

Andrews University

## Digital Commons @ Andrews University

---

Master's Theses

Graduate Research

---

2019

### A Narrative Analysis of Genesis 3:1-7 and the Theological Significance of the Serpent

Milton Gonzalez

Andrews University, [miltong@andrews.edu](mailto:miltong@andrews.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/theses>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Gonzalez, Milton, "A Narrative Analysis of Genesis 3:1-7 and the Theological Significance of the Serpent" (2019). *Master's Theses*. 144.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.32597/theses/144/>

<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/theses/144>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact [repository@andrews.edu](mailto:repository@andrews.edu).

ABSTRACT

A NARRATIVE ANALYSIS OF GENESIS 3:1-7  
AND THE THEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SERPENT

by

Milton Gonzalez

Chair: JoAnn Davidson

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Thesis

Andrews University

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

Title: A NARRATIVE ANALYSIS OF GENESIS 3:1-7 AND THE THEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SERPENT

Name of the researcher: Milton Gonzalez

Name and degree of faculty advisor: JoAnn Davidson, Ph.D.

Date completed: December, 2019

Problem

The Christian tradition of the Fall as it relates to Gen 3 is an interpretive construct that is foreign to the text and its immediate context. While scholars continue to view humanity and its fallen state as the central theme of the narrative, I suggest that such are but second to an even greater narrative—namely, a cosmic conflict between Elohim—the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and the serpent.

## Method

The first chapter of this study considers the traditional view of the temptation narrative (i.e. Gen 3:1-7) as the Fall of Man and suggests that the story of Adam and Eve speak not to the origin of sin and death—i.e. the Fall—but to the debut of the serpent and its shrewdness. The second chapter examines the character introductions of Elohim, Adam and Eve, and the serpent, respectively. The third chapter examines the characterization of the serpent as ערום (Gen 3:1a) followed by an understanding of how the narrator prepares his audience for the masterly dialogue between serpent and woman. This dialogue is analyzed in the fourth chapter with an emphasis on the plausibility of an existing thematic pattern of discourse present in each segment of speech.

## Results

The results of this investigation suggest that the central theme of the temptation narrative is not the Fall of Man but that such is only second to the introduction of the serpent and its shrewdness.

## Conclusion

Though Gen 3:1-7 unequivocally speaks of a real temptation and the failure of humanity to resist that temptation; though ancient interpreters were correct in viewing the story of Adam and Eve as the beginning and commencement of humanity's mortality and human sinfulness; and however theologically significant and relevant these themes are, the Fall is an interpretive construct that remains second—moreover, a consequent—to the greater narrative of a cosmic conflict and nevertheless functions as a byproduct of the serpent's shrewdness.

Andrews University  
Seventh-day Theological Seminary

A NARRATIVE ANALYSIS OF GENESIS 3:1-7  
AND THE THEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SERPENT

A Thesis  
Presented in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Masters of Arts in Religion

by  
Milton Gonzalez

2019

A NARRATIVE ANALYSIS OF GENESIS 3:1-7  
AND THE THEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SERPENT

A thesis  
presented in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree  
Masters of Arts

by

Milton Gonzalez

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

---

JoAnn Davidson, Ph.D., Chair

---

Oliver Glanz, Ph.D.

---

Date Approved

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Purpose.....	5
Methodology.....	5
Limitations.....	7
2. CHARACTER INTRODUCTION.....	8
Introduction.....	8
Genesis 1:1 and the Introduction of Elohim as Character.....	9
Introduction of Adam and Eve as Character.....	12
Genesis 3:1 and the Introduction of the Serpent as Character.....	14
Conclusion.....	16
3. STAGE PREPARATION.....	18
Introduction.....	18
ערום and the Characterization of the Serpent.....	19
Setting the Stage for Gen 3:1b-5.....	22
4. A DISCOURSE OF DISCLOSURES.....	25
Introduction.....	25
The Serpent: Its Presence in Gen 2:16-17.....	25
Eve: “Neither Shall You Touch It”.....	27
The Serpent: As Antagonist.....	29
The Serpent: One Who Holds Relational Knowledge of Elohim.....	31
The Serpent: Point of Origin of Fallen Human History.....	33
CONCLUSION.....	35
Appendix	
A. TEXTUAL ANALYSIS: GENESIS 1.....	37
B. TEXTUAL ANALYSIS: GENESIS 3.....	43

BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... 48



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The commencement of the Second Temple period marked the dawn of a new era with regard to Scripture and its interpretation. An apparent distinctive mode of interpreting biblical texts characterized the exegetical development of the postexilic period and gave way to the predominance of interpretive traditions that ultimately shaped the theological perspective of succeeding generations. To such influential traditions Christianity was of no exception. Remnants of these ancient interpretations continue to form an integral part of Christian tradition. Their establishment render them the framework from which biblical scholars tend to approach pivotal texts such as the story of Adam and Eve and thus engage in an understanding of its narrative.

From the outset of the retelling of the Genesis account, the renaissance of its exegetical interest fostered philosophical inquiries that consequently shaped the premise of a fall<sup>1</sup> with regard to the story of Adam and Eve. Questions regarding humanity and its fallen condition led ancient interpreters to view the biblical text of Gen 3 as one that speaks to the origins of human mortality and human sinfulness.<sup>2</sup> Their interpretation

---

<sup>1</sup> When I speak of a fall, I refer to a “falling away” or a departure from the ideal of and for humanity depicted by Creation and the Garden of Eden narrative (Gen 2) and thereafter lost according to the biblical story of Adam and Eve (Gen 3).

<sup>2</sup> Ancient interpreters of the Judaic period saw the story of Adam and Eve as the fall of humanity in the sense that human mortality and human sinfulness entered the world through their apparent disobedience of God’s command (Gen 2:17). Though mortality was the consequent of the divine punishment decreed specifically to Adam and Eve, their descendants also shared in this mortality due to an

served as an influential framework from which the meaning and significance of the text was understood and thus maintained an authoritative standing throughout first century Judaism. It was not until thereafter that Christian tradition retained its inheritance of these ancient interpretations of human mortality and human sinfulness and encapsulated them within the doctrinal premise of “the Fall” with regard to Adam and Eve and the biblical text (i.e. Gen 3).

Scholars to date continue in the interpretive tradition. The conception of the Fall as the identifying factor of the biblical narrative is of commonplace within systematic theology and OT scholarship. Though its significance is of unequivocal importance with regard to the story of Adam and Eve and remains imperative to its interrelatedness to Christian doctrine<sup>3</sup>, the tradition of the Fall nevertheless remains a construct of interpretation that is foreign to the immediate context of Gen 3.<sup>4</sup> Its apparent emphasis on the post-Eden human condition and the fallen state of the created world inaccurately render sin and death the subject matter of the text.<sup>5</sup> To state that the narrative speaks not

---

inherited state of sinfulness that seemingly originated with or directly stemmed from Adam and Eve. This interpretation answered possible questions interpreters had regarding why humans were mortal if mortality was specifically decreed to Adam and Eve alone, since they were the ones who originally disobeyed the divine command and not their descendants. See: James L. Kugel, *The Bible as It Was* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1997), 67-72.

<sup>3</sup> By Christian doctrine I refer to the systematic beliefs of Christianity and how the conception of the Fall is intertwined with these doctrinal beliefs.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. James Barr, *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1992), ix; Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, trans. John J. Scullion S.J. (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1974), 276; Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis* (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1982), 41.

<sup>5</sup> Sin and death are the primary consequences of the apparent fall of Adam and Eve. Their entrance into the world unequivocally marred God’s creation and henceforth constitute the reality of the present fallen world that humanity currently lives in. Since the interpretive tradition of the Fall encapsulates the conceptions of sin and death and functions as the identifying factor of the story of Adam and Eve, sin and death—by default—are rendered the subject matter of the biblical narrative that hence leads into the subsequent narrative of Redemptive history.

of a fall is to indeed ignore that the creation account of Adam and Eve (Gen 2) is intrinsically tied to the subsequent scriptural narrative of human history.<sup>6</sup> However, to state that the text speaks to the Fall is to violate the integrity of the text (Gen 3) as a single literary unit and nevertheless discard its immediate context.

In his book *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality*, James Barr claimed that “Old Testament scholars have long known that the reading of the story [of Adam and Eve] as the ‘Fall of Man’ in the traditional sense, though hallowed by St. Paul’s use of it, cannot stand up to examination through a close reading of the text.”<sup>7</sup> He asserted that scholars “have not succeeded in formulating a general picture of the purpose and impact of the story which could rival the traditional one and could carry an equal force or similar relevance over so wide a range of biblical materials and theological considerations.”<sup>8</sup> While this thesis does not deny the notion of a fall as an indirect implication conveyed by the canonical text, I suggest that to the latter of Barr’s claim the perception of a cosmic conflict motif present in the narrative can do much to fulfill that need.

In his article *Ancient Near Eastern Mythography as It Relates to Historiography in the Hebrew Bible: Genesis 3 and the Cosmic Conflict*, Richard Averbeck argues that scholars “have failed to take seriously the ancient Near Eastern Israelite awareness of

---

<sup>6</sup> Wayne Grudem notes that “the history of the human race as presented in Scripture is primarily a history of man in a state of sin and rebellion against God and of God’s plan of redemption to bring them back to himself.” Wayne A. Grudem, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 490. It would be illogical and unreasonable to conclude that such history commenced at some point of reference outside of Genesis 3, which is preceded by the immediate creation narrative of Genesis 2.

<sup>7</sup> Barr, ix. For a response to this claim defending the Pauline usage of the tradition, see: John Collins, “What Happened to Adam and Eve?” *Prebyterion* 27/1 (2001): 12-44. For a response to this claim defending the traditional conception of a fall, see: Terrence E. Frethiem, “Is Genesis 3 a Fall Story?” *Word & World* 16/2 (1994):144-53

<sup>8</sup> Barr, ix.

cosmic battle mythology as the conceptual world for reading or hearing Genesis 3 in that day.”<sup>9</sup> Accordingly, Averbeck draws attention to the “parallels between poetic texts in the Hebrew Bible and the mythological ideas and motifs expressed in the Ugaritic Baal myth” which demonstrate that “the theme of a cosmic battle between God and the serpentine monster bent on evil and destruction was alive and well in ancient Israel.”<sup>10</sup> Such an observation allows for the plausibility that ancient Israel likely interpreted the serpent of Gen 3 as “the archenemy of Yahweh and the people of God.”<sup>11</sup> From this point of view, Gen 3 “would have been the very beginning of a cosmic battle that [ancient Israel] were feeling the effects of in their own personal experience and their national history.”<sup>12</sup> Averbeck’s contribution accordingly advocates for the necessity of scholarship to take seriously (1) the cosmic conflict motif prevalent throughout ancient Near Eastern mythology and (2) how such consequently formed part of the cognitive environment of ancient Israel; and, moreover, determined their understanding of the Genesis account and their interpretation of the serpent and its identity.

This thesis acknowledges that scholars have recently begun to take notice of the cosmic conflict motif as such relates to Gen 3 and hence seeks to contribute to the academic discussion. Approaching the text from a narrative-theological perspective, I

---

<sup>9</sup> Richard Averbeck, “Ancient Near Eastern Mythography as It Relates to Historiography in the Hebrew Bible: Genesis 3 and the Cosmic Conflict” in *The Future of Biblical Archaeology: Reassessing Methodologies and Assumptions*, ed. James K. Hoffmeier and Alan Millard (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 355. In context, Averbeck makes this argument based on the complaint scholars have made with regard to their exegetical work imposing elaborate theories about Satan on the text of Genesis 3.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, 351.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, 353.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

propose and suggest that the Adam and Eve story of the temptation narrative (Gen 3:1-7) speaks not to the origin of sin and death—i.e. the Fall—but to the debut of the serpent and its shrewdness. This apparent focus set forth by the narrator himself places the conceptual reality of a fall in its proper sphere and sets the conception of a cosmic conflict at the forefront of the narrative.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The Christian tradition of the Fall as it relates to Gen 3 is an interpretive construct that is foreign to the text and its immediate context. While scholars continue to view humanity and its fallen state as the central theme of the narrative, I suggest that such are but second to an even greater narrative—namely, a cosmic conflict between Elohim—the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and the serpent.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of this thesis is to explore the theological significance of the serpent within the context of the temptation narrative and thereby gain insights concerning its contextual identity and function that will in turn further the plausibility of an already existing cosmic conflict motif present in the text.

