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This dissertation reevaluates the most significant biblical evidence and theological implications involved in the debate over possible vocabulary pertaining to a sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 1-3. Thus, this study addresses the following research question: Is there evidence for the sanctuary/temple in the creation and Eden narratives, and if so, what are the implications of this evidence?

Chapter I introduces the background to the problem by summarizing the most significant scholarly arguments for and against allusions to the sanctuary/temple in Gen 1-3. In addition, this chapter projects particular implications related to the interpretation of the Eden narratives (Gen 2:4b-3:24), the creation account (Gen 1:1-2:4a), and the theology of the sanctuary/temple in the biblical canon.
Chapters II-III reexamine the biblical evidence in the Eden narratives of Gen 2-3, specifically the arguments arising from the Hebrew word עֵדֶן in Gen 2:8, the garden as a mountain in Gen 2:10, the river of Eden in Gen 2:10, the Hebrew verbs עָבַד and שָמַר in Gen 2:15, the Hebrew word צֵלָע and the Hebrew verb בָנָה in Gen 2:21-22, the Hebrew participleךְֵּמִתְהַל in Gen 3:8, the Hebrew word כֻּתֹּנֶת and the Hebrew verb לָבַשְׂ in Gen 3:21, the Hebrew word כְּרֻּבִים in Gen 3:24, and the eastern entrance to the garden in Gen 3:24. The discussion leads to the conclusion that the Garden of Eden and its cultic conceptual framework reflect the sanctuary/temple in the heavenly realm. Accordingly, the earthly sanctuary/temple (the wilderness tabernacle/Solomon’s Temple) is not the only type of the heavenly counterpart: the Eden narratives of Gen 2-3 portray in vertical typology an equivalence of functionality (Ezek 28).

Chapter IV reveals that the motif of temple building and the creation account of Gen 1:1-2:4a show a corresponding purpose by concluding with rest on the seventh day. This connection indicates that just as God governs from his sanctuary/temple (in the heavens), he governs the newly created earth (Gen 2:1-3; cf. Exod 20:11; 31:17; Pss 78:69; 132:7-8, 13-14; Isa 66:1-2). Similarly, the connection between the creation account and the sanctuary/temple motif is observed when the special vocabulary of the fourth day of the creation week is recognized (Gen 1:14-16), revealing the writer’s intentionality to embed the historical narrative within a semantic or conceptual framework.

Chapter V discusses the theological implications of the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 1-3. The biblical evidence points to the interpretation of the beginning and end of Scripture (creation and re-creation) through the sanctuary/temple motif. Thus, the
historical development of God’s creative and redemptive acts is framed by the sanctuary/temple. This conclusion is reached when considering the equivalence of functionality between heaven and earth through vertical typology, a pattern that is prevalent in Scripture. Accordingly, this vertical typology approach establishes the concept of Eden as an archetypal framework from the beginning of the biblical narrative to the end of it, and even beyond Heilsgeschichte into eternity.

Chapter VI summarizes the findings of this study. The reevaluation of the major biblical arguments for the sanctuary/temple motif reveals the presence of this motif both linguistically and conceptually in Gen 1-3. The protological and eschatological intertextual relationship comprehends a correlational semantical framework: the canonical/biblical narrative commences with Eden in heaven (Ezek 28), continues with Eden on Earth (Gen 2-3), and ends with a heavenly Eden on earth (Rev 22). Therefore, archetypically the Garden of Eden was, is, and will be the ideal place of rest in protology and eschatology.
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<tr>
<td>TJB</td>
<td>The Jerusalem Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB</td>
<td>Living Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLOT</td>
<td><em>Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTC</td>
<td>Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td><em>Theological Studies</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWOT</td>
<td><em>Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TynBul</td>
<td>Tyndale Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TZ</td>
<td><em>Theologische Zeitschrift</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBCS</td>
<td>Understanding the Bible Commentary Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td><em>Ugarit-Forschungen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td><em>Vetus Testamentum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTSup</td>
<td>Supplements to <em>Vetus Testamentum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC</td>
<td>Word Biblical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>World English Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTJ</td>
<td><em>Westminster Theological Journal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td><em>Word &amp; World</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYC</td>
<td>Wycliffe’s Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YLT</td>
<td>Young Literal Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAW</td>
<td><em>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZPEB</td>
<td>The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

The opening chapters of the book of Genesis are among the most well-known passages of Scripture.¹ In recent years, more scholarly attention has been paid to investigating the creation and Eden narratives² in light of sanctuary/temple allusions. These scholars’ works have generated meaningful questions, the pursuit of which is likely to lead to a better understanding of Gen 1-3.³ Therefore, this dissertation reevaluates major current scholarly arguments for and against allusions to the sanctuary/temple in Gen 1-3. Except when specific reference is made to a biblical text, the words allusions and motif are used throughout this study to indicate the possibility of sanctuary/temple imagery in these chapters. In this sense, allusions and motif do not refer to a source text (see the “Methodology” section below). The expression sanctuary/temple refers to the motif as it is found in the wilderness tabernacle, Israel’s temple in Jerusalem


² In this dissertation, the creation narrative will refer to Gen 1:1-2:4a and Eden narratives to Gen 2:4b-3:24.

³ See especially pages 9-10 of this dissertation.
(including the Zerubbabel Second Temple), the vision of a new temple given to the prophet Ezekiel, and the heavenly sanctuary/temple.

The Hebrew Bible resembles a literary echo chamber because of the widespread usage of intertextuality. Scholars who study the Old Testament with this approach have found the book of Genesis a particularly rewarding resource. Although the creation and Eden narratives have been connected to other parts of the Bible, few lines of investigation have caused an effect as potentially significant (to the interpretation of Gen 1-3) as the possibility of allusions to the sanctuary/temple. These allusions have been pondered and summarized for some time in numerous scholarly works, but recently fresh interest has

---


arisen, yielding insightful reassessments of this topic. The following paragraphs summarize some of the most significant issues in the debate over possible allusions to the sanctuary/temple in Gen 1-3.

Scholars have identified sanctuary/temple allusions in Gen 1:1-2:4a on exegetical and intertextual grounds. However, recent reassessment suggests a growing consensus


8 The following list of allusions is not intended to be exhaustive. It represents an overview with the purpose of illustrating the direction this research might take. Also, many of the connections are proposed and summarized in Wenham, “Sanctuary Symbolism,” 19-25; Donald W. Parry, “Garden of Eden: Prototype Sanctuary,” in Temples of the Ancient World: Ritual and Symbolism, ed. Donald W. Parry (Salt Lake City: Deseret, 1994), 126-27; Davidson, “Cosmic Metanarrative,” 109-11; Richard M. Davidson, “Earth's First Sanctuary: Gen 1-3 and Parallel Creation Accounts,” AUSS 53.1 (2015): 65-89. The basic

For the sake of clarity, these possible allusions are listed in the order of the biblical narrative:


2. The term מָאוֹר [māʾôr; “lamp” or “luminary”] in Gen 1:14 is the technical term for the light of the menorah. Cf. Exod 25:6; 27:20; 35:8, 14, 28; 39:27; Lev 24:2; Num 4:9, 16.


Davidson observes additional allusions in the following verbs: see, make/do, behold, finish, work, bless, and sanctify/consecrate. Davidson also suggests that the verb בָדַל [bâḏal; “to divide” or “separate”] “is used to describe the way God created by separation (Gen 1:4, 6-7, 18), and after the creation account the next usage of the term *bdl* in Scripture describes the veil in the Mosaic sanctuary which divides between the Holy Place and the Most Holy Place (Exod 26:33).” See Davidson, “Earth’s First Sanctuary,” 82-83.

Blenkinsopp also argues that the next biblical reference to the Spirit of God, after Gen 1:1, is found in Exod 31:3, which constitutes a linguistic parallel. He concludes that this fact confirms “the structural interdependence within P of creation, construction of the sanctuary, and occupation of the land.” Blenkinsopp, “The Structure of P,” 282. See also Richard M. Davidson, “The Holy Spirit in the Pentateuch” (paper presented at IX Biblical-Theological Symposium, Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, May 2011), 8.

among critics with regard to the methods used by some interpreters of Gen 1. For example, John H. Walton applies some allusions to the sanctuary/temple in Gen 1 to set forth a “Cosmic Temple Inauguration” view. Although Walton provides some evidence of biblical connections between the sanctuary/temple and the creation narrative, criticism has been directed at his reliance on extra-biblical analogues, which has been termed “excessive” and “quite troubling.” However, aside from the use of ANE texts or any suggested ANE Sitz im Leben of Gen 1-3, Walton himself appears to introduce the first contention. He writes, “The word ‘temple’ does not occur in the text, and nothing there would alert the modern reader to any connection.” In fact, biblical evidence of the cosmos as a sanctuary/temple primarily depends on the idea that “divine rest is in a temple” (Gen 2:1-3). This idea is based on possible intertextual linkages (cf. Ps 132: 7-

9 Walton makes an effort to validate what he calls “functional creation” as more important than material creation and completing the work of creation. According to Walton, the “functional creation” is normative within the ANE. Walton, Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology, 23-28; 127-39. But this contention has been countered on the same grounds of ancient texts. See various examples of material creation in ANE texts in Averbeck et al., “Four Responses to Chapter Five,” 172. See also Jacques B. Doukhan, “Review of John H. Walton's Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology,” AUSS 51.1 (2013): 84-85.


12 Beale, Temple and the Church's Mission, 60-63; Walton, Lost World of Genesis One, 72-77. See also Morales, The Tabernacle Pre-Figured, 77. Cf. John Laansma, “‘I Will Give You Rest’: The Rest Motif in the New Testament with Special Reference to Mt 11 and Heb 3-4” (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 17-76. A secondary motif is temple building (Exod 25-31); see Kearney, “Creation and Liturgy,” 375-78. According to Weinfeld, Kearney’s parallelism of six commands is hardly convincing. However, it is significant that the number of commands during the construction process is six. Weinfeld, “Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement,” 502. It is important to consider also Doukhan’s discussion on Kearney’s
14; Isa 66:1; 2 Chr 6:41, 42). According to Daniel Block, who thoroughly criticizes this connection, neither Gen 2:1-3 nor any texts that look back on this moment have God dwelling in the structure just constructed. Block argues that rather than referring to a cosmos-sized temple, “when later texts speak of YHWH resting they are less concerned with the creation of the cosmos than with Zion theology.”

Collins aptly observes, “Now, the idea of the cosmos as a temple might be illuminating. If we want to establish it, though we would need more attention to the way the rest of the Hebrew Bible itself actually reflects on Genesis 2:1-3.” Indeed, the reevaluation of this idea may yield some dividends, considering the possibility of sanctuary/temple allusions and their implications in the creation account.

---

13 Some interpreters support the notion of divine rest in light of ANE texts. However, Doukhan has already noted that “God’s rest in Genesis 2 is also fundamentally different from that of the gods in other Near Eastern texts.” Doukhan, “Review of John H. Walton,” 87.

14 Block gives various arguments to conclude that Israel’s rest on the seventh-day Sabbath “says nothing about a temple metaphor underlying Gen 1.” Block, “Eden: A Temple?,” 6, 19-20.


16 For example, Vogels argues that Gen 2:1-3 is primarily concerned with time. Thus, inasmuch as Gen 1 begins with time, mentions time in the middle, and ends with time, the connection between the first, fourth, and seventh days indicates that the seventh day is one of the cultic calendars mentioned in the fourth day. Vogels proposes that the parallels between the creation narrative (Gen 1:2-4a), the building of the sanctuary (Exod 25-31; 25-40), and the investiture of the priests (Lev 8-9) represent the founding of sacred time, of sacred space, and of sacred status. Vogels further states, “Many extra-biblical creation narratives end with the building of a sanctuary. Not so for the biblical story. That story is concerned with time: The founding of the cultic and civil calendars. Sanctuaries and priestly functions are all secondary. They can change and even disappear.” Vogels, “Cultic and Civil Calendars,” 176, 178-79. Cf. Turner, “Theological Reading of Genesis 1,” 74. Nahum M. Sarna also comments that this emphasis on time “is in striking contrast to the Babylonian cosmology, which culminates in the erection of a temple to Marduk by the gods, whereby asserting the sanctification of space.” Nahum M. Sarna, Genesis (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 15.
Scholars have also advanced on exegetical and intertextual grounds the idea that the pre-Fall narrative of Eden\(^\text{17}\) (Gen 2) and the post-Fall narrative of Eden\(^\text{18}\) (Gen 3)

\(^{17}\) See, for example, some of the proposed exegetical/intertextual allusions in Gen 2:


5. The Hebrew word נָבַש (nâḇâš; “rib,” “side”) and the Hebrew verb נַפְשׂ (nafšî; “to build”) in Gen 2:21-22 are associated with the construction of the tabernacle (cf. Exod 25:12; 26:20, 26, 27, 27:7; 30:4; 36:31, 32; 37:3, 5, 27; 38:7) and with Solomon’s temple (cf. 1 Kgs 6:5; 8, 15, 16, 34; 7:3).

