3

Recent Studies

Several recent studies (since 1990) have significant correlations with this book. In what follows I review studies that have attempted to discern the meaning of Genesis 1–3 as a coherent literary unit within the Pentateuch, as well as studies focused on the relationship between the early chapters of Genesis and Israel's history as it is portrayed in the Deuteronomistic History (Josh 1—2 Kgs 25).

THOMAS KEISER

Thomas Keiser's recent dissertation argues for the literary and theological coherence of Genesis 1–11. He devotes considerable attention to Genesis 1 and 2. According to Keiser these two chapters represent "probably the highest profile issue related to the unity of the Primeval History," because critical scholarship has regarded Genesis 1 and 2 as "two separate, and often apparently contradicting, creation accounts."[1] Keiser argues for the unity of Genesis 1–2 by offering diachronic and synchronic evidence, rhetorical features present in the text, and by looking at the Hebrew accenting in the discourse structure (discourse analysis).[2]

After a thorough literary analysis, Keiser devotes the final chapter to the relationship of Genesis 1–11 to the Pentateuch as a whole. Keiser argues, like Terence Fretheim, that the relationship between the introduction and the conclusion of the Pentateuch are key to understanding its overall strategy.[3] Keiser's appraisal of the introduction and conclusion

1. Keiser, "Genesis 1–11," 28.

2. Ibid., 29–34. For more diachronic evidence, see Blenkinsopp, *Pentateuch: Introduction*, 62–63; Shea, "Unity of Creation Account," 9–39. On discourse structure, see Lode, "Two Creation Stories," 1–52.

3. Keiser, "Genesis 1–11," 194. See especially Fretheim, *Pentateuch*, 53–63.

of the Pentateuch are of a more general nature, however,[4] and so his argument for the importance of the introduction and the conclusion of the Pentateuch remain largely unexplored.[5]

ANDRÉ SOUSAN

André Sousan's dissertation applies a rhetorical critical analysis to Genesis 2–3.[6] He discusses important literary features[7] and difficult exegetical issues related to the exegesis of the chapters.[8] He also notes possible literary parallels between Adam and Abram[9] as well as Adam and Israel. Further, he devotes a considerable amount of attention to the correlations between Genesis 2–3 and the Primary History. Among the parallels he notes is the bringing of Adam/Israel from a desert land into a luscious land of plenty. Sousan writes,"[T]he interpretation of God's benevolence in transporting Adam from a desertic world to a paradisiacal garden, in exchange of which Adam is commanded to take care of the garden and not eat from one tree, has a covenantal character that

4. Keiser, "Genesis 1–11," 198–201.

5. For instance, Keiser does not analyze the significance of the large clusters of terminology found only in the introduction and conclusion to the Pentateuch. Thus, Keiser's observations are, for the most part, not grounded in the text. As I shall argue in a subsequent chapter, these lexical inclusions are important evidence for evaluating both the meaning of Genesis 1–3 and, in turn, the overall intentions of the Pentateuch in its final form.

6. Sousan, "Woman in Eden," 89. Sousan's rhetorical-critical methodology is guided by J. Muilenburg's rhetorical criticism and Roland Barthes' five codes of textual analysis. Barthes' five codes are (1) the hermeneutic code, (2) the proairetic code, (3) the semic code, (4) the cultural code, and (5) the symbolic code (Sousan, "Woman in Eden," 103–5).

7. Ibid., 109–12. For example, Sousan argues that the word employed for the creation of woman in 2:22, namely to "build" (בנה), is intentionally assonantal with the Hebrew word for "building" a family (see Gen 16:2; Ruth 4:11; Jer 31:3–4) through sons (בנים). He also calls attention to numerous word plays in Gen 2–3, including "Adam," "ground," and "mist" (אדם, אדמה, אד), "man" and "woman" (איש, אישה), "naked," "shrewd/prudent," and "skin" (ערום, ערום, עור), "pain," "plants," and "tree" (עצבון , עשׂב, עץ), to "stretch out" (שׁלך, *qal*) and to "send out" (שׁלך, *piel*), and a possible metathesis of "cherub" (כרוב) and "bless" (ברך).

8. Ibid., 144. For example, the relationship between the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" and the "tree of life," both of which are described as being "in the midst of the garden."