### **Methodology**

To arrive at a satisfactory conclusion, this endeavor first requires an examination of character introduction<sup>13</sup> as such pertains to the characters of Elohim, Adam and Eve,

---

<sup>13</sup> Character introduction is composed of two components: (1) Character description and (2) character entrance. Character description deals with the announcement of a character for the first time. How the narrator first describes a character is the primary concern of this first component. Character

and the serpent. Beginning with Gen 1:1, I first examine how Elohim is introduced into the Creation narrative and develop an understanding of what this introduction conveys about Him. This process of first examining a character's introduction followed by a developed understanding of what such an introduction conveys about the character is the means I use to also examine the character introduction of both Adam and Eve and the serpent—respectively. Here, I contrast and compare each introduction with the aim of finding similarities, commonalities, and/or distinctions between characters. This methodology of examining character introduction, in conjunction with the hierarchical structure of the text in which a particular character is found, helps understand and determine the prominence of each character and its place within the narrative of Gen 1-3, respectively.

With the conclusion of this first section, I turn to the third chapter of this thesis which first examines the characterization of the serpent as ערום (Gen 3:1a). I engage with the academic insights of Gordon Wenham, Victor P. Hamilton and Roger N. Whybray due to their relevancy of the subject matter and hence suggest an alternative reading of ערום that is based on the immediate context of the temptation narrative (Gen 3:1-7) and that of Gen 2—i.e. the Eden narrative. To this, an understanding of how the narrator prepares his audience for the consequential dialogue between serpent and woman with specific preliminaries—which includes the characterization of the serpent as ערום, is also introduced and considered.

---

entrance, on the other hand, deals with the scene or set of circumstances surrounding a character. How the narrator prepares the scene for the first appearance of a character is the primary concern of this second component. These will be the tools used to examine the main characters of Gen 1-3:1-7.

From here, the fourth and final chapter of this thesis draws its attention to the masterly dialogue between the serpent and the woman. I approach this section of the temptation narrative emphasizing the plausibility of an existing thematic pattern of discourse that is present in each segment of speech. Such disclosures are examined and considered. With the exception of the woman's segment of speech, I posit that these disclosures are pivotal pieces of information as such relate to the character of the serpent and its contextual identity.

In this final chapter I also bring together all the elements discussed above hence postulating that the central theme of the temptation narrative is not the fall of man but that such is only second to the introduction of the serpent and its shrewdness. It is posited that such an interpretation and understanding is faithful to the sequential narrative structure of Gen 3:1-7, its immediate context of Gen 2, and seemingly conveys the plausibility of an inherent cosmic conflict motif already present in the text.

### **Limitations**

The scope of this thesis would be quite vast if all relevant particularities with regard to the subject matter of the temptation narrative, the serpent, and the fall of humanity were given due attention as such have deservedly received from scholars in the past. In this regard, I am indebted to the exegetical and philosophical work of other scholars and will focus primarily on the serpent as character as such relates to Gen 3:1-7 and the immediate context of Gen 2. Character introduction and the narratorial development of implicit details present in the text will be the examined focal point of this thesis.

## CHAPTER II

### CHARACTER INTRODUCTION

#### **Introduction**

The serpent of Genesis 3 is without question an enigmatic figure. Its presence within the temptation narrative presents itself an interpretive conundrum that seemingly remains unresolved within OT scholarship.<sup>14</sup> To address this difficulty, scholars have resorted to ancient Near Eastern<sup>15</sup> mythology as a means for reconstructing the mythological environment of ancient Israel in an effort to decipher the interpretive significance of the serpent in accordance to its ANE context.<sup>16</sup> These endeavors have undoubtedly contributed to OT scholarship in (1) presenting the necessity of contextualizing the serpent within the proper sphere of ANE mythology and (2) in

---

<sup>14</sup> While interpreters of the postexilic period and Christian scholars of virtually all ages shared in their interpretation of the serpent as Satan, it remains unlikely that ancient Israel—the intended audience of the text—interpreted the text in like manner. Cf. Gordon Wenham, *Genesis 1-15* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 72. Wenham notes that “there is no trace of a personal devil in early parts of the OT.” In accordance with this observation, Martin Emmrich states that “there seems to be not substantial support for the view that the ‘original’ audience would have read” the text in the same manner the postexilic interpreters and subsequent Christians did. He cautions that even with the latest dating of the J source (seventh century BC) there is no evidence of interpreting the serpent as Satan prior to the second century. Martin Emmrich, “The Temptation Narrative of Genesis” *The Evangelical Quarterly* 73 (2001):10. Thus, outside of the canonical perspective with regard to the serpent as Satan, the identity of the serpent and how ancient Israel interpreted its identity and function remains unresolved within OT scholarship.

<sup>15</sup> Henceforth, abbreviated ANE.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Umberto Cassuto, *Genesis: From Adam to Noah* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1989), 139-42. To solve the difficulty in determining the nature of the serpent in the account of Gen 3, Cassuto suggest that “we must consider the ideas that were associated with the concept of the serpent among the Israelites themselves.”



suggesting probable frameworks from which ancient Israel possibly understood the identity and meaning of the serpent.

Notwithstanding the significance of these endeavors and their contribution to scholarship, ANE mythology in and of itself cannot suffice in determining the contextual interpretation of the serpent and how such was perceived by ancient Israel. The biblical narrative alone and the structural composition of its story are to form the initial basis of any contextualized assessment of the serpent and its text. To this matter, a narrative approach to the temptation narrative can assist in making sense of the enigmatic presence of the serpent and furthermore contribute to recent studies on ANE mythology and its correlation to (1) the cognitive environment of ancient Israel and (2) the serpent.

I suggest that in accordance with the narrative of Gen 1-3, the significance of the serpent, its identity and function lie not in the mythological worldview of ancient Israel but begins primarily with the manner in which the narrator composes his narrative and introduces his characters. An analysis of these two features reveal an apparent similarity that presently exists between the character of Elohim and that of the serpent. How the narrator introduces these characters into his narrative denotes an unequivocal similitude that is, respectively, unique to each. This observation begins to take form once the reader begins to incorporate the characters of Adam and Eve into the equation and then contrasts them with those of Elohim and the serpent.

### **Genesis 1:1 and the Introduction of Elohim as Character**

The book of Genesis begins with Elohim—the Creator of the heavens and the earth. No narrative space is given to His introduction. No “statements or speculation on

what God is like or the conditions of his existence” are given.<sup>17</sup> He is simply the beginning of Creation and the commencement of its narrative. Here, the narrator uniquely endows Elohim with complete autonomy.<sup>18</sup> In allowing Him to set the cosmic scene and cosmic stage,<sup>19</sup> the narrator seemingly grants Elohim the prerogative of declaring Himself not only the beginning of Creation and its subsequent narrative, but also as one whose character marks the point of origin from which all other characters and sequences follow.<sup>20</sup> This deliberate literary feature implicitly orchestrated by the narrator demands attention and warrants close examination as the narrative of Genesis 1-3 continues to unfold.

---

<sup>17</sup> W. Lee Humphreys, *The Character of God in the Book of Genesis* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 23.

<sup>18</sup> Jan Fokkelman notes that in “religion and theology mortals, including writers, are subordinate to God.” But when it comes to narratology and story-telling, the situation is radically different. Accordingly, “in narrative texts God is a character; i.e. a creation of the narrator and writer.” It is the narrator who dictates “whether God is allowed to say anything in the story and if so, how often and how much.” Jan P. Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Narrative* (Leiderdorp, The Netherlands: Deo Publishing, 1999), 58.

<sup>19</sup> Humphreys observes that “unlike many stories where some sense of scene is set before the central character appears, in this story the central character appears to set the scene.” Humphreys, 23. Accordingly, the narrator here in Gen 1:1 takes no initiative to prepare his audience for the debut of his character Elohim nor does he attempt to set the stage for His appearance. He allows Elohim Himself to set the cosmic stage with His appearance. Out of nowhere, Elohim enters the narrative and commences it by setting the scene: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” Here, it is Elohim who sets the stage with His appearance and it is Elohim who sets the scene with and by His creative power.

<sup>20</sup> Though it is apparent that the narrator is the one facilitating the narration of the story, it is nevertheless the character of Elohim that controls the narrative. In accordance to the hierarchical structure of the text, the story of Genesis 1 seemingly begins with v. 3a: “And said Elohim,” since the clause itself is of a *WayX* construction. This clause is preceded by the opening sentence of Genesis—the head clause from which all subsequent main clauses follow; that is, the place where Elohim initiates the narrative and commences His story—See Appendix A.

Accordingly, each main verbal clause thereafter—with the exception of vss. 27a, 28a, 28b (which add the complement object “to them”) and vss. 31 d and e—begins with the *WayX* construction: “And said Elohim.” These clauses are immediately followed by a narrative quote and subsequently (in my judgment) narrative discourse. Following the main-head clause of Genesis 1: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,” Elohim henceforth speaks and the narrator follows either affirming or commenting on that which God had spoken. Therefore, the autonomy endowed to Elohim in v. 1 seemingly remains throughout the narrative of Genesis 1:1-2:3, hence indicating that it is Elohim who is controlling the narrative. He is the one implicitly telling the story. The narrator is, therefore, seemingly functioning only as a medium.

From a theological perspective, it is acknowledged that the opening statement of Genesis is without question the foundation of all that is to follow in Scripture.<sup>21</sup> It stands at the beginning of OT theology as one which “forms the beginning of the Pentateuch, the beginning of the Old Testament as a whole and thereby the beginning of the Bible.”<sup>22</sup> From a narrative perspective, however, this latter acknowledgement of beginnings also holds true as such relates to the theological and contextual understanding of the serpent of Gen 3. Accordingly, this pivotal text of Gen 1:1 not only functions as the beginning of Scripture and OT theology but also as the beginning of a disclosure that seemingly marks the beginning of an unraveling with regard to the serpent and its character.<sup>23</sup>

Paul R. House observes that “from the very first verse of the canon God’s uniqueness and sovereignty emerge.”<sup>24</sup> It accordingly conveys the theological assertion that Elohim alone is Creator, for He alone is the originator and beginning of Creation and all created things.<sup>25</sup> Notwithstanding the certainty of this truth, the narratorial sphere of

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. John H. Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 82. Sailhamer notes that the account of Genesis opens with a “concise statement about the Creator and the Creation.” It is the “foundation of all that is to follow in the Bible” and its purpose is threefold: to identify the Creator, to explain the origin of the world, and to tie the work of God in the past to the work of God in the future.”

<sup>22</sup> Rold Rendtorff, *The Canonical Hebrew Bible*, trans. David E. Orton (Leiderdorp, The Netherlands: Deo Publishing, 2005), 13.

<sup>23</sup> According to Brueggemann, “The serpent is a device to introduce the new agenda.” He asserts that “whatever the serpent meant in earlier versions of the story, in the present narrative it has no independent significance. It is a technique to move the plot of the story.” Brueggemann, 47. To this assertion, however, I suggest that according to the following narrative analysis of this thesis, the serpent is not a mere “device” or “technique” but rather a significant character within the narrative itself.

<sup>24</sup> Paul R. House, *Old Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 59.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. House, *Ibid.* When compared to other ancient Near Eastern creation accounts, House notes the following about Genesis 1:1: “In the beginning’ only one God creates the heavens and the earth. No other deity challenges God’s right to create; no other deity helps God create; no other deity opposes God’s creative activity.” From the viewpoint of Genesis 1:1-2:4a as narrative, Humphreys also observes the following: “God does not so much appear on stage as set about creating the cosmic stage for subsequent appears. Until well into this week of creation there is no other figure sharing the stage with him. There is

the text with regard to the character of Elohim in comparison to others also conveys a significance that should not be overlooked. As readers engage in the Creation and Eden narratives and smoothly flow into the story of Adam and Eve where they suddenly encounter the serpent, it becomes evident that the once-unique characteristics attributed to Elohim in Genesis 1:1 are not limited to Him alone, but shared—though in variation—with that of the serpent. Here, commonalities of abrupt appearance and apparent beginnings begin to surface not from an immediate reading of Gen 3, but rather as such similarities between these two characters demand close attention to how the narrator embeds humanity into the narrative—in contrast to Elohim and the serpent—and thus paves the way for their corporate and individual introductions, respectively.