6. Additional sanctuary/temple aspects allude to specific imagery of the garden: for example, the gold, precious stones, arboreal imagery, and tripartite structure of the garden.

\(^{18}\) The following arguments are suggested exegetical/intertextual allusions in Gen 3:

1. The Hebrew verb נְבָא (nabhâ; “go, walk”), forming the participle נְבָאֵת (nabhât; “walking around”) in Gen 3:8 is associated with God’s presence in the sanctuary. Cf. Lev 26:12; Deut 23:15[14]; 2 Sam 7:6, 7.


depict an archetypal (first) earthly sanctuary. Some interpreters of Gen 2-3 resort to extra-biblical literature to support a temple-oriented reading of the biblical text. Nevertheless, a recent reassessment of biblical evidence concludes that “every supposed link is either illusory or capable of a different interpretation.” The rationale for this conclusion becomes more visible when one recognizes that much of the cited biblical evidence revolves around the interpretation of the Hebrew words עֵדֶן [‘ēden; “land of bliss,” “happy land”] and כְּרוּב [keruḇîm; “cherub”]. Less evident, but much more prevalent, is the fact that both advocates and critics of sanctuary/temple allusions seem to depend on their interpretations of Ezek 28:11-19, which in scholarly literature tend to go in several directions. For example, Gregory K. Beale comments that the association between the words עֵדֶן and כְּרוּב describes a temple scenario. Other commentators contend that

(5) Sailhamer suggests some comparisons between the Eden narrative and Deut 32. Israel’s wilderness wanderings were in a land formless and void, but entrance into Canaan was entering the Garden of Eden. John H. Sailhamer, “Genesis,” in The Expositor’s Bible Commentary, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990), 2:25.

(6) Davidson, in addition to exegetical/intertextual allusions, identifies various conceptual connections, including, among others, investigative judgment, the sacrificial system initiated, and heptadic patterns. See full discussion in Davidson, “Earth's First Sanctuary,” 74-80.

19 For example, Jacob Rennaker argues that the connection with the Enuma Elish goes beyond Gen 1. He remarks that a temple-oriented conversation between Gen 1-3 and the Enuma Elish demonstrates that temple imagery permeates Gen 2-3. Jacob Rennaker, “Temple Voices in Conflict and Chorus: A Comparative Approach to Temple Imagery in Genesis 1-3 and the Enuma Elish” (paper presented to the Society of Biblical Literature, San Diego, 2014).


21 Beale further comments that “Ezekiel 28:18 is probably, therefore, the most explicit place anywhere in canonical literature where the Garden of Eden is called a temple.” Beale, Temple and the Church’s Mission, 75-76. Cf. Hurowitz, “YHWH's Exalted House,” 87; Turner, “Theological Reading of Genesis 1,” 75.
כְּרוּב is not restricted to sacred space, and therefore, the use of כְּרוּב in Gen 3:24 and Ezek 28 does not establish the garden as a sanctuary.  

The repercussions of such possible connections could affect scholarly understanding of the entire Bible, due to the fact that among the variety of approaches as to what forms the theological center of Scripture, some scholars contend that sanctuary/temple allusions in Gen 1-3 are a foundational interpretive key to biblical theology. For the purpose of this study, the controversial implications are mainly related to the interpretation of Gen 1-3 and the theology of the sanctuary.  

Laurence A. Turner suggests that “to see sanctuary theology here requires a greater degree of literary engagement, a willingness to accept that these chapters might be more than simple historical accounts of actual events, and an openness to new ways of


24 Davidson calls this approach a “multi-faceted theological center of Scripture,” which is based on the creation and Eden narratives. Among the seven dimensions of Gen 1-3 that he observes, the seventh facet demonstrates that “the first chapters of Genesis present the Garden of Eden as a Sanctuary. The sanctuary is the setting of the rise of the Great Controversy on earth, just as it was the setting for its prior inception in heaven, as described in Isa 14 and Ezek 28.” Richard M. Davidson, “Back to the Beginning: Genesis 1-3 and the Theological Center of Scripture,” in Christ, Salvation, and the Exchaton: Essays in Honor of Hans K. LaRondelle, ed. Daniel Heinz, Jiří Moskala, and Peter M. Van Bemmelen (Berrien Springs: Andrews University, 2009), 5-29; Davidson, “Cosmic Metanarrative,” 104-13. Roberto Ouro also understands the link between the sanctuary and creation in the context of the Garden of Eden narrative as an essential canonical key for Old Testament theology. Ouro, Old Testament Theology, 38-57.

utilizing Scripture.” Gordon J. Wenham is also open to a cultic interpretation of these chapters in view of sanctuary/temple allusions. Some scholars consider that such allusions seem to warrant the idea that Gen 1-3 is primarily a temple/cultic text, rather than a historical record of material origins.

Possible substantiation of sanctuary/temple allusions in Gen 1-3 brings up important questions concerning the relationship between creation and redemption. Do allusions to the sanctuary/temple in Gen 1-3 substantiate the notion that the creation is

---

26 Turner further states that “the fact that the biblical text weaves sanctuary symbolism into its account of creation also constitutes a significant counter to frequent exhortations from certain quarters that the only legitimate approach to Genesis 1 is to read it ‘literally.’ This position assumes the text to be one-dimensional. Rather, it is a complex and subtle narrative that works at more than one level, rewarding both literal and theological/symbolic readings.” Turner, “Theological Reading of Genesis 1,” 77-78.


28 In this dissertation the word cultic is employed to mean “related to any setting of worship.” This term refers to “all those fixed conventions of worship, observed by both the individual and the group, by which the benefits of divine favor in everyday life could be realized.” See Brevard S. Childs, Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context (Philadelphia: Fortress, 198), 155. Cf. Leo G. Perdue, Wisdom and Cult: A Critical Analysis of the Views of Cult in the Literature of Israel and the Ancient Near East (Missoula: Scholars, 1977), 9-11. Scholars sometimes prefer to use the word liturgy. This term refers narrowly to words and actions performed by cultic officials or laity in the course of worship. See J. W. Hilber, “Liturgy and Cult,” in Dictionary of the Old Testament: Prophets (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 2012), 514.


30 Gage comments that the relationship between creation and redemption is primarily soteriological. He proposes that Scripture depicts six great redemptive reenactments of creation, which describe “divine victory over the anti-creative beast followed by the establishment of a royal residence or temple.” Gage, The Gospel of Genesis, 17-19.
subordinated to soteriological considerations? A more precise question would be: Do allusions to the sanctuary/temple in Gen 1-3 speak about redemption and/or covenant, and if so in what way?

Implications regarding sanctuary/temple theology are also vital. Since an intertextual approach is essential to establish sanctuary/temple allusions, for some scholars the justification of these connections seems to imply that “the earthly sanctuary is not primarily a type of heavenly counterpart but a reflection of the cosmos or creation.” This observation raises some questions: Are such allusions in Gen 1-3 merely a reflection of an earthly sanctuary/temple, or do they necessarily require the existence of a cosmic sanctuary/temple? In addition, is the existence of a cosmic sanctuary/temple in Gen 1-3 in harmony with the existence of a heavenly sanctuary/temple? If so, what is the implication of a heavenly sanctuary/temple (as reflected in Gen 1-3) for the fate of the cosmos?


32 Gen 3:15 has been at the center of attention with regard to covenantal allusions in the opening chapters of Genesis. However, the focus here is rather on the sanctuary/temple allusions. For example, Collins observes that Gen 2:15-17 is a covenant. See various covenantal “hints” in C. John Collins, Genesis 1-4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary (Phillipsburg: P & R, 2006), 112-13.

33 The festival of Kippur (Day of Atonement) in Leviticus 16 had cosmic implications. According to Doukhan, “the cleansing of the sanctuary is in fact the sign of the total purification of the whole earth on the day of God’s judgment. Biblical theology understood the Israelite sanctuary as representative of the whole world that God created.” Jacques B. Doukhan, Secrets of Daniel: Wisdom and Dreams of a Jewish Prince in Exile (Hagerstown: Review and Herald, 2000), 129.

34 Souza further explains that, according to the parallelism between Daniel 7 and 8, “the sanctuary in these chapters is not an amorphous or ethereal cosmic temple—or world temple for that matter—but a sanctuary in heaven with structural and functional links with the sanctuary temple described elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.” Elias Brasil de Souza, “Sanctuary: Cosmos, Covenant, and Creation,” JATS 24.1 (2013): 25, 26, 39, 40.
**Problem Statement**

There is a lack of agreement among biblical scholars who investigate possible evidence for allusions to the sanctuary/temple in Gen 1-3. The question remains: Is there evidence for the sanctuary/temple in the creation and Eden narratives, and if so, what are the implications of this evidence?

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this dissertation is to reevaluate major current scholarly arguments for and against allusions to the sanctuary/temple in the creation and Eden narratives. In the process, I will explore the implications of sanctuary/temple allusions in these chapters, in particular the implications related to the interpretation of Gen 1-3 and the theology of the sanctuary.

**Justification for this Study**

Sanctuary/temple allusions in Gen 1-3 have been utilized independently to put forward various concepts.35 Scholars also mention such allusions in Bible commentaries,36 but referring mainly to some seminal studies.37 Although some sanctuary/temple allusions are mentioned in these studies, they are not the central focus of research.

---


Many of these scholars’ works have considerable merit, but room exists for further research. While some of these studies focus on specific aspects of the creation and Eden narratives, no work has thoroughly investigated (as a whole) allusions to the sanctuary/temple in Gen 1-3. In fact, despite the growing interest and reassessment, various fundamental issues remain unresolved.\(^{38}\)

A recent contribution in this research area is a book edited by L. Michael Morales, *Cult and Cosmos*, which reprints a collection of seminal essays dealing mainly with the relationship between cosmos and cult, often citing sanctuary/temple allusions in the creation and Eden narratives.\(^{39}\) Yet, there is limited scholarly dialogue between these studies. Moreover, it is often the case that sanctuary/temple allusions are dealt with separately (for example, the cultic meaning of the fourth day,\(^{40}\) divine rest,\(^{41}\) the temple-building motif,\(^{42}\) the Garden as holy mountain,\(^{43}\) and the river in Eden,\(^{44}\) among others). Exploring interconnections between possible allusions, this dissertation brings together, reevaluates, and synthesizes the biblical data currently available in scattered studies.

**Scope and Delimitations**

The focus of this dissertation is Gen 1-3 in relation to major current scholarly arguments for and against allusions to the sanctuary/temple. The analysis of these

---

\(^{38}\) See pages 3-8 of this dissertation.


\(^{40}\) Vogels, “Cultic and Civil Calendars,” 163-80.


\(^{44}\) McCarter, “River Ordeal,” 403.
arguments is based on the final form of the biblical text, and a comprehensive exegesis of the biblical text is not attempted. Only those aspects of the text that are relevant to the research question will receive special attention. In the process of this reevaluation I will delimit this research primarily, but not exclusively, to discussion of the following aspects:

1. The Hebrew word עֵדֶן in Gen 2:8.
2. The garden as a mountain in Gen 2:10.
3. The river of Eden in Gen 2:10.
4. The Hebrew verbs עָבַד and שָמַר in Gen 2:15.
5. The Hebrew word עֵינֶים and the Hebrew verb בָּנָה in Gen 2:21-22.
8. The Hebrew word כְּרֻּבִים in Gen 3:24.
11. The Hebrew words מוֹעֵד and מָאוֹר on the fourth day of creation.

Methodology

A review of the scholarly arguments (see “Background of the Problem” above) indicates that advocates and critics of the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 1-3 have employed intertextual theological analysis and biblical exegesis. Accordingly, I will combine both approaches in order to determine on the same grounds the extent and implications of such allusions. The following considerations will be taken into account in this study.
Scholars stress two fundamental exegetical methods for Old Testament studies: synchronic and diachronic.45 Daniel H. Ryou, drawing from Eep Talstra’s work, writes that these two approaches have different purposes in reading the text and are to be seen as complementary to each other.46 Talstra advances the idea that priority should be given to the former over the latter. He explains:

Of these two forms of textual analysis the synchronic analysis has an “operational priority” over the diachronic. The terminology is R. Polzin’s. He rightly stresses the use of the term “operational.” For the point is not that the synchronic is fundamentally privileged above the diachronic. The operational priority of the synchronic analysis means only that one first reads a text as a whole, as a unity, in an attempt to establish the structure of meaning of the whole and the contributions of the constituent parts of the text to the total meaning. Then comes the diachronic question of whether all the constituent parts of the text presuppose the same time and situation of origin.47

45 Biblical studies can be approached from two perspectives: diachronic and synchronic. Oeming explains that “this means the focus can be on either the historical development of texts, in which the later one draws on an earlier one, or on a possible interrelation between texts that can be discerned by someone who reads them together, especially when, as in the case of the Hebrew Bible, they form part of a defined corpus (canon).” Manfred Oeming, “To Be Adam or Not to Be Adam: The Hidden Fundamental Anthropological Discourse Revealed in an Intertextual Reading of אדם in Job and Genesis,” in Reading Job Intertextually, ed. Katharine J. Dell and William L. Kynes (New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2013), 21.

