos*.<sup>11</sup> For Domning, this selfishness is ‘innocent’ and ‘amoral’ until, in morally self-aware humans, it becomes sin. “[T]he first humans were simply far too late on the scene to have originated the unpleasant overt behaviours that in our species alone, through our moral choices, took on the character of sins.”<sup>12</sup>

By consciously sinning, the first humans fell into the state of covenantal (and thus *relational*) sinfulness, having violated the ‘Adamic’ (or ‘human’) covenant *no sooner than it had been enacted*.<sup>13</sup> This legal state is shared by all of subsequent humanity. Thus all humans are born legally, covenantally and *relationally* ‘in sin’.

Whilst the evolutionary challenge to *monogenism* doesn’t support a singular human representative, it is in no tension whatsoever with the legal language of an ‘Adamic covenant’. The absence of *monogenism*, and the resulting lack of an identifiable, singular, ‘head’ of the human race, does not hinder God from establishing the ‘Adamic [*human*] covenant’ with humanity, and thus cannot hinder God from lawfully imputing sin to humanity.<sup>14</sup>

In this restatement, the *sinful state is shared*, rather than the ‘alien’ *guilt being inherited*.<sup>15</sup> For example, babies are born ‘in sin’ according to the covenant, but morally innocent until they develop moral self-awareness and become ‘guilty’ through their own sins.

## Evolutionary Biology and Christian Scripture

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Denis Edwards, *The God of Evolution: A Trinitarian Theology* (New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1999), 65, who talks of humans as an innocent but fallible “symbiosis of genes and culture.”

<sup>12</sup> Domning & Hellwig, *Original Selfishness*, 107-8. He then goes on to clarify that this inherited selfishness does not equate to our bad behaviour being ‘determined’ any more than in a non-evolutionary understanding; sin remains a human act. See also Daryl P. Domning, “Evolution, Evil and Original Sin”, *America* 185.15 (2001): 14-21; cf. Edwards, *The God of Evolution*, 66-8.

<sup>13</sup> Or in other words, they fall into sin and thus are no longer innocently selfish but *damned sinful*.

<sup>14</sup> See also Brendan Byrne, SJ, “Musing on Evolution and Paul: A Clarification”, *The Australasian Catholic Record* 83.4 (2006): 476; cf. Habets, ‘Reforming the Doctrine of Original Sin’, 3, though he holds to biological as well as spiritual headship; see also Nicola Hoggard-Creegan, “The Fall and Beyond”, in *Animal Suffering and the Problem of Evil* (MacMillan, forthcoming), who (following Blocher, Dunn and Ricoeur) suggests that “the story of human fallenness must have an historical edge”; cf. Robin Collins, “Evolution and Original Sin”, in *Perspectives on an Evolving Creation*, Ed. Keith B. Miller (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 469-71.

<sup>15</sup> Again, cf. Habets, “Reforming the Doctrine of Original Sin”, 3, who denies the imputation of Adam’s *personal* sin and guilt, while retaining legal or covenantal sinfulness: “We are punished for our own sinful actions but we are punished on the basis of the covenant which Adam, on behalf of us all, entered into. Adam is thus our covenant representative, not our substitute in the garden in committing a personal sin.”

We now assess this evolutionary restatement of the doctrine against Scripture; first against the two classic Original Sin passages (Genesis 1-3 & Romans 5), and then against various other passages.

### Genesis 1-3

For our purposes, it is only necessary to show that the above evolutionary restatement of Original Sin is in harmony with the meaning and message of Scripture.<sup>16</sup> The two central issues to contend with in this passage are 1) *monogenism* and 2) the post-Fall entry of death and evil.

Regarding *monogenism*, though Scripture, as one would expect, consistently refers to Adam and Eve as the progenitors of humanity, there are passages that leave open the very real possibility (even on a literal reading) that they might have lived among other humans.<sup>17</sup> The questions about Cain's wife (4:17), him fearing 'others' after murdering Abel (4:14) and early technology (4:17-22) are legitimate ones. Nonetheless, the theological concerns of the passage (as well as the doctrine of Original Sin) are not obscured in the absence of *monogenism*.

As for the post-fall entry of death and evil, there is even clearer biblical evidence for the existence of both before humanity. The earth's chaotic state is seen in its description (1:2) as 'formless and void' (*tohu va vohu*); pre-human death is implied in the presumable existence (1:20-23) of both predatory organisms and those with short life-spans; and the presence of the tempting serpent (together with other biblical witness about angels that sinned) speaks of pre-fall evil.<sup>18</sup> Also, there is evidence that the death sentence in 2:17 is not referring to immediate, physical death.<sup>19</sup> Perhaps the simplest point is to observe the *absence* of any descriptions of 'perfection' in this passage. Humans and creation are deemed 'very good' but not 'perfect'.