### **Introduction of Adam and Eve as Character**

Adam and Eve first appear as a unit by means of divine intent. By way of divine speech, it is Elohim who takes the initiative and introduces humanity into the Creation story. Here, through an interplay of speech and commentary, the narrator skillfully allows Elohim to build upon a series of cosmic events that subsequently lead to the gradual debut of humanity. Their appearance and introduction depend not on the narrator but on the initiation and verbalization of Elohim Himself.<sup>26</sup> It is He alone who gives humanity its place in Creation and hereto provides them entrance into the cosmic drama of His narrative.

---

no other to relate to, compete with, or in any way detract from a sustained focus on the authority, command, power, rage for order, urge for life, and especially the effectiveness of god in what he does and says.” Humphery, 23.

<sup>26</sup> Here, Adam and Eve are introduced into the narrative by a character within the narrative itself and not by the narrator. This is in juxtaposition to the appearance and introduction of Elohim and serpent as characters, whose entrance into the narrative depend completely on the jurisdiction of the narrator himself.

With the introduction of mankind in Gen 1:26, the narrator is now at liberty to reintroduce humanity—i.e. Adam and Eve, as individual characters into the subsequent storyline of the Eden narrative of Genesis 2:4 onward. Here, the narrator commences<sup>27</sup> with an apparent depiction of the earth before the existence of mankind.<sup>28</sup> With the nominal statement וְאָדָם אֵין (v. 5e), he informs his audience of humanity’s absence and by thus highlighting their absence the narrator skillfully creates an atmosphere that permits a seamless transition from absence to presence allowing him to thus introduce his audience to the creation and formation of man later followed by that of the woman.<sup>29</sup> Through this means of absence, Adam and Eve hence find entrance into the Eden narrative and thereafter develop as characters.

This gradual development of their introduction from their appearance as mankind to their entry as individuals hereto marks a stylistic feature of character introduction that

---

<sup>27</sup> Beginning with Gen 2:4 the narrative roles of story-telling seemingly change. After the cosmic account of Creation is complete; after Elohim is done telling His story, the narrator picks up the autonomy which he seemingly gave to Elohim with the תולדות formula and continues the narrative focusing on the creation of humanity and the garden of Eden.

<sup>28</sup> Sailhamer notes that the Eden narrative “begins with a description of the condition of the land before the creation of humanity.” Accordingly, “the focus of this description is on those parts of the land that were to be directly affected by the Fall (3:8-24). The narrative [thus] points to the fact that before the man was created (in 2:7), the effects of human rebellion and of the Fall had not yet been felt on the land.” Sailhamer, 97. While Sailhamer is correct in his observation, it is this sense of absence—that is, the absence of the shrubs of the field; the absence of the plants of the field; the absence of rain; and the absence of אדם (mankind) that evidently paves the way for v. 7: the creation and formation of האדם (the man). Unlike the characters of Elohim and subsequently the serpent, Adam does not appear into the narrative without notice, but is introduced immediately after the narrator engages in informing his audience of things that were not yet present. Here, Kenneth A. Matthews notes that by depicting what the land was like before the creation of man and noting a source of subterranean source water, the narrator was preparing his audience “for the principle clause in v. 7, the creation of the first man.” Kenneth A. Matthews, *NAC: Genesis 1-11:26*, (USA: Broadman & Holamn Publishers, 1996), 192.

<sup>29</sup> In v. 5e, the narrator interestingly uses the negation אֵין (non-existence) to refer to the absence of humanity. Here, he informs his audience that mankind, at this point, did not exist. It is thus in the absence of its existence that the narrator thereafter introduces man into the narrative, subsequently followed by the later introduction of the woman. It is therefore after the mentioning of their absence that their apparent presence comes into play in the narrative.

is evidently distinct from that of (1) Elohim's and (2) the serpent's. As the reader encounters the unforeseen shift in narration; as he witnesses the abruptness of the serpent's entrance in the temptation narrative, he is immediately drawn to the once-considered-unique appearance and entrance of Elohim. This apparent allusion to Gen 1:1 artistically set forth by the narrator seemingly highlights the significance of the serpent consequently denoting an evidential plausibility of an existing resemblance between it and Elohim.

### **Genesis 3:1 and the Introduction of the Serpent as Character**

As the reader immerses in the beauty and blissfulness of Creation; as he witnesses the creation and formation of mankind; as he observes the harmonious divine-human relation between Creator and creation, he is abruptly confronted with a startling new character—namely, the serpent and its characterization. Here, the narrator deliberately disrupts the narrative flow of character introduction and abruptly introduces the serpent into the story of Adam and Eve. Such an intentional shift in narrative style should not be overlooked nor ignored.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Here, it should be reiterated that in the Eden narrative the narrator prepared his audience for the introduction of both Adam and Eve, respectively. For Adam, he first creates an atmosphere of absence and then introduces his character into the narrative. This atmosphere of absence remained as the subsequent narrative seemingly anticipates the moment when Eve will be introduced into the narrative. For her, the narrator allows YHWH-Elohim to further create an atmosphere of absence by stating that it was not good for man to be alone. (Cf. Matthews who states the following: “the Hebrew construction of v. 18 accentuates the negative phrase “not good” by placing it at the head of the sentence.” Through this declaration, “God announces that more is to be done to achieve the ideal for the man.” Matthews, 213) This sense of absence is continued and intensified by the narrator when he informs his audience that after naming the animals Adam noticed that there was no “suitable helper” for him. It is at this moment when the reader is introduced to the creation of the woman, hence introducing Eve into the narrative.

Accordingly, the same can be said of Elohim in the account of Genesis 1:26. Elohim does not abruptly introduce humanity into His narrative but rather reveals His intention of creating humanity (after building up to it), which is immediately followed by the narrator's commentary affirming their creation. It is only Elohim and subsequently YHWH-Elohim who abruptly appear into narratives of Creation.

From the outset of Gen 3, the serpent is depicted as an animal of the field with a given origin but is nevertheless characterized as having no equal among its peers,<sup>31</sup> and is furthermore given no introduction. Such detail is not without notice. The specificity of the narrator in conjunction with the literary style in which the serpent enters the narrative cues the reader to its significance and associates it with Elohim as a prominent and influential character.<sup>32</sup> Such specificity and character introduction furthermore depicts the serpent as seemingly forming the beginning of Redemptive history<sup>33</sup>, which in turn alludes to the plausibility that as character the serpent marks the point of origin from which the fall of humanity, its degradation and consecutive shamefulness seemingly follow.<sup>34</sup> It is this stylistic resemblance of abrupt entrance and apparent parallelism of character function—i.e. as a marker from which all other sequences follow—with Elohim

---

<sup>31</sup> At this juncture it is imperative to remember that Gen 1:1 depicts and declares Elohim Creator and such is attributed to Him alone. As Sailhamer observes, “The purpose of Gen 1:1 is not to identify [Elohim] in a general way but to identify him as the Creator of the universe.” Furthermore, “by identifying God as the Creator, the author introduces a crucial distinction between the God of the fathers and the gods of the nations, gods that the biblical authors considered mere idols. God alone created the heavens and the earth.” Sailhamer, 82-3. To state that the serpent was *ערום מכל חית השדה* is to distinguish it from among the rest of peers as Gen 1:1 similarly distinguishes—though implicitly—Elohim from the rest of all ANE gods.

<sup>32</sup> The prominence of the serpent as character is also made evident when considering that the opening clause of Gen 3 is a *WXQt* clause. The subject is placed before the predicate thus emphasizing the significance of this new character that has just stepped into the scene.

<sup>33</sup> Redemptive history is here used as denoting “the entire spectrum of biblical events and their scriptural interpretations through which, in Christian understanding, God is bringing redemption to the world.” R. W. Yarbrough, “Heilsgeschichte,” *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 546. Such can be said to begin in Genesis 3, commencing with v. 15—the protoevangelium. Therefore, to state that the serpent forms the beginning of Redemptive history is not to imply that it forms the means of redemption but the reason behind its commencement. Redemptive history rightly understood is the consequential byproduct of humanity’s fall which undoubtedly finds its origin within the storyline of the temptation narrative (Gen 3:1-7). It is the serpent that initiates the temptation and it is the serpent who formulates the fall of man and its strategic effectiveness throughout fallen human history.

<sup>34</sup> The narrative of Gen 3 begins with the *WXQt* clause: *והנחש היה ערום מכל חית השדה* (v. 1a) and is immediately followed by the *Way0* clause: *ויאמר אל האשה* (v. 1b)—see Appendix B. Here, the introduction of the serpent and its characterization set the scene and hence commences the narrative. Similar to the hierarchical structure of Gen 1:1 and in accordance to the hierarchical structure of Gen 3, everything after v. 1a seemingly finds its origin back to the *WXQt* clause of Gen 3:1.

that thus denotes the supremacy of both these characters; furthermore, placing them on equal playing fields within the present narrative of the Adam and Eve story.

### **Conclusion**

Given the stylistic resemblance between the serpent and Elohim with regard to character introduction and character function, it can therefore be posited that the serpent is unequivocally a prominent character and remains superior to that of the characters of Adam and Eve. However important of role humanity may have, it is evident that both Adam and Eve are only second to the significance and character of the serpent.

The following charts summarize the present similarities and differences between the serpent in Gen 3 and Elohim in Gen 1.

**Table 1: Similarities between the Serpent and Elohim**

Text	Similarity	Text	Similarity
Gen 1:1	Elohim enters the narrative abruptly.	Gen 3:1	The serpent enters the narrative abruptly.
Gen 1:1	Elohim is given no introduction.	Gen 3:1	The serpent is given no introduction.
Gen 1:1	Elohim forms the beginning of Creation and all that follows.	Gen 3:1	The serpent forms the beginning of the fall of man and all that follows.

**Table 2: Differences between the Serpent and Elohim.**

Text	Difference	Text	Difference
Gen 1:1	Elohim is given no place of origin. He simply exists.	Gen 3:1	The serpent is given a place of origin. It was created by Elohim.



Gen 1:1	Elohim has no peers.	Gen 3:1	The serpent is said to form part of “the beast of the field.”
---------	----------------------	---------	---

## CHAPTER III

### STAGE PREPARATION

#### Introduction

Commenting on the opening scene of Gen 3, Gordon Wenham notes that “explicit characterization of actors” is “rare in Hebrew narrative.”<sup>35</sup> He suggests that in noting the עָרוֹם (shrewdness) of the serpent, the narrator is seemingly hinting that its remarks should be examined carefully.<sup>36</sup> Accordingly, from the outset of the narrative the reader is cautioned with the term עָרוֹם to weigh carefully the words of the serpent.<sup>37</sup> Though Wenham and scholars alike are correct in their interpretation, it nevertheless stands that this explicit characterization of the serpent as עָרוֹם warrants further study due to (1) its

---

<sup>35</sup> Wenham, 72.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid; cf. also Matthews, 232. Matthews also suggests that in describing the serpent as “crafty” the narrator is alerting “the reader to weigh the words of the beast carefully.”