9. Ibid., 125. Sousan argues for the existence of an intentional link between Adam's sleep in 2:21 and Abram's sleep in 15:12—note the use of the root נפל ("to fall") and תרדמה ("sleep") in both passages. This is discussed in a subsequent chapter.

recalls the transport of Israel from a desert to the promised land under the terms of the Covenant at Sinai."[10]

Sousan's contribution to the discussion of Genesis 2–3 comes by way of his understanding of Genesis 2–3 as an intentional metaphor of the prophets' interpretation of the Sinai Covenant as a marriage between God and his people:[11] Adam corresponds to the people of Israel (a collective group of males and females) and Eve corresponds to the wife of God or the Royal City.[12] According to Sousan, the "*ādām*" represents generic humanity, and the woman represents the *šᵉgūllâ* (סגולה; see Exod 19:5), or, God's special choice personified. Sousan equates Adam's inability to find a partner among the animals (Gen 2:20) with his volitional decision to keep the covenant (Gen 2:16–25) rather than choosing to live like an animal. Eve's creation, therefore, is a direct response to man's declaration of obedience to the covenant. She becomes the means through which God's covenant with the man is ratified. Sousan sees in Genesis 2–3 strong parallels to the narrative in Exodus 19–24, where Israel willingly accepts the conditions of the covenant (see Exod 19:8), and, as a result, the covenant is then ratified (Exod 24:5–6). The ratification of the covenant enables Israel to become God's "special treasure," *šᵉgūllâ* (Exod 19:5).[13] Sousan finds numerous parallels between the formulations of God's "covenant" with Adam and with Israel. To quote him at length:

> The respective formulations of the covenant with Adam and the Covenant at Sinai then become identical, making the former a metaphor for the latter:
>
> (1) two parties, of which one is the divine witness, respectively God and Adam, and God and the people of Israel;
> (2) a prologue of past benefactions, respectively the transport of Adam to the garden and the Exodus from Egypt;
> (3) the obligations specified by God, respectively the duties and commandments given to Adam, and the Ten Commandments;
> (4) the declarations of obedience of Adam and the people of Israel;

10. Ibid., 176.
11. Ibid., 241–42.
12. Ibid., 203.
13. Ibid., 184.

(5) God's ratification of the declaration of obedience, respectively by the creation of the woman and by the creation of the *šᵉgūllâ*.[14]

In light of the alleged parallels, Sousan concludes that Genesis 2–3 teaches that the divine purpose for the creation of humanity is to perpetuate life through the gift of covenants.[15] Sousan attempts to substantiate his thesis by means of tracing the inner-biblical effective history of Genesis 2–3 throughout the remainder of the Tanakh, particularly the Prophets and Canticles.

JOHNSON TENG KOK LIM

Johnson Teng Kok Lim, in his recent study of Genesis 1–11, advocates what he calls a "reader responsible reading," by which he means "reading a text in accordance with its genre and exercising some kind of hermeneutical humility as we engage the text." Thus, his goal is to understand the text rather than undermining it.[16] Lim identifies the theme of Genesis 1–11 (from Eden to Babylon) as "grace in the midst of judgment," a title echoing Paul's statement in Romans, "where sin abounds, grace much more abounds."[17] Lim argues that this theme not only connects with the rest of Genesis, but also with the remainder of the Pentateuch, particularly as this relates to Moses and Israel as recipients of grace in spite of their sin and rebellion.[18] Moreover, Lim argues that Genesis 1–11 are pivotal chapters in the rest of the OT, whereby subsequent biblical authors pick up on its themes of creation, blessing, sin, and mercy.[19]

C. JOHN COLLINS

C. John Collins, like Lim, focuses on the final form of Genesis 1–4 (he proposes a discourse-oriented literary approach[20]) as part of the final edition (form) of the Pentateuch.[21] Although Collins argues that the real

14. Ibid., 185.
15. Ibid.
16. Lim, *Grace*, vii.
17. Ibid., 192.
18. Ibid., 193.
19. Ibid., 194.
20. Collins, *Genesis 1–4*, 5–32.
21. Ibid., 33.

