

**YAHWEH'S SONG:
A HANDBOOK FOR UNDERSTANDING OLD TESTAMENT HISTORICAL
THEOLOGY**

Rodger Dalman

Copyright by Rodger Dalman, 2009

Fifteenth Revised Edition

If the Lord blesses you through this work, gifts of support can be sent to:

Rodger W. Dalman
5549 Girard Ave. N.
Brooklyn Center, MN55430

PREFACE

Yahweh's Song is a handbook intended for a specific audience. It is written for conservative Christians.¹ It is designed for students who share the authors' assumption that the autographs of the Biblical books were inspired and inerrant.² This assumption dominates the book. Yahweh's Song will be of less value for readers who do not share this assumption. Yahweh's Song grows from the author's deep concern that Evangelical Christians are loosing the intellectual battle within their own families. Roughly 70% of the young people raised in conservative and Evangelical Christian homes abandon the church when they graduate from High School. Roughly the same percentage of young people who call themselves Christians when entering college no longer call themselves Christians when they graduate. The conservative church is loosing its young people, and youth are the future of any church.

There are many reasons why the church is loosing the battle for its own young people. Sensuality and non-Christian value sets are being pushed at young people on every hand. The post-modern world has also called into question whether truth itself can be known, and any exclusive claims to truth have been rejected out of hand by a whole generation.³ Despite these practical problems, the greatest reason that the church is loosing its youth may be a broad lack of intellectual credibility. Young people are taught by their environment that Christian beliefs are old fashioned and that they can not be sustained in the modern world. The conservative church faces a problem that began more than a century ago. Before that time, conservative Christians could be found at the forefront of many academic fields. The rise of evolution and theological liberalism alienated conservatives from the academic community, and the church largely retreated from engagement with the intellectual world. That retreat was a tragedy. The Bible is true. Its history is accurate. Its claims hold up to the closest examination if the Biblical text is properly understood. By retreating from the academic process, conservatives left both the selection of relevant evidence and the interpretation of that evidence to authors who have often begun with the assumption that the Biblical text could not be correct. If the church's current intellectual crisis is to be reversed, conservatives must

1

The words conservative, liberal, and Evangelical are used in so many ways that they are almost meaningless. The word Evangelical has had an interesting history. It is a transliteration of a Greek word that is used in the New Testament to mean good news or gospel. So on one level, any Christian can be called an Evangelical. A German form of the word was used in the Reformation to describe the Lutheran church. So on another level, any Lutheran has a right to the name Evangelical. In this sense, the largest liberal Lutheran church calls itself the Evangelical Lutheran church even though rather few of its pastors believe in the inerrancy of the Biblical text. The word is also used in the Roman Catholic community for people who seek a close relationship with God. In this sense, the Evangelical Scholarly Initiative gives research grants to anyone willing to use the name Evangelical. The Evangelical Scholarly Initiative does not expect its applicants to believe in Biblical inerrancy, and such a belief may even make the awarding of a research grant less likely. This book will use the word Evangelical to describe people who believe that there were autographs of the Biblical books and that those autographs were inspired and inerrant. That is the definition of Evangelical assumed by the Evangelical Theological Society. It rules out those who believe that Biblical books like Genesis developed by a complex process over centuries because such a perspective makes the existence of autographs per se almost impossible.

A belief in Biblical inerrancy is a faith choice. The earliest surviving Hebrew text of the Pentateuch was written well over a thousand years after Moses wrote Genesis. Only a few tiny fragments of the Hebrew text are older than the Qumran scrolls. See for example, Gabriel Barkay, et al, "The Challenges of *Ketef Hinnom*: Using Advanced Technologies to Reclaim the Earliest Biblical Texts and their Context," *Near Eastern Archaeology* 66 (2003): 162-71. It is impossible to prove that the Biblical authors wrote their books, but it is equally impossible to prove that they did not write them. A great deal of evidence can be raised both in support of the accuracy of the Biblical text and opposed to it. Yet neither position can finally be proven. All basic perspectives applied to the Biblical account are taken largely on faith. Since the text was copied by hand, copying errors did arise in the text. Anyone who reads Greek and Hebrew has to wrestle with the textual apparatus and assess the rival readings in it. As errors were copied, families of texts appeared. This is the normal assumption in Greek translation, and the Qumran scrolls suggest that it was common in Hebrew as well. For interpretations of the Hebrew textual evidence, see Frank Moore Cross Jr. "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert," 177-95 in F. M. Cross and S. Talmon, eds. *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975). J. Homan, "A Comparative Study of the Psalter in Light of II QPs^a," *Westminster Theological Journal* 40 (1977): 116-29. When all is said and done though, the presuppositions brought to the text normally control the conclusions drawn from it.

For an Evangelical perspective on the impact of postmodern thinking on Biblical interpretation, see Robertson McQuilkin and Bradford Mullen, "The Impact of Postmodern Thinking on Evangelical Hermeneutics," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40 (1997): 69-82.

begin reading and learning far more than they have in the past. Ignorance is not a virtue. It is a weakness that has recently cost the church more than it can afford to pay.

Yahweh's Song is intended to open the doors to the academic debate and to point the way. It points to evidence that has been neglected in the modern debate, and it suggests ways that the evidence can be understood from a conservative perspective. While *Yahweh's Song* discusses the academic debate at length, the study often suggests interpretations that are outside of the mainstream. The purpose of *Yahweh's Song* is not to defend a conservative worldview within the context of mainstream scholarship. *Yahweh's Song* is an attempt to start over in the debate. It is an attempt to select and arrange the evidence in a new way that grows from conservative presuppositions. *Yahweh's Song* is intended to encourage each reader to seek the hard evidence behind the modern academic debate and to evaluate that evidence in new ways. The author encourages each reader to integrate the historical evidence into his or her own perspective instead of accepting uncritically any of the positions suggested either in this study or in the academic orbit as a whole.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface iii

Table of Contents v

PART ONE: GENESIS AS HISTORY AND THEOLOGY 1

CHAPTER 1: KEY THEOLOGICAL MOTIFS IN GENESIS 1

A. CREATION AS A WILDERNESS POLEMIC

- 1) Genesis as a Polemical Argument for the Wilderness Community
- 2) Rival Creation Accounts
- 3) Yahweh of Khnum?
- 4) Creation and the Hyksos

B. Eden in a Covenant and Treaty Context

- 1) Creation and Treaty Terms
- 2) Technical Treaty Vocabulary Later in Genesis
- 3) Yahweh's Covenant Lawsuit

CHAPTER 2: GENESIS 1-11 AS HISTORY AND THEOLOGY 12

A. Creation and a Revolt at the Dawn of Time

- 1) A Ruler of This World
- 2) Yahweh as the Eternal King

B. Eden and the Climate History of the Near East

- 1) Eden and the Alleröd
- 2) Violence during the Younger Dryas

C. Noah's Flood and the Younger Dryas/Preboreal Transition

- 1) Noah and the Younger Dryas
- 2) Noah's "Now and Not Yet" Theology

D. Post-Flood History

- 1) Post-Flood Resettlement
- 2) Faith during the Ubaid

E. Uruk and a Tower to Heaven

- 1) A Tower during the Uruk
- 2) The West Semitic Tradition of Faith
- 3) Egypt and the Levant