---

<sup>16</sup> In order to focus on Scripture specifically relevant to the doctrine of Original Sin, we will not be concerned here with discussions of the age of the Earth, length of 'days' or other such questions.

<sup>17</sup> See D.C. Spanner, *Biblical Creation and the Theory of Evolution* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1987), 77-79.

<sup>18</sup> For an evolutionary theodicy dealing with animal suffering involved in evolutionary process, see Christopher Southgate, *The Groaning of Creation: God, Evolution, and the Problem of Evil* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), particularly 28-35; on Genesis being non-chronological, see page 102.

<sup>19</sup> Blocher draws attention to how God's curse for Adam ("...to dust you shall [future tense] return") differs from the implication of the earlier warning ("...in the day that you eat of it, you shall die."); Man "originates from the earth, and in the end that is what he again becomes. Death is not a possibility that in its very essence is completely alien to mankind." Henri Blocher, *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1984), 185; see also discussion from 179-91. Some (e.g. Michael Dembski, *The Edge of Evolution*) have also postulated the notion of 'backwards causation', such that the pre-fall death is still caused by human sin even if it occurs chronologically after it.

## Romans 5

The fundamental challenge for reconciling an evolutionary account of Original Sin with Scripture is to deal faithfully with the Adam/Christ texts, both in Romans (5:12ff) and in 1 Corinthians (15:21-22). In both passages, Paul, as we would expect, consistently links the “first Adam” and his sin with the entry of “death” in the world and into humanity.

Many commentators agree with James Dunn that Paul indeed makes use of Adam as an “epochal figure” who “initiated the first major phase of human history and thereby determined the character of that phase for those belonging to it.”<sup>20</sup> But even given this, Paul certainly would have assumed the historicity of Adam.<sup>21</sup> Which raises the question, does our evolutionary restatement of Original Sin do justice to Paul’s juxtaposition of Adam and Christ?

The tension is not with Paul’s theological purpose (showing the covenantal contrast between being ‘in Adam’ and being ‘in Christ’), but is rather between Paul’s language of sin and death entering the world through *one* man, and the evolutionary challenge to *monogenism*. The lack of a historically identifiable, singular progenitor of our species means that for an evolutionary account we can only *historically* speak in terms of ‘the first humans’ (though *theologically* and *biblically* there is no problem at all with using the language of being ‘in Adam’, etc).<sup>22</sup>

## Other Passages

Other than those two key passages there are many others that are to be brought to bear on the doctrine of Original Sin. The universality of the sinful human state, a central conviction behind the doctrine, is reinforced throughout Scripture: Gen 6:5 (human heart intent on evil) and 8:21 (evil from youth); Psalm 14:3 (all turned away – echoed in Romans

---

<sup>20</sup> James Dunn, *Romans 1-8* (Dallas: Word, 1988), 289; Gary A. Anderson, “The Fall”, in *The New Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, D-H, Volume 2* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2007), 425; Spanner, *Biblical Creation and the Theory of Evolution*, 76-77, 79-80; Gregory R. Peterson, “Falling Up: Evolution and Original Sin”, in *Evolution and Ethics: Human Morality in Biological and Religious Perspective*, Eds. Philip Clayton & Jeffrey Schloss (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 274; see also Henri Blocher, “The Theology of the Fall and the Origins of Evil”, in *Darwin, Creation and the Fall: Theological Challenges*, Eds R.J. Berry & T.A. Noble (Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 2009), 169-72.

<sup>21</sup> N.T. Wright, “The Book of Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections”, in *The New Interpreters Bible: Volume X* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 526; “Paul was, we may be sure, aware of what we would call mythical or metaphorical dimensions to the story, but he would not have regarded these as throwing doubt on the existence, and primal sin, of the first historical pair.”

<sup>22</sup> Wright, “Romans”, 526, “What ‘sin’ would have meant in the early dawn of the human race it is impossible to say; but the turning away from open and obedient relationship with the loving creator, and the turning instead toward that which, though beautiful and enticing, is not God, is such a many-sided phenomenon that it is not hard to envisage it at any stage of anthropoid development.”