<sup>37</sup> It should be noted that scholars have also attribute an acoustical function to עָרוֹם. R. W. L. Moberly points out that “the most obvious point to the reader of the Hebrew text is the play on words between the serpent as עָרוֹם (cunning) and the man and woman as עָרוֹם (naked).” R. W. L. Moberly, “Did the Serpent Get It Right,” *The Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1988): 24; Victor Hamilton attributes עָרוֹם (astute, clever) an acoustical function with עָרוֹם (nude) as one helping “to link the Creation narrative with the Fall narrative.” Victor P. Hamilton, *I*, 187; Bruce Waltke also acknowledges this acoustical function stating that “the word play of ‘nude’ and ‘shrewd’ links the two scenes and draws attention to Adam and Eve’s painful vulnerability.” Bruce K. Waltke, *Genesis* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 90; Wenham also comments on the acoustical function of עָרוֹם but elaborates a bit further. He states that the choice of עָרוֹם in Genesis 3:1 “is one of obvious plays on words in the text; for the man and his wife have just been described as עָרוֹם ‘nude’ (2:25). They will seek themselves to be shrewd (cf. 3:6) but will discover that they are ‘nude’ (3:7, 10).” Hereto, the narratorial function of עָרוֹם (shrewd) is twofold.

significance as a prominent character and (2) the term's function as a preliminary element preparing the reader for the upcoming theatrical dialogue between serpent and woman.

### **ערום and the Characterization of the Serpent**

Following its debut as character, the serpent is immediately characterized as one possessing a level of shrewdness that exceeded that of its peers. Victor Hamilton notes that “much has been made of the author’s decision to describe the serpent” as ערום rather than חכם, “the most *cunning* rather than the ‘wisest’ of all the animals.”<sup>38</sup> Here, Hamilton contributes to the discussion by suggesting that the term “astute, clever” are to be taken as appropriate descriptions of the serpent since they aptly describe “its usage of a strategy of prudence when it engages the woman in dialogue.”<sup>39</sup> According to this interpretation, an understanding of ערום as it relates to the serpent is seemingly dependent on its remarks and its apparent intent. Notwithstanding the plausibility of this interpretation, at this juncture it is important to note two notable objections.

First, the context of the narrative (Gen 3:1-7) unequivocally portrays the serpent as one with malicious and deceptive intent. This portrayal can undoubtedly influence one’s understanding of the term ערום thus distorting its meaning as one having negative connotations thus implying a negative characteristic. Such an approach to determine the meaning of ערום by the remarks of the serpent can therefore create a sense of obscurity and consequently hinder a more elaborate understanding of the term and its usage.

Secondly, at this point in the narrative the opening *WXQt* clause of Gen 3 nonetheless

---

<sup>38</sup> Hamilton, 187. Italics form part of the original.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid, 188. It is important to note that Hamilton implicitly attributes a negative connotation to these terms. Since he views the serpent as one who is “consistently evil,” he, then, interprets ערום as one that carries a moral connotation that is apparently negative due to the serpent’s intent.

introduces ערום as an ambiguous term; and such ambiguity should not be taken lightly. Since the function of the *WXQt* clause is to draw attention to the serpent as the focal point of its narrative discourse, I therefore suggest that the meaning and significance of ערום should derive not from what the serpent says but from the initial sense of ambiguity present in the text and the circumstantial clause of v. 1 in its entirety—namely, the *WXQt* clause of v1 and its subsequent *xQtX* clause (i.e. v1b).<sup>40</sup> These two clauses should thus form the basis from which one begins to construct an understanding of ערום as such relates to (1) the serpent and (2) the beast of the field.

While Hamilton seemingly acknowledges the ambiguity of ערום by referring to it as an “ambivalent term that may describe a desirable or undesirable characteristic,”<sup>41</sup> Wenham further notes that “on the one hand” ערום “is a virtue the wise should cultivate, but misused it becomes wiliness and guile.”<sup>42</sup> Herein lies a crucial and noteworthy observation. Can the ערום spoken of in Gen 3:1 with regard to (1) the serpent and (2) the beast of the field here be understood as a positive attribute—namely, a virtue originally endowed to every beast of the field but seemingly manipulated by the serpent thus becoming wiliness and guile?

In his study on the intellectual tradition of the OT, Roger N. Whybray observes that the term ערום “appears to have been originally a word without specific moral

---

<sup>40</sup> The significance of the *xQtX* clause lies in the fact that it is a relative clause which provides attentional information. This additional information is pivotal for a proper understanding of the term ערום and how such relates to (1) the serpent and (2) the other beast of the field.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid, 187.

<sup>42</sup> Wenham, 72.

connotations denoting shrewdness of a purely practical kind.”<sup>43</sup> Though he states that “in Job, however, it had acquired a pejorative sense” and seemingly suggests that in this sense “it is therefore entirely appropriate as an epithet applied to the serpent,”<sup>44</sup> I suggest that the original meaning of ערום—i.e. as “one denoting shrewdness of a purely practical kind”—remains as an accurate interpretation of the term with regard to its usage in Gen 3:1.<sup>45</sup> Since the narrator specifically states that the serpent was one of the creatures YWHW-Elohim had made (3:1; cf. 2:19, 20) and deliberately compares its ערום with the ערום of the beast of the field, it seems unlikely that he would attribute to the serpent a negative characteristic; for to do so would be to (1) implicitly imply that all the beast of the field shared in this same characteristic and (2) stand in direct opposition to Gen 1:25, which depicts Elohim as assessing His creation and thereafter deeming it good.<sup>46</sup> Therefore, I suggest that with the presence of “the tree of the knowledge of good and evil”<sup>47</sup> already lurking within the backdrop of Gen 3—hence alluding to the plausibility

---

<sup>43</sup> R. N. Whybray, *The Intellectual Tradition in the Old Testament* (Germany: Walter de Gruyter, 1974), 106.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> With regard to the term ערום and its meaning within the context of Gen 3, Moberly notes that in Proverbs that word is depicted as a “good and commendable quality—‘prudent or ‘shrewd.’” But outside its usage in Proverbs, he observes that the “word is never clearly good or commendable and should probably always be rendered ‘cunning’ or ‘crafty,’ that is a quality that is inherently ambiguous from a moral perspective; for cunning naturally arouses both admiration and suspicion.” Moberly, 25. I, however, uphold to an understanding of ערום as “shrewd” as opposed to “cunning” due to the latter’s negative connotations in the English language. Furthermore, to attribute moral attributes to literal animals (i.e. the beast of the field) even before the fall of man and the world is seemingly questionable.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Moberly’s comment on the serpent and the problem of evil: “Although the serpent is the agent of disobedience and is hostile to man, the serpent itself is not described as evil. This is no doubt because of the strong Hebrew sense that all that God had created was good and the serpent is specifically one of the creatures Yahweh God had made (3:1, cf. 2:19, 20). To characterize the serpent as evil,” therefore, “would imply that God had created evil.” Moberly, 24. Accordingly, it is imperative to understand the significance of the term ערום correctly and in its proper context remaining mindful of the theological consequences such an understanding may have.

<sup>47</sup> Henceforth, tree of knowledge.

that evil (or at least a knowledge of) already existed,<sup>48</sup> the intent of the narrator in using ערום as a characteristic pertaining to both the serpent and the other beast of the field was not to depict the serpent as being “astute, clever, cunning” but rather to convey to the reader that the superiority of its endowment at some unknown point transitioned from shrewdness to that of craftiness.<sup>49</sup> Both the serpent and the beast of the field were all endowed with a level of ערום in its purest sense, but the serpent, however, misused this ערום and such manipulation is hence manifested in its speech.

### **Setting the Stage for Gen 3:1b-5**

After introducing the serpent into the narrative of Gen 3 and presenting his readers with specific detail pertaining to its origin and characterization, the narrator now ceases from commentary briefly fading into the background allowing the serpent to engage in a conversation with the woman. It is hence through speech and dialogue that the narrator permits the serpent to further introduce itself and disclose the nature of its intent and character. Here, the narrator seemingly grants the serpent a sense of autonomy that is similar to that of Elohim’s in Gen 1:1. Claus Westermann comments that in Gen 3:1a “the amazing skill of the narrator shows itself in that he does not really introduce the

---

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Matthews, 203. Matthews comments that “as the ‘tree of life’ indicated the source and presence of life in the garden, which had its origins in its Planter, the ‘tree of the knowledge’ thus indicated the presence of the ‘knowledge of good and evil’ in the garden, and the eating of it confers that knowledge (3:5, 22).”

With regard to the origin of evil, it is evident that the narrator at no point provides an explanation or allusion to its origin. As Westermann and other scholars note, “The origin of sin remains a complete mystery. The most important thing that J has to say here is that there is no etiology for the origin of evil.” Westermann, 239.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Moberly, 24. “The serpent is not evil as such but is possessed of a morally ambiguous quality that easily lends itself to evil. Thus, the depiction of the serpent ignores the theoretical issue of how God’s good creation can become evil, but rather illustrates the disastrous consequences of a classic misuse (for reasons unknown) of a rather unusual and ambiguous God-given quality.”

snake; he draws attention to one of its qualities that colors the following scene.” But to this observation I suggest that it is the serpent who nevertheless sets the scene for the subsequent dialogue and not the circumstantial clause of Gen 3:1.<sup>50</sup> Here, it is the *Way0* clause of v. 1 (ואמר אל האשה) followed by the words of the serpent that seemingly commence the narrative and set the scene for that which is to follow. Similar to Gen 1:1 where Elohim is endowed with complete autonomy and initially sets the stage with His presence and commences the creation narrative with His words in Gen 1:1, the serpent here in Gen 3:1 in similar fashion is allowed to set the scene and seemingly commence the narrative not with its presence, however, but with its words.<sup>51</sup>

According to Gen 3:1c-5, the theatrical scene between serpent and woman is composed of three main segments. Two are specifically dedicated to the serpent while

---

<sup>50</sup> The circumstantial clause of Gen 3:1 seemingly functions not as a means for setting the scene of the subsequent dialogue, but rather as one providing the reader with crucial information knowing that in due time the competent reader will decipher the malicious and deceitful intentions of the serpent and be forced to return to Gen 3:1 and exegetically examine the pivotal term of its *WXQt* clause—namely, ערום. As the reader begins to grapple with the apparent evil intentions of the serpent, he is forced to rely on the information provided him by the narrator. It is through this information that the reader begins to understand that however mysterious the concept of evil may be, Elohim did not create evil (for He declared everything to be good) and in some inexplicable way the serpent managed to manipulate a God-given quality that was endowed to every beast of the field.

Cf. Fokkelman, 22; Fokkelmann states the following about the author of a given biblical text: “The writer knows that he cannot always accompany his text to provide explanations, clear up misunderstandings etc. He has to let go of his product completely; he should leave it to his poem or story to take care of itself on its own. So he decides to provide his text with the devices, signals and shapes with which it can withstand the onslaught of time and guide the reading activities of the loyal listener.” Accordingly, it is therefore my suggestion that the term ערום functions precisely as one of these “devices” mentioned by Fokkelman for the benefit of all competent readers.

<sup>51</sup> This follows a similar structure in Gen 1. While Elohim sets the stage with His presence and sets the scene with His creative power in Gen 1:1, the narrative seemingly begins in with v. 3a: “And said Elohim.” So too in similar fashion with the serpent in Gen. 3. Though the narrator takes the initiative and gives the serpent its place in the narrative, he allows the serpent to commence the scene with its words just as Elohim began the creation narrative with His words. Such similarities, though in variation, should not be overlooked or dismissed. The only apparent structural difference between the two is that Gen 1:3a begins with a *WayX* and Gen 3:1c begins with a *Way0*, since (1) its subject—the serpent—has previously been mentioned by the narrator himself and (2) there is no additional background information as there is between Gen 1:1 and v. 3a.

the woman is only given one. As the serpent initiates the dialogue in v1, an unsettling and eerie atmosphere begins to overshadow the scene. With the subject matter of interest in place—namely, Elohim and subsequently the tree of the knowledge, the narrator here permits the serpent to set the stage and commence the narrative with its words thus further captivating the reader’s attention.

