1

Introduction

Pre-critical Christian scholars interpreted Genesis 1–3 as the fountainhead for all biblical theology and the basis for God's ultimate act of redemption through the provision of the Seed of the woman in the person of the Messiah.[1] These scholars also accepted without question the continuity between the intentionality of Torah or Book of Moses (in its canonical or final form) and the NT interpretation of it (see John 5:46–47). In essence, Moses (the man and the book) was regarded as a faithful witness of the future Messianic realities (see Heb 3:5), and the compositional intentionality of the Pentateuch was tightly moored to the hope of the new covenant. The rise of critical scholarship, however, brought in its wake not only the rejection of the literary unity of Genesis 1–3, but also a whole new understanding of the compositional history and intentionality of the Pentateuch in its final form. Genesis 1–3 was deemed to be composed of two mutually contradicting creation accounts from differing time periods and with differing theologies. Eventually, Gen 2:4b—3:24 was attributed to an earlier prophetic source ("J"), and 1:1—2:4a was attributed to a final post-exilic priestly layer ("P"). Likewise, the intentionality of the Pentateuch (or Hexateuch/Tetrateuch) was tightly bound to the agenda of the post-exilic priestly circles: namely, Second Temple Judaism.

Recent trends in modern Pentateuchal scholarship in particular, and biblical studies in general, have called into question both the notion of the disunity of Genesis 1–3 (and the Pentateuch as a whole) as well as the assumption that the intentionality of the final form (canonical) Pentateuch is bound up with the priestly agenda of Second Temple Judaism. Although the climate of Pentateuchal studies is changing, there have been relatively few attempts to interpret Genesis 1–3 as a coherent

1. See the history of interpretation in chapter 2.

unity, and as a literarily strategic introduction to the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings (Tanakh) as a whole.

PURPOSE

The primary purpose of this book is to apply a text-centered, compositional analysis to Genesis 1–3 in order to discern the relationship between these chapters and the remainder of the Torah. In addition, the function of Genesis 1–3 in the canonical Tanakh is investigated. Studies of the first three chapters of Genesis have generally focused on the exposition of the content of the individual hypothetical sources,[2] ANE parallels,[3] scientific and ecological issues;[4] ethical issues of gender, sexuality, and marriage;[5] and theological issues pertaining to the image of God and the doctrine of the Trinity.[6] Although there have been many literary analyses applied to Genesis 1–3,[7] to date there have been relatively few

2. Bauks, "Genesis 1 als Programmschrift," 333–45; Bechtel, "Rethinking," 77–117; Bechtel, "Genesis "2.4b—3.24," 3–26; Begrich, "Paradieserzählung" 93–116; Engnell, "'Knowledge' and 'Life,'" 103–19; Firmage, "Genesis 1" 97–114; Hurowitz, "P—Understanding the Priestly Source," 30–37, 44–47; Kutsch, "Paradieserzählung," 9–24; Levin, "Redaktion RJP," 15–34; Lohfink, "Erzählung von Sündenfall," 81–101; Schüle, "Würde," 440–54; Vervenne, "Genesis 1,1—2,4," 35–79; Weimar, "Struktur und Komposition," 803–43.

3. Atwell, "Egyptian Source," 441–77; Harris, "Symbolism in Creation." Hurowitz, "Genesis of Genesis," 36–48, 52–54; Johnston, "Genesis 1," 178–94; Sparks, "Enuma Elish," 625–48; Walton, "Creation in Genesis 1:1—2:3," 48–63; Walton, *Lost World of Genesis One*.

4. Bozung, "Evaluation," 406–23; Elbert, "Genesis 1," 23–72; Greenspoon, "From Dominion to Stewardship?" 159–83; McConnell, "In His Image" 114–27; Raj, "Yahweh's Earth," 40–60; Ronan, "Stewardship Model," 18–19; Zimmer, "Creation Story," 77–92; Zimmer, "Creation of Man," 16–26; Zimmer, "Genesis 1 as Sign," 172–80.