author is the person responsible for the final form of the text, the implied author is Moses (see Josh 1:7–8, 1 Kgs 8:53, Mal 4:4, Dan 9:11, etc.), and so, in terms of a reading strategy, the Pentateuch is best understood when interpreted *as if* it is Moses' words to Israel.[22] According to Collins, no argument is necessary to show that the Pentateuch is about the Mosaic Covenant.[23] Moreover, Collins contends that the Mosaic Covenant is the realization of the covenants and promises previously made to the Patriarchs, and not their replacement. It is from within this context that Collins interprets Gen 1:1—4:26: "Genesis 1–11 sets the stage for this mission of Israel to live as God's treasured people and thereby to be the vehicle of blessing to the rest of the world."[24] Genesis 1 introduces the one God who enters into a relationship with the first human beings (representatives of the universal character of God's plan); and although that relationship is broken (Gen 2–3), God mercifully persists in restoring his universal plan for creation through a particular nation by means of the Mosaic Covenant.[25] Thus, for Collins, Genesis 1–3 sets the universal stage upon which a particular covenant (Mosaic) is introduced. This is particularly clear when Collins discusses environmental ethics in the context of the creation mandate to "dominate" and "subdue" the "earth" (Gen 1:26, 28).[26] Collins argues on the basis of commandments and conditions that Genesis 2:15–17 is to be understood as a covenant between God and Adam (see Hos 6:7; also Sir 14:17),[27] and Adam is to be understood as one who acts on behalf of his future posterity.[28] Collins does not develop parallels between Adam's reception and violation of the "covenant" and Israel's reception and violation of the covenant. Rather, he argues that the purpose of Genesis 1–4 is intended to undergird the religion of the Pentateuch (the Mosaic Covenant) by (1) introducing God as the Creator who provided a world divinely suited for his covenant partners; and (2) pointing to the human need for redemption through the fulfillment of covenant ordinances (Sinai's sacrifices) as a means of returning

22. Ibid., 36–37.
23. Ibid., 33.
24. Ibid., 35.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid., 68–69.
27. Ibid., 112–14.
28. Ibid., 114.

to "Eden."[29] It should be noted at this point that Collins' interpretation of Genesis 1–4 as an endorsement of the Mosaic Covenant is contrary to the one taken in this book: yet, his focus on the final form of Genesis 1–4 within the context of the final form of the Pentateuch is shared.

GENESIS 1–3, THE PENTATEUCH, AND THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL

Several other studies elaborate the importance of Genesis 1–3 as the introduction to the Pentateuch, and include parallels between the opening chapters and Deuteronomic theology, as well as the remainder of the so-called "Primary History" (Gen 1:1—2 Kgs 25:30). Alonso Schökel was among the first scholars[30] to call attention to parallels between the opening chapters of Genesis[31] and the *historia salutis* ("the history of salvation" or "salvation history"). He also pointed out a constellation of terms found almost exclusively in wisdom literature.[32] Schökel noticed connections between Genesis 2–3, not only with key passages in the Pentateuch, but also with later events in the biblical history. Parallels noted by Schökel include (1) the narrative depiction of Adam's covenantal relationship to God in Genesis 2–3 and Israel's covenantal relationship to God in Exodus 19–34 (covenant-sin-punishment-reconciliation); (2) the depiction of Adam's being taking from outside the garden and placed ("rested") inside it and Israel's being brought from outside the land of Canaan and being placed inside it (see Gen 2:15; Deut 3:20; 30:3–4; Josh 1:13, 15; Jer 27:11; Ezek 36:34; 37:14, 21; Isa 14:1; (3) Adam's downfall following his "cleaving" to a woman and the downfall of Israel at Baal Peor and also the downfall of Israel's subsequent kings due to their having cleaved to seductive women; (4) the apodictic laws of the

29. Ibid., 244–45.

30. According to Sousan ("Woman in Eden," 178–81), Karl Barth also noticed this connection. See Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, 273.

31. It would appear that Schökel excluded Gen 1:1—2:4a from his range of investigation for source critical reasons. As I already argued, attempts to interpret Gen 2–3 in isolation from Gen 1 seriously undermine an exegetical vantage point only appreciated by means of a holistic reading of these chapters.