CHAPTER 3: ISRAEL'S PATRIARCHAL AGE AS A WILDERNESS POLEMIC 47

A. Archaeology and the Fading Patriarchs

B. Abraham the Hebrew

- 1) Patriarchal Chronology
- 2) Abraham and History
- 3) Abraham's Birth
- 4) Abraham as a Hebrew
- 5) Abraham, the Hebrew Merchant

C. Abraham, Jerusalem, and Sodom

- 1) Chedorlaomer's Campaign
- 2) Passing a Test on the Holy Mountain

D. Abraham and the Covenant

- 1) Genesis and Treaty Motifs
- 2) Moses and the Covenant Blessings in Genesis

E. Abraham and the Gentiles

- 1) Abraham in a West Semitic World
- 2) Hagar and Abraham
- 3) Gentiles and the Believing Community

F. Yahweh's Judgment on Sodom and Human Culture Opposed to God

- 1) The King Comes in Blessing and Judgment
- 2) The Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah

G. Jacob

- 1) Jacob and the Egyptian 12th Dynasty
- 2) Esau and the Edomites

H. Rebellion within the Patriarchal Household

- 1) Idols in the Family
- 2) Revolution in the Family

I. Joseph as the Ideal Vassal

- 1) A Deeply Dysfunctional Family
- 2) A Faithful Slave in a Foreign Land
- 3) A Vizier over All of Egypt
- 4) Climate Change and Joseph's Famine
- 5) Joseph and Sesostris III

J. The Believing Remnant Left in Palestine

PART TWO: THE EXODUS 103

CHAPTER 4: THE EXODUS AND THE WILDERNESS 103

A. Egypt and Israel's Sojourn

- 1) The Collapse of the Middle Kingdom

- 2) The Hyksos Rule in Egypt
- 3) Israel and the Hyksos

B. The Rise of an Egyptian Empire

- 1) The Rise of a New Egyptian Dynasty
- 2) Thutmose III
- 3) The Beginning of an Egyptian Empire

C. Israel's Exodus from Egypt

- 1) Seth, Horus, and the Burning Bush
- 2) El Shaddai and Yahweh, the God of the Mountains and the Wilderness
- 3) Amenhotep II and the Exodus

D. The Location of Israel's Sea Crossing

- 1) The Sea Crossing Debate
- 2) An Old but Useful Suggestion
- 3) Climate Change and the Sea Crossing

CHAPTER 5: KEY THEOLOGICAL MOTIFS IN MOSAIC HISTORY 137

A. Eden, the Holy Mountains, and the Eternal Now

B. Moses and Sinai

- 1) Canaanite Holy Mountain Imagery
- 2) Sinai as a Holy Mountain
- 3) The Tabernacle as Heaven on Earth
- 4) Law from the Holy Mountain
- 5) Thutmose III and Yahweh's Glory

C. The Sea Crossing and Hyksos Theology

- 1) Israel's Sea Crossing and Baal's Combat Motifs
- 2) Early Evidence for Baal Worship
- 3) The Sea Crossing Debate against Baal Worship
- 4) Baal's Holy Mountain Imagery
- 5) Baal Worship at Sinai

D. The Sea Crossing and Egyptian Underworld Theology

- 1) Polemics and the Exodus
- 2) The Exodus and Egyptian Mortuary Literature
- 3) The Sea Crossing and Egyptian Field of Reeds Motifs
- 4) The Sea Crossing and Paths through the Reeds
- 5) The Sea Crossing and the Winds
- 6) The Exodus and God's Dwelling Place
- 7) The Sea Crossing and a Dawn Crossing
- 8) The Sea Crossing and Underworld Fire Motifs

PART THREE: ISRAEL'S EARLY HISTORY 185

CHAPTER 6: KEY THEOLOGICAL MOTIFS FOR ISRAEL'S HISTORY 185

A. *Moses, Deuteronomy, and the Formal Establishment of God's Kingdom*

- 1) The Ancient Treaties
- 2) Moses and the Second Millennium Treaties
- 3) Treaty Vocabulary and Law Suits
- 4) Joshua and the Treaty Pattern

B. *Moses, Joshua and Israel's Earliest Eschatology*

- 1) Patriarchal Age Eschatology
- 2) Wilderness Age Eschatology
- 3) Joshua's Conquest Eschatology

CHAPTER 7: ISRAEL'S ORIGIN AND THE ACADEMIC DEBATE 204

A. *Claims of a 19th Dynasty Exodus in the Academic Community*

B. *The 18th Dynasty Exodus Revival*

C. *The Nature of Early Israel*

CHAPTER 8: CONQUEST OR COMPROMISE? 213

A. *History and Polemic*

B. *The Conquest*

C. *Joshua's Battles for the Promised Land*

D. *Amarna and the Habiru*

CHAPTER 9: THE JUDGEA AND A KINGDOM IN REBELLION AGAINST ITS KING 227

A. *Chronology versus Structure in the Judges*

B. *Early Oppressions*

C. *Deborah and Jabin*

D. *Gideon*

E. *The Sea People*

F. *Jephthah*

G. *Samson*

PART FOUR: ISRAEL'S MONARCHY 256

CHAPTER 10: THE UNITED MONARCHY 256

A. *Minimalists, Maximilists, and the United Monarchy*

- 1) David and the Academic Debate
- 2) Solomon and the Academic Debate

B. *The United Monarchy as an Eschatological Kingdom*

- 1) Saul and History
- 2) David and History
- 3) Solomon and History

CHAPTER 11: THE DIVIDED MONARCHY 282

A. The Divided Nation and the Rejection of Yahweh's Kingdom

- 1) Rehoboam
- 2) Abijah
- 3) Asa
- 4) Jehoshaphat
- 5) Jehoram
- 6) Athaliah
- 7) Joash (Jehoash)
- 8) Amaziah
- 9) Uzziah (Azariah)
- 10) Jonah
- 11) Amos
- 12) Joel
- 13) Hosea
- 14) Micah
- 15) Isaiah 1-39
- 16) Jotham
- 17) Ahaz
- 18) Pekah

B. Judah's End in Yahweh's Covenant Curses and the Promise of a New Kingdom

- 1) Hezekiah
- 2) Isaiah 36-66
- 3) Manasseh
- 4) Josiah
- 5) Nahum and Zephaniah
- 6) Jehoahaz
- 7) Jehoiakim
- 8) Jehoichin
- 9) Zedekiah
- 10) Jeremiah

C. Captivity and Restoration without Rule

- 1) Ezekiel
- 2) Daniel
- 3) Esther
- 4) Ezra and Nehemiah
- 5) Kings and Chronicles

D. The Post-Exilic Prophets

- 1) Haggai
- 2) Zechariah
- 3) Malachi

E. The Second Temple Period and the Birth Pains of the Kingdom

- 1) Life in the Diaspora
- 2) Jewish Life in Palestine

PART FIVE: THE NEW TESTAMENT 358

CHAPTER 12: THE THEOLOGICAL FOUNDATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 358

A) *The Egyptian/Platonic/Jewish Synthesis*

- 1) Platonic Theology in Egypt and Palestine
- 2) Apocalyptic and the Vision of God
- 3) Philo and the Vision of God
- 4) Proto-Gnosticism and the Vision of God
- 5) Merkabah Mysticism and the Vision of God

B) *The Messianic Foundation of the New Testament*

- 1) The Old Testament and the Messiah
- 2) Messianic Speculation in the First Century

C) *Jesus as a First Century Messiah*

- 1) Jesus as a First Century Messiah
- 2) Jesus' Messianic Authority
- 3) Messianic Conflicts
- 4) A "Now and Not Yet" Messianic Kingdom