46 Ryou further comments that “the final text must be treated as a legitimate literary entity, even if it may contain layers of tradition and redaction such as historical data or aspects. One should not overestimate the later. After all, the exegetical process must start synchronically. In fact, the linguistic layer of a text should be studied as extensively as possible without inquiring into authors, genres or historical situations. This means that in order to prevent too much subjectivity in the use of such criteria (i.e., historical data) one should first make an analysis of the facts as they present themselves in the text. It would be quite wrong to start from a specific historical situation and allow this to determine the exegesis. Daniel H. Ryou, Zephaniah’s Oracles Against the Nations: A Synchronic and Diachronic Study of Zephaniah 2:1-3:8 (New York: Brill, 1995), 5.

47 Eep Talstra, Solomon’s Prayer: Synchrony and Diachrony in the Composition of 1 Kings 8:14-61, trans. Gebed Van Salomo (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993), 83-84.
Thus, in a synchronic exegetical analysis, “it is not the text in its historical process of development which is central, but only the text itself as a result of this process.”\textsuperscript{48} E. J. van Wolde describes this synchronic approach when an intertextual analysis is employed:

The reader is in the central position, on the basis of the idea that the reader is the one who allows the texts to interfere with one another. A reader who does not know any other texts cannot identify any intertextual relationships. The reader is the one who, through his or her own reading and life experience, lends significance to a great number or possibilities that a text offers. Consequently, the presumed historical process by which the text came into being is no longer important, but rather the final text product, which is compared with other texts in synchronic relationships.\textsuperscript{49}

In this sense, this dissertation adopts a mainly synchronic approach to biblical exegesis and intertextual analysis,\textsuperscript{50} which deals with the final form\textsuperscript{51} of the Masoretic Text.\textsuperscript{52} For our research, a synchronic exegetical/intertextual analysis entails a study of


\textsuperscript{50} Ryou further comments that “it must be remembered that diachronic questions arise from synchronic analysis (syntactic and stylistic analysis). . . . By separating synchronic matters from the diachronic ones, the exegetes thus arrive at good position to see the text clearly. This has, of course, clearly a heuristic value in dealing with the text.” Ryou, \textit{Zephaniah's Oracles}, 7. One may concede, with Ulrich Luz, that “the quest for intertexts is primarily a synchronous quest.” Ulrich Luz, “Intertexts in the Gospel of Matthew,” \textit{HTR} 97.2 (2004): 122.

\textsuperscript{51} This study refrains from the highly conjectured enterprise of historically reconstructing the sources of the Masoretic Text. Accordingly, major current scholarly arguments for and against allusions to the sanctuary/temple in Gen 1-3 are examined in the order of the biblical narrative.

Gen 1-3 as a whole, and also of the use of words (Leitworte)\textsuperscript{53} and the themes that play a role in possible allusions to the sanctuary/temple. Two areas of investigation will be combined in this synchronic exegetical/intertextual task: linguistic/syntactic analysis\textsuperscript{54} and literary analysis.\textsuperscript{55}

Consequently, the task of reevaluating major current scholarly arguments for and against allusions to the sanctuary/temple in Gen 1-3 is not primarily concerned with determining a source text.\textsuperscript{56} Rather, the analysis of intertextual allusions focuses on the possible motif of the sanctuary/temple in these chapters.

Interpreters identify different kinds of intertextual markers, which often occur in conjunction with one another. For the sake of clarity, in this dissertation there is no attempt to categorize each possible sanctuary/temple allusion. Nevertheless, it is profitable to identify the most common kinds of literary markers. Scholars use the

\textsuperscript{53} Bakon defines Buber’s notion of Leitworte as “the words and their derivatives or even synonymous that are repeated in various contexts in the Bible.” Shimon Bakon, “Creation, Tabernacle and Sabbath,” *JBQ* 25.2 (1997): 80.

\textsuperscript{54} Hebrew grammar is instrumental in this analysis.

\textsuperscript{55} Literary/stylistic analysis is used to investigate the literary devices employed in the biblical text.

following terms for these markers: allusions, key words and motifs, quotations, echoes, and analogy. There are some cases when the relationship may not be deliberately proposed by the biblical author and/or not be exegetically verifiable. Waltke calls this kind of intertextual relation “conceptualization.” He remarks:

Texts may also be connected by conceptualization. For example, as will be shown, themes such as people, land, law, rebellion, exile, and restoration that can be extrapolated from the Garden of Eden narrative can be connected with those same semantic themes in the rest of Scripture only by those conceptions, apart from citations, key words, or obvious allusions in the text.

57 Sommer offers a comprehensive analysis of intertextuality. He writes, “First, the reader recognizes what Ben-Porat calls a marker, an identifiable element or pattern in one text belonging to another independent text. The marker is one aspect of a sign in the referring text. The sign may be a poetic line or sentence or a phrase, or it may consist of a motif, a rhythmic pattern, an idea, or even the form of a work or its title. The second stage in the recognition of the allusion is the identification of the evoked text. This is not identical with the first stage, because it is possible that a reader will recognize a marker as referring to another text without recalling what the evoked text is. The third stage is the modification of the interpretation of the sign in the alluding text. The reader brings certain elements of the evoked text of the marked to bear on the alluding text, and these alter the reader’s construal of meaning of the sign in the alluding text.” Benjamin D. Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66 (Stanford: Stanford University, 1998), 11-12.

58 Waltke suggests that “just as the repetition of a key word gives coherence and focus to an individual text, so also the repetition of abstract words in numerous texts may signal their intertextual connections and biblical themes.” Bruce K. Waltke, An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 129.

59 Leene argues that this concept refers to similar syntactic patterns existing in clauses, besides their agreements in vocabulary. Leene, Newness in Old Testament Prophecy, 6.

60 Waltke, An Old Testament Theology, 142. A word of caution is in order, however. There are punctual elements to reconsider when evaluating intertextual relationships. Zakovitch comments, “One must not be carried away by coincidental associations between one biblical narrative and another, but rather care must be taken from the start to determine that a relation between the two narratives was intended: common expressions, plots with similar themes, and which are constructed in parallel or similar fashion.” Yair Zakovitch, “Through the Looking Glass: Reflections/Inversions of Genesis Stories in the Bible,” BibInt 1.2 (1993): 139-40. In view of this risk, Van Wolde proposes important criteria for intertextual and literary analysis in the Hebrew Bible: (1) Study the texts on their own; (2) Compile an inventory of repetitions in the compared texts; and (3) Analyze the new network of meaning originating from the meeting of the two texts. Van Wolde, “Texts in Dialogue with Texts,” 7-8. In the process of analyzing the meeting of the two texts, James Barr’s observation should also be considered—that “the distinctiveness of biblical thought and language has to be settled at sentence level, that is, by the things the writers say, and not by the words they say them with.” James Barr, The Semantics of Biblical Language (London: Oxford University, 1961), 270.
Finally, the trajectory of investigation in this study is as follows: After reviewing the background of the problem (chapter I), this dissertation reevaluates major current scholarly arguments for and against allusions to the sanctuary/temple in the pre-Fall narrative of Eden recorded in Gen 2:4b-2:25 (chapter II), in the post-Fall narrative of Eden recounted in Gen 3:1-3:24 (chapter III), and in the creation account in Gen 1:1-2:4a (chapter IV). This order of study was chosen because major scholarly arguments for and against allusions to the sanctuary/temple motif have emerged from Gen 2-3. Although interpreters also find evidence in the creation account of Gen 1:1-2:4a, the most common arguments are taken from the Eden narratives. Additionally, this study seeks to determine the extent and theological implications of sanctuary allusions in the creation and Eden narratives (chapter V). Lastly, a conclusion that includes a synthesis of the results (chapter VI) summarizes the contributions of this dissertation.
CHAPTER II

THE PRE-FALL NARRATIVE OF EDEN

Introduction

The scholarly discussion of textual evidence of the sanctuary/temple motif in the narrative of Eden (Gen 2:4b-3:24) has offered a wider spectrum of interpretation than that regarding the creation narrative (Gen 1:1-2:4a).¹ For this reason, in this chapter, I will first review the scholarly literature and reevaluate the textual/conceptual evidence purportedly related to the sanctuary/temple in the pre-Fall narrative of Eden (Gen 2:4b-2:25). The prominent syntactic and literary characteristics of this narrative that scholars have regarded as having a connection with the sanctuary/temple motif are: the Hebrew word עֵדֶן; the garden as a mountain in Gen 2:10; the river of Eden; the Hebrew verbs עָבַד and שָמַר in Gen 2:15; and the Hebrew word צֵלָע and the verb בָנָה in Gen 2:21-22.

Genesis 2:4b-2:25 and the Sanctuary/Temple Motif

The pre-Fall narrative of Eden introduces to the biblical canon the concept of the primeval paradise, an idea very well known in ancient literature.² Yet, a number of factors in Gen 2:4b-2:25 suggest that the author presents this narrative depicting the garden of Eden as a real place: rivers, trees, animals, flowering plants, etc.³ Thus, one

initial point can be made. Although the author describes Eden as a paradisiacal place, he distinguishes the garden from its surroundings with particular features. As has been pointed out by commentators, these particularities reverberate in the biblical canon. The question that is at issue for the purposes of this dissertation is this: Is the concept of Eden (and its surroundings) related to the sanctuary/temple motif?

The Hebrew Word עֵדֶן in Genesis 2:8

What is the meaning of Eden? The word עֵדֶן [‘ēden; “land of bliss,” “happy land”] in Gen 2-3 is described in association with the word גַן [gan; “garden”]. The etymology of this word “should be sought in relation to the Hebrew root ‘adan, which has the connotation of ‘pleasure’ and ‘delight’ (Ps 36:8; Jer 51:34),” perhaps linked with the sense of “a place where there is abundant water-supply.” Furthermore, עֵדֶן in the Hebrew Bible when it relates to the גַן of Gen 2 is identified as the “garden of the Lord” גַן־יְּהוָ֑ה, a place where joy, gladness, thanksgiving, and the voice of melody will be found (Isa 51:3; cf. Ezek 28:13 NKJV), in other words, a paradise (cf. Rev 2:7).  

---


5. The lexeme occurs fourteen times in the Hebrew Bible, but with the reference to the garden of Gen 2 only seven times (Isa 51:13; Ezek 28:13; 31:9, 16, 18; 36:35 and Joel 2:3). Scholarship generally favors the meaning of the term rendered by the LXX τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς (Gen. 3:23): “the land of luxury/splendor/light.” See A. R. Millard, “The Etymology of Eden,” VT 34.1 (1984): 103, 105. This is the meaning probably used in Rev 2:7: “Paradise of God.”


Yet, as crucial as this information has proven, it is by itself insufficient to determine the semantic framework that עֵדֶן may carry. The canonical semantic field of the word עֵדֶן is probably for some scholars “the most explicit place anywhere in canonical literature where the Garden of Eden is called a temple,” especially in light of Ezek 28:13. Other commentators, however, are critical of this concept and advance the idea that the terminology of Ezek 28 does not establish the garden as a sanctuary/temple. For this reason, intertextual analysis can be helpful to open up possibilities to determine meaningful canonical concepts. Advocates and critics of the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 2-3 often find Ezek 28:11-19 to be the key passage. The Hebrew text and its translation read:

28:11 The word of the LORD came to me, saying,
13. יַזְכֶּרָה אֵלָ֖ה אֲדֹנֶּ֣י לֵאָ֑מר

28:12 “Son of man, take up a lamentation for the king of Tyre, and say to him, ‘Thus says the Lord GOD: “You were the seal of perfection, Full of wisdom and perfect in beauty.

28:13 You were in Eden, the garden of God; Every precious stone was your covering: The sardius, topaz, and diamond, beryl, onyx, and jasper, sapphire, turquoise, and

10 Davidson, “Earth's First Sanctuary,” 67.
12 Unless otherwise indicated, English translation of the Hebrew text is taken henceforth from the NKJV.
emerald with gold. The workmanship of your timbrels and pipes was prepared for you on the day you were created.

28:14 “You were the anointed cherub who covers; I established you; You were on the holy mountain of God; You walked back and forth in the midst of fiery stones.

28:15 You were perfect in your ways from the day you were created, till iniquity was found in you.

28:16 “By the abundance of your trading You became filled with violence within, And you sinned; therefore I cast you as a profane thing out of the mountain of God; And I destroyed you, O covering cherub, from the midst of the fiery stones.

28:17 “Your heart was lifted up because of your beauty; You corrupted your wisdom for the sake of your splendor; I cast you to the ground, I laid you before kings, That they might gaze at you.

28:18 “You defiled your sanctuaries By the multitude of your iniquities, by the iniquity of your trading; therefore I brought fire from your midst; It devoured you, and I turned you to ashes upon the earth In the sight of all who saw you.

28:19 All who knew you among the peoples are astonished at you; you have become a horror, and shall be no more forever.”