32. Schökel ("Motivos Sapienciales" 302–3) perceptively notes parallels between Adam and Solomon, such as wisdom concerning the animal world and downfalls connected with women. He fails to factor in the royal overtones of Gen 1:26–28 into his analysis of the parallels between Adam and Solomon (this is more thoroughly treated in a subsequent chapter).

garden and the apodictic laws of Sinai; and (5) the covenantal style of the consequence of disobedience in the garden and the consequence of disobedience to Sinai.

Several scholars concur with Schökel's findings with respect to the relationship of Genesis 1 and 2–3, Deuteronomic theology, and Israel's biblical history.[33] The following is a list of these scholars with abbreviated summaries of their findings in the footnotes: Joseph Blenkinsopp,[34] Carlos R. Bovell,[35] Martin Emmrich,[36] Brian G. Toews,[37] William J. Dumbrell,[38] and Terence Fretheim.[39]

33. For a recent history of interpretation of Gen 2–3 see Gillingham, *Image,* 10–44; Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, 305–17.

34. Blenkinsopp, *Pentateuch Introduction*, 66. So also, for example, Gardner ("Genesis 2:4b—3," 15), who writes, "Genesis 3 can be viewed as a mythological interpretation of Israelite religious history from the time of the settlement." Gardner draws parallels between Eve's duplicity in Adam's downfall with subsequent women in the Deuteronomistic History (see 1 Kgs 11:4–13; 16:31–33) and the garden with the Promised Land. For the conviction of a redactional effort to link the Tetrateuch and Deueteronomy with the Deuteronomistic History, see Schmitt, "Spätdeuteronomistische Geschichtswerk," 261–79.

35. Bovell, "Genesis 3:21?" 361–66. Bovell draws parallels between the serpent and the Canaanites, and Adam's mandate to conquer the land and Israel's mandate to do the same. Bovell's primary thesis is that Gen 3:21 (the provision of the garments of skin) represents an attempt on the part of the exilic writers of the final composition of the Pentateuch to explain the exile to current and/or subsequent readers that Israel had in fact become just like the inhabitants of Canaan (Adam and Eve are now dressed like the animals of the land), they had not kept the Torah, and therefore they were no longer worthy of the land.

36. Martin Emmrich, "Temptation Narrative," 3–20. Emmrich's work provides a rare attempt to understand the temptation narrative as part of the Pentateuch, and in terms of its contribution to the Primary History. Emmrich sees parallels between the gift of the garden and the gift of the Promised Land, the two trees (representing life and death) and the Torah, the serpent and the false prophets (Deut 13:1–3), and the woman of the garden and the women who would later instigate Israel's apostasy from the Lord.

37. Toews, "Genesis 1–4," 38–52. Toews' argument is broader than that of Bovell and Emmrich. He argues that Gen 1–4 is the introduction proper to the entire OT and its theology. In addition to finding parallels between Gen 1–3 and Israel's history, Toews attempts to trace archetypical patterns introduced in Gen 1–4 throughout the rest of the tripartite Hebrew canon. With respect to the relationship between Gen 1–4 and the Pentateuch, Toews sees parallels between the dividing of the waters of creation and the dividing of the Red Sea, the Garden of Eden and the Tabernacle, and the covenant theology of Gen 2–3 and the book of Deuteronomy (e.g., exile due to disobedience).

38. Dumbrell, "Genesis 2:1–3," 219–30; see also, Dumbrell, *Faith of Israel.* Dumbrell notes that both Adam and Israel share royal-priestly roles (see especially Gen 1:26, 28; Exod 19:4–6), both enjoy the conditional provision of a divinely prepared land, and both lose access to the divine space due to their transgression and exile.