D) *Jesus' Life in the Context of the Old Testament*

- 1) Born as a Messiah
- 2) A Messiah and a Savior
- 3) A King and a Sacrifice

CHAPTER 13: PAUL AND THE RISE OF NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY 421

A) *Paul and the First Century Pharisees*

- 1) A Pharisee of the Pharisees
- 2) Paul and the Merkabah Mystics
- 4) A Life "in" Christ

B) *Galatians, James, and the Jewish Christians*

- 1) Israel's Law and the New Testament Church
- 2) Conflicts over the Law
- 3) The Jerusalem Council
- 4) The Book of Romans

C) *Paul and Proto-Gnosticism*

D) *Luke and Paul's Legal Defense*

- 1) Luke as a Legal Brief
- 2) Acts as a Legal Brief

CHAPTER 14: AN AGE OF PERSECUTION AND ALIENATION 448

A) *Hebrews and the Loss of a Nation*

- 1) Nero's Persecution
- 2) Flight and the Destruction of Jerusalem

B) *John in a Gentile World*

- 1) John as a Late First Century Gospel
- 2) John and the Jewish/Christian Conflict
- 3) John's Pauline Theology

C) *Revelation and the Loss of Immanence*

PART ONE: GENESIS AS HISTORY AND THEOLOGY

CHAPTER 1: KEY THEOLOGICAL MOTIFS IN GENESIS

A) GENESIS AS A WILDERNESS POLEMIC

1) GENESIS AS A POLEMICAL ARGUMENT FOR THE WILDERNESS COMMUNITY

The book of Genesis has traditionally been placed at the beginning of the Old Testament even though it may not have been the first book of the Old Testament written.⁴ Genesis has always been placed at the beginning of the Bible because it recorded the earth's creation, the origin of the human race, and Israel's origin. This content has led to a surprising neglect of the historical setting within which Genesis was written. The book's historical setting was properly that of the wilderness community. Genesis was written under the influence of the history, needs, and theological problems of the wilderness community. Because of this, Genesis should properly be studied after Exodus. Genesis can only be understood in the context of the wilderness community. The great questions in Genesis properly interact with Moses' perception of the needs of the wilderness community. Several accounts in Genesis should be analyzed in terms of the wilderness generation and its needs. A few basic questions should always be asked of these passages including the following. Why might Moses have included these accounts in the Genesis history? How could these accounts have provided a lesson for the wilderness generation? What problems in the wilderness might Moses have addressed by writing the book of Genesis the way that he wrote it?

These questions should be asked especially of the creation account in Genesis 1-3. How could these chapters have fit the needs of the wilderness community?⁵ It is important to note first that Moses faced a serious problem with idolatry in the wilderness. According to Ezekiel 20:7-8, Israel had fallen into idolatry in Egypt. To some degree, the nation had shared the worldview of Egypt and the ancient Near East. Seely argued that Israel expressed its knowledge of God within the religious and cultural forms of the age, and that Israel's basic world view had come to resemble that of Egypt in a number of ways.⁶

4

It is not impossible that the book of Job may have been written during Israel's Egyptian sojourn. The story recorded in Job certainly occurred before the exodus, although various dates have been proposed for the composition of the book itself.

Evangelicals have been surprisingly resistant to asking this question. For the last 150 years, Christians have been struggling to integrate the Biblical and scientific evidence for human origins. This debate has often been heated and even bitter. The emotions expressed in this debate have so hardened positions that new options are often not seriously considered. One exception to this rule is Tremper Longman who wrote the following about Gen. 1-3. "From the time of the patriarchs down through the rest of the period of the Old Testament, the children of Abraham lived in the midst of a pagan world. Only Israel worshiped Yahweh, while the rest of the nations had their own gods and goddesses—and they also had their own creation accounts. Since God's people were constantly tempted to worship the deities of other nations, we shouldn't be surprised that the biblical accounts of creation were shaped in such a way as to provide a clear distinction from those of other nations. Even so, there are similarities. In any case, the most interesting and the richest reading of the biblical creation accounts takes place in the light of the rival accounts of the ancient Near East." Longman, Tremper III, *How to Read Genesis*, (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005), 72.

Paul H. Seely, "The Firmament and the Waters above Part I: The Meaning of *Raquia*' in Gen 1:6-8," *The Westminster Theological Journal* 53 (1991): 235. Paul H. Seely, "The Geographical Meaning of "Earth" and "Seas" in Genesis 1:10,"

2) RIVAL CREATION ACCOUNTS

Moses may have included the creation and flood accounts in Genesis because they provided a point by point refutation of key ideas that were at the heart of Egyptian theology.⁷ Egypt contained many temples. The theology of each temple was different from the theology of its neighbors. The theology of each temple also developed over time. This resulted in an enormous theological diversity. The Egyptians delighted in affirming a vast number of contradictory ideas at the same time. A tradition of creation accounts stood beneath the glorious diversity of their theology. Egypt contained three very important creation accounts drawn from the temple theologies at Memphis, Hermopolis, and Heliopolis. All three creation traditions were addressed by the Genesis creation account. Egypt also knew a number of minor creation traditions drawn from the theology of lesser temples.⁸ While Egypt contained a number of creation accounts, the narratives all tended to be based on similar principles, and these principles were at the heart of Egyptian theology. From temple to temple, nearly all of Egyptian theology was a direct outgrowth of its creation accounts.

As Moses taught Israel proper theology, he began with his own creation account.⁹ The wilderness community would have expected "God's Word" and proper theology to grow from just such a creation account.¹⁰ Like the Egyptians, the Israelites would have believed that the nature of reality was determined by the nature of its creation. Moses began Genesis with a creation account that made it impossible for the Israelites to worship both Yahweh and the Egyptian gods at the same time. Moses' creation account formed a theological argument by mimicking key aspects of the Egyptian creation accounts.¹¹

The first way that Moses' creation account mimicked Egyptian accounts can be seen in Genesis 1:1. In this verse, Moses claimed that Elohim had created the heavens and the earth. This contrasted sharply with the creation account at Heliopolis where the gods Geb (earth) and Nut (sky) were born from the gods Shu (air) and Tefnut (moisture). Shu and Tefnut were in turn the children of the primal god Atum. In most Egyptian creation accounts, the earth was not really

The Westminster Theological Journal 59 (1997), 246.

Mark Brett discussed the polemical purpose of Genesis 1. Brett wrote from a critical perspective, so he limited the polemical purpose in Genesis 1 to the material in Genesis that critical authors associate with the P, or priestly, source. Brett argued that the author of the P material made claims about the past that were intended to give Israel a ground for hope about the future. Mark G. Brett, "Motives and Intentions in Genesis 1," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991): 1-16. Evangelical authors commonly reject the division of Genesis into J, E, D, and P sources. Thomas Briscoe argued that the ancient Near East as a whole saw the world in the conceptual framework reflected in the Enuma Elish, the Atrahasis Epic, and the Egyptian cosmologies. Briscoe argued that the authors of Scripture were aware of these myths. Briscoe noted that it is hard to know if the authors of the Old Testament intentionally used common Near Eastern ideas about pagan mythology. Thomas Briscoe, "The Creation Narratives: A View from the Tell," *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 40 (1998): 49-64. John Currid argued that the creation account did echo Egyptian motifs. John D. Currid, *A Study Commentary on Genesis: Volume 1: Genesis 1:1-25:18*, (Darlington, UK: Evangelical Press, 2003), 47-51, 67, 77.