14 The attribution of the cherub as the subject of the dirge or as playing the same role as in Gen 3:24 depends on which text is adopted (in relation to the pointing of הַשֵּׁם). Bertoluci’s examination of this issue observes that the MT makes the cherub the subject of the dirge, while the LXX sets the cherub as the garden dweller. Bertoluci, “Son of the Morning,” 262-63. However, regardless of how it is read here, the semantic framework of both perspectives arrives at the same description of the cherub as a living creature in a very sublime place. Cf. Cooke, Book of Ezekiel, 317; Kalmon Yaron, The Dirge over the King of Tyre, Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1964), 303; Walther Zimmerli, Ezekiel: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, ed. Frank Moore Cross and Klaus Baltzer (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 2:85-86.
The interpretation of this passage\textsuperscript{15} raises at least two pertinent questions that need reconsideration. Is the \textit{עֵדֶן} of Gen 2-3 the same reality as the \textit{עֵדֶן} of Ezek 28:13? If they are not the same, where on earth (or somewhere else) is the \textit{עֵדֶן} of Ezek 28:13 located? Most importantly: Is \textit{עֵדֶן} a sanctuary/temple, as some scholars contend? While there is abundant scholarship that examines either Gen 2-3 or Ezek 28, there seems to be relatively little work that examines both passages to explore any possible correlations between them concerning the sanctuary/temple motif. In the following paragraphs, I will summarize the relevant arguments that have been advocated, and then I will discuss any relevant exegetical factors for and/or against the biblical evidence of the sanctuary/temple motif. Let us consider four issues in the text over which scholarly interpretations diverge.

First, the oracles against Tyre in Ezek 28 have two literary units: vv. 1-10 and vv. 11-19, although they are closely connected as one single theme. This observation is essential to distinguish between the identity of the addressees: לִנְּגִ֙יד צִֹּ֜ר (to the prince of Tyre in v. 2) and עַל־מֶֶ֣֜לֶךְ צּ֑וֹר (for the king of Tyre in v. 12). Scholars addressing this issue have reached a variety of conclusions. For example, some scholars take these two

16 Scholars often conclude, regardless of their interpretation of the figurative language, that there are two distinct literary panels having divergences in genre, style, and content. Cf. Leslie C. Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, WBC 29 (Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 92; Lamar E. Cooper, Ezekiel, NAC 17 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 268; Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 73. See, for example, a comparative table from Block, The Book of Ezekiel, 88-89.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Comparison of Ezekiel 28:1-10 and 28:11-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner of punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of the nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A Inclusio (vv. 12b-13).
B “The anointed cherub who covers” (v. 14).
C “I establish you” (v. 14).
D “on the holy (qodesh) mountain of God” (v. 14).
E “In the midst of the stones of fire” (v. 14).
F “Perfect in your ways from the day you were created” (v. 15a).
F’ “Til iniquity was found in you, and you sinned” (vv. 15b, 16).
E’ “From the midst of the stones of fire” (v. 16).
D’ “From the mountain of God a profane thing (hll)” (v. 16).
C’ “I will destroy you” (v. 16).
B’ “O covering cherub” (v. 16).
A’ Inclusio (vv. 17-19).

expressions as conclusive evidence for different authors or periods of time.\textsuperscript{19} Also, commentators often observe in these two expressions two different entities.\textsuperscript{20} A common argument asserts that "Nágíd "is an expression attested only for humans,"\textsuperscript{21} and that the word "Chmél" in the book of Ezekiel "always refers to an earthly king."\textsuperscript{22} Therefore, some scholars conclude that the primary referent in both oracles is the human king of Tyre.\textsuperscript{23}

However, there are a number of textual particularities\textsuperscript{24} that prompt us to think that the two literary units of vv. 1-10 and vv. 11-19 are the product of one single author\textsuperscript{25} and present a transition from the earthly historical realm to the heavenly realm.

The distinction between the two literary units of vv. 1-10 and vv. 11-19 can be observed in the use of the terms "Nágíd" and "Chmél". At the beginning of the Israelite monarchy, the writers’ usage of these two terms seems to indicate rulership on two different levels. Frequently the writers say that God designated Saul, David, or another...

\textsuperscript{19} Cf. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 90; Yaron, Dirge over the King, 45-46; Pulley, “Qinah Concerning the King,” 30.


\textsuperscript{22} Block, The Book of Ezekiel, 103. Cf. 17:12; 19:9 (Babylon); 29:2–3 (Egypt); 27:33; 28:17 (kings of the earth); 34:24; 37:25 (Davidic ruler).

\textsuperscript{23} A. A. Bevan, “The King of Tyre in Ezekiel XVIII,” JTS 4 (1903): 500. B. S. Childs, among other scholars, considers “that the mythological motifs are employed for illustrative purposes only, as extended figures of speech.” Brevard S. Childs, Myth and Reality in the Old Testament, SBT (London: SCM, 1960), 70-71.

\textsuperscript{24} See further arguments in Bertoluci, “Son of the Morning,” 231, 246, 249, 256; Souza, “The Heavenly Sanctuary/Temple,” 282-84, 290.

\textsuperscript{25} The idea that these literary units were produced by different authors in separate periods of time seems to overlook the vocabulary usage. Note for example the use of חכימה (“wisdom”) three times in vv. 1-10 (vv. 4, 5, 7) and twice in vv. 11-19 (12, 17); יופי (“beauty”) occurs once in vv. 1-10 (v. 7) and twice in vv. 11-19 (vv. 12, 17); חנום (“traffic, merchandise”) occurs once in vv. 1-10 (v. 5) and twice in vv. 11-19 (vv. 16, 18); the association of the words נגִיד and חָכְּמה (“heart” and “to be high”) occurs twice in vv. 1-10 (v. 2, 5) and once in vv. 11-19 (v. 17).
charismatic leader as the נָגִי over his people, while the term נֶגֶר would refer to God himself as the true King (cf. 1 Sam 9:16; 10:1; 12:12; 13:14; 2 Sam 5:2; 6:21; 7:8; 1 Kgs 1:35; 14:7; 20:5; 2 Kgs 20:5; 1 Chr 11:2; 2 Chr 32:21). The fact that the “ruler” (נָגִי) of Tyre in vv. 1-10 is called “king” (ךְּמֶלֶ) in vv. 11-19 suggests that there is something different about the one addressed in the lament.\(^{26}\) This difference suggests to some interpreters that the prophet Ezekiel in vv. 11-19 depicts a figure with a position of super-terrestrial glory.\(^{27}\)

Another point to consider is that while the designation “cherub” (Ezek 28:14, 16), used elsewhere in the book of Ezekiel for members of the divine entourage, describes a supernatural being,\(^{28}\) Ezek 28:1-10 suggests that the נָגִי is a human being, as 28:2 and 9 make clear: “yet you are a man and not God.” This seems to emphasize that despite all the pride and glory of the historical “prince” (נָגִי) of Tyre, he remains a mere human being. It should be noted that vv. 2 and 8 locate the “prince” in “the heart of the seas,” an appropriate description for the geographical location of Tyre, and concurring with the actual setting of the human ruler. Evidently, the phrase “you were in Eden, the garden of God” (v. 13) is the most difficult obstacle to the interpretation of the king of Tyre as the literal king of the city.\(^{29}\) In fact, since v. 17 reports that the cherub was thrown to the

---

\(^{26}\) Cooper, Ezekiel, 266-67.

\(^{27}\) See Carl Friedrich Keil and Franz Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 9:233. It is noteworthy that Dan 9:25 refers to Christ in the messianic prophecy as נָגִי, but in Rev 15:3; 17:14, and 19:16 Christ is called King (βασιλεύς). This characterization could indicate the differences in Christ’s mission on earth and in heaven.


earth, the cherub’s earlier location must have been outside the earth. The above biblical evidence would suggest that the two oracles may not only refer to two different personages, but that the נָגִיד and the כְּמֶלֶ are portrayed in two different settings. The prophet’s description gives the impression that vv. 11-19 transcend the historical figures of the earthly realm. In point of fact, a study of Isa 14 provides intertextual evidence to support a similar vertical dynamic focusing on the fall of a supernatural figure behind the historical king of Babylon. Thus, these prophetic writings refer not only to immediate historical events, but also to realities beyond themselves.

Second, the usage of the word עֵדֶן in Gen 2-3 and in Ezek 28:13 is highly significant. One may agree with C. John Collins’s contention that Ezekiel has a “fall story” based on Gen 3, yet it may be inadequate to consider this passage only “as a rhetorically powerful application of that story to the Phoenician king.” The fact that the

---

30 Similar conclusions have been offered by Patrick Fairbairn, Ezekiel and the Book of His Prophecy: An Exposition (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1876), 260; Skinner writes that the point of view is very different in these two sections because “in the first the prince is still conceived as a man; . . . in the second, however, the king appears as an angelic being. . . . sinless at first, and falling from his high state through his own transgression.” Skinner, The Book of Ezekiel, 252-53. Cf. Mackay, “The King of Tyre,” 239, 241. Thus, there is substantial evidence that in these two oracles “there is a movement from the local, historical realm, of the early ‘prince’ (נָגִיד, נָגִי) in Ezek 28:1-10, to the heavenly realm of a cosmic ‘king,’ (כְּמֶלֶ), the supernatural ruler of Tyre, in Ezek 28:11-19.” See Davidson, “Chiastic Literary Structure,” 87.


32 Contra C. John Collins, Did Adam and Eve Really Exist?: Who They Were and Why You Should Care (Wheaton: Crossway, 2011), 69. Norman Habel has observed:

If we argue that Ezekiel is borrowing directly from the text of Gen. 2-3, despite the obvious divergences between the two portraits of the first man, then it becomes evident that Ezekiel was led to ignore certain elements of the Genesis narrative as secondary in communicating the primary message
two literary units of Ezek 28 (vv. 1-10 and vv. 11-19) describe two different scenarios, one natural and one supernatural,\(^{33}\) makes it difficult to identify the עֵדֶן of Gen 2-3 as the same עֵדֶן of Ezek 28:13.\(^{34}\) Even if this vertical movement is not recognized, the differences between the עֵדֶן of Gen 2-3 and the עֵדֶן of Ezek 28:13 are equally noteworthy.

There are important reasons to think that Ezek 28:1-19 does not report the same events as the creation, sin, and fall of the first human beings in Gen 2-3. In Ezek 28:13 עֵדֶן is described as the גַּן־אֱלֹהִים (garden of God); in contrast Gen 2 reports that God planted a גַּן for the benefit of humankind. In Ezek 28:14 עֵדֶן is located קֹֹּ֤דֶש בְּהַ֙ר of the Fall to another situation. Furthermore, he was apparently not compelled by an earlier text (or tradition) to adhere to details but felt free, under the guidance of God, to modify certain features to make them more appropriate for his proclamation.

Habel aptly outlines the evidence to substantiate that the writer of Ezekiel had in mind the fall of another being. Yet, Habel’s conclusion depends upon his idea that Ezek 28:12-19 represents the reformulation of the fall tradition. Habel, “Ezekiel 28 and the Fall,” 522-24. Similarly, Bevan writes that Ezek 28:14, 16 “is not simply borrowed from the account of the Garden of Eden and of the fall of man In the early chapters of Genesis, for some of the features which are most prominent in Ezekiel's description for example, the holy mountain of God and the stones of fire have no counterpart in Genesis.” Bevan, “King of Tyre,” 501. However, as we will see below, the holy mountain of God and the stones of fire do indeed have counterparts in Gen 2-3.

\(^{33}\) Mackay, “The King of Tyre,” 239-41. Mackay argues that the supernatural figure in Ezek 28:11-19 is the patron deity of Tyre, Merlkart, though this theory has been already disallowed in Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 90.