39. Fretheim, *Pentateuch*. Although he does not deny the existence of different

From within another faith tradition, Tvi Erlich, an Israeli scholar writing in Modern Hebrew, also finds numerous links between the story of the Garden of Eden and the story of Israel's sojourn at Mount Sinai.[40] On the basis of numerous innertextual links between these two narratives, Erlich argues that Sinai and the tabernacle (and a return from exile to a special land prepared by God) are depicted as the solution to Adam's sin, or as he describes it, תיקון חטא הקדמון. Although Erlich discusses the similarities between Eden and Sinai, he argues that the distinctions between these two narratives are the key for one's interpretation and assessment of the theological import of Sinai within the Pentateuch. Although both narratives recount sin and retreat (חטא ונסיגה), a careful comparison reveals important and exegetically significant differences. At this point it would be helpful to reproduce a portion of Erlich's charts highlighting the similarities and key differences between the two narratives.[41]

sources underlying Gen 1–3, Fretheim's commitments lie with the final form of the text (ibid., 72). His desire to understand Gen 1–3 as part of the Pentateuch leads him to the conclusion that the two trees, the giving of commandments, and the choices of life and death in the garden anticipate the giving of the law at Sinai (Deut 30:15–20) (ibid., 75). Fretheim argues that the juxtaposition of the very good creation with the subsequent entrance of sin "dramatically portrays the need for a reclamation of creation" and demonstrates God's "commitment to stay with the world, come what may in the wake of human sinfulness" (ibid.,72).

40. Erlich, "Story of Garden," 17–35 [Modern Hebrew].

41. Ibid., 20–34; translation from Modern Hebrew my own.

Table 1: Similarities between the Garden of Eden and the Sinai Narrative (Erlich)[42]

Garden of Eden	Position of Mount Sinai
God gives commandments directly to Adam, who in turn communicates them to his wife. The woman sins, Adam is dragged after her, and both of them are distanced from the Lord.	God gives commandments directly to Moses, who in turn communicates them to Israel. The people sin, but Moses is not dragged after them,[43] and therefore, he causes the rectification of the sin and renewed approach to the Lord.
The one who does not take heed (שׁמר) and transgresses the Lord's commandment will surely die (מות ימות) (Gen 2:15–17).	The one who does not take heed (שׁמר) and transgresses the Lord's commandment will surely die (מות ימות) (Exod 19:12–13).
The woman added to the prohibition not to touch (נגע), although this was not commanded, and as a consequence, subtracted from the commandment in the end (Gen 3:2–3).	The prohibition of touching (נגע) was included in the Lord's commandment in order to prevent a serious sin of ascending the mountain without permission (Exod 19:12–13).
Commandments of do and commandments of do not do, concerning which the man will transgress in the continuation of the narrative (Gen 2:16–17).	Commandments of do and commandments of do not do, concerning which the people will transgress in the continuation of the narrative (Exod 20:2–3).
After the sin, the man was unable to hear the voice (שׁמע קול) of the Lord and to stand before the *Shekinah*, and therefore he fearfully[44] (ירא) hides from the presence of the Lord (Gen 3:8, 10).	Similar to the first man's reaction, the people of Israel are unable to directly hear the voice (שׁמע קול) of the Lord and to stand near the *Shekinah*. Therefore, they fearfully (ירא) stand at a distance from it, and request Moses to intercede to the Lord on their behalf (Exod 20:14–15; Deut 5:19–20).
After the sin, Adam enters into a situation in which he is prevented from drawing near to life (חיים) (Gen 3:24).	Due to the sin of the first man, the people of Israel are unable to stand in the presence of the revelation of the living (חיים) God (Deut 5:22).

42. *Source*: Tvi Erlich, "The Story of the Garden of Eden in Comparison to the Position of Mount Sinai and the Tabernacle," *Alon Shvut for Graduates of the Har Eztion Yeshiva* 11 (1998) 20–34. Used by permission.

43. Elsewhere, however, Moses follows the people in their unbelief (Num 20:12; see 14:11), and like Adam (and Israel), he dies in exile.