Richard J. Clifford and John J. Collins, "Introduction: The Theology of Creation Traditions," 1-15 in Richard J. Clifford and John J. Collins, eds. *Creation in the Biblical Traditions*, (Washington DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1992), 2-3.

Otto Helweg wrote, "To the Hebrews in the desert, God gave the reverberating creation account. It obliterated each of the Egyptian gods. Osiris did not create the universe, God did. Ra does not rule the Sun, God does. The narrative's purpose had much less to do with how God created all things and much more to do with declaring who created all things." Otto J. Helweg, "How Long an Evening and Morning?" *Creation ex Nihilo Technical Journal* 11 (1997): 299.

Clifford and Collins argued that cosmogonies were very meaningful in the ancient Near East. They argued that creation was the defining moment that determined the nature and purpose of reality. Clifford, and Collins, "Introduction: The Theology of Creation Traditions," 1.

It is impossible to determine what the ultimate source may have been behind the Egyptian mythological parallels to Genesis. The Egyptian parallels could have reflected a remnant of truth preserved from an ancient knowledge of the truth that dated back to the flood. The parallels could also reflect Egyptian syncretism. Egypt had always been in contact with the West Semitic world and with the tradition of faith preserved within the West Semitic world.

created. Instead, the earth developed through the successive births of various gods.¹² Moses insisted that Elohim created a physical earth that was only an object. For Moses, the earth was not in any way a god. It was simply Elohim's creation.

In Genesis 1:2, Moses described a time when the earth already existed but was formless and void. God's Spirit moved over the primal waters of creation. This mimicked and refuted the Egyptian claim at Hermopolis that the god Amun brooded over the face of the primal waters, stirred the waters, and caused the first land to rise from the water.¹³ Amun was identified with the wind just as the Hebrew word *ruah* in Genesis 1:2 meant both "wind" and "spirit." A variety of other Egyptian motifs were also attacked by Genesis 1:2. In Egyptian theology, Geb (or Seb) was the lord of the watery abyss. He lived in the watery mass of the sky. So in a sense, Geb hovered over the primal deep. Jan Zandee compared Genesis 1:2 to the creation account at Heliopolis as well. Zandee noted that the creation account at Heliopolis was Atum. He was associated with the *Bnw* bird that hovered over the primal deep. Zandee also compared the darkness over the face of the deep in Genesis 1:2 with the Egyptian concept of *kkw* which was the primal darkness.¹⁴ Moses argued that all of these motifs were incorrect. God's Spirit alone moved over the primal waters forming the earth.

In Genesis 1:3, Moses recorded Elohim's command, "Let there be light!"¹⁵ Moses noted that this command produced light. All subsequent creation occurred by the Word of Elohim. In several Egyptian creation motifs, the gods Ptah and Atum created things by wishing in their hearts and speaking a word with their mouths.¹⁶ The creation account at Hermopolis was based on a similar claim. At Hermopolis, Thoth created the world with a word from his mouth. Thoth was the Egyptian god of Wisdom.¹⁷ To understand the importance of this, remember that Egypt's religious literature was claimed to be "the words of the god." This religious literature was, then, of the same character and authority as the creative word that had formed the earth. Moses wrote Genesis as the beginning of the greater Word of God. As such, Genesis shared the authority of Elohim's creative Word itself. Moses also stressed that Yahweh Elohim and He alone had the power and authority to speak such a creative word.¹⁸

In Genesis 1:5, Moses stated that there was evening and morning, one "day." Subsequent creation occurred in a series of six "days," and Yahweh rested on the seventh "day." The

¹²

Rudolf Anthes, "Egyptian Theology in the Third Millennium B.C." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 18 (1959): 172.

¹³ E. O. James, *The Tree of Life*, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966), 131. A. H. Sayce, "The Egyptian Background of Genesis 1," 419-23 in *Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith*, (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1932), 421.

¹⁴ Jan Zandee, "Egyptological Commentary on the Old Testament," 269-81 in M. A. Beek, ed., *Travels in the World of the Old Testament*, (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974), 270.

¹⁵ It is very unlikely that Gen. 1-11 recorded the exact words used by God during creation or the exact words spoken in Eden. Adam and Eve walked in the Garden anywhere from 2500 to 8500 years before Moses was born depending on the date assigned to Eden. Languages change rapidly over time. Moses expressed Adam's words in the language of his own day. The words that Moses recorded in the creation account were an accurate depiction of the content of Adam's words but probably not Adam's words *per se*. So it is appropriate to look for the 2nd millennium BC theological meaning of the vocabulary that Moses chose to use to describe creation.

¹⁶ James P. Allen, *Genesis in Egypt: The Philosophy of Ancient Egyptian Creation Accounts*, (New York: Yale Egyptological Seminar, 1988), 36-47. Gerhard Hasel argued that creation through a spoken word was unknown in Mesopotamia but it was an important motif in Egypt. Hasel suggested that the spoken word in Egyptian texts made things appear that had already existed as potentials in previously created matter. Hasel suggested that Genesis differed from the Egyptian creation accounts in this regard. In Genesis, the spoken word was a truly creative force. Gerhard F. Hasel, "The Polemical Nature of the Genesis Cosmology," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 46 (1974): 90.

¹⁷ Ragnhild B. Finnestad, "Ptah, Creator of the Gods," *Numen* 23 (1978): 81, 104-06. James, *The Tree of Life*, 131.

¹⁸ The motif of God's "Word" was also an ancient West Semitic idea. Dahood argued that Ebla contained a temple of the "Word," and Ugarit worshiped a minor deity called the "Voice." Mitchell Dahood, "The Minor Prophets and Ebla," 47-67 in Carol L. Meyers and M. O'Conner, eds. *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth*, (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 51. There has been some debate about whether *Dabir* should be understood as the Word or the plague. Many of Dahood's suggestions about the Ebla texts are no longer widely accepted.

evangelical world has understood these creation "days" in a great many ways.¹⁹ Creation "days" were important in the ancient Near East. The whole ancient world structured time in 7 day weeks that were based on the four phases of the 28 day lunar month. Egypt also reflected rather loosely the idea of a week in its creation accounts. The "Eye of Horus" was formed in six days.²⁰ The theology of Heliopolis celebrated a festival on the seventh day in honor of its creation.²¹ Another Egyptian motif depicted the god Ptah "resting" after he had created the world by the word of his mouth.²² Moses grounded the seven day week in Elohim's creative activity instead of either the moon's phases or the Egyptian creation motifs.²³

Perhaps the most useful Egyptian parallel to the Genesis creation "days" can be seen in the creation account from Hermopolis. This creation account was also structured in creation "days." The similarity between Genesis 1 and the Hermopolis cosmology was suggested as early as 1932 by A. H. Sayce.²⁴ The first four creation days at Hermopolis echoed the first four creative "days" in Genesis. In the first creative "day" at Hermopolis, the chaotic deep was formed. In the second "day," god's "breath" moved over the primal waters of the great deep. In the third creative "day," light was created. Then in the fourth creative "day," the primeval hill rose above the waters of the great deep. While these similarities are quite striking, it is important not to oversimplify the relationship between the Egyptian motifs and the Genesis creation account. There were importance differences between them as well. Perhaps the most important fact was that the Israelites could not accept both Moses' creation accounts in Genesis 1-3 and the Egyptian creation accounts. At heart, they were not compatible.