At this juncture, it is important to note that from the outset of the Eden narrative, the narrator took to task the necessity of presenting his readers with the existence and presence of the tree of the knowledge via commentary (2:9) and divine speech (2:17). This in itself already begins to prepare the reader for what is to soon follow in Gen 3. Since the reader is engaging with the text from a reality and perspective outside of the perfection and ideal of Eden, it seemingly creates an anticipation that at some point along the way something was going to go wrong. And if John Collins is correct in his observation that the definite article attached to the serpent (הנחש) in Gen 3:1a is commonly anaphoric—that is, “referring back to ‘the snake we have been talking about,’” hence suggesting the plausibility that the serpent was one with which the narrator and the reader were apparently familiar with,<sup>52</sup> then its abrupt presence would have immediately alerted the reader and seemingly intensified the anticipation already lingering since the introduction of the “tree of knowledge.” Here, it can be postulated that since the Gen 2:9 the narrator has been intentionally preparing his audience not for the introduction of the serpent and its characterization but the consequential dialogue between the serpent and the woman.

---

<sup>52</sup> C. John Collins, “What Happened to Adam and Eve?” *Presbyterion* 27 (2001):27.



## CHAPTER IV

### A DISCOURSE OF DISCLOSURES

#### **Introduction**

With the establishment of several noted preliminaries, the narrator now ceases from commentary and fades into the background of his narrative allowing the masterly dialogue between serpent and woman (3:1c-5) to take center stage. As the theatrical scene unravels, each segment of speech demands of the reader a rereading of the Eden narrative and—with the exception of the woman’s speech, a retrospective analysis of specific particularities that pertain to the personage of serpent. Accordingly, each character discloses a set of implicit details that provide the reader with a treasure trove of information. As these disclosures being to unfold, their revelatory significance demand attention.

#### **The Serpent: Its Presence in Gen 2:16-17**

With the first segment of speech (Gen 3:1), the reader is confronted with the startling yet astonishing words of the serpent. Wenham here suggests that at this juncture the narrator expects his audience to ask a series of two questions. First, how did the serpent “know about God’s command?”<sup>53</sup> This pivotal inquiry draws attention to the implicit reference of the serpent referring to itself as one who was present when Adam

---

<sup>53</sup> Wenham, 73.

was first given access to every tree of the garden (2:16) and then commanded not to eat from the tree of knowledge on pain of death (2:17). Here, “How did the serpent know about God’s command?” demands of the reader a retrospective analysis of the Eden narrative (i.e. Gen 2:4a-25).

Upon inspection, it is evident that prior to Gen 3 the serpent is never explicitly mentioned. Though its implicit reference by the general term “beast of the field” places it at the scene when Adam gives names to every beast, cattle and bird of the air (2:19, 20),<sup>54</sup> the serpent is never identified—either implicitly or explicitly—as being present when Adam is placed in the garden of Eden (2:15) and hence given his divine instructions (2:16-17); moreover, divine command. Accordingly, at this juncture, the reader is left wanting. No additional information is provided. The audacious claim of the serpent in Gen 3:1 is here left unchallenged. Both narrator and actor remain silent; thus, seemingly alluding to the truthfulness of the serpent’s claim and this unaccountable disclosure.

This leads to Wenham’s second question: if the serpent “heard [God’s] command,” why has it “grossly distorted it?”<sup>55</sup> It is important to note that at this point in the narrative the intentions and motives of the serpent remain obscure. Apart from its theological consequence,<sup>56</sup> the serpent’s statement remains ingenuous. No implication of

---

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Cassuto, 21.

<sup>55</sup> Wenham, 73.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Brueggemann, 47. Brueggemann comments that this segment “is the first theological talk in the narrative. The new mode of discourse here warns that theological talk which seeks to analyze and objectify matters of faithfulness is dangerous enterprise”; Westermann, 239: “The purpose is clear from the very first sentence of the question; it is God’s command and this is put into question”; Waltke, 91: “Satan smoothly maneuvers Eve into what may appear as a sincere theological discussion, but he subverts obedience and distorts perspective by emphasizing God’s prohibition, not his provision, reducing God’s command to a question, doubting his sincerity, defaming his motives, and denying the truthfulness of his threat.”

malicious or deceptive intent is present in the text. Accordingly, it is not until the second segment of its speech (vss. 4-5) that the malignity of the serpent is truly disclosed.

Therefore, the distortion here spoken of cannot be attributed to malice.

Wenham correctly observes that the gross distortion of the serpent is an illustration of its shrewdness.<sup>57</sup> But it is imperative to keep in mind that the text of Gen 3:1 speaks not primarily of gross distortion but of an implied misunderstanding of YHWH-Elohim's words; moreover, command. While it is evident that the serpent grossly distorted the divine command, such distortion, however, is present in the text as a mishearing or misunderstanding of the serpent due to an implied element of surprise.<sup>58</sup> The serpent here approaches Eve as one seemingly shocked that YHWH-Elohim would be so harsh and deprive Adam and Eve from eating of every tree of the garden. Eve likely understood and interpreted the serpent's remark in this manner and thus took the initiative to correct the serpent and respond.

### **Eve: "Neither Shall You Touch It"**

With the second segment of speech (Gen 3:2-3), the reader is now confronted with yet another astonishing disclosure. In her effort to correct the serpent, the woman unequivocally alters YHWH-Elohim's command (Gen 2:17) with the added prohibition: "Neither shall you touch it." While scholars generally view this alteration as either an

---

<sup>57</sup> Wenham, 73.

<sup>58</sup> Though the translation of the phrase כִּי הִנֵּה remains open to discussion, it is best taken as "an expression of surprise," hence translated: "Indeed! To think that...!" Cf. Jerome T. Walsh, "Genesis 2:4b-3:24: A Synchronic Approach" *JBL* 96 (1977):164. Accordingly, here in Gen 3:1 the serpent seems not to be distorting the words of YHWH-Elohim but has seemingly misunderstood them.

exaggeration<sup>59</sup> or an apparent misrepresentation<sup>60</sup> of the divine command, I suggest that it appears best to take the slight refinement: “neither shall you touch it” as an apparent disclosure alluding to the plausibility that at some unknown moment between Gen 2:23 and 3:1 further elaboration concerning the divine command and its implications were provided.

According to Cassuto, such a suggestion is improbable due to the position that “the exact nature of the prohibition should have been precisely formulated when the Lord God spoke to the man.”<sup>61</sup> He, therefore, suggest that “the clause *neither shall you touch it* is simply synonymous with the preceding clause *you shall not eat thereof*.”<sup>62</sup> Though Cassuto is correct in his latter suggestion, it nevertheless remains that the present alteration of the divine command presents itself as an apparent disclosure that is congruent with a thematic pattern seemingly present throughout the temptation narrative—that is, within the dialogue between serpent and woman.

As noted above, it is through the disclosure of the serpent that the reader is made aware of its presence in the midst of its absence; that is, of its presence in Gen 2:16, 17 though the narrative itself makes no mention of it. Here in Gen 3:2-3 the narrator follows suit in allowing Eve to disclose information previously unknown to the reader. Though the significance and purpose of such disclosure is beyond the scope of this paper, it

---

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Gerhard Von Rad, *Genesis* (Philadelphia, Penn: Westminster, 1972), 88; Westermann, 237; Hamilton, 189.

<sup>60</sup> Matthews, 235.

<sup>61</sup> Cassuto, 145.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid*, italics in the original.

nevertheless depicts the existence of a congruent thematic pattern of disclosure present in the theatric and revelatory discourse of both serpent and woman.<sup>63</sup>

### **The Serpent: As Antagonist**

With the third and final segment of speech (vss. 4, 5), the reader is now confronted with a series of startling remarks by the serpent and its implicit disclosures. First, the serpent here discloses itself as antagonist and reveals its true motives and intention in approaching Eve with its “feigned expression of surprise”<sup>64</sup> of v1. Westermann states that though “the words of the serpent are certainly directed against God,” one is “not justified by the text”—that is, Gen 3:1b, 4, 5—“in seeing behind these words a complete orientation of the serpent against God or being at enmity with God.”<sup>65</sup> He observes that the serpent’s reply to Eve can be “made in a way that is quite friendly to the woman.”<sup>66</sup> Though the serpent’s words are a “real temptation,” they are “only recognized as such in its consequences.”<sup>67</sup>

At this juncture it is important to note that in their present dialogue, both the serpent and the woman speak of Elohim—i.e. the cosmic God of Creation.<sup>68</sup> But the

---

<sup>63</sup> To add to the congruency of this thematic pattern, it should be noted that here Eve also discloses the location of the tree of knowledge, which is implied in Gen 2:9 but never explicitly specified. While the tree of life is specified as being “in the midst of the garden” and the tree of knowledge is not, here in Gen 3:3 the tree of knowledge though not addressed by name but is addressed by its location: “the tree in the midst of the garden.”

<sup>64</sup> Hamilton, 189.

<sup>65</sup> Westermann, 238.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid, 240.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

<sup>68</sup> Scholars have made much of the use of the name Elohim by both the serpent and the woman. Cf. Wenham, 73. Wenham suggests that “in describing God simply as [Elohim] instead of YHWH-Elohim, which is characteristic of the rest of Gen 2-3, there is a suggestion of the serpent’s distance from God. God is just the remote creator, not Yahweh, Israel’s covenant partner.” He also suggests that in her response to

reader is well aware that the Elohim spoken of here is not simply the Elohim of Creation but also the Elohim of the Eden narrative—namely, YHWH-Elohim: the covenantal God of Israel; the God with whom ancient Israel—the immediate audience of the text—would have been all too familiar with.<sup>69</sup> Accordingly, the name YHWH-Elohim in retrospect here serves a significant purpose that cannot be overlooked. In knowing that his audience would eventually encounter the consequential dialogue between the serpent and the woman, the narrator purposefully introduces YHWH-Elohim as the Creator God of the Eden narrative with the intent of providing his audience with a backdrop from which the reader is to grasp and understand who the true subject matter of their conversation really is. Hence, with the opening speech clause of v4 (לא מות תמתון), the serpent undoubtedly confronts the reader with a “frontal attack”<sup>70</sup> not only on the previous words of YHWH-Elohim (2:17) but also His character.<sup>71</sup> Therefore, from the vantagepoint of the reader—though the text may not speak of direct enmity—it is evident that with this second segment of speech (3:4) the serpent here undoubtedly discloses itself as antagonist—i.e.

---

the serpent (vss. 2, 3), Eve seemingly “adopts the serpent’s description” of YHWH-Elohim “describing him simply” as Elohim. To this observation, I suggest that in using YHWH-Elohim, the narrator is likely using terminology that is relevant and well known to his audience; something that neither the serpent or the woman was familiar with. Therefore, the serpent and the woman address the cosmic Elohim—the Being they knew and were aware of and not the covenantal God of Israel; Westermann states that a sufficient reason for this usage by the serpent is that the name YHWH “belongs only to the context of the relation of humans to God.” Westermann, 239.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Rendtorff who observes that the “fundamental significance of God’s name for his relationship with Israel, and especially for Israel’s relationship with God, finds striking expression in the narrative of the call of Moses in Ex 3.” Accordingly, the name YHWH not only commences “the history proper of Israel as a nation,” but also depicts that its allegiance to YHWH as one that is “a fundamental element of Israel’s identity.” Rendtorff, 589; 41.

<sup>70</sup> Hamilton, 189.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Grudem, 157. Grudem observes that “the names of God in Scripture are various descriptions of his character.” Since the compound name YHWH-Elohim is a description and representation of God’s character—i.e. who He is, the serpent is not only attack what He has said but in implicit fashion His character.

one who is not only in direct opposition to what YHWH-Elohim has said, but also to YHWH-Elohim Himself.<sup>72</sup>

### **The Serpent: One Who Holds Relational Knowledge of Elohim**

Wenham observes that it is in the serpent's reply (3:4, 5) that one can "appreciate why [it] is called shrewd."<sup>73</sup> He asserts that the serpent here uttered "half-truths" and that "there is a subtle ambiguity" in its "words which warrants describing [it] as shrewd."<sup>74</sup> Though Wenham is correct in his observation and conclusion, the shrewdness of the serpent is not only seen in its words but also in its modus operandi. As stated above, the serpent approached Eve with an expression of surprise: "Indeed! To think that God said you shall not eat from every tree in the garden." To such a statement one must ask: What is the serpent here implying with its expression of surprise? What is the serpent trying to communicate?