\(^{34}\) Habel, for example, observes that the rejection of the being is definitive and “no symbol of reconciliation grace is to be expected. Rather, he is to be exposed before kings.” Habel, “Ezekiel 28 and the Fall,” 520, 522. McKenzie also recognizes that “in Ezekiel the garden is full of precious stones; there are no trees; the being is clothed; he is endowed with marvelous attributes; he does not keep and till the garden, which located on the mountain of God; there is no serpent; and, most important of all, there is no woman.” John L. McKenzie, “The Literary Characteristics of Genesis 2-3,” TS 15.4 (1954): 552. See more divergences in Umberto Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, trans. Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961), 1:74-81; Herbert G. May, “King in the Garden of Eden: A Study of Ezekiel 28:12-19,” in Israel’s Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg (Harper, 1962), 168-69; Theodor Herzl Gaster and James George Frazer, Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament: A Comparative Study with Chapters from Sir James G. Frazer’s Folklore in the Old Testament (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 622-24; McKenzie, "Mythological Allusions," 324.
לֹאֵהִים (on the holy mount of God), while in Gen 2 עֵדֶן is planted on earth, and the text reports that it is situated מִקֶּדֶם (in the east). 35

Although the divergences between the עֵדֶן of Gen 2-3 and the עֵדֶן of Ezek 28:13 have been identified, 36 both narratives are connected through an edenic setting. This semantic framework cannot be easily dismissed because the setting of the עֵדֶן of Ezek 28:13 portrays several features that provide strong links with sanctuary/temple imagery. The nine stones listed in Ezek 28:13 seem to be analogous to the jewels adorning the chestpiece of Israel’s high priest (cf. Exod 28:17-20 and 39:10-13). 37 The expression “you were the anointed cherub who covers” (ךְָ֑תְּ־כְּרִ֔וּב מִמְּשַָ֖ח הַסּוֹכֵ) in Ezek 28:14 seems to echo the cultic and sacred functions of cherubim in the rest of the Old Testament: (1) They faced each other and overshadowed the ark (Exod 25:18-20, 22; 37:8, 9); (2) God is represented as revealing his will from between them (Num 7:89); (3) Two cherubim in Solomon’s temple resembled those of the desert tabernacle (1 Kgs 6:23-28; 8:6-8; 2 Chr 3:10-13); (4) Cherubim were part of the decorations of the tabernacle and temple (curtains: Exod 26:1, 31; 36:8, 35; 2 Chr 3:14; walls and doors of the temple: 1 Kgs 6:29, 32; Ezek 41:18); (5) The cherubim are referred to as the carriers of God (2 Sam 22:11; Ps 18:10); (6) God is described as enthroned between cherubim (1

35 Although Block does not see a vertical movement in Ezek 28:1-10 and 11:11-19, he affirms that the title for this personage is כְּרִוּב (Ezek 28:12), and when he is identified otherwise, he is כְּרִוּבים, a role fundamentally different from the כְּרִוּב in Gen 3:24. Furthermore, he argues that the renowned figure in Ezek 28 is not characterized by a cultic role, but by wisdom, which the Hebrew Bible never associates with priests, but does with kings. Thus, the renowned personage is primarily a royal figure. See Block, “Eden: A Temple?,” 9-10.


Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; Ps 99:1; cf. 2 Kgs 19:15; 1 Chr 13:6; Is 37:16); (7) In the NT the author of Hebrews refers to the cherubim above the ark (Heb 9:5). The evident difference with Gen 3:24 is that Ezekiel’s cherub is singular, not plural, and he walks about in the garden, rather than being stationed at the entrance east of the garden.

Within the context just described, another connection to sanctuary/temple imagery in this edenic setting is the verb חָלַל (ḥālāl; “pollute,” “profane”). חָלַל is used in the Mosaic law in the piel stem with the meaning of desecration or profanation (for example, the altar in Exod 20:25; the Sabbath in Exod 31:14; YHWH’s name in Lev 18:21; 19:12; the sanctuary in Lev 21:12, 23; cf. Lev 22:15; Num 18:32). In Ezek 28 חָלַל occurs in v. 16 “I cast you as a profane thing out of the mountain of God” (וָאֶחַלֶלְּךָ מֵהַ֙ר אֱלֹהִֹּ֤ים) and in v. 18 “You defiled your sanctuaries” (חִלַָלְּתָ מִקְּדָשֶ֑יך). It is significant that חָלַל is used in connection with the expressions “the mountain of God” and “sanctuaries” because in this way the edenic setting is furnished with cultic connotations.

Moreover, the biblical evidence seems to specify the locale of the sanctuary/temple alluded to in Ezek 28:11-19. The fact that the terms “heaven,” “Eden,” “the sides of the north,” and “the temple” refer to basically the same place further indicates a connection with a cultic scenario (cf. Pss 116:19; 135:2; 92:12, 13). “The expressions like ‘guardian cherub’ (vv. 14, 16), ‘my (your) sanctuaries’ (v. 18), and ‘fiery stones’ (vv. 14, 16), seem to indicate that the ‘garden of God’ mentioned in the passage under discussion should be identified with a sanctuary,”38 or at least they should be

interpreted as cultic.\(^{39}\) According to Pss 36: 8-10; 92:12-14; Ezek 31:2-3; Isa 14:8-14, the expressions “house of God” and “garden of Eden” are interchangeable, and there is no clear dividing line between the “house of the Lord” and “the mountain of God.”\(^{40}\) It is possible to argue from Isa 14:13 that there is no differentiation between “heaven,” “Eden,” “the side of the north,” and “the temple.”\(^{41}\)

This interchangeable terminology has been reexamined by Souza, who has written a comprehensive study tracing the heavenly sanctuary/temple through the Old Testament. According to his line of reasoning:

It must be noted that since v. 17 reports that the cherub was cast to the earth, he must have been located in some place outside the earth. Additionally, that the "cherub" was covered with “precious stones” among the “stones of fire” indicates a location at the very presence of YHWH, as implied in Ezek 1:13 and 10:2. Moreover, the connections with Isa 14:12-15 also indicate a heavenly setting for Ezek 28:11-19, which strengthens the probability that the sanctuary referred to in the latter pericope is the heavenly sanctuary.\(^{42}\)

This terminological framework has led to the recognition of cosmic connotations related to sanctuary/temple narratives.\(^{43}\) This factor has been known as a precursor of the correlations between a heavenly Zion and Eden, which is a notion that has long held

---

\(^{39}\) Some interpreters find the Tyrian sanctuary in these allusions. For example, Bevan comments that “Solomon was closely allied with the king of Tyre and that the temple at Jerusalem was built by Tyrians. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the style and decorations of the Solomonian temple were mainly, if not entirely, copied from Tyrian models.” Thus, he concludes: “the Tyrian sanctuary, as Ezekiel figured it to himself, must have borne a great resemblance to the temple at Jerusalem.” See Bevan, “King of Tyre,” 502.

\(^{40}\) See the following section entitled “The Garden as a Mountain in Gen 2:10.”

\(^{41}\) Yaron, Dirge over the King, 40-45.


\(^{43}\) William Foxwell Albright, the dean of American Biblical Archaeologists, for several years postulated cosmic symbolism in the temple of Solomon. See William F. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1956), 148-51.
scholarly attention. An article by Levenson asserts: “No wonder temples in the ancient Near East sometimes contained a paradisal garden and no wonder that Zion, the Temple mountain, ‘perfect in beauty’ (Ps. 50:2; Lam. 2:15), was equated with the Garden of Eden.”

According to Levenson’s analysis, this literary correspondence evokes cosmic symbolism of the temple of Jerusalem. Indeed, that creation was symbolically expressed in terms of temple architecture was common in Egyptian temple theology. If the canonical biblical text portrays Zion typologically representing the עֵדֶן/dwelling place of God and his creatures in heaven (Ezek 28:11-19), then ultimately Gen 2-3 would describe the עֵדֶן/dwelling place of God and his creatures on earth. The landscape of Gen 2-3 provides an indicator that “the garden of Eden is not viewed by the author of Genesis

44 For a detailed scholarly survey of biblical evidence concerning the heavenly sanctuary/temple, see Kim Papaioannou and Ioannis Giantzaklidis, eds., Earthly Shadows, Heavenly Realities: Temple-Sanctuary Cosmology in Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Jewish Literature (Berrien Springs: Andrews University, 2016), especially 31-108.

45 Levenson, “Temple and the World,” 297. The significance of Zion in the Hebrew Bible (Cf. Ezek 5:5; 38:12) reveals that the Temple of Jerusalem (Mount Zion) is spoken of in terms of “heaven and earth” (Cf. Ps 78:69 [Hebrew]; 76:3 [Hebrew]; 134:1-3 [Hebrew].

46 Levenson, Creation and the Persistence, 95. See also S. L. Klouda, “Zion,” DOTWPW 938. Gage comments that “the temple of Zion, as a sanctuary that God has established, becomes a microcosmic metaphor of creation itself.” (Cf. Ps 78:69; 150:1). He argues further on this idea and finally claims that “the holy of holies of Solomon’s temple appears to have been a very conscious symbolic reconstruction of the Garden of Eden.” Gage, The Gospel of Genesis, 54, 57.

simply as a piece of Mesopotamian farmland, but as an archetypal sanctuary, that is a place where God dwells and where man should worship him.”

The above evidence warrants a homogenous terminological framework, namely, that the sanctuary/temple motif embraces the narratives of the עֵדֶן in Gen 2-3 and the עֵדֶן in Ezek 28:13. Wallace also notes this fact and remarks: “Gen 2-3 is probably meant to be understood primarily as a dwelling place of Yahweh rather than simply a place of human habitation.” In accordance with this understanding, “one should not overlook the correspondence between the earthly sanctuary and its heavenly counterpart. The cosmic overtones derived from the terminological framework of the עֵדֶן in Ezek 28:13 may set forth a similar conceptual vertical relationship in the עֵדֶן of Gen 2-3. As Gage also points


49 Wallace observes that עֵדֶן is clearly associated with Paradise, a heavenly dwelling set aside for the righteous and faithful. He argues that “the issue has to do with the question of whether Eden was understood as a human paradise or a divine dwelling. It ultimately bears on the meaning of the narrative. The argument that the garden was created after the first human and therefore could not have been Yahweh’s dwelling misses the subtlety of the situation. Many of the motifs of Eden are also those of the divine dwelling described in Mesopotamian and Canaanite myth. These include the unmediated presence of the deity, the council of the heavenly beings, the issuing of divine decrees, the source of subterranean life-giving waters which supply the whole earth, abundant fertility, and trees of supernatural qualities and great beauty.” Howard N. Wallace, “Eden, Garden of,” ABD 2:281-82.

out: “The conception of the earth in scripture is consistently after the pattern of
heaven.”

Third, the royal status of the figure in Ezek 28:11-19 should not be overlooked.

Block correctly observes the kingship depiction of the כְּרוּב, but he overstates the
differences between kingship and priestly functions in the Hebrew Bible as an either/or
dichotomy, and thus he rejects any allusion to a cultic framework. As Karl Deenick has
shown, the priestly and kingship roles are not mutually exclusive. The supernatural
ruler of Tyre seems to be regarded in this oracle as having both cultic and royal status, a
royal priesthood portrayal, and consequently, the precious stones could be related to the

---

51 Gage, The Gospel of Genesis, 51. Cf. Meredith G. Kline, Images of the Spirit (Grand Rapids:


53 Deenick argues this by reference to 1 Sam 2:35, 2 Sam 6, and Heb 7. The books of Samuel do
not address the absence of a king but the failure of the priesthood. Deenick has demonstrated that the rise of
the priest will come neither from the house of Eli, nor from the house of Aaron. He comments:

The sons of Eli are disobedient and Eli and his household are cut off, and the demise of the house of
Aaron is foreshadowed. In this context Yahweh promises a new priest, an “anointed.” One naturally
expects that Samuel will be that person. But his sons, too, prove unfaithful and the people ask for a
king (1 Sam 8:1-5). In the light of earlier biblical history those who heard this promise of 1 Sam 2:35
would surely have understood “anointed” to refer to a priest. But the most surprising fact in these
eyarly chapters of Samuel is that the first person to be anointed after the promise of 1 Sam 2:35 is not a
priest, but a king. In Ch. 10 Saul is anointed king.

Furthermore, he concludes by saying that “the strong connection between the Davidic covenant
and the promises of 1 Sam 2:35 clearly suggests that it is through David's line that the promised priest will
come.” See Karl Deenick, “Priest and King or Priest-King in 1 Samuel 2:35,” WTJ 73.2 (2011): 335-38.
See also Robert D. Bergen, 1, 2 Samuel, NAC 7 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996), 331-32, 351. Cf.
Gordon J. Wenham, “Were David's Sons Priests?” ZAW 87.1 (1975): 79-80. Thus, Block's remark that
wisdom in the Hebrew Bible is never associated with priestly functions but with kingship needs
reconsideration, since Block himself admits that in the ancient world heads of state often combined royal

54 See further discussion of this concept in Eugene H. Merrill, “Royal Priesthood: An Old
15:3; 19:16. It has been also well documented that royal priesthood is pervasive in the ANE. See Helmer
walls of the temple and/or to the clothing of the mentioned figure.\(^{55}\) If this is the case, the terminological framework of עֵדֶן in Ezek 28 implies that the עֵדֶן of Gen 2-3 could also be associated with a cultic notion in a royal/palatial setting.\(^{56}\) Undeniably, royal/palatial notions are present in the Pentateuch, but the most important “kingdom” concepts occur in poetic passages such as Gen 49; Num 23:21; 24:7, and especially the song of the sea found in Exod 15:1-18. “According to the message of this poem, God himself at creation prepared and ‘planted’ his own sanctuary ‘in the mountain of his inheritance’ (Exod 15:17).”\(^{57}\) The intended framework of redemption in Exodus and that of creation converge at this point. Therefore, it seems reasonable to perceive the deity’s sovereignty at creation as endowing Adam and Eve with priestly and royal (pre-Fall) roles as ambassadors and bestowing royal/palatial significance on the newly created center of worship (Eden).

---

\(^{55}\) Barnes, “Ezekiel's Denunciation of Tyre,” 51-52.