In Genesis 1:26, Moses claimed that Elohim had made man in His image.²⁵ In Egypt, the "image" motif was represented in at least two ways. First, it appeared in a wisdom text called *The Instruction of Merikare*. This text claimed that every man had been formed from a god's body and was the image of a god. This wisdom text was written before Abraham was born. It was very ancient in Moses' day. It is hard to evaluate how well known and influential it still was, although the text clearly was still in use. The only surviving copy of *The Instruction of Merikare* was produced during the Egyptian 19th Dynasty.²⁶ By the 19th Dynasty, the "image of god" motif in Egypt was no longer used to describe common people. The great "image of god" was now Egypt's

¹⁹

The "24 Hour Day View" has argued that all of creation occurred within six 24 hour days. The "Day Age View" has argued that creation occurred in six very long time periods. The "Gap Theory" has held that there was a huge chronological gap between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2. The "old earth" was formed in that "gap." The "Re-creation View" has held that the old earth was destroyed in God's judgment. It was then re-created in six 24 hour periods. The "Local Creation View" has held that the earth was very old, but Palestine was created in six 24 hour periods. The "Creation Revelation View" has suggested that the creation of the old earth was revealed to Moses in six 24 hour periods. A wide variety of other perspectives have also been defended, including attempts to interpret the creation accounts as myth instead of history.

²⁰ The "Eye of Horus" was a key Egyptian motif. It was used in several different ways.

Coffin Spell 674 described the deceased celebrating the 6th day and 7th day festivals in god's presence. The same festivals are described in Coffin Spells 61 and 1004. R. O. Faulkner, *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts*, 3 vols. (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1977), II: 243.

²¹ Finnestad, "Ptah, Creator of the Gods," 84, 97.

The link between Gen. 1 and the Sabbath was recognized by critical authors like Brandon, Westerman, and Kapelrud. See the discussion in Brett, "Motives and Intentions in Genesis 1," 6-7.

²⁴ A. H. Sayce, "The Egyptian Background of Genesis 1," 419-423 in *Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith*, (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1932), 421.

²⁵

The idea that man was God's image reflected rather common ancient Near Eastern motifs. For a later Assyrian example, see W. Randall Gar, "Image and Likeness in the Inscription from Tell Fakhariyeh," *Israel Exploration Journal* 50 (2000): 227-234. For a survey of Biblical material related to the image of God motif, see Nathan Jastram, "Man as Male and Female: Created in the Image of God," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 68:1 (2004): 5-96.

²⁶ If an 18th Dynasty exodus is accepted, this was two centuries after the exodus. If a 19th Dynasty exodus is defended, this was roughly the Mosaic Age. This would make the text contemporary with Moses.

Pharaoh who claimed to be the god Horus incarnate and the living image of god.²⁷ Pharaoh's claim to god's image was a claim to personal divinity. It is less clear whether the "image of god" motif was already being used as a claim to divinity in the Mosaic Age. Moses stressed that every man was created in Elohim's image and that no man was in any way divine.

3) YAHWEH OR KHNUM?

In Genesis 2:7, Moses recorded that Yahweh Elohim had formed Adam from the dust of the ground and had breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. Cyrus Gordon noted that the Hebrew verb *yatsar*, "formed," in Genesis 2:7 came from the same root as the Hebrew word for "potter." In the Egyptian texts, men were formed from clay on the wheel of the potter god Khnum who gave man's nostrils the breath of life.²⁸ Morschauser argued that this motif was also reflected in the Pentateuch in Exodus 1:16.²⁹ So Moses may have been arguing that Adam was formed from clay by Yahweh instead of the Egyptian potter god Khnum.

The man created by Yahweh Elohim was named Adam. This name was closely related to the Hebrew word for "ground" since Adam was taken from the ground.³⁰ The name Adam was also similar to the name of the Egyptian primordial god Atum.³¹ The god Atum was the father of the gods. Rudolf Anthes noted that the god Atum completed in himself all of the other gods and was preserved in the form of a man. While Atum was a god, he resembled in some ways the first man ever to exist.³² Moses argued that the first man was not in any way divine. He was simply a man created by Yahweh Elohim.

In 1974, Gerhard Hasel noted that Egyptologists have stressed the great differences between Genesis and the Egyptian creation accounts. Egyptologists have noted that Genesis did not express the typical Egyptian fear of a return to chaos. Genesis saw creation as a linear event instead of a cyclical event. The Egyptian accounts saw creation as a primordial event that was constantly being repeated. Hasel noted that Egyptologists have also argued that the events in Genesis 1 were depicted in generally non-mythical ways while the Egyptian creation accounts were heavily mythological. Egyptian creation accounts often depicted the successive births of the most important Egyptian gods. Egyptologists have argued that when the primal deep and the sky were created in the Egyptian texts, the primal gods like Geb and Nun appeared. These in turn gave birth to high gods like Osiris and Horus. In the Genesis creation accounts, Yahweh simply formed earth, sky, and sea. Yahweh did not give birth to other deities. He alone was God. Yahweh just made things that He controlled and owned. Hasel noted that these differences suggest to many Egyptologists that the Genesis account should not be associated with the Egyptian creation

²⁷

James Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt: Historical Documents*, 5 vols. (New York: Russell & Russell, 1962 reprint), III: 121, 181.

²⁸

The god Khnum was depicted as extending the Ankh sign of life to the nostrils of the men who he had just formed on his potter's wheel. Cyrus Gordon, "Khnum and EI," *Egyptological Studies* 28 (1982): 204-06.

Morschauser argued that the word translated as "birthstool" in Ex. 1:16 actually meant "potter's wheel" and that this was a term for pregnancy. Scott Morschauser, "Potter's Wheels and Pregnancies: A Note on Exodus 1:16," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 (2003): 731-33.

³⁰

The name Adam is also closely related to the Old Testament name "Edom" which refers to the barren red lands southeast of Palestine. Hans Goedicke noted that Eve was formed from Adam's "rib." He argued that the Egyptian words for "rib" and "clay" were homophones that were sometimes confused in the Egyptian texts. He argued that Eve was actually formed from Adam's "clay" instead of his "rib." Hans Goedicke, "Adam's Rib," 73-6 in *Biblical Studies Presented to Samuel Wry*, (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1985).

³¹

In ancient Near Eastern languages, the letter *d* and *t* are very closely related. For example, the Hebrew letter *taw* can be pronounced as either a *d* or a *t* depending on the nature of the word in which it appears.

³²

Anthes, "Egyptian Theology in the Third Millennium B.C." 173-77, 209.

accounts in any way.³³ In reply, it could be noted that these differences are exactly what should be expected if the Genesis creation account was intended as a polemical argument against the Egyptian creation accounts.