3:23) and 51:5 (born in sin, brought forth in iniquity); Ecclesiastes 7:20 (not one who doesn't sin) and Isaiah 53:6 (all go astray like sheep). Other passages seem to equate sinfulness with simply being human: Job 4:18-19 (if angels are guilty, how much more are 'clay' humans?), Romans 7:23-24 (sinful law in 'members' – who will deliver from body of death), and Ephesians 2:3 (by 'nature' children of wrath).<sup>23</sup> Some passages, for example Hosea 6:6-8 (humans have broken the covenant 'like Adam') and 1 Corinthians 15:21-22 ('in Adam' all die), reinforce the covenantal view of Adam as the first and representative human.

A few passages significantly challenge some aspects of the traditional formulation of the doctrine. First, 2 Peter 2:4, Jude 6 and Revelation 12:9 speak of angelic sin, and the great 'serpent of old', and speak of evil and sin before humanity; challenging the 'fall from perfection' view. Psalm 8 speaks of humans as crowned with glory and honour, even post-fall (which surely holds some relevance even in a Christological reading – i.e. Hebrews). And rather intriguingly, Ezekiel 18:20 challenges the traditional understanding of imputed guilt; "The son *shall not bear the guilt* of the father, nor the father bear the guilt of the son."

### **Evolutionary Biology and Christian Theology**

The tapestry of Christian Theology is such that adjustment to one doctrine pulls a thread attached to other doctrines and theological categories. The categories most linked are Anthropology, Christology and Soteriology.

#### Anthropology

The evolutionary restatement above is not 'soft on sin'.<sup>24</sup> The universality and tragedy of human sin are only too real. The key difference in our restatement is that the Fall is not a '*fall from perfection*' but rather to '*fall short of perfection*'. Thus, our restatement opts for a teleological rather than substantial view of the *Imago Dei*. Humans sin not because they are too human, but rather *not human enough*. Furthermore, with a Christotelic understanding of the *Imago Dei* (or indeed *Imago Christi*), human sin is equated with falling short, not of Adam, but of Christ. Though all humans are 'born in sin' in relationship to God and within the 'Adamic' or human covenant, human guilt (both of the first human 'parents' or the parents of any individual) does not need to be imputed through some kind

---

<sup>23</sup> Cf Robin C. Cover, "Sin, Sinners (OT)", in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary: Volume 6*, Ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: DoubleDay, 1992), 33.

<sup>24</sup> Somewhat contra Thornhill, "Unravelling the complexities of the 'original sin' tradition", *The Australian Catholic Record* 83.1 (2006): 36-37, though his sensitivities are warranted.

of transmission; in this view, it is simply *realised* by the reality that all sin and fall short of the glory of God – namely Christ.

However, the view above does not deny human dignity and worth. Humans are thus ‘good and sinful’, so to speak. We are Genesis 1 & 2; and we are Genesis 3. Calvin held a strong view of inherited guilt, condemnation and sinfulness, calling human nature (even in infants) “a seed-bed of sin”.<sup>25</sup> However, though babies are born ‘in sin’ covenantally and relationally, they are still ‘very good’ and ‘innocent’ morally until they incur guilt by their own sins. Stanley Grenz, though not committing himself to this view, describes the ‘existentialist’ interpretation, in which all humans born innocent, but “at some point in childhood” fall “from innocency into sin.”<sup>26</sup> Irenaeus wrote that Adam and Eve were ‘as yet an infant’.<sup>27</sup> Human nature is sinful, but “it is certainly not to be *identified* with original sin.”<sup>28</sup>

### Christology

The dual-nature person Christ is both fully human and fully divine. In the Incarnation, Christ came ‘in the likeness of sinful flesh’ – yet without sin. Thus, everything ‘good and sinful’ about human nature was assumed *and thus saved* by Christ.

The person of Christ is where the categories of Anthropology and Christology meet, especially with (as above) a Christo-telic view of the *Imago Dei*. Christ, not Adam, is the *telos* of humanity. This contrasts with the ‘high’ Christology of a ‘back-to-Eden’ view (common among anti-evolution creationists), and stands against the evolutionist Christology with Jesus as merely a “high-point in evolutionary development or ‘mutation’...”<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion – Book Two*, <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/institutes.iv.ii.html> (accessed 30 May 2010); the context is worth repeating here: “[E]ven infants bringing their condemnation with them from their mother’s womb, suffer not for another’s, but for their own defect. For although they have not yet produced the fruits of their own unrighteousness, they have the seed implanted in them. Nay, their whole nature is, as it were, a seed-bed of sin, and therefore cannot but be odious and abominable to God. Hence it follows, that it is properly deemed sinful in the sight of God; for there could be no condemnation without guilt.”