Garden of Eden	Position of Mount Sinai
The chosen man of humanity is cast out from the presence of God (Gen 3:23–24).	The chosen man of humanity is called into a close encounter with the Lord (Exod 24:12, 18).
The woman influences the man to sin and, consequently, to lose connection with the Lord (Gen 3:17, 23).	Since Eve influenced Adam to sin, when Israel wants to draw close to the Lord it is incumbent upon them to separate themselves from women (Exod 19:15).
The man in the Garden of Eden aspired to reach an imaginary good (טוב), but when he transgressed the Lord's commandment, God guarded (שׁמר) the way to life (הדרך לחיים) from him (Gen 3:24).	Keeping (שׁמר) the commandments of the Lord leads the people of Israel on the way (דרך) that leads to the true good (טוב) and to the true life (חיים) (Deut 20:14–15).
The man goes away from the place of the *Shekina* and cherubim are caused to dwell (שׁכן) at the entrance to the garden with the flaming sword (Gen 3:24).	The people of Israel are privileged to draw near to the *Shekina* and the glory of God dwells (שׁכן) on Mount Sinai before the eyes of Israel (Exod 24:16–17).
The man's return to the dust of the ground (אדמה) constitutes part of his atonement for his sin (Gen 3:17).	The ground (אדמה) from which the man was fashioned atones for his sins (Exod 20:24).
The sin obligates the man to cover his nakedness (ערותו) (Gen 3:21).	The location of the textual portion after the Ten Commandments is apparently not entirely understood. But if this portion is tied to the Garden of Eden, then the matter is understood that also on Mount Sinai it is commanded concerning atonement of the ground for the sin of the first man, and it is essential to even point out the maintenance of modesty in attire because it comes out of the original sin (Exod 20:22).

44. Erlich does not use the word "fearfully" in his explanation but underlines this term as an innertextual link between both passages in the body of his paper. I have added this word to the chart in order to bring out an important element in his observations.

Erlich also finds numerous parallels between the Fall in Genesis 3 and the Golden Calf Narrative. It will be helpful to reproduce a portion of his chart:

Table 2: Parallels between Genesis 3 and the Golden Calf Narrative (Exod 32:1–6)[45]

The Sin in the Garden	The Sin of the Calf
The description of Adam and Eve just prior to their sin (יתבשׁשׁו) (Gen 2:25)	Even the word בשׁשׁ from the root בוש is reminiscent of the story of the Garden of Eden in the sense of the shame in the nakedness and even at Mount Sinai in the context of Moses' delay. It is essential to notice that the use of the *polal*/*hithpolal* with this root only appears in these two places (Exod 32:1).
Transgression of the commandment do-not-do which was thrown upon the man was done by means of eating (Gen 3:6).	Transgression of the first commandment do-not-do in the Ten Commandments: "Do not make for yourselves a carved image" combines the act of eating with the sin (Exod 32:3–6).
The Lord's inquiry of the sin (Gen 3:13)	Moses' inquiry, who did not sin, of the one who catalyzed the sin (Exod 32:21)
Adam is condemned to death in his sin and the sword guards the tree of life from the sinful man (Gen 3:19, 24).	The people of Israel rectify their sin by putting to death the sinners with the sword (Exod 32:27)
The man is sent out (שׁלח) and cast out (גרשׁ) from the Garden of Eden and from the presence of the Lord and he is not able to go in the way (דרך) of life (Gen 3:23–24).	God minimizes the level of his connection with the people and now it is not the Lord himself who leads them but he sends (שׁלח) his angel who casts out (גרשׁ) the peoples of Canaan, lest the Lord destroy Israel who is going on the way (דרך) (Exod 33:2–3).

Again, the key to evaluating the theology of Sinai within the Pentateuch, according to Erlich, lies in the differences between the accounts of the Fall of Adam and the Fall of Israel (the golden calf). Erlich makes much of the fact that though the people (corresponding to Eve)

45. *Source*: Tvi Erlich, "The Story of the Garden of Eden in Comparison to the Position of Mount Sinai and the Tabernacle," *Alon Shvut for Graduates of the Har Eztion Yeshiva* 11 (1998): 20–34. Used by permission.

sinned, Moses (corresponding to Adam) did not. In fact, on the basis of Moses' intercession God consents not to destroy Israel and to abide with the people in their conquest of the land (Exod 33:15–17). Moses also participates in the atoning process by investigating—God was the investigator in the garden—the events concerning the golden calf, destroying the idol, making the people drink of its ashes, and then commanding the Levites to slay the offenders.[46] Erlich also argues on the basis of the parallels and differences between the position of Mount Sinai and the tabernacle, and between the tabernacle and the Garden of Eden, that, although Israel failed (like Eve), Moses (unlike Adam) successfully mediates for the provision of God's lasting presence and closeness (unlike the garden) with the people of Israel.[47]