The significance of the Egyptian creation accounts for the interpretation of Genesis 1-3 has also been supported in the academic community.³⁴ As early as 1932, A. H. Sayce discussed the similarities between creation accounts in Egypt and Genesis 1-3.³⁵ His position was supported and amplified in 1983 by James Hoffmeier.³⁶ In 1989, Clark Pinnock argued that Genesis 1 was an antimyth intended to counter errors contained in the creation myths of the ancient Near East.³⁷ In 1991, John Currid supported authors like A. S. Yahuda who had seen an Egyptian influence in the Genesis creation accounts. Currid noted that this perspective has not gained wide acceptance in the academic world. He argued that there was a close relationship between the Genesis creation account and Egyptian cosmogony. Currid suggested that this similarity could be seen in thematic parallels, lexical parallels, and philological parallels. He argued that the parallels between Genesis and Egyptian thought are much closer than parallels between Genesis and Mesopotamian thought.³⁸

4) CREATION AND THE HYKSOS

If the Genesis creation account was fundamentally a polemical argument against Egyptian theology, it was not exclusively an attack on Egypt's religious system. Just as Israel's Red Sea crossing was in some ways a polemic against Hyksos religion, the Genesis creation account also confronted both East and West Semitic religious traditions. In the East Semitic tradition, creation began in a great battle with the *tehom* which was both a deity and the great primal abyss.³⁹ The later Canaanite conflicts between Baal and Yam have often been seen as a development from this earlier motif although the Canaanite texts at Ugarit did not contain a clear and detailed creation account. Creation was far less an issue for Baal worship than for traditional Egyptian theology. In Canaanite theology, Baal was involved in great conflicts including his battles with Yam, "the sea," and Mot, "death." Moses' statement in Genesis 1:2 has often been taken in this context. God's Spirit floated above the surface of the *tehom* which was the "deep." In Genesis

³³

Hasel, "The Polemical Nature of the Genesis Cosmology," 84-5. The Genesis creation account was not unique in refuting ancient Near Eastern mythology this way. The book of Job also drew on ancient Near Eastern imagery to write a theological argument. This can be seen in Job 38:16-18; 38:31-33, and 38:37.

³⁴Emmrich also suggested a possible polemical purpose behind Gen. 2:16. He noted that Palestine was often described with Eden imagery later in the Old Testament. He noted that Eden imagery appeared in Num. 24:5-7, Deut. 33:13-16, I Kngs. 5:5, Mic. 4:4, Ezek. 36:33f., Zech. 3:10, and other passages. Emmrich suggested that the Garden of Eden account may have taught Israel a valuable lesson. They may have learned that rebellion would drive them from the land, just as it had driven Adam from paradise. Martin Emmrich, "The Temptation Narrative of Genesis 3:1-6: A Prelude to the Pentateuch and the History of Israel," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 73 (2001): 4-5.

³⁵Sayce, "The Egyptian Background of Genesis 1," 419-23.

³⁶James Hoffmeier, "Some Thoughts on Genesis 1 & 2," *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 15 (1983): 39-49.

³⁷Clark H. Pinnock, "Climbing Out of a Swamp: The Evangelical Struggle to Understand the Creation Texts," *Interpretation* 43 (1989): 149.

³⁸John D. Currid, "An Examination of the Egyptian Background of the Genesis Cosmogony," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 35 (1991): 18-40.

³⁹The East Semitic culture was geographically rather distant from the wilderness generation. Its potential theological significance may be demonstrated by the fact that a cuneiform text of Adapa was found in Egypt from the 14th century BC. If Israel left Egypt during the 18th Dynasty, this would have been shortly after Joshua's conquest of Palestine. The presence of Adapa in Egypt suggested that East Semitic motifs may not have been beyond the cultural horizon of the wilderness community. For parallels between Adapa and Adam in the Genesis text, see William H. Shea, "Adam in Ancient Mesopotamian Traditions," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 15 (1977): 27-8. Gerhard F. Hasel, "The Significance of the Cosmogony in Genesis 1 in Relation to Ancient Near Eastern Parallels," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 10 (1972): 4-7.

1:2, Moses argued that the *tehom* was simply a physical creation of God and that it was completely under His control. Moses' claim in Genesis 1:10 has also gained academic interest in this context. In Genesis 1:10, Elohim gathered the waters that He had created and called them *yameim*, "the seas." Moses' God did not have to fight a great battle against the sea God Yam. Instead, Moses' God created the sea and named it. By doing so, God determined its nature and declared it to be water instead of a deity.⁴⁰

The challenge for conservative exegetes of Genesis is to find a reading of the text that affirms the texts inherent authority and inerrancy while avoiding the defense of a flat earth. That has not proven to be an easy task. Quite a few old earth interpretations of Genesis 1-11 have been proposed, but most fail the tests of exegesis, history, and science. One struggle for the church in the next decade will be to find an interpretation of Genesis that is true both to the Word and to the hard evidence of the world as it is. The answer to this quandary may well arise through a more detailed study of theological beliefs in the wilderness community for which Genesis was originally written.

B) EDEN IN A COVENANT OR TREATY CONTEXT

One of Moses' central concerns was with the formation of the sovereign King Yahweh's vassal treaty with Israel. Moses included treaty or covenant content in his record of God's revelation on Sinai. After writing Genesis, Moses would go on to write a formal treaty document in the book of Deuteronomy.⁴¹ When Moses wrote Genesis, he traced out in it covenant or treaty motifs, and he grounded Yahweh's covenant in the origin of the human race itself. When searching for covenant or treaty content in the opening chapters of Genesis, it is important to realize that Adam and Eve did not speak Biblical Hebrew in the Garden of Eden. Languages have always changed rapidly over time. Even if a 4004 BC creation were defended, Adam would have lived 2500 years before Moses wrote Genesis. Many evangelicals today date the Garden of Eden around 10,000 BC to avoid the serious historical problems created by a 4004 BC creation date. If the garden was occupied that early, Adam would have lived 8,500 years before Moses. Linguistic continuity over that great a span was nearly impossible. Under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, Moses wrote Genesis 1-11 in the language of his own day. Since that was true, Moses' choice of vocabulary in Genesis 1-11 reflected the theological issues that he perceived in the Garden of Eden account. Moses perceived the theological issues in Eden at least partly as covenant or treaty issues. As will be discussed in more detail later, Moses made extensive use of the international treaty form in writing the Pentateuch. Moses probably learned this treaty form when he was educated in the Egyptian court.⁴²

1) CREATION AND TREATY TERMS

40

Hvidberg argued that Genesis 1 was "undoubtedly" connected in some way with Canaanite religion. Fleming Hvidberg, "The Canaanite Background of Gen. I-III," *Vetus Testamentum* 10 (1960): 286. Cassuto argued that the "stones of fire" in Eden in Ezek. 28:14 were analogous to the "stones of lightning" associated with Baal at Ugarit. Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, 2 vols. (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961), 80.

41
Moses may not have been the only author using vassal treaty imagery in a religious context. Fensham argued that vassal treaty imagery was an important element in the *KRT* epic at Ugarit. F. Charles Fensham, "Notes on Treaty Terminology in Ugaritic Epics," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 11 (1979): 265-74.

42
A note by Goelet could be used to argue against this claim. He commented on the treaty between Rameses II and the Hittites. He noted that the hieroglyphic language used in the treaty was quite awkward. He suggested that treaties were essentially foreign to the Egyptians. If Goelet was right, it may be fair to question whether Moses would have learned the treaty pattern in Egypt's court. Ogden Goelet Jr. and Baruch A. Levine, "Making Peace in Heaven and on Earth: Religious and Legal Aspects of the Treaty between Rameses II and Hattushili III," 252-99 in Meir Lubetski, et al, eds. *Boundaries of the Ancient Near Eastern World*, (JSOT, 1998), 257.