\(^{56}\) Consider, for example, some cosmic hints of royal ideology in Gen 2-3 in a comparative study between the garden of Eden and royal gardens in the ANE; see Jericke Detlef, “Königsgarten und Gottes Garten: Aspekte der Königsarcheologie in Genesis 2 und 3,” in Exegese vor Ort: Festschrift für Peter Welten, ed. Christl M. Maier (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2001), 161-76. Certainly, at first glance, this concept seems speculative since the words “priest” and “king” are not used in Gen 2-3, yet this notion gains considerable weight when the peculiar terminological framework is viewed together. Gregory Wagenfuhr has advanced the idea that Gen 1-3 should not be understood in terms of the sanctuary/temple. He argues that “Eden is best understood as the name of a palace (with gardens) and a kingdom, very much in contrast to Enoch of Cain. God visits his gardens from the throne room in the cool of the day to walk and hold conference with his vicegerents.” Although he prefers to see in Gen 2-3 only a palace setting (I do not find his arguments entirely convincing), Wagenfuhr’s work is helpful in showing the link between temples/sanctuaries and palaces. See Gregory P. Wagenfuhr, “Toward a Palatial Biblical Theology (Conference Title: Reconsidering the Cosmic Temple: Palaces and the Priesthood of All Believers)” (paper presented at Evangelical Theological Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 2017), 1-8; Gregory P. Wagenfuhr, “Problems with the Cosmic Temple,” 5 April 2016, https://www.academia.edu/24070814/Problems_with_the_Cosmic_Temple, 2-7.

There is a fourth additional element to ponder: Who is the personage described in Ezek 28:11-19? Numerous interpretations have been proposed for this passage, but the characterization of the individual in these verses, in light of the intertextual comparison within the whole biblical canon, points to the conclusion stated by Davidson:

The implicit linking of the start of the Cosmic War and the Sanctuary in Revelation 12 becomes explicit and even emphatic when we go to the two OT passages that form the counterpart to Revelation 12, namely Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28. Here we see a spotlight upon the heavenly Sanctuary setting for the rise of the cosmic conflict.58

The origin of evil in a glorious created being called “Day Star, Son of Dawn” (Isa 14:12; traditionally rendered Lucifer, following Jerome’s Vulgate)59 is carefully intertwined.linked with the heavenly מֵעֶדֶן, that is, the sanctuary/temple in heaven. In

---


59 Traditionally the following explication has been offered in order to link Lucifer with the renowned figure of Ezek 28:11-19:

The serpent was known for his craftiness (Gen 3:1), his deceit, and his anti-God attitude (3:4), leading humanity to sin (3:6–7). Elsewhere he is presented as a deceiver (Rev 12:9; 20:2), an instigator of evil (John 13:2, 27), one who seeks worship as a god (Luke 4:6–8; 2 Thess 2:3–4), and one who seeks to get others to renounce God (Job 2:4–5). He appears as an angel of God (2 Cor 11:14) and as the father of lies and violence (John 8:44), distorts Scripture (Matt 4:6), opposes believers (2 Cor 2:11), and finally is judged (Matt 25:41; Rev 19:20–21; 20:13–15). Therefore the conclusion that the figure behind the poetic symbol is the serpent (also known as the adversary, the devil, Satan; Rev 12:9) is a logical one.

interpreting Gen 2 with this typological vertical view, we should consider the chronological setting: the oracle of Ezek 28:11-19 describes the heavenly עֵדֶן before the creation of earth (Gen 2) and therefore before the fall of Adam and Eve (Gen 3). In other words, the description of the heavenly Garden of Eden portrays the covering cherub before the rise of evil, while he was still perfect. This, in turn, suggests that the cultic and royal depictions in both passages, Ezek 28:11-19 and Gen 2, share a common element in terms of time before sin, but also present a difference in terms of locale (heaven/earth).

In sum, there are three concluding observations to contemplate in relation to the word עֵדֶן in Gen 2:8 and its intertextual semantic framework. First, the differences between Ezek 28:11-19 and Gen 2-3 subtly nuance the nature and function of both places called עֵדֶן. As demonstrated by Souza, “one should hold in mind that the allusions to the Garden of Eden contribute to corroborate the sanctuary setting [Eze 28:11-19] indicating a location in the very presence of YHWH: in heaven. Second, since the connection between temple and garden is quite obvious to the Eastern mind (cultic-royal symbolism), and because of the similar terminological scenery between Gen 2-3 and Ezek 28:11-19, it might be held that we are dealing in both passages with a sanctuary/temple framework, or even with a “palace” framework. Third, the biblical


61 According to Terje Stordalen, it is beyond doubt that gardens were connected to temples having a royal symbolism. Stordalen, Echoes of Eden, 112, 115-16. “A ‘temple’ in the ancient East was not a building but a sacred enclosure round a (small) shrine. The earliest Semitic sanctuaries were gardens planted in oases where the unexpected fertility of the soil suggested to the Semite the presence of a beneficent deity. The Solomonic temple preserved the memory of Eden the garden-sanctuary, for its walls were adorned with figures of guardian Cherubim (cf. Gen 3: 24), palm-trees, and flowers (cf. 1 Kgs 6: 29, 32).” See Barnes, “Ezekiel's Denunciation of Tyre,” 51. Cf. W. Robertson Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites (London: A. and C. Black, 1901), 97-106, 136; Bevan, “King of Tyre,” 503.

62 In this sense, Walton concurs with this notion. He argues that temples and palaces shared common accoutrements in the ANE. See Walton, Lost World of Adam, 117. Cf. especially the symbolism
evidence reviewed thus far suggests that the writer of Ezek 28 did not necessarily have Gen 2-3 in mind, although he might have been familiar with the text and edenic scenery. On the one hand, if the vertical movement found from Ezek 28:1-10 to Ezek 28:11-19 is correctly identified, then Gen 2-3 is built upon a historical retrojection of a preexisting (before Gen 1-3) sanctuary/temple. On the other hand, as Doukhan puts it: “Obviously, the author of Genesis did not have in mind all the connections between Zion, the temple of Jerusalem, and the garden of Eden, which belong to a later time (Ps 48:1-2).” In other words, this implies that the earthly sanctuary/temple (wilderness tabernacle/Solomon’s Temple) is not the only type of the heavenly counterpart, but the narrative of Gen 1-3 also portrays a similar typology. This could partly explain why the construction of the tabernacle is narrated with terminology evocative of creation.


Now one may inquire about the relationship between the sanctuary/temple and the covenant (redemption) in biblical/canonical theology.\(^{67}\) The fact that the tabernacle came to be constructed after God’s people obtained freedom from slavery does not limit either the covenantal relationship between God and his people or the sanctuary/temple framework of functions prior to Sinai.\(^{68}\) Is creation the theological foundation for the entire sanctuary/temple system? Or is the sanctuary/temple system the theological foundation for the created cosmos? Answers to these questions might argue in favor of a canonical temple theology.\(^{69}\) The theological implications of this biblical evidence will be discussed in chapter V of this research. At this point, it needs only to be mentioned that the exegetical evidence points to the presence of the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 2-3, thus forming a conceptual framework.

### The Garden as a Mountain in Gen 2:10

Scholars who support sanctuary/temple symbolism in Gen 2 often cite comparative studies with the ANE milieu, particularly in relation to the concept of the *Weltberg/Länderberg* or “world/cosmic mountain.”\(^{70}\) Consequently, the notion of the

---


\(^{68}\) *Contra* Souza, “Sanctuary: Cosmos, Covenant, and Creation,” 31-32.

\(^{69}\) On this point, Margaret Barker has made a valuable contribution. As a Methodist theologian, she is breaking new ground and filling in blank spots in Old Testament temple theology. See further in Margaret Barker, *Temple Theology: An Introduction* (London: SPCK, 2004), 17.

\(^{70}\) A tendency still pervasive in some scholarly studies is to believe that all cosmological narrative is derived from Babylonian mythology. For a brief overview of the so-called pan-Babylonianism, see Omar Carena, *History of the Near Eastern Historiography and its Problems: 1852-1985: Part One 1852-1945*, AOAT 218/1 (Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1989), 101-11. See additionally some seminal contributors to the idea of the sacred space of a cosmic mountain as the center of the cosmos/universe (*axis mundi*): Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* (New York: Harcourt, 1959); Ronald
cosmic mountain of God has been considered central to the ANE worldview,\(^{71}\) mainly for the people of Israel.\(^{72}\) The line of reasoning behind this support goes like this: “. . . given that the cosmic mountain informed the temple cults of the ancient Near East, including that of Israel, then one might expect mountain narratives to contain temple symbolism.”\(^{73}\) Although the perception of that mountain encompassing cosmic dimensions has been debunked and rejected for some time,\(^{74}\) recently scholars have renewed this debate in light of the Eden narrative.\(^{75}\) While the pages ahead will be dedicated to reevaluating the scholarly arguments, it should be taken into account that the focus of this research is on

---


\(^{73}\) Morales, \textit{The Tabernacle Pre-Figured}, 1.


\(^{75}\) Cf. Walton, \textit{Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology}, 86-99.
the biblical evidence.\textsuperscript{76} Thus, exegetical/conceptual features of the text involve, broadly, the following aspects: mountain as sacred space and the dwelling place of God in the Hebrew Scriptures.\textsuperscript{77} The question to be answered is this: What is the biblical canonical evidence to recognize the garden as a mountain? Let us reconsider four arguments that have been advanced to justify this interpretation.

First, obviously, the words for “mountain” or “hill” do not occur in Gen 1-3.\textsuperscript{78} One is left with two options: any linkage between garden and mountain is implicitly indicated or not present at all. There is one piece of textual evidence that scholars often find convincing. The Hebrew expression \textsuperscript{79}גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן (translated in the NKJV as “Now a river went out of Eden to water the garden,” Gen 2:10) subtly reveals information about the location of the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן. While the four headwaters of the river provide information about the geographical location of the Garden of Eden, the course of the river allows for a more captivating theological inquiry. The phraseology of Gen 2:10, particularly regarding the verb יָצָא \textsuperscript{76} (“go (come) out,” “go (come) out of”)...

\textsuperscript{76} It would be an error to assume a monolithic religious understanding across the ANE, in our case concerning a cosmic mountain. See Walton’s principles for comparative studies: Walton, Ancient Near Eastern Thought, 26-27. I would contend that if there is an overlapping similar understanding between ancient Israel and the rest of the ANE nations, the differences at the conceptual level are more significant. Cf. Clifford, The Cosmic Mountain, 190-92; Cohn, Shape of Sacred Space, 4-5.

\textsuperscript{77} There is an important scholarly consensus concerning the significant role of space in cult. See, for example, Eliade, Sacred and the Profane, 20-32; Se Young Roh, “Creation and Redemption in Priestly Theology” (PhD diss., Drew University, 1991), 177-90.

\textsuperscript{78} To be sure, Block is right in observing that “the absence of explicit reference to a mountain is striking.” Block, “Eden: A Temple?,” 15.

forth”].

E. A. Speiser, later followed by Victor P. Hamilton, notes that when נָשָׁא is followed by the preposition מִן [min; “go (come) out,” “go (come) forth”], it does not mean “flow from” but rather “rise in.” Yet, Wenham’s reading of the text seems a better choice. He remarks that “the phraseology suggests that the river rose in Eden and then flowed into the garden to water it,” with the implication that the דֶּן גַּן־עִֵ֔ can be situated on uneven elevated ground. One may posit, then, as Fishbane goes on to explain:

A geography of primordial space is thus mapped out which serves to supplement Gen 1:1 – 2:4. . . . The prototype of this symbolic image is often found in ancient religious iconography: a navel releasing life-giving water to the four corners of creation, together with a world mountain is only indirectly suggested in Gen 2:10-14, by its reference to the streams’ downward flow. A later reflex of the Eden motif (Ezek 28:11-19) preserves this component more explicitly: The garden is found on a “mountain of God” (v 14). It is undoubtedly on such a primal landscape, sustained by providential fertility, that man is placed in Gen 2:15.

Lifsa Schachter picks up the same idea: “Putting the story's visual clues together leads to placing Eden on a mountain top, because the rivers flow downward from there.”