<sup>26</sup> Stanley J. Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 145.

<sup>27</sup> A.N.S. Lane, “Irenaeus On the Fall and Original Sin”, in *Darwin, Creation and the Fall: Theological Challenges*, Eds R.J. Berry & T.A. Noble (Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 2009), 136; cf. discussion in Terence E. Fretheim, “The Book of Genesis: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections”, in *The New Interpreters Bible, Volume I* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1994), 368.

<sup>28</sup> T.A. Noble, “Original Sin and the Fall”, 106.

<sup>29</sup> For the former, see Henry Morris, quoted in Ted Peters & Martinez Hewlett, *Evolution from Creation to New Creation* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2003), 77, “He is Lord of all, able and sure to restore the whole creation someday to its primeval perfection...”; for the latter, see Gerd Theissen, *Biblical Faith: An Evolutionary Approach* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 128, seeing Jesus as 1) a ‘mutation’ of human life, 2) a ‘protest’ against the principle of selection, or 3) a successful ‘adaptation’ to the central reality.

## Soteriology

Once again, the Christo-telic view of the *Imago Dei* is fundamental to the evolutionary restatement of Original Sin. Salvation, in this sense, is none other than being made like Christ – being humanised according to the *Imago Christi*. Not merely a ‘return’ to Eden to bear again the image of Adam, but to bear the image of the Man from heaven (1 Cor. 15:49).

Of particular concern here is that a ‘return to Eden’ would put humanity back in the state Augustine described as being both ‘able to sin and able not to sin’ (*posse peccare et posse non peccare*), as opposed to progressing on to the perfect, complete, final state of the Age to Come where humans will be ‘not able to sin’ (*non posse peccare*).<sup>30</sup> More is gained in Christ than is lost in the fall. “Jesus lifts humankind to a higher plane than that enjoyed by the first human pair...”<sup>31</sup> This higher plane is (again) not by way of evolutionary mutation, but by transforming Grace in Christ.<sup>32</sup>

## **Evolutionary Biology and Christian Mission**

In its simplest form, the mission of the Church is to work and pray for the Kingdom of God to come “on earth as it is in heaven” in both word and deed, which involves everything from making disciples of Jesus, to being priests and stewards of Creation (human and non-human). Whilst the mission of the Church is far wider than aspects related to evolution, a few challenges should be noted.

Evolutionary biology has unfortunately been seen by those both inside and outside the Church as a barrier and/or a distraction to the faith and mission of the Church. Some within the Church still see evolution as a threat to faith and/or orthodoxy (for example, many see evolution as a threat to the doctrine of Original Sin). This creates an urgent need for better education in this area as a part of discipleship or catechesis. And indeed, many outside the Church also assume a direct conflict between science and religion in general and evolution and creation in particular. This highlights the need for clarifying these issues in the public arena as a part of both evangelism and pre-evangelism.

---

<sup>30</sup> A.N.S. Lane, “Irenaeus On the Fall and Original Sin”, 132-3.

<sup>31</sup> Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 191.

<sup>32</sup> For a thorough well-considered evolutionary Christology, see Celia Deane-Drummond, *Christ and Evolution: Wonder and Wisdom* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2009), of particular relevance to Soteriological discussion is the last chapter “The Future of the Human: Transhuman Evolution or Human Identity as *Imago Christi?*”, 256-87.

Apart from these unfortunate views within and without the Church, evolutionary biology can and should enrich and sharpen the mission of the Church, rather than hinder or blunt it. Modern biological knowledge does not endanger our understanding of human sinfulness, nor could we ever gain enough of it to absolve us from our sin. Instead, it should only help us see ourselves and our world in increasingly rich detail, making our need for Christ's saving work all the more plain, and making our ethical and moral lives all the more informed.<sup>33</sup>

## **Conclusion**

We have seen that an evolutionary restatement of the doctrine of Original Sin can remain orthodox. It retains both a historical fall at the dawn of humanity and the origin of a covenantal, relational inheritance of sinfulness, and thus is faithful to the intent of the doctrine. It is not contradictory to the message and content of Scripture, which doesn't clearly demand a 'perfect' pre-fall state or *monogenism*. It is theologically coherent, especially with a Christo-telic view of the Imago Dei, and therefore is faithfully applied to Anthropology, Christology and Soteriology. And although it adds to the task of Christian mission, in terms of pre-evangelism, it is in no conflict with the task of kingdom-bringing, disciple-making work.