To understand the creation account, it is important to recognize that 2nd millennium BC international treaties used common West Semitic words in a unique way.⁴³ Several West Semitic words became technical treaty terms with specific covenant or treaty content when used in a covenant context. These words included love, hate, live, die, good, evil, and know. Moses permeated the Garden of Eden account with technical treaty vocabulary to teach the covenantal character of the Eden account. While Moses did not use the word "covenant" to describe Adam's relationship with God, Moses depicted Adam as having a relationship with God that resembled a covenant.⁴⁴ Treaty vocabulary in Genesis may first have appeared in Genesis 1-3. The creation account stressed continually that the things created by Yahweh were "good." This may suggest more than the beauty and value of the things created. It may suggest that Yahweh's world was created to be in covenant with the divine sovereign. Treaty vocabulary may have continued in the tree of the "knowledge of good and evil" and the tree of "life" in the Garden of Eden. Genesis 2:17 warned Adam and Eve that they would surely "die" on the day that they ate from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. "Knowledge" was a technical treaty term. The high king "knew" his vassals and was "known" by them. "good" and "evil" referred to life inside and outside of the covenant. In Genesis 4:7, Moses recorded God Himself using "good" in this context in His warning to Cain. When Cain chose "evil" instead, Cain moved outside of God's covenant and was driven from His presence.⁴⁵ So the general context of the Eden trees was a covenantal context.⁴⁶

What may have been the purpose for the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil? The tree provided Adam with an opportunity to choose covenant faithfulness, and to gain from this choice the ability to administer God's kingdom on earth. In the Old Testament as a whole, "knowing good and evil" was often tied to the idea of authority and administration. Before the fall, only God determined the nature of "good and evil."⁴⁷ In later Scriptural passages, the Angel of the Lord remained the One who truly could determine "good and evil."⁴⁸ However, those who administered civil and religious authority in God's name were also able to determine "good and evil" in a more limited way.⁴⁹ In the Old Testament, the specific idea of "knowing good and evil" rarely appeared

43

Ernest W. Nicholson, *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 61-5. W. L. Moran, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 24 (1963): 77-87. D. J. McCarthy, "Notes on the Love of God in Deuteronomy and the Father-Son Relationship between Yahweh and Israel," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 27 (1965): 144-47. H. B. Huffmon and S. B. Parker, "A Further Note on the Treaty Background of Hebrew YADA," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 184 (1966): 36. W. L. Moran, "A Note on the Treaty Terminology of the Sefire Stelas," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 22 (1963): 173-76. M. Fox, "TOB as Covenant Terminology," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 209 (1973): 41. A. R. Millard, "For He is Good," *Tyndale Bulletin* 17 (1966): 115-17.

McCoy argued that Scripture depicted creation as the formation of a covenant relationship between God and all of the earth. McCoy, Charles S. "Creation and Covenant: a Comprehensive Vision for Environmental Ethics," in *Covenant for a New Creation*, (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1991), 213. McCoy's position could be supported by Jer. 33:20 which mentioned God's covenant with the day and night. This interpreted creation as the formation of a covenant.⁴⁵

Kline argued that God's interaction with Cain was a court hearing. Kline argued that God's judicial action against Cain led to the origin of human government. Meredith G. Kline, "Oracular Origin of the State," 132-41 in Gary A. Tuttle, ed. *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor*, (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1978), 137.

⁴⁶ Moses may have used treaty terms as early as Gen. 2:18. This verse noted that it was not "good" for Adam to be alone. This verse might mean that Adam lacked a covenant with someone of his own kind.

In Gen. 1:4, God judged the light to be "good" and separated the "good" light from the darkness. In Gen. 2:18, God declared that Adam's aloneness was not "good," and God acted to change the situation.⁴⁸

⁴⁹ II Sam 14:17.

Lev. 27:12-33; Num. 13:19; II Sam. 19:35; I Kgs. 3:9.

outside of the context of competent administration.⁵⁰ If that usage is read back into Genesis, the basic question at the tree may not have been intellectual knowledge. The issue may have been instead whether Adam and Eve would serve as faithful vassals administering God's authority over His kingdom or reject Yahweh's authority in favor of autonomy. Then "knowing good and evil" in a proper way would have given Adam and Eve the right to administer God's kingdom as vassal rulers. Faithful vassal service would have made them the divinely appointed rulers on earth in place of the demonic usurper. Unfortunately, Adam chose to reject God's authority over His kingdom. Adam became instead the ruler of a human kingdom which would share Satan's revolt against God's authority. As such, Adam and Eve were driven from God's throne room into a barren and cursed earth.⁵¹

Adam and Eve were warned that they would "die" on the day that they ate from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. If "dying" in this context was a technical covenant word, it would mean losing their covenant relationship with God. Adam and Eve "died" by eating from the tree because they lost their status as faithful vassal rulers of the earth under the sovereign control of Yahweh. Adam and Eve were then restored to "life" before God when God came to them in judgment and grace, calling for repentance, and instituting both sacrifice and promise. The Tree of Life may also reflect treaty terminology.⁵² The word "life" in the name "Tree of Life" was a Hebrew masculine plural noun. It is possible to translate this noun into English with the singular noun "life."⁵³ In a few passages, the noun does appear in a plural form with an apparently singular meaning. Yet in most instances, this masculine plural noun requires a plural meaning. So it is at least possible to translate the name in Genesis as "The Tree of Lives."⁵⁴ The "Living Ones" could then be Adam and Eve who Moses called "living souls" in Genesis 2:7. What then would the Tree of the Living Ones provide Adam and Eve? It probably would not provide eternal physical life. The Hebrew word translated "forever" in Genesis 3:22 was *l'olam*. This word carried the idea of "for a very long time." Hebrew had no word for "eternity" per se. Even without continuing to eat from their tree, Adam and Eve would live for nearly 1,000 years after this time. A lengthened life would give them relatively little more than they already had. It might be that the "life" given by Adam's tree could have been the administration of God's sanctuary in Eden⁵⁵ seized by sinful means. In the future, Adam and those who imitated his repentance would "live" in faith waiting as sojourners and wanderers for Yahweh to bring them back to His earthly sanctuary in the eschaton. Their lives as vassals of Yahweh until that time would be a "now and not yet" service to the High King lived out in earthly sanctuaries that were a shadow of the heavenly reality first seen in Eden.

2) TECHNICAL TREATY VOCABULARY LATER IN GENESIS

⁵⁰

Clark argued that "knowing good and evil" was a legal phrase indicating the ability to make a decision in court. Clark associated the tree of knowledge with the material in Genesis and compared this passage to similar claims for Solomon. Clark argued that Adam and Solomon both had judicial authority. However, Adam seized his authority by force while Solomon received his authority as a gift from God. W. Malcolm Clark, "A Legal Background to the Yahwist's Use of 'Good and Evil' in Genesis 2-3," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 269.

It is striking that God cursed the earth but not Adam. The lack of a righteous administrator led to a cursed land. It is also striking that God's decree in Gen. 3:16 established the future administration of the human race. This was consistent with the theme of righteous administration in the Eden account.

⁵²

While the Tree of Knowledge has received little academic notice, the Tree of Life has received endless discussion. A number of ancient Near Eastern texts mention either plants of life or the water of life. See: Faulkner's Pyramid Text Utterance 758. R. O. Faulkner, *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 318. For a survey of the discussion, see Paul Watson, "The Tree of Life," *Restoration Quarterly* 23 (1980): 232-38. Howard N. Wallace, *The Eden Narrative*, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 101-41. Helmer Ringgren, "Israel's Place among the Religions of the Ancient Near East," 1-8 in *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel*, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972).