Moberly suggests that what matters "is not that the serpent's words are obviously false, but that they imply that a total prohibition is the sort of unreasonable prohibition that one might expect from God, who is to be seen as more interested in restriction than in freedom."<sup>75</sup> Yet, if the view that v1 is a statement of surprise holds, then it can be posited that the implication here (3:1b) is not that Elohim would demand "total

---

<sup>72</sup> It is important to note that the hierarchical structure of the text denotes that the impetus of the serpent's response to Eve is found in the xYq0 clause of v4: its direct contradiction to the words of Elohim. The following clauses of v5 flow from the xYq0 clause of v4 (see appendix B). Therefore, according to the hierarchical structure of the text, it is evident that the words of the serpent are in direct opposition to YHWH-Elohim's divine statement (2:17)—it is the serpent's words against Elohim's.

<sup>73</sup> Wenham, 73.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid, 74.

<sup>75</sup> Moberly, 6.

prohibition” but that Elohim actually did—that is, that He actually prohibited Adam and Eve from eating of all the trees in the garden. Accordingly, the serpent here conveys a sense of surprised—or even shock—due to an apparent understanding that complete prohibition of such sort was seemingly outside something Elohim would do. Therefore, in an effort to verify that there was no need to be surprised or shocked, the woman takes an initiative and responds to the serpent’s surprise with the aim of providing a sense of clarity. Here, Eve (vss. 2, 3) confirms that what the serpent understood Elohim to be remained since He allowed them to eat from every tree in the garden with the exception of one. This hence provided the serpent with the opportunity to respond and outright disclose itself as one who not only held a relational knowledge of Elohim but who was now at liberty to disclose the meaning behind the prohibition and seemingly divulge the apparent will of Elohim (v. 5).

With this implicit disclosure of v1, the serpent now (v5) presents itself as one who can now give an account as to the motive and reason behind the divine statement: “you shall surely die” (2:17). As Humphreys observes, the challenge here is not “to what Yahweh God *said* but to what he *knows* and thereby implicitly what he *intends or means*.”<sup>76</sup> He notes that the serpent “as narrator is more bold than the narrator of Genesis 2-3 in stating what is on God’s mind.”<sup>77</sup> But on what grounds—one must ask—does the serpent base its audacity and authority in communicating the mind, if not the will, of Elohim? Though to this regard the reader is left without commentary or clarification, I suggest that the narrative (Gen 3) itself makes the argument that the authority the serpent

---

<sup>76</sup> Humphreys, 45. Italics form part of the original.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.



stands on is (1) its shrewdness<sup>78</sup> and, more importantly, (2) its allusion to possessing some type of relational knowledge of Elohim; for to express a sense of surprise or shock with regard to an act of “total prohibition” by Elohim (3:1) is to undoubtedly convey the notion of possessing an understanding and/or knowledge of who Elohim is and consequently how He functions.<sup>79</sup>

### **The Serpent: Point of Origin of Fallen Human History**

With the third and final segment of speech, the theatrical scene between serpent and woman comes to an end and the narrator reappears on the scene informing his audience of what transpired immediately after. He begins with a description depicting the effects the remarks of the serpent had on the woman (v6) and thereafter informs his audience of its immediate consequences: both Adam and Eve eat from the tree of knowledge (v6) and thereafter knew that they were both naked (v7). This apparent awareness brings forth a sense of shamefulness that consequently leads to (1) a fear of YHWH-Elohim’s presence (v8), propels (2) a separation between YHWH-Elohim and mankind (vss. 8, 10; cf. vss. 23-24), which henceforth (3) constitutes the “fall” of man and the continual development of this fall throughout the OT account of human history. Here, I suggest that the temptation narrative of Genesis (3:1-7) serves as an intermediate between the narratives of Creation (Gen 1-2) and the History of Redemption (Gen 3:8-

---

<sup>78</sup> See Wenham’s commentary on vss. 4-5, 73-75. Here Wenham concludes that the “serpent was indeed shrewd” since it “told no outright lies, merely highly suggestive half-truths.”

<sup>79</sup> At this juncture, one may appeal to the linguistic association between the noun נָחַשׁ (serpent) and the verb נָחַשׁ (to practice divination). As Duane E. Smith notes, there exists a cognitive association between these two terms and “early exponents” of the text “would have perceived an association between” the two. Duane E. Smith, “The Divining Serpent: Reading Genesis 3 in the Context of Mesopotamian Ophiomancy” *JBL* 134 (2015): 45-6. Such an association, however, does not take away from the fact that narrative itself presents the argument that the serpent’s knowledge or understanding is due to (1) its shrewdness and (2) its alluded relational knowledge to Elohim.

onward—i.e., the Pentateuch, the Prophets, the Writings), whose central theme pivots not on the apparent “fall” of humanity but the debut of the serpent and its ערום (shrewdness).

According to the temptation narrative, Eve presents herself with confidence and surety that the tree of knowledge was inaccessible due to what YHWH-Elohim had spoken (Gen 3:3). It was not until after considering the remarks of the serpent that Eve began to see things differently (v6) and thereafter: ate from the tree of knowledge; gave to her husband and he ate; knew that she was naked; became ashamed of her nakedness; sewed fig leaves together to cover her nakedness. It was as a result of the serpent’s shrewdness that Adam and Eve hid from YHWH-Elohim; that condemnation fell upon Adam, Eve, and even the serpent; and that Gen 3:15 pronounces what is understood as the protoevangelium and hence the initiation of Redemptive History. Therefore, it can be postulated that the historical initiation of “fallen” human history and that which follows takes its cue from the end result of the serpent’s shrewdness.

It is here that the serpent takes center stage within the temptation narrative of Genesis and it is from the perspective of the results of its craftiness that the History of Redemption hence begins to develop. Just as the character of Elohim in Gen 1:1 marks the primary point of origin from which all other characters and sequences follow, so too the serpent in Gen 3:1 marks the point of origin from which all other post-fall sequences and events seemingly follow.

## CONCLUSION

The purpose of this thesis was to (1) explore the theological significance of the serpent as such is depicted within the context of the temptation narrative that in turn would (2) provide a contextual understanding of its identity and function and (3) thus further the plausibility of an existing cosmic conflict already present in the text.

Through a narrative analysis of character introduction, I have sought to demonstrate the significance of the serpent as one who upholds a prominent place within the temptation narrative of Gen 3. Given its stylistic resemblance to the character of Elohim—the Creator and Originator of Creation, it is evident that the narrator depicts the serpent as a pivotal figure whose role and significance demands consideration and attention. Its distinguished level of shrewdness (3:1) and manipulation thereof (cf. 3:1b; 4-5) identify the serpent as antagonist—that is, an oppugnant character whose apparent subject matter is unequivocally Elohim. It is the unveiling of this oppugnancy and apparent antagonistic character that forms the central theme of the temptation narrative thus depicting an apparent conflict between the characters of Elohim and that of the serpent.

Though Gen 3:1-7 unequivocally speaks of a real temptation and the failure of humanity to resist that temptation; though ancient interpreters were correct in viewing the story of Adam and Eve as the beginning and commencement of humanity's mortality and human sinfulness; and however theologically significant and relevant these themes are,

the Fall is an interpretive construct that remains second—moreover, a consequent—to the greater narrative of a cosmic conflict and nevertheless functions as a byproduct of the serpent's shrewdness.

## APPENDIX A

### GENESIS 1

[<Ob> בראשית] [<Ti> ברא] [<Pr> אלהים] [<Su> את השמים ואת הארץ] [<Ob>]	xQtX << [R]	GEN 01,01
[<PC> ו] [<Cj> הארץ] [<Su> היתה] [<Pr> תהו ובהו] [<PC>]	WXQt << xQtX	GEN 01,02
[<PC> ו] [<Cj> חשך] [<Su> על פני תהום] [<PC>]	NmCl << WXQt	GEN 01,02
[<Co> ו] [<Cj> רוח אלהים] [<Su> מרחפת] [<PC> על פני המים] [<Co>]	Ptcp << NmCl	GEN 01,02
	-----	
[<Su> ו] [<Cj> יאמר] [<Pr> אלהים] [<Su>]	WayX << xQtX	GEN 01,03
	=====	
[<Su> ו] [<Cj> יהי] [<Pr> אור] [<Su>]	ZYqX << [Q]	GEN 01,03
	=====	
[<Su> ו] [<Cj> יהי] [<Pr> אור] [<Su>]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,03
[<Ob> ו] [<Cj> ירא] [<Pr> אלהים] [<Su> את האור] [<Ob>]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,04
[<Pr> ו] [<Cj> טוב] [<Pr>]	xQt0 [object ]	GEN 01,04
[<Co> ו] [<Cj> יבדל] [<Pr> אלהים] [<Su> בין האור ובין החשך] [<Co>]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,04
[<Ob> ו] [<Cj> יקרא] [<Pr> אלהים] [<Su> לאור] [<Co>] [<Ob>] יום]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,05
[<Ob> ו] [<Cj> לחשך] [<Co> קרא] [<Pr> לילה] [<Ob>]	WxQ0 << WayX	GEN 01,05
[<Su> ו] [<Cj> יהי] [<Pr> ערב] [<Su>]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,05
[<Su> ו] [<Cj> יהי] [<Pr> בקר] [<Su>]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,05
[<PC> ו] [<Cj> יום אחד] [<PC>]	NmCl << WayX	GEN 01,05
[<Su> ו] [<Cj> יאמר] [<Pr> אלהים] [<Su>]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,06
	=====	
[<PC> ו] [<Cj> יהי] [<Pr> רקיע] [<Su> בתוך המים] [<PC>]	ZYqX << [Q]	GEN 01,06
[<Co><sp> ו] [<Cj> יהי] [<Pr> מבדיל] [<PC> בין מים / למים] [<Co><sp>]	WYq0 << ZYqX	GEN 01,06
	=====	
[<Ob> ו] [<Cj> יעש] [<Pr> אלהים] [<Su> את הרקיע] [<Ob>]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,07

[<Co> בין המים ] [<Pr> יבדל ] [<Cj>ו]	Way0 << WayX	GEN 01,07
[<PC><sp> / לרקיע ] [<Re> אשר ]	NmCl [attrib.]	GEN 01,07
[<cj><pa> /ו] בין המים ]	Defc << Way0	GEN 01,07
[<PC> מעל לרקיע ] [<Re> אשר ]	NmCl [attrib.]	GEN 01,07
[<Mo> כן ] [<Pr> יהי ] [<Cj>ו]	Way0 << Way0	GEN 01,07
[<Ob> שמים ] [<Co> לרקיע ] [<Su> אלהים ] [<Pr> יקרא ] [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,08
[<Su> ערב ] [<Pr> יהי ] [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,08
[<Su> בקר ] [<Pr> יהי ] [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,08
[<PC> יום שני ]	NmCl << WayX	GEN 01,08
[<Su> אלהים ] [<Pr> יאמר ] [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,09
=====		
[<Co> אל מקום אחד ] [<Su><sp> המים / מתחת השמים ] [<Pr> יקוו ]	ZYqX << [Q]	GEN 01,09
[<Su> היבשה ] [<Pr> תראה ] [<Cj>ו]	WYqX << ZYqX	GEN 01,09
=====		
[<Mo> כן ] [<Pr> יהי ] [<Cj>ו]	Way0 << WayX	GEN 01,09
[<Ob> ארץ ] [<Co> ליבשה ] [<Su> אלהים ] [<Pr> יקרא ] [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,10
[<Ob> ימים ] [<Pr> קרא ] [<Co> למקוה המים ] [<Cj>ו]	WxQ0 << WayX	GEN 01,10
[<Su> אלהים ] [<Pr> ירא ] [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,10
[<Pr> טוב ] [<Cj>כי ]	xQt0 [object ]	GEN 01,10
[<Su> אלהים ] [<Pr> יאמר ] [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX	GEN 01,11
=====		
[<Ob><pa> עשב / דשא ] [<Su> הארץ ] [<Pr> תדשא ]	ZYqX << [Q]	GEN 01,11
[<Ob> זרע ] [<PC> מזריע ]	Ptcp [attrib.]	GEN 01,11
[<pa> עץ פרי ]	Defc << ZYqX	GEN 01,11
[<Aj> למינו ] [<Ob> פרי ] [<PC> עשה ]	Ptcp [attrib.]	GEN 01,11
[<PC> בו ] [<Su> זרעו ] [<Re> אשר ]	NmCl [attrib.]	GEN 01,11
[<Lo> על הארץ ]	Defc << Ptcp	GEN 01,11
=====		
[<Mo> כן ] [<Pr> יהי ] [<Cj>ו]	Way0 << WayX	GEN 01,11
[<Ob><pa> עשב / דשא ] [<Su> הארץ ] [<Pr> תוצא ] [<Cj>ו]	WayX << Way0	GEN 01,12
[<Aj> למינהו ] [<Ob> זרע ] [<PC> מזריע ]	Ptcp [attrib.]	GEN 01,12
[<cj><pa> /ו] עץ ]	Defc << WayX	GEN 01,12