---

80 This verb in Gen 2:10 appears as qal participle masculine singular: נָשָׁא.
82 Speiser’s and Hamilton’s semantic observation allows them to go so far as to conclude that “what is pictured here is not a river emerging from the garden and subsequently branching into four separate rivers, but rather a river that is formed just outside the garden by the convergence of four separate branches.” Speiser, Genesis, 19-20. Cf. Hamilton, The Book of Genesis, 167-68.
83 Wenham, Genesis 1-15, 64.
such, the conclusion one finds is that although the words for “mountain” or “hill” do not occur in Gen 1-3, the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן seems to be at least in an elevated location, due to the flowing river.87

Second, there seems to be a pattern of “going through the waters to the mountain of God for worship” in Gen 1-3 and in the rest of the Hebrew Bible.88 Morales advances this idea indicating that “Noah is delivered through the deluge waters and brought to the Ararat mount (Gen 6-9); Moses foreshadowing the Exodus of Israel is delivered through the waters of the Nile and brought to the mount Horeb (Exod 1-19); Israel is delivered through the sea waters and brought to the Sinai’s mount (Exod 14-24).”89 One key point that should be highlighted in Morales’s idea is that this pattern is generally found in describing a nation’s or individual’s deliverance. This means that this pattern would only work if it were recognized that the earth was delivered though the primal waters and Adam was brought to the Eden mount. A weakness in Morales’s pattern is that it implies the mythological motif of God’s battle with the chaos waters (chaoskampf).90

Yet, there is indeed a pattern of “returning to the mountain” in the Hebrew Bible. This pattern, which is purportedly depicted with cosmic dimensions, contrasts and incorporates two places as sacred: God’s sacred mountain and the tabernacle. Questions

---

87 Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 510; Levenson, Sinai and Zion, 129.
88 It is common among scholars to maintain that mountain ideology is an important element of temple liturgy in the ANE. See, for example, the section “Sanctuary Ideology in the Ancient Near East” in John A. Davies, A Royal Priesthood: Literary and Intertextual Perspectives on an Image of Israel in Exodus 19:6, JSOTSup 395 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 141-44.
89 Morales, The Tabernacle Pre- Figured, 4-5; 54-60.
90 A theory reevaluated in David T. Tsumura, Creation and Destruction: A Reappraisal of the Chaoskampf Theory in the Old Testament (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), especially 143-95. For example, Isa 40:12 and Ps 136:6 seem to portray God’s sovereignty as a “no-conflict” relationship with the created cosmos.
such as “Who may ascend into the hill of the Lord?” “Who may stand in his holy place?” (Ps 24:3), “And Lord, who may abide in your tabernacle?” “Who may dwell in your holy hill?” (Ps 15:1) inescapably admit this pattern. Fundamentally, this pattern functions as a typological apparatus to illustrate conceptually the sacred space of God’s dwelling in the Hebrew Bible, beginning with the Eden narrative. Note for example that Exod 15:13, 17 reveals God’s plan to return (or to plant) Israel to a distinctive place and sacred status: “to your holy dwelling,” “to the mountain of your inheritance,” “to God’s dwelling holy sanctuary which was established by himself” (Cf. Isa 65:9). This portion of the song of the sea offers a double directionality: First, this poem post-figures the Eden narrative (if not also the whole of the creation narrative), and second, this poem pre-figures the cultic context of the heavenly sanctuary and foretells God’s original/ultimate

---


92 It is noteworthy that the divine planting motif in the Hebrew Bible occurs in cultic contexts. Just as God planted נָטַע [nāṭa‘; “to plant”] the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן (Gen 2:8), God envisions planting Israel and his worship in the Promised Land (Cf. Gen 21:33; Exod 15:17; Num 24:6; 2 Sam 7:10; 1 Chr 17:9; Isa 5:2-7; 17:11; 51:16; Jer 2:21; 11:17; 24:6; 32:41; 42:10; Amos 9:15). See also Ouro, Old Testament Theology, 49.

93 This expression is not found elsewhere in the Bible. See Nahum M. Sarna, Exodus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991), 82.

94 Sailhamer notes that “the author of Exodus 15 understands the garden of Eden in Gen 2 in terms that anticipate the tabernacle sanctuary (Exod 21-31).” Sailhamer, Meaning of the Pentateuch, 577, 581.
plan of “returning to the mountain” where the immense crowd of the redeemed will sing a song of victory (Rev 15:2-4). This point coincides well with Dumbrell’s insight:

The details of this old hymn present the redemption of the Exodus as a new creation. Our attention is drawn by the features of the hymn to the goal of the Exodus, which is the establishment of Israel in the Promised Land. This land is viewed in verse 17 as a sacred site, God’s own mountain. The reference to the “mountain” does not convey with it an anticipation of later temple centralization at Jerusalem as some have argued, but in terms of Ps 78:54 is a reference to the Land of Palestine viewed totally as a divine sanctuary.

Dumbrell, who gives substance to Fishbane’s contention, argues that some key literary motifs in Rev 21 and 22 originated and developed in Gen 1-3 and in the rest of the Old Testament. Thus, in view of cosmographical correspondences between Eden and Zion, the return to Eden of Adam and Eve (and humankind) or the return to the holy mountain of God would be the pattern envisioned all through the Scriptures. This was precisely the purpose of the Exodus redemption. On Horeb’s mount, Moses is commanded to go to Egypt to bring Israel to the Mountain of God (Exod 3:1, 12). The Israelites were promised that the proper religious/cultic experience at the sanctuary/temple (particularly Sabbath day worship) would open the way to that edenic reality. God promised: “Even them I will bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer”


96 While Dumbrell’s motifs are well developed (the New Jerusalem, the New Temple, the New Covenant, the New Israel, and the New Creation), a few aspects detract from his book. Yet, the underlying unity and continuity of this conceptual framework of the biblical narrative are noteworthy. William J. Dumbrell, The End of the Beginning: Revelation 21-22 and the Old Testament (Homebush West: Lancer Books, 1985), 40.

97 One may agree with Fishbane’s proposal that the recurrent motifs are key semantic frameworks that give coherence and cohesion to the biblical narrative. Fishbane, Text and Texture, 12-17.

98 A detailed analysis of these cosmographical correspondences between Zion and Eden is provided by Gage, The Gospel of Genesis, 50-54.
Doukhan notably has demonstrated that “the ultimate lesson that the Bible has retained is the prophetic promise that one day we shall return to the Garden of Eden.”

Third, this argument comes from an intertextual observation. It was shown above that the writer of Ezekiel places the king of Tyre far above any royal dignitary on earth, “in the holy mountain of God” (Ezek 28:14). This depiction entails the origin of evil in Eden, specifically in the heavenly sanctuary/temple setting. In view of this claim, it has also been a long-held position that a parallel passage of this pretentious Ezekelian royal figure is Isa 14:12-14. Notably, the prophet Ezekiel places the guardian cherub in the heavenly Eden, and the same personage is described by the prophet Isaiah as intending to ascend to heaven and install his throne בְּהַר־מוֹעֵָ֖ד (“on the Mount of the congregation” Isa 14:13 NKJV), specifically on the farthest sides of the north. The similar phraseology in Ezek 28:14 (ְּבַּהַר־קֹֹּדֶשֶׁאֱלֹהִים) and in Isa 14:13 (בְּהַר־מוֹעֵָ֖ד) seems to substantiate the connection between the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן and the בְּהַר־מוֹעֵָ֖ד, not in the sense of

99 Cf. Collins, Genesis 1-4, 91; Morales, The Tabernacle Pre-Figured, 16.

100 Doukhan, Genesis, 78. This fact would detract from Clement’s contention that “the patriarchal religion had thought of the divine presence in a personal and clan relationship, while the Canaanite sanctuaries strongly emphasized the belief in a divine attachment to certain places.” Clements, God and Temple, 27. Israel’s notion of God’s presence was generally attached to this pattern of returning to the Promised Land. The divine presence was indeed associated with historical events and framed within real and figurative sanctuary/temple elements. This growing experience clearly developed Israel’s consciousness of the divine.


102 Mount Zion is described as being “on the sides of the north” in Ps 48:2. As Winfried Vogel has noted: “The climax of the usage of the mountain motif as referring to a cultic location in the OT context undoubtedly has to be seen in the tradition of Mt. Zion.” Winfried Vogel, “The Cultic Motif in Space and Time in the Book of Daniel” (PhD diss., Andrews University, 1999), 36. See also Bertoluci, “Son of the Morning,” 92-94, 200-203.
being equivalent, but in the sense of being a comparable cultic location par excellence. Davidson rightly observes that “Isa 14:12 calls the heavenly Sanctuary the Mount of the congregation implying the original worship function of the Sanctuary before sin. The heavenly Sanctuary, on the holy mountain, was the location of the throne of God, and here the unfallen universe came to worship the Most High God.”

To an important degree, it could be argued that the notion of a mountain with religious significance comprises a cultic semantic framework reflected in the history of Israel. Accordingly, the location of the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן in Gen 2 seems to be demarcated at a moderately elevated position and could be assimilated within the semantic framework provided by the Hebrew word הַר [har; “mountain,” “range”].

Fourth, if the above proposition is correct, then it follows to expect that the semantic framework of the Hebrew word הַר is a case to compare the particular characterization of Jerusalem with the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן. “The phrase 'holy mountain' is familiar to us from the Prophets and the Psalms as a designation of the sanctuary of Jerusalem. In most places, the local sanctuary seems to have stood on an eminence overlooking the city.”

As shown above, the oracle against the supernatural ruler of Tyre (Ezek 28:11-19) describes him upon the heights of the holy mountain (vv. 13, 14). Moreover,

103 In the Old Testament, since the sanctuary/temple was situated on a mountain, both realities are frequently interchangeable. Cf. Exod 15:17; Isa 2:3; 56:7; 66:20; Jer 26:18.

104 Davidson, “Cosmic Metanarrative,” 107-8.


106 Bevan, “King of Tyre,” 504.
Ezekiel’s vision of the New Eden also portrays a temple/city on a very high mountain (Cf. 40:2; 47:12). A fine example of this particular characterization is found in Ps 48:1-2:

48:1 Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised  
In the city of our God,  
In his holy mountain.

48:2 Beautiful in elevation,  
The joy of the whole earth,  
Is Mount Zion on the sides of the north,  
The city of the great King.

Two correlations seem to stand out: first, the comparison between “in the city of our God” and “his holy mountain”; second, the comparison between “Mount Zion” and “The city of the great King.” Clearly, the association of these places/concepts indicates that the dwelling place of God is in an overlooking location. Then, what is the mountain that YHWH has chosen as his abode/sanctuary, and how does it relate to the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן? Usually scholars contend that the strongest candidate is Sinai because “the early date of the text [Exod 15] would eliminate Zion from the list.” However, as noted above, if the return of Adam and Eve (and

---

107 It should be considered that John’s description of the re-created Eden in Rev 21:10 places it upon a very great and high mountain.
109 Sometimes the meaning of Mount Zion is extended to the entire city (Lam 2:6-8) and even the entire land of Israel (Isa 57:13; Ps 126:1).
110 See Seung Il Kang, “Creation, Eden, Temple and Mountain: Textual Presentations of Sacred Space in the Hebrew Bible” (PhD diss., The Johns Hopkins University, 2008), 158. Other places have been proposed, such as Gilgal, Shiloh, Carmel, Tabor, Gerizim, and the land of Canaan in Israel’s northern highlands. See more in William Henry Propp, *Exodus 1-18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYBC 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 564.
humankind) to Eden or the holy mountain of God is a pattern envisioned all through the Scriptures, the comparison of the particular characterization of Jerusalem with the גַּן-עִֵ֔דֶן enhances this view and identifies the original dwelling place of God on earth.\footnote{Meaning before any cultic architectural institutions were installed, such as the wilderness tabernacle and/or Solomon’s temple.} YHWH’s chosen abode/sanctuary on earth was the גַּן-עִֵ֔דֶן, embodied later in the biblical narrative in Solomon’s temple in Jerusalem.\footnote{This fact would explain some of the cosmic characterizations of Solomon’s temple on Mount Zion. See further George Ernest Wright, “The Significance of the Temple in the Ancient Near East: Part III The temple in Palestine-Syria,” BA 7.4 (1944): 74-75. Cf. Clements, God and Temple, 65-67.} As illustrated in Ps 78:1-2, Mount Zion (Jerusalem) is the place God has elected. Indeed, Isa 51:3, Ps 46:5 [Eng. 46:4], and Ps 65:10 [Eng. 65:9] relate Zion to the luxurious paradise of Gen 2. Levenson has successfully criticized the theory that Sinai/Moses and Zion/David represent two contradictory sets of traditions.\footnote{Similarly, Ps 132:11-18 and Isa 2:2-4.} One may add that instead of representing two competing views, these two sacred mountains are interconnected via the גַּן-עִֵ֔דֶן and refer to the same motif/concept/reality, though their historical functions have important nuances. In effect, Israel’s eschatological hope was woven into the reestablishment of an edenic sanctuary/temple.\footnote{Levenson argues that there is no subordination of Zion/David tradition in the south to Sinai/Moses tradition in the north. He associates Zion with the ANE’s notion of the cosmic mountain and equates it with the Garden of Eden/paradise. Levenson, Sinai and Zion, 111, 131.} Gage brings out this insight: “Since the temple of Zion represented the cosmic house of creation to the Israelite, we may assume that the cosmological correspondence between the temple (microcosm) and creation (macrocosm)...”\footnote{Anderson, “Celibacy or Consummation,” 129. Cf. Jacques Ellul, The Meaning of the City, trans. D. Pardee (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), 189; Gage, The Gospel of Genesis, 52-54.}
would largely reduce to the concepts of the mountain, the garden, and the city.”

In brief, Jerusalem may be seen as a reminiscence of the Garden of Eden. Just as the “garden of the Lord” גַּן־יְּהוָ֑ה is identified as a place where joy, gladness, thanksgiving, and the voice of melody will be found (Isa 51:3; cf. Ezek 28:13 NKJV), the new created city of Jerusalem will be a place of joy and happiness (Isa 65:17-19).