⁵³

In Gen. 1-3, "life" appears in both singular and plural forms. It is not always clear why the noun takes the form that it does.

⁵⁴

If translated this way, the Tree of the Living Ones may also have been the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil

⁵⁵

For a discussion of Eden as a sanctuary, see Gordon J. Wenham, "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story," 399-404 in Richard S. Hess and David Toshio Tsumura, eds. *"I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood": Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11*. (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994).

After the creation account, Moses continued to use treaty vocabulary in Genesis. "Love" and "hate" were used in a technical sense in Genesis 26:27-28. In verse 27, Isaac asked Abimelech why he had come since Abimelech "hated" him. Then in verse 28, Isaac offered to form a covenant or treaty with him. Abimelech had been in a treaty relationship with the patriarchs before this time. The treaty had fallen apart and Abimelech now "hated" Isaac. So a new treaty was formed. The same idea might stand behind the blessing and cursing in Genesis 22:17 and 24:60. Abraham and Rebekah were promised dominance over those who opposed them. The specific promise was that they would possess the gate of those who "hated" them. It would be easy to see "hating" in this context as a lack of covenant or treaty relationship.

Scripture later described God's relationship with the patriarchs in similar terms. Both Malachi 1:1-3 and Romans 9:13 stressed the God had "loved" Jacob and "hated" Esau. "Love" and "hate" in these passages spoke of membership in the covenant instead of an emotion experienced by God. It is also possible that "hate" had a similar meaning in Genesis 29:31-33. These verses claim that Leah was "hated" by Jacob. That seems an unlikely emotion for the patriarchal family. So both the New American Standard version and the New International version of the Bible softened the word to "unloved," or "not loved," instead of "hated." It would seem more accurate to interpret "hate" in Genesis 29 as a claim that Jacob was not fulfilling his marriage covenant responsibilities toward her. The lack of a living marriage relationship between Jacob and Leah may be implied as well by Genesis 44:27. In this rather surprising verse, Jacob wailed that his wife had only given birth to two sons. This implied that Jacob regarded only Rachel as his true wife. If Jacob regarded his marriage with Leah as being somehow less valid, he had broken his marriage covenant with her and thus "hated" her.⁵⁶

The words "live" and "die" in Genesis seem to have this technical meaning several times. For example, the word "live" appeared in this technical sense in Genesis 17:18. In this verse, Isaac had not yet been born. God promised Abraham that Sarah would bear a son. Abraham responded, "Oh that Ishmael might live before Thee!" Abraham was not asking that Ishmael should have a prolonged physical life. Abraham was saying, "Oh that Ishmael might be the promised child of the covenant!" "Live" in this context was clearly membership in God's covenant community and perhaps leadership of it.⁵⁷

3) YAHWEH'S COVENANT LAWSUIT

Another aspect of the treaty pattern was the motif of a covenant lawsuit. When vassals violated their treaty or covenant, their sovereign brought them into court and charged them with covenant violation. Moses included in Genesis 1-11 historical details that resembled the covenant trial or lawsuit pattern.⁵⁸ Meredith Kline noted that Form Critical analysis has seen a legal-court pattern in both Genesis 3 and 4. Kline suggested that God first brought Adam into court for his rebellion in the Garden of Eden. God summoned Adam to trial in Genesis 3:9. God questioned the witnesses in Genesis 3:9-13. It is interesting that God did not question Satan. Yahweh then

⁵⁶

⁵⁷ In Mal. 2:14, marriage was later declared to be a covenant relationship.

⁵⁸ The same idea can be seen in passages like Hos. 13:1-2. Ephraim did wrong through Baal and "died." Consequently, they continued to make more idols and increased their sin. Death in this context was a loss of vassal obedience. In Deut. 33:6, Moses gave his blessing to the tribe of Reuben. Moses declared simply, "May Reuben live and not die." In the context of Gen. 35:22 and 49:3-4, this was a call for vassal faithfulness.

Wright argued that the treaty lawsuit pattern also appeared later in the Song of Moses recorded in Deuteronomy 32. Wright argued that Deut. 32:1-6 introduced the lawsuit by calling heaven and earth to court. This section also declared Yahweh's faithfulness and Israel's lack of treaty faithfulness. Deut. 32:7-14 declared God's mighty acts. Deut. 32:15-18 gave God's indictment against His people. Deut. 32:19-29 declared God's sentence against His people. Wright suggested that the rest of the chapter turned to a promise of future salvation for Israel. Wright claimed that the Song of Moses was written in the 11th century BC. G. Ernest Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," 26-67 in Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson, eds. *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962), 34-6. Joseph Blenkinsopp argued that Genesis 18-19 depicted a judicial process used against Sodom and Gomorrah. Joseph Blenkinsopp, "The Judge of All the Earth: Theodicy in the Midrash of Genesis 18:22-33," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 42 (1989): 146.

announced His verdict and sentence in Genesis 3:14-24. Yahweh's sentence decreed that the serpent would be cursed. It would crawl on his belly and eat dust all of its life. This was a prophecy that pointed down through the years to the eschaton. Isaiah 65:25 promised that in the eschaton, the lion would eat straw like an ox, while dust would still be the serpent's food.⁵⁹ Neither would harm other creatures because the "knowledge" of the Yahweh would fill the earth as waters filled the sea. So a restoration of covenant "knowledge" would restore the ideal conditions of Eden. This may suggest a continuity of treaty terminology from Genesis to Isaiah.

Moses noted that part of Yahweh's sentence included His decree in Genesis 3:15 against the demonic presence within the serpent. Passages like Revelation 20:2 identified this ancient Serpent as Satan, the devil, and the ancient accuser of God and man. Genesis 3:15 promised that Satan would be defeated in the future. A promised descendant of Adam and Eve would one day crush the Serpent's head while driving its poisonous fangs into His own heel.⁶⁰ So the promised Son would give up His own life in order to defeat the Serpent.⁶¹

Kline suggested that Yahweh also brought Cain into court for the murder of his brother. Kline argued that the trial motif can be seen in Genesis 4:9-15. Cain complained that he would be "hidden from God's face" because of God's judgment. Kline suggested that Cain was complaining that he would be cut off from God's judicial protection. Kline argued that Cain had wanted the protection that would come from God's presence. Cain feared that without God's judicial protection, he would be killed as he had killed Able.⁶²

⁵⁹

This judgment on the serpent had a parallel in the pain that would accompany child birth for the woman. It might also have been paralleled in a loss of divine glory by Adam and Eve. Early Christian authors believe that Adam and Eve had been filled with God's glory in the garden because they walked in God's presence. They lost this glory at the fall and realized that they were naked. While this idea is speculation, it is appealing. Alexander Colitzin mentioned this tradition among early Syrian Christians. Alexander Golitzin, "Recovering the 'Glory of Adam': 'Divine Light' Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Ascetical Literature of Fourth-Century Syro-Mesopotamia," in James R. Davila, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity*, (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 285-86.

⁶⁰ Ps. 91:11-13 alluded to this text and understood the serpent as a cobra. Even Satan understood this passage as a prophecy of Jesus in Matt. 4:6.

Anne Gardner traced how the promise of eternal life grew from Gen. 3:15 to Dan. 12:1-2. Anne E. Gardner, "The Way to Eternal Life in Dan 12:1e-2 or How to Reverse the Death Curse of Genesis 3," *Australian Biblical Review* 40 (1992): 1-17.

⁶² Kline, "Oracular Origin of the State," 133.