Unique to Erlich, moreover, is his comparison of the sin in the garden and the sin of Nadab and Abihu. Both sins involve taking (לקח), giving (נתן), and violating what God commanded (צוה) (Gen 3:6, 11; Lev 10:1); both sins involve *lex talionis* of death (Gen 2:17; Lev 10:2); both sins result in a bodily removal from the presence of the *Shekinah* (Gen 3:23–24; Lev 10:3); in both cases the tunics (כתנות) of the violators (Gen 3:21; 10:5) are mentioned. Yet, Erlich argues that this parallel is not an exact repetition of Adam's total failure because the punishment was meted out on the individuals responsible and not on all of Israel (unlike the garden) and access to the presence of God remained after Nadab and Abihu's sin (unlike the garden).[48] Erlich concludes his article, however, by noting that Israel's entrance into the Promised Land and the building of the temple was the divinely intended means of rectifying the sin in the garden. Yet, Israel's violation of the commandments again resulted in the expulsion from the chosen place. In essence, Adam's sin was repeated again.[49]

At this point, it is worth pointing out an important distinction between Erlich's analysis of Genesis 1–3 and its connections to the Sinai Narrative and those of many others. Erlich's thesis is rooted in the conviction that innertextual links between the garden and Sinai are intended to provide an exegetical framework for a theological assessment of the

46. Ibid., 27–28.

47. Ibid., 29–33. Erlich acknowledges, however, that fear resulting from the first sin (Gen 3:10) remains as an abiding testimony to conditions after the Fall.

48. Ibid., 33–35.

49. Ibid., 35.

significance of the Sinai Covenant within the Pentateuch. While I completely agree with Erlich's thesis, my interpretation of the Pentateuch's theological assessment of the Sinai Covenant differs markedly from his.

JOHN SAILHAMER

To date, John Sailhamer's *The Pentateuch as Narrative* represents the only full-scale attempt to apply a text-centered compositional analysis to the Pentateuch.[50] According to Sailhamer, the key to discerning the compositional strategy of the Pentateuch is the presence of three macrostructural junctures where the author has inserted large blocks of poetry into structurally strategic locations.[51] Sailhamer notes that in each of these poems a key figure (Jacob, Balaam, and Moses) proclaims what will take place in the "last days" (see Gen 49:1; Num 24:14; Deut 31:39).[52] On this basis, Sailhamer argues that eschatology is primary to the compositional concerns of the Pentateuchal author. Since the Pentateuch spans from the "beginning" (Gen 1:1) to the "end," Sailhamer suggests that "one of the central concerns lying behind the final shape of the Pentateuch is an attempt to uncover an inherent relationship between the past and the future."[53] By recognizing the "inherent relationship between the past and the future" the reader discovers a vital hermeneutical key for unlocking the purpose of the Pentateuchal narratives: many of the narratives assume a narrative-typological significance. "Earlier events foreshadow and anticipate later events. Later events are written to remind the reader of past narratives."[54] If Sailhamer is correct, one would expect to find "narrative typology" in the early chapters of Genesis as well.

Before looking at his interpretation of Genesis 1–3, it is essential to note that Sailhamer, like Erlich, views the covenant between God and Israel at Mount Sinai as the central concern of the Pentateuch. However, unlike many Pentateuchal scholars, Sailhamer makes a careful distinction between the Sinai Covenant and the Pentateuch as a whole. Thus,

50. For an explication of compositional analysis or composition criticism, see Fohrer et al., *Exegese des Alten Testments*, 139–42.

51. Sailhamer, *Pentateuch as Narrative*, 36.

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid., 37.

54. Ibid., 37–41. Sailhamer argues, for instance, that Gen 12:10–20 foreshadows Gen 41—Exod 12, and the spread of sin in Gen 1–11 parallels the defilement of the camp in Lev 11–16.

the Pentateuch is an evaluation of the Sinai Covenant, but not the covenant itself.[55] The Pentateuch's perspective on the Sinai Covenant is summarized in three points: (1) the covenant of Sinai is presented as God's means of restoring God's original plans to bless humanity (Gen 1:26–28; 12:1–3; Exod 2:24); (2) the Sinai Covenant failed to restore the creation blessing because of Israel's failure to trust and obey God; (3) God's plan to restore the creation blessing will one day succeed when God gives Israel a circumcised heart to trust and obey (Deut 30:1–10).[56] Thus, the overall thrust of the Pentateuch is oriented toward the future, and encourages the reader to wait on God to fulfill his promises.