[<Ob> פרי] [<PC> עשה]				Ptcp [attrib.]	GEN 01,12	
[<PC> בו] [<Su> זרעו] [<Re> אשר]				NmCl [attrib.]	GEN 01,12	
[<Aj> למינהו]				Defc << Ptcp	GEN 01,12	
[<Su> אלהים] [<Pr> ירא] [<Cj>ו]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,12	
[<Pr> טוב] [<Cj> כי]				xQt0 [object ]	GEN 01,12	
[<Su> ערב] [<Pr> יהי] [<Cj>ו]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,13	
[<Su> בקר] [<Pr> יהי] [<Cj>ו]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,13	
[<PC> יום שלישי]				NmCl << WayX	GEN 01,13	
[<Su> אלהים] [<Pr> יאמר] [<Cj>ו]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,14	
				=====		
[<Lo> ברקיע השמים] [<Su> מארת] [<Pr> יהי]				ZYqX << [Q]	GEN 01,14	
[<Co> להבדיל] [<Pr> ]				InfC [adjunct]	GEN 01,14	
[<Co> לאתת ולמועדים ולימים ושנים]	[<Pr> היו] [<Cj>ו]				WQt0 << ZYqX	GEN 01,14
[<Lo> ברקיע השמים] [<Co> למאורת] [<Pr> היו] [<Cj>ו]					WQt0 << WQt0	GEN 01,15
[<Co> על הארץ] [<Pr> להאיר]					InfC [adjunct]	GEN 01,15
				=====		
[<Mo> כן] [<Pr> יהי] [<Cj>ו]				Way0 << WayX	GEN 01,15	
[<Su> אלהים] [<Pr> יעש] [<Cj>ו]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,16	
[<Ob><ap>את שני המארת הגדלים / את המאור הגדל / לממשלת היום / ו/ את המאור הקטן / לממשלת הלילה / ו/ את הכוכבים]						
[<Co> אתם] [<Ob> אלהים] [<Su> ברקיע השמים]	[<Cj>ו] [יתן] [<Pr> ]			WayX << WayX	GEN 01,17	
[<Co> על הארץ] [<Pr> להאיר]				InfC [adjunct]	GEN 01,17	
[<Co> למשל] [<Pr> ]	[<Cj>ו]			InfC [coordin]	GEN 01,18	
[<Co> להבדיל] [<Pr> ]	[<Cj>ו]			InfC [coordin]	GEN 01,18	
[<Su> אלהים] [<Pr> ירא] [<Cj>ו]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,18	
[<Pr> טוב] [<Cj> כי]				xQt0 [object ]	GEN 01,18	
[<Su> ערב] [<Pr> יהי] [<Cj>ו]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,19	
[<Su> בקר] [<Pr> יהי] [<Cj>ו]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,19	
[<PC> יום רביעי]				NmCl << WayX	GEN 01,19	
[<Su> אלהים] [<Pr> יאמר] [<Cj>ו]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,20	
				=====		
[<Ob> שרץ נפש חיה] [<Su> המים] [<Pr> ישרצו]				ZYqX << [Q]	GEN 01,20	

[<Co><sp> עול פני רקיע השמים / על הארץ ] [ <Pr> יעופף ] [ <Su> עוף ] [ <Cj>ו ]				WXYq << ZYqX	GEN 01,20
				=====	
[ <Ob> נפש כל נפש ] [ <Su> אלהים ] [ <Pr> יברא ] [ <Cj>ו ]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,21
[ <PC> חיה ] [ <Re>ה ]				AjC1 [attrib.]	GEN 01,21
[ <PC> רמשת ] [ <Re>ה ]				Ptcp [attrib.]	GEN 01,21
[ <Su> המים ] [ <Pr> שרצו ] [ <Re> אשר ]				xQtX [attrib.]	GEN 01,21
[ <Aj> למינהם ]				Defc << WayX	GEN 01,21
[ <Aj> למינהו ] [ <Ob> כנף ] [ <Cj>ו ] [ <Cj>ו ]				Ellp << WayX	GEN 01,21
[ <Su> אלהים ] [ <Pr> ירא ] [ <Cj>ו ]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,21
[ <Pr> טוב ] [ <Cj> כי ]				xQt0 [object ]	GEN 01,21
[ <Su> אלהים ] [ <Ob> אתם ] [ <Pr> יברך ] [ <Cj>ו ]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,22
[ <Pr> לאמר ]				InfC [adjunct]	GEN 01,22
				=====	
[ <Pr> פרו ]				ZIm0 << [Q]	GEN 01,22
[ <Pr> רבו ] [ <Cj>ו ]				WIm0 << ZIm0	GEN 01,22
[ <Ob><sp> את המים / בימים ] [ <Pr> מלאו ] [ <Cj>ו ]				WIm0 << WIm0	GEN 01,22
[ <Lo> בארץ ] [ <Pr> ירב ] [ <Su> העוף ] [ <Cj>ו ]				WXYq << ZIm0	GEN 01,22
				=====	
[ <Su> ערב ] [ <Pr> יהי ] [ <Cj>ו ]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,23
[ <Su> בקר ] [ <Pr> יהי ] [ <Cj>ו ]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,23
[ <PC> יום חמישי ]				NmC1 << WayX	GEN 01,23
[ <Su> אלהים ] [ <Pr> יאמר ] [ <Cj>ו ]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,24
				=====	
[ <Aj> למינה ] [ <Ob> נפש חיה ] [ <Su> הארץ ] [ <Pr> תוצא ]				ZYqX << [Q]	GEN 01,24
[ <Aj> למינה ] [ <Ob> בהמה ורמש וחיתו ארץ ]				Ellp << ZYqX	GEN 01,24
				=====	
[ <Mo> כן ] [ <Pr> יהי ] [ <Cj>ו ]				Way0 << WayX	GEN 01,24
[ <Aj> למינה ] [ <Ob> את חית הארץ ] [ <Su> אלהים ] [ <Pr> יעש ] [ <Cj>ו ]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,25
[ <Aj> למינה ] [ <Ob> את הבהמה ] [ <Cj>ו ]				Ellp << WayX	GEN 01,25
[ <Aj> למינהו ] [ <Ob> את כל רמש האדמה ] [ <Cj>ו ]				Ellp << Ellp	GEN 01,25
[ <Su> אלהים ] [ <Pr> ירא ] [ <Cj>ו ]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,25
[ <Pr> טוב ] [ <Cj> כי ]				xQt0 [object ]	GEN 01,25
[ <Su> אלהים ] [ <Pr> יאמר ] [ <Cj>ו ]				WayX << WayX	GEN 01,26





[<Pr> עשה]	[<Re> אשר]				xQt0 [reg/rec]	GEN 01,31
[<Mo> מאד]	[<PC> טוב]	[<Ij> הנה]	[<Cj>ו]			AjC1 << WayX GEN 01,31
	[<Su> ערב]	[<Pr> יהי]	[<Cj>ו]			WayX << WayX GEN 01,31
	[<Su> בקר]	[<Pr> יהי]	[<Cj>ו]			WayX << WayX GEN 01,31
	[<PC> יום הששי]					NmC1 << WayX GEN 01,31

## APPENDIX B

### GENESIS 3

[<Aj> מכל חית השדה [<PC> ערום [<Pr> היה [<Su> הנחש [<Cj>ו]	WXQt << [R] GEN 03,01
[<Su> יהוה אלהים [<Pr> עשה [<Re> אשר	xQtX [attrib.] GEN 03,01
[<Co> אל האשה [<Pr> יאמר [<Cj>ו]	Way0 << WXQt GEN 03,01
	=====
[<Su> אלהים [<Pr> אמר [<Cj> כי [<Mo> אף	xQtX << [Q] GEN 03,01
	=====
[<Co> מכל עץ הגן [<Pr> תאכלו [<Ng> לא	xYq0 << [Q] GEN 03,01
	=====
[<Co> אל הנחש [<Su> האשה [<Pr> תאמר [<Cj>ו]	WayX << Way0 GEN 03,02
	=====
[<Pr> נאכל [<Co> מפרי עץ הגן	xYq0 << [Q] GEN 03,02
	=====
[<Fr> מפרי העץ [<Cj>ו	CPen << [Q] GEN 03,03
[<PC> בתוך הגן [<Re> אשר	NmCl [attrib.] GEN 03,03
	=====
[<Su> אלהים [<Pr> אמר	ZQtX << CPen GEN 03,03
	=====
[<Co> ממנו [<Pr> תאכלו [<Ng> לא	xYq0 [resumpt] GEN 03,03
[<Co> בו [<Pr> תגעו [<Ng> לא [<Cj>ו	WxY0 << xYq0 GEN 03,03
[<Pr> תמתון [<Cj> פן	xYq0 << xYq0 GEN 03,03
	=====
[<Co> אל האשה [<Su> הנחש [<Pr> יאמר [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX GEN 03,04
	=====
[<Pr> תמתון [<Mo> מות [<Ng> לא	xYq0 << [Q] GEN 03,04
[<Su> אלהים [<PC> ידע [<Cj> כי	Ptcp << xYq0 GEN 03,05

[<Fr> ביום] [<Cj> כי]	CPen [object ] GEN 03,05
[<Co> ממנו] [<Ps> אכלכם]	InfC [reg/rec] GEN 03,05
[<Su> עיניכם] [<Pr> נפקחו] [<Cj> ו]	WQtX [resumpt] GEN 03,05
[<PC> כאלהים] [<Pr> הייתם] [<Cj> ו]	WQt0 [coordin] GEN 03,05
[<PC> ידעי טוב ורע]	NmCl [attrib.] GEN 03,05 =====
[<Su> האשה] [<Pr> תרא] [<Cj> ו]	WayX << WayX GEN 03,06
[<Aj> למאכל] [<Su> העץ] [<PC> טוב] [<Cj> כי]	AjCl [object ] GEN 03,06
[<Aj> לעינים] [<Su> הוא] [<PC> תאווה] [<Cj> כי]	NmCl [coordin] GEN 03,06
[<Su> העץ] [<PC> נחמד] [<Cj> ו]	Ptcp [coordin] GEN 03,06
[<Pr> להשכיל]	InfC [adjunct] GEN 03,06
[<Co> מפריו] [<Pr> תקח] [<Cj> ו]	Way0 << WayX GEN 03,06
[<Pr> תאכל] [<Cj> ו]	Way0 << Way0 GEN 03,06
[<Aj> עמה] [<Co> גם לאישה] [<Pr> נתן] [<Cj> ו]	Way0 << Way0 GEN 03,06
[<Pr> יאכל] [<Cj> ו]	Way0 << Way0 GEN 03,06
[<Su> עיני שניהם] [<Pr> תפקחנה] [<Cj> ו]	WayX << WayX GEN 03,07
[<Pr> ידעו] [<Cj> ו]	Way0 << WayX GEN 03,07
[<Su> הם] [<PC> עירמם] [<Cj> כי]	AjCl [object ] GEN 03,07
[<Ob> עלה תאנה] [<Pr> יתפרו] [<Cj> ו]	Way0 << Way0 GEN 03,07
[<Ob> חגרת] [<Co> להם] [<Pr> יעשו] [<Cj> ו]	Way0 << Way0 GEN 03,07
[<Ob> את קול יהוה אלהים] [<Pr> ישמעו] [<Cj> ו]	Way0 << Way0 GEN 03,08
[<Ti> לרוח היום] [<Co> בגן] [<PC> מתהלך]	Ptcp [attrib.] GEN 03,08
[<Lo> בתוך עץ הגן] [<Co> מפני יהוה אלהים] [<Su> האדם ואשתו] [<Pr> יתחבא] [<Cj> ו]	WayX << Way0 GEN 03,08
[<Co> אל האדם] [<Su> יהוה אלהים] [<Pr> יקרא] [<Cj> ו]	WayX << WayX GEN 03,09
[<Co> לו] [<Pr> יאמר] [<Cj> ו]	Way0 << WayX GEN 03,09 =====
[<PS> איכה]	NmCl << [Q] GEN 03,09 =====
[<Pr> יאמר] [<Cj> ו]	Way0 << Way0 GEN 03,10 =====
[<Lo> בגן] [<Pr> שמעתי] [<Ob> את קלך]	xQt0 << [Q] GEN 03,10 -----
[<Pr> אירא] [<Cj> ו]	Way0 << xQt0 GEN 03,10