5. Claassens, "Moon Spoke Up: Genesis 1," 325–42; D'Angelo, "Gender Refusers," 149–73; Jastram and Weinrich, "Man" 3–96; Jervis, "Story," 265–79; Magnuson, "Marriage," 26–42; Scotchmer, "Lessons from Paradise," 80–85; Stark, "Augustine on Women," 215–41; Tarwater, "Covenantal Nature of Marriage"; Valiyapparambil, "Power of the Powerless," 163–64.

6. Auld, "Imago Dei in Genesis" 259–62; Baker, "The Image of God," 97–109; Grenz, "Social God," 87–100; Jenson, "Bible and Trinity," 329–39; MacDonald, "Imago Dei and Election," 303–27; Mays, "Self in Psalms," 27–43; McConnell, "In His Image," 114–27; Packer, "Reflected Glory," 56; Towner, "Clones of God," 341–56; Wall, "Imitatio Creatoris," 21–42.

7. Collins, "What Happened?" 12–44; Collins, *Genesis 1–4*; Culley, "Action Sequences," 25–33; Hess, "Genesis 1–2," 143–53; Jobling, "Myth Semantics," 41–49; Kovacs, "Structure," 139–47; Levine, "Curse and Blessing," 189–99; Lim, *Grace.* Ouro,

text-centered attempts to interpret Genesis 1–3 as the introduction to the Pentateuch.[8] Furthermore, text-centered studies that have attempted to interpret Genesis 1–3 as the introduction of the Pentateuch are by no means exhaustive. It is the contention of this book that Genesis 1–3 merits further investigation, not only in terms of its relationship to the rest of the Pentateuch, but also in terms of its significance for discerning the overall redactional concerns behind the formation and shaping of the Tanakh.[9]

THESIS

In this book the following thesis is argued: when understood as the introduction to the Torah and to the Tanakh as a whole, Genesis 1–3 intentionally foreshadows Israel's failure to keep the Sinai Covenant as well as their exile from the Promised Land in order to point the reader to a future work of God in the "last days." Adam's failure to "conquer" (Gen 1:28) the seditious inhabitant of the land (the serpent), his temptation and violation of the commandments, and his exile from the garden is Israel's story *en nuce*.[10] The certitude of failure in the introduction to the Pentateuch anticipates the conclusion (Deut 28:69 [29:1, English versions]—34:12). Just as it was in the beginning, under the best of circumstances, so also it will be in the end. In the conclusion to the Pentateuch, Moses presents Israel's future apostasy and exile as a certainty (see Deut 30:1–10; 31:28–29). Thus, the Pentateuch is framed with a prophetic awareness[11] of Israel's exile due to their failure to keep the Sinai Covenant both in the present and in the future (see for example Deut 32:1–43) because of the evil "inclination" (יצר) of their heart (compare Gen 6:5; 8:21 with Deut 31:21). This *inclusio* of pessimism at both ends of the Pentateuch with respect to human abilities to "do this and live," not only supplies the contextual framework for interpreting the Sinai Narrative, but also provides

"Linguistic and Thematic Parallels" 44–54; Ouro, "Garden of Eden Account," 219–43; Parker and Patte, "Structural Exegesis," 141–59; Patte, "Genesis 2 and 3," 1–164; Shea, "Unity of Creation Account," 9–39; Trimpe, *Von der Schöpfung*.

8. Notable exceptions include Collins, *Genesis 1–4*; Sailhamer, *Pentateuch as Narrative*; Toews, "Genesis 1–4," 38–52.

9. The Law, the Prophets, and the Writings.

10. See Bovell, "Genesis 3:21?" 361–66.

11. For the notion of a "prophetic" Pentateuch—in contradistinction to a "priestly" Pentateuch as is commonly assumed—see Sailhamer, *Meaning of Pentateuch,* 248–49.

the rationale for the need of a new work in the "last days," whereby God would rectify the human inclination by means of a circumcised heart (Deut 30:6). Moreover, the groundwork is also laid for the expectation of another "Adam" (another priest-king) to arise from among the people of Israel who will ultimately fulfill the creation mandate in the "last days." In other words, Genesis 1–3, when read as integrally related to the Pentateuch and the Tanakh as a whole, *is not meant to encourage Israel to keep Sinai*; rather, it forthrightly admits that Israel did not (and will not) keep it, and therefore prepares the reader to wait expectantly in exile for a new work of God in the last days (just as Jacob and Moses did).