Turning to Genesis 1–3, Sailhamer argues that Gen 1:1—2:4a (a literarily cohesive unit) serves as the introduction to the Pentateuch.[57] Based on his sense of the overall intentions of the Pentateuch and the importance of the Sinai Covenant, Sailhamer argues that 1:1—2:4a introduces three central themes of the Pentateuch: God the Creator, human beings, and the land.[58] Sailhamer entitles Gen 1:2—2:3 the "preparation of the Land." The dividing of the waters of creation and the gift of the land are seen as parallels to the dividing of the waters of the Red Sea and God's gift of the land to the people of Israel.[59] Sailhamer also notes the fact that the poem of Deuteronomy 32 draws a connection between the creation account and God's covenant with Israel, using the same terminology found in Genesis 1.[60] The dividing of the waters on the third day (1:9–13) parallels the Flood (Gen 6–9) and the parting of the Red Sea (Exod 14–15): and, in all three places water is an obstacle for human enjoyment of the land.[61]

Sailhamer regards Genesis 2:4–24 as the gift of the land, and understands the Garden of Eden as a prototypical tabernacle (Exod 25–31, 35–40). Based on the geographical descriptions (2:8–14), Sailhamer posits that the location of Eden is closely aligned with the land promised to Abraham and his descendants (see Gen 15:18).[62] Sailhamer also

55. Ibid., 27.
56. Ibid.
57. Ibid., 26.
58. Ibid., 28–29.
59. Ibid., 84.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid., 91.
62. Ibid., 97–100. Several parallels between Gen 2–3 and 15–16 (Adam and

contends that the terminology used to describe Adam's occupation in the garden (2:15) depicts the first man as a priest who is called to worship and obey God. Moreover, as in the remainder of the Torah, Adam's enjoyment of the land, like Israel's, is contingent upon his obedience to the commandments (Deut 30:15–18)[63]

Finally, Sailhamer entitles Genesis 2:25—4:26, "the land and the exile."[64] According to Sailhamer, the "sound" of the Lord and Adam's retreat foreshadow the Lord's appearance on Mount Sinai and Israel's retreat (Exod 20:18–21): thus, Adam and Eve's sin in the garden foreshadows Israel's sin at Mount Sinai. Also noted by Sailhamer in the Fall Narrative is the author's interest in eating, a concern later elaborated on in the Torah (Lev 11; Deut 14). The covering provided for Adam's nakedness (Gen 3:21) anticipates the covering provided for the nakedness of the priests (Exod 28:42–43). Sailhamer argues that Adam's exile from the garden is intended to parallel the casting out of a ritually impure individual from the midst of the people (Exod 31:14), thereby portraying the Fall as akin to ritual contamination (see Lev 13:1—14:57). Finally, the cherubim standing guard to the access of the Tree of Life foreshadow the Torah's presence in the Ark of the Covenant (also protected by cherubim; Exod 25:10–22; Deut 31:24–26).

CONCLUSION

In the history of interpretation, I called attention to an emerging return to certain assumptions governing the pre-critical Christian interpretation of Genesis 1–3. First, I noted a return to the acceptance of the unity of Genesis 1–3, albeit for reasons clearly differing from those maintained by pre-critical scholars. Second, I pointed to a return to the conviction of a prophetic orientation of the canonical Pentateuch. Finally, I discussed a growing number of scholars who seek to understand Genesis 1–3 as an integral part of the Pentateuch. I also referred to scholars who find parallels between Genesis 1–3 and Israel's biblical history.

There is more work to be done, however. To some extent, the diversity of interpretations are piecemeal, with no concerted effort to connect the dots leading from the Pentateuch to the Primary History, and

Abraham), which are discussed in a subsequent chapter, lend credence to this association between Eden and the Promised Land.

63. Ibid., 100–101.

64. Ibid., 102–16.

from the Primary History to the canonical Tanakh. This book represents an attempt to meet this need by means of a more thorough analysis of Genesis 1–3 and its relationship to the Pentateuch, to the Primary History, and finally, to the tri-partite canon or Tanakh.