[<Su> אנכי ] [<PC> עירם ] [<Cj> כי ]	AjC1 << Way0	GEN 03,10
[<Pr> אחבא ] [<Cj>ו]	Way0 << Way0	GEN 03,10
	=====	
[<Pr> יאמר ] [<Cj>ו]	Way0 << Way0	GEN 03,11
	=====	
[<Co> לך ] [<Pr> הגיד ] [<Su> מי ]	XQt1 << [Q]	GEN 03,11
[<Su> אתה ] [<PC> עירם ] [<Cj> כי ]	AjC1 [object ]	GEN 03,11
[<Co> מן העץ ] [<Qu>ה]	Defc << XQt1	GEN 03,11
[<PO> צויתך ] [<Re> אשר ]	xQt0 [attrib.]	GEN 03,11
[<Co> ממונו ] [<Pr> לבלתי אכל ]	InfC [adjunct]	GEN 03,11
[<Pr> אכלת ]	ZQt0 << Defc	GEN 03,11
	=====	
[<Su> האדם ] [<Pr> יאמר ] [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX	GEN 03,12
	=====	
[<Fr> האשה ]	CPen << [Q]	GEN 03,12
[<Co> עמדי ] [<Pr> נתתה ] [<Re> אשר ]	xQt0 [attrib.]	GEN 03,12
[<Co> מן העץ ] [<Co> לי ] [<Pr> נתנה ] [<Su> הוא ]	XQt1 [resumpt]	GEN 03,12
	-----	
[<Pr> אכל ] [<Cj>ו]	Way0 [coordin]	GEN 03,12
	=====	
[<Co> לאשה ] [<Su> יהוה אלהים ] [<Pr> יאמר ] [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX	GEN 03,13
	=====	
[<Pr> עשית ] [<Ob> מה זאת ]	xQt0 << [Q]	GEN 03,13
	=====	
[<Su> האשה ] [<Pr> תאמר ] [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX	GEN 03,13
	=====	
[<PO> השיאני ] [<Su> הנחש ]	XQt1 << [Q]	GEN 03,13
	-----	
[<Pr> אכל ] [<Cj>ו]	Way0 << XQt1	GEN 03,13
	=====	
[<Co> הנחש ] [<Su> יהוה אלהים ] [<Pr> יאמר ] [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX	GEN 03,14
	=====	
[<Ob> זאת ] [<Pr> עשית ] [<Cj> כי ]	xQt0 << [Q]	GEN 03,14
[<Aj> מכל הבהמה ומכל חית השדה ] [<Su> אתה ] [<PC> ארור ]	Ptcp << xQt0	GEN 03,14
[<Pr> תלך ] [<Co> על גחנך ]	xYq0 << Ptcp	GEN 03,14
[<Ti> כל ימי חיך ] [<Pr> תאכל ] [<Ob> עפר ] [<Cj>ו]	WxY0 << xYq0	GEN 03,14

[<Co>]	זרעה	[<Pr>]	אשית	[<Ob>]	איבה	[<Cj>]	ו]				WxY0	<<	WxY0	GEN	03,15
[<Ob>]	ראש	[<PO>]	ישופך	[<Su>]	הוא						XYqt	<<	WxY0	GEN	03,15
[<Ob>]	עקב	[<PO>]	תשופנו	[<Su>]	אתה	[<Cj>]	ו]				WXYq	<<	XYqt	GEN	03,15
															=====
[<Pr>]	אמר	[<Co>]	אל	האשה							xQt0	<<	WayX	GEN	03,16
															=====
[<Ob>]	עצבונך	[<Pr>]	ארבה	[<Mo>]	הרבה						xYq0	<<	[Q]	GEN	03,16
[<Ob>]	בנים	[<Pr>]	תלדי	[<Aj>]	בעצב						xYq0	<<	xYq0	GEN	03,16
[<Su>]	תשוקתך	[<PC>]	אל	אישך	[<Cj>]	ו]					NmC1	<<	xYq0	GEN	03,16
[<Co>]	בך	[<Pr>]	ימשל	[<Su>]	הוא	[<Cj>]	ו]				WXYq	<<	NmC1	GEN	03,16
															=====
[<Pr>]	אמר	[<Co>]	לאדם	[<Cj>]	ו]						WxQ0	<<	xQt0	GEN	03,17
															=====
[<Co>]	לקול	אשתך	[<Pr>]	שמעת	[<Cj>]	כי					xQt0	<<	[Q]	GEN	03,17
															-----
[<Co>]	מן	העץ	[<Pr>]	תאכל	[<Cj>]	ו]					Way0	<<	xQt0	GEN	03,17
[<PO>]	צויתך	[<Re>]	אשר								xQt0	[attrib.]		GEN	03,17
[<Pr>]	לאמר										InfC	[adjunct]		GEN	03,17
															=====
[<Co>]	ממנו	[<Pr>]	תאכל	[<Ng>]	לא						xYq0	<<	[Q]	GEN	03,17
															-----
[<Aj>]	בעבורך	[<Su>]	האדמה	[<PC>]	ארורה						Ptcp	<<	xQt0	GEN	03,17
[<Ti>]	כל	ימי	חיך	[<PO>]	תאכלנה	[<Aj>]					xYq0	<<	Ptcp	GEN	03,17
[<Co>]	לך	[<Pr>]	תצמיח	[<Ob>]	קוץ	ודרדר	[<Cj>]	ו]							WxY0 << xYq0 GEN 03,18
[<Ob>]	את	עשב	השדה	[<Pr>]	אכלת	[<Cj>]	ו]				WQt0	<<	xYq0	GEN	03,18
[<Ob>]	לחם	[<Pr>]	תאכל	[<Aj>]	בזעת	אפיך					xYq0	<<	xYq0	GEN	03,19
[<Co>]	אל	האדמה	[<Ps>]	עד	שוכך						InfC	[adjunct]		GEN	03,19
[<Pr>]	לקחת	[<Co>]	ממנה	[<Cj>]	כי						xQt0	<<	xYq0	GEN	03,19
[<Su>]	אתה	[<PC>]	עפר	[<Cj>]	כי						NmC1	<<	xQt0	GEN	03,19
[<Pr>]	תשוב	[<Co>]	אל	עפר	[<Cj>]	ו]					WxY0	<<	NmC1	GEN	03,19
															=====
[<Ob>]	חזה	[<Ob>]	שם	אשתו	[<Su>]	האדם	[<Pr>]	יקרא	[<Cj>]	ו]	WayX	<<	WxQ0	GEN	03,20
[<PC>]	אם	כל	חי	[<Pr>]	היתה	[<Su>]	הוא	[<Cj>]	כי		XQt1	<<	WayX	GEN	03,20

[<Ob> כתנות עור [<Co> לאדם ולאשתו [<Su> יהוה אלהים [<Pr> יעש [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX GEN 03,21
[<PO> ילבשם [<Cj>ו]	Way0 << WayX GEN 03,21
[<Su> יהוה אלהים [<Pr> יאמר [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX GEN 03,22
	=====
[<PC><sp> כאחד / ממנו [<Pr> היה [<Su> האדם [<Ij> הן	XQt1 << [Q] GEN 03,22
[<Ob> טוב ורע [<Pr> לדעת	InfC [adjunct] GEN 03,22
[<Ti> עתה [<Cj>ו]	MSyn << XQt1 GEN 03,22
[<Ob> ידו [<Pr> ישלח [<Cj>פן]	xYq0 << MSyn GEN 03,22
[<Co> גם מעץ החיים [<Pr> לקח [<Cj>ו]	WQt0 << xYq0 GEN 03,22
[<Pr> אכל [<Cj>ו]	WQt0 << WQt0 GEN 03,22
[<Ti> לעלם [<Pr> חי [<Cj>ו]	WQt0 << WQt0 GEN 03,22
	=====
[<Co> מגן עדן [<Su> יהוה אלהים [<PO> ישלחהו [<Cj>ו]	WayX << WayX GEN 03,23
[<Ob> את האדמה [<Pr> לעבד	InfC [adjunct] GEN 03,23
[<Co> משם [<Pr> לקח [<Re> אשר	xQt0 [attrib.] GEN 03,23
[<Ob> את האדם [<Pr> יגרש [<Cj>ו]	Way0 << WayX GEN 03,24
[<Ob> את הכרבים ואת להט החרב [<Co><sp> לגן עדן [<Pr> מקדם /	Way0 << Way0 GEN 03,24
[<PC> מתהפכת [<Re> ה]	Ptcp [attrib.] GEN 03,24
[<Ob> לשמר [<Pr> את דרך עץ החיים]	InfC [adjunct] GEN 03,24

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Averbeck, Richard. "Ancient Near Eastern Mythography as It Relates to Historiography in the Hebrew Bible: Genesis 3 and the Cosmic Conflict." Pages 328-56 in *The Future of Biblical Archaeology: Reassessing Methodologies and Assumptions*. Edited by James K. Hoffmeier and Alan Millard. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Barr, James. *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Genesis*. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1982.
- Cassuto, Umberto. *Genesis: From Adam to Noah*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1989.
- Collins, John. "What Happened to Adam and Eve?" *Prebyterion* 27/1 (2001):12-44.
- Emmrich, Martin. "The Temptation Narrative of Genesis" *The Evangelical Quarterly* 73 (2001):3-20.
- Fokkelman, Jan P. *Reading Biblical Narrative*. Leiderdorp, The Netherlands: Deo Publishing, 1999.
- Frethiem, Terrence E. "Is Genesis 3 a Fall Story?" *Word & World* 16/2 (1994):144-53.
- Grudem, Wayne A. *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Hamilton, Victor P. *NICT: Genesis 1-17*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- House, Paul R. *Old Testament Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998.
- Hmphreys, W. Lee. *The Character of God in the Book of Genesis*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Kugel, James L. *The Bible as It Was*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Matthews, Kenneth A. *NAC: Genesis 1-11:26*. USA: Broadman & Holamn Publishers, 1996.



- Moberly, R. W. L. "Did the Serpent Get It Right." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1988):1-27.
- Rendtorff, Rold. *The Canonical Hebrew Bible*. Translated by David E. Orton. Leiderdorp, The Netherlands: Deo Publishing, 2005.
- Sailhamer, John H. *The Pentateuch as Narrative*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.
- Smith, Duane E. "The Divining Serpent: Reading Genesis 3 in the Context of Mesopotamian Ophiomancy." *JBL* 134 (2015):31-49.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. *Genesis*. Philadelphia, Penn: Westminster, 1972.
- Walsh, Jerome T. "Genesis 2:4b-3:24: A Synchronic Approach." *JBL* 96 (1977):161-77.
- Waltke, Bruce K. *Genesis*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.
- Wenham, Gordon. *Genesis 1-15*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 1-11*. Translated by John J. Scullion S.J. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1974.
- Whybray, R. N. *The Intellectual Tradition in the Old Testament*. Germany: Walter de Gruyter, 1974.
- Yarbrough, R. W. "Heilsgeschichte." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Edited by Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.