---

<sup>33</sup> For an example of evolutionary impetus for ecological concern, see Deane-Drummond, *Christ and Evolution: Wonder and Wisdom*, 279-87.

## Bibliography

- Anderson, Gary A. "The Fall". In *The New Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, D-H, Volume 2*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2007.
- Barth, Karl. *The Epistle to the Romans, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed*, Trans. Edwyn C. Hoskyns. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- Berry, R.J. "Did Darwin Dethrone Humankind?" In *Darwin, Creation and the Fall: Theological Challenges*, Eds. R.J. Berry & T.A. Noble. Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 2009.
- Blocher, Henri. *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1984.
- . "Original Sin". In *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*, Ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer. Grand Rapids: Baker; London: SPCK, 2005.
- . "The Theology of the Fall and the Origins of Evil". In *Darwin, Creation and the Fall: Theological Challenges*, Eds R.J. Berry & T.A. Noble. Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 2009.
- Byrne, SJ, Brendan. "Musing on Evolution and Paul: A Clarification". In *The Australasian Catholic Record* 83(4): (2006), 474-7.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion – Book Two*.  
<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/institutes.iv.ii.html>, (accessed 30 May 2010).
- Carrigan, Jr. Henry L. "The Fall". In *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, Ed. David Noel Freedman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Collins, Robin. "Evolution and Original Sin". In *Perspectives on an Evolving Creation*, Ed Keith B. Miller. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Cover, Robin C. "Sin, Sinners (OT)". *The Anchor Bible Dictionary: Volume 6*, Ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: DoubleDay, 1992.
- Deane-Drummond, Celia. *Christ and Evolution: Wonder and Wisdom*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2009.
- Domning, Daryl P. "Evolution, Evil and Original Sin", *America* 185(15): (2001), 14-21.
- Domning, Daryl P. & Hellwig, Monika K. *Original Selfishness: Original Sin and Evil in the Light of Evolution*. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006.
- Dunn, James. *Romans 1-8*. Dallas: Word, 1988.

- Edwards, Denis. *The God of Evolution: A Trinitarian Theology*. New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1999.
- Fretheim, Terence E. "The Book of Genesis: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections". *The New Interpreters Bible, Volume I*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994.
- Grenz, Stanley J. *Theology for the Community of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Griffith-Jones, E. *The Ascent Through Christ: A Study of the Doctrine of Redemption in the Light of the Theory of Evolution*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1901.
- Habets, Myk. "Reforming the Doctrine of Original Sin". Unpublished article.
- Hoggard-Creegan, Nicola. "The Fall and Beyond". In *Animal Suffering and the Problem of Evil*. MacMillan, (forthcoming).
- Lane, A.N.S. "Irenaeus On the Fall and Original Sin". In *Darwin, Creation and the Fall: Theological Challenges*, Eds R.J. Berry & T.A. Noble. Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 2009.
- Noble, T.A. "Original Sin and the Fall: Definitions and a Proposal". In *Darwin, Creation and the Fall: Theological Challenges*, Eds R.J. Berry & T.A. Noble. Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 2009.
- Peters, Ted. *God – The World's Future: Systematic Theology for a Postmodern Era*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992.
- Peters, Ted & Hewlett, Martinez. *Evolution from Creation to New Creation*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2003.
- Peterson, Gregory R. "Falling Up: Evolution and Original Sin". In *Evolution and Ethics: Human Morality in Biological and Religious Perspective*, Eds. Philip Clayton & Jeffrey Schloss. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Reeves, Russ P. "Fall of Humankind". In *Encyclopedia of Fundamentalism*, Ed Brenda E. Brasher. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Southgate, Christopher. *The Groaning of Creation: God, Evolution, and the Problem of Evil*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- Spanner, D.C. *Biblical Creation and the Theory of Evolution*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1987.
- Strickberger, Monroe W. "Evolution and Religion", *BioScience* 23(7): (1973), 417-21.
- Theissen, Gerd. *Biblical Faith: An Evolutionary Approach*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Thornhill, John. "Unravelling the complexities of the 'original sin' tradition", *The Australian Catholic Record* 83(1): (2006), 25-37.

Wright, N.T. "The Book of Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections". In *The New Interpreters Bible: Volume X*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002.

Zahniser, Charles Reed. "Evolution and the Fall", *The Biblical World* 29(1): (1907): 41-44.