Finally, one may adduce from the above four arguments that if this interpretation of the Garden of Eden as an elevated location (mountain) is regarded as valid, it implies that a common ideology from the ANE is present in the Hebrew Bible: namely, that mountains or elevated locations were considered sacred locations, particularly Mount

---


117 The biblical evidence is summarized in Kang, “Creation, Eden, Temple and Mountain,” 78-92. Here are the main points:

a. Sacred waters as source of life: As the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן gives life through the waters of the river, Jerusalem is said to have not a perennial river or natural stream, but a spring of water: Gihon (Ps 36:9-11 [Eng. 36:8-10]; 46:2-8; 65:10; cf. Isa 33:20-22; Joel 3:17-18; Zech 14:8). This was the primary source of water for temple rituals, and significantly the location of religious events such as the anointing of King Solomon (1 Kgs 1:33, 38, 45). For further treatment of Gihon see Levenson, Sinai and Zion, 131; M. Görg, “Gihon (Place),” ABD, 1018-1019.

b. Sacred waters in prophetic perspective: As the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן gives life through the waters of the river, the prophet Ezekiel, describing a pictorial prophecy in a literal economy, envisages a river “coming out from under the threshold of the temple” in Ezek 47:1-2, 5, 7. “The sufficiency of this life-giving water from the throne of God is portrayed in language reminiscent of the Garden of Eden and is similar to that of Rev 22:1-4.” Cooper, Ezekiel, 411. For structural correspondences within the book see Davidson, “Chiastic Literary Structure,” 74-79.

c. The restoration of Jerusalem (or Zion) in Ezek 36: 33-35 is described in terms reminiscent of the Garden of Eden; the prototypical plan was to restore the city to make it like the original garden God himself planted in Gen 2 (cf. Isa 51:3), “well-watered everywhere like the garden of the Lord” (cf. Gen 13:10). See Keil and Delitzsch, Commentary on the Old Testament, 9:440.

Certainly it is worthy of careful consideration that the restoration of Eden upon Mount Zion was the hope of the Bible writers. The above connections between Gen 2

וֹ הַר־קָדְּש (his holy mountain) or הַר־צִִ֭יוֹן (Mount Zion) seem to correspond with the notion of considering the גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן a sacred space. One aspect stands out in this

119 Isa 31:4; 33:5, 14; 52:1; 56:7; 60:14; 64:10; 66:20; Jer 31:23; Joel 2:1; Obad 16-17; Zech 8:3; Dan 9:16; cf. Isa 14:13-14; Ezek 28:14-16.

120 The author of Hebrews refers to Mount Zion as the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem “whose building and maker is God” (Heb 11:10; 12:22).

121 A good definition for sacred space may be “the locus of divine revelation and of continued divine-human interactions.” See Kang, “Creation, Eden, Temple and Mountain,” 59. It has been recognized that the following elements of the גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן have associations with sacredness (or cultic settings):

a. The גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן is the designated location for God-human encounters. God’s presence creates sacred space. David P. Wright explains this fact in a coherent way:

Primary evidence for the garden’s sanctity is the presence of the deity. This, from the native Israelite point of view, is the chief determinant of holiness. The deity, for example, manifests himself in the burning bush at Horeb. The ground is therefore holy and Moses must remove his shoes (Exod 3:5; cf. Josh 5:15). The god’s appearance at Sinai makes the mountain holy, and the people need to purify and guard against encroachment (Exod 19:9-25). The sanctifying effect of the god’s appearance is implied in the subsequent erection of altars and massebot (Gen 12:7; 28:17-18, 22; 35:1-7, 9-14; Judg 6:20-24). The dedication of the wilderness tabernacle, Solomon’s temple, and Ezekiel’s temple are all accompanied by the appearance of the deity which, in addition to dedicatory rites, consecrates the structures (Exod 40:34-35; Lev 9:4; 6:23-24; Num 9:15; 1 Kgs 8:10-11; 2 Chr 5:11-14; 7:1-3; Ezek 43:1-5; 44:1-3).


b. Gen 3:8 presents God walking in the גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן, similarly to Deut 23:15 [Eng. 23:14], where God walks in Israel’s camp. See the section on this topic in chapter III of this dissertation.

c. The river flowing from גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן, which was later divided into four streams, seems connected with the symbolic nature of the number four in Scripture (for example, the four corners of the earth in Isa 11:12; the prophet’s vision of four horses that patrol the entire world in Zech 1:8; the four heavenly winds in Jer 49:36; cf. Ezek 37:9; Zech 2:10 [Eng. 2:6]; 6:5). Thus, the implication is that the גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן is the center of the world, reaching the four corners of it. Centrality is consequential to sacredness. See Kang, “Creation, Eden, Temple and Mountain,” 63.

d. Trees in general terms may be considered sacred or related to sacred locations of God’s self-disclosure (Gen 2:9; cf. Gen 12:6-7; 18:1). Walton, Lost World of Adam, 116-18, 124. “Tree symbolism permeates the Bible and is present in different forms throughout the ancient Middle Eastern civilizations. In all cases the tree symbolized life, a concept that first appeared in the Garden of Eden.” Doukhan, Secrets of Revelation, 196. Sacred trees may be seen represented in the sanctuary/temple itself. Doukhan affirms that the menorah in the tabernacle
scenario: God’s presence. “Adam and Eve’s expulsion from the Garden of Eden appears also to represent the removal from their former proximity to God. The perception that the Garden of Eden, like the tabernacle and the Temple, is a place where God dwells, stands as a unifying factor that underlines the connections and analogies among these places.”

In this regard, Block critiques Walton’s proposal that Gen 2 develops the idea of considering the Garden of Eden as the holy of holies of the cosmic temple or a place for God’s presence. Gen 2 does not establish the founding of the גַּן-עִדֶּן in cosmic terms, but it is evident that Gen 2 does indeed establish the גַּן-עִדֶּן as a place for God’s presence. In all likelihood, the sanctuary/temple motif found in the גַּן-עִדֶּן, as the sought-


e. As we will see in chapter V of this dissertation, protology and eschatology (via גַּן-עִדֶּן) in biblical canonical theology meet within the relationship between the concepts/motifs of the mountain/city/temple. See the relevance of this aspect in the book of Daniel in Vogel, “Cultic Motif,” 29-67.


after sacred land in Scripture (key word הַר), becomes an overarching narrative in biblical canonical theology.  

Consequently, another point to which more exegetical/theological significance should be attached is that this notion should be understood, following Morales, via vertical typology “whereby an earthly mountain symbolizes the heavenly abode of the deity (cf. תַבְּנִית tabni’ī of Exod 25:9.” This typology seems to imply that just as the wilderness tabernacle was patterned according to the model (the primordial sanctuary/temple “mountain”), the גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן was patterned with the same architectural model. Furthermore, noting that the restoration of Eden upon Mount Zion was the hope of the Bible writers, it is from this perspective that the following Aramaic verses of Dan 2 should be interpreted:

\[\text{2:35} \text{ And the stone that struck the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth.} \]

\[2:35 \text{ וְאַבְּנֶָ֣א׀ דִָֽֽי־מְּחֶָ֣ת לְּצַלְּמָּ֗א הֲוָ֛ת לְּט֥וּר רַָ֖ב וּמְּלָ֥ת כָל־אַרְּעָָֽא׃} \]

124 See Joel 2:1; Amos 1:2; Obad 17; Mic 4:2; Zech 1:17; 8:3; Rom 11:26; 1 Pet 2:6; cf. Heb 12:22; Rev 14:1.


126 One may ask, where is this primordial sanctuary/temple “mountain”? The biblical evidence points to the heavenly/cosmic realm. In this sense, it is consistent with Mircea Eliade’s key proposal: the Temple Mount is central and primordial (prior to the creation of the cosmos). Eliade, Sacred and the Profane, 36-47. Or, as Levenson prefers to say it, “protological.” “The cosmic mountain is situated at the center of the world; from it, everything else takes its bearings.” Levenson, “Temple and the World,” 282-83.

127 The fact that the Eden narrative canonically precedes the tabernacle narrative does not necessarily preclude this theological implication. The theological content of a text can indeed predate its compositional historical role in the biblical canon. Following this idea, Davidson concludes that “if the earthly Eden is a copy of the heavenly original Eden sanctuary, we may reasonably conclude that the earthly Eden also functioned as a sanctuary where Adam and Eve worshiped and communed with their Creator.” Davidson, “Earth's First Sanctuary,” 68-69.
Inasmuch as you saw that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands. . .

“The coincidence between the origin and the outcome implicitly testifies to the kingdom’s divine nature.”\(^{128}\) The conceptual framework of the “mountain” from the perspective of vertical typology is key for understanding the climax of the great controversy depicted in the biblical narrative (cf. Dan 11:45; Rev 16:16).\(^{129}\) At this apex of human history, God reestablishes his supreme sovereignty on earth, as it has been on his sanctuary/temple “mountain” in heaven, by defeating the evil forces of the lawless one. Therefore, it is evident that the motif of the “mount” enhances the connection between heaven and earth,\(^{130}\) in the context of the conflict between good and evil.

This conceptual framework would follow the theological implication that the earthly tabernacle is primarily a vertical type of the heavenly counterpart and not merely a reflection of the cosmos or creation. Levenson, Beale, and Walton, among other scholars, claim that when the heavenly sanctuary/temple appears in the biblical narrative, it only refers to the heavens, cosmos, or creation.\(^{131}\) Rather, the earthly tabernacle reflects


\(^{130}\) Levenson, \textit{Creation and the Persistence}, 97; Beale, \textit{Temple and the Church’s Mission}, 32-33; Walton, \textit{Ancient Near Eastern Thought}, 123-27; Walton, \textit{Lost World of Genesis One}, 78-92; Walton,
the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן of creation by means of the original model (the primordial and heavenly sanctuary/temple “mountain”). Thus, “the earthly Eden sanctuary functioned as an earthly sign of the preexistent heavenly Eden sanctuary (cf. Heb 8:5).”

The River of Eden in Genesis 2:10

Is the river a merely incidental and auxiliary reference in the parklike landscape description of the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן? The presence of water seems to be logically understandable within this edenic arboreal scenario, since it is a characteristic of nature. Yet, the inquiry set before us is to reevaluate the credibility of the arguments proposed by some scholars concerning the biblical evidence—in this case, that the presence of a flowing river allegedly contributes to the semantic framework of a sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 2. As Gage has put it: “The cosmography in Gen 2-3 depicts Eden as containing the world mountain from whose numinous summit descended the great river of paradise.”

It should be mentioned that Bible scholars often state that the cosmologies of the ANE “consistently portray the sacred mountains surrounded by cosmic waters,” and generally, these accounts associate temples with springs of water. This association is

---


132 Doukhan, Genesis, 114.


135 John H. Walton, Victor Harold Matthews, and Mark W. Chavalas, The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000), see commentary on Ezek 41:1. “The oldest sanctuaries of the Semites were natural gardens, that is to say, spots naturally fertile with a perennial
based on the ancient Near Eastern idea that the earth’s water originates on the mountain of the gods. Walton explains this ancient worldview:

This association between ancient Near Eastern temples and spring waters is well attested. In fact, some temples in Mesopotamia, Egypt and in the Ugaritic myth of Baal were considered to have been founded upon springs (likened to the primeval waters), which sometimes flowed from the building itself. Thus, the symbolic cosmic mountain stood upon the symbolic primeval waters. On this point, then, the ancient world and the biblical picture agree.

In the particular case of the biblical material, apart from the ANE conceptual worldview, there are at least three scholarly observations to reevaluate. The first is the framework that arises from the concepts of sacred space and the presence of waters. For example, this conceptual relationship between primeval waters and sacred waters may be observed in Gen 1:2. Yet, specifically in Gen 2, scholars maintain that the relationship between waters (or rivers) and the sacred mountain follows a significant cultic pattern that is a conceptual backdrop in the Hebrew Bible. This seems to be evidenced by the connections supply of water.” Bevan, “King of Tyre,” 503. See further in Smith, Religion of the Semites, 165-212; Lundquist, “What Is a Temple,” 208.


137 Walton, “Garden of Eden,” DOTP 205. There is one particular parallel between the biblical text and the ANE worldview that seems substantiated by some scholars. The so-called river judicial ordeal builds upon a Mesopotamian phenomenon of trial by river ordeal, where emerging from the water is victory/innocence and being overpowered by water means the divine verdict of guilt. See McCarter, “River Ordeal,” 403-12; Mary K. Wakeman, God’s Battle with the Monster: A Study in Biblical Imagery (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 90-91; Bertrand Lafont, “The Ordeal,” in Everyday Life in Ancient Mesopotamia (eds. Bottéro and Finet; Baltimore: John Hopkins University, 2001), 199-210. The problem with this apparent parallel is that those biblical passages are reframed to fit the ancient combat myth ideology and/or decontextualized. While it is true that some of God’s judiciary actions employ waters (Gen 6-9), the biblical material does not use this image in the sense of creating a watery abode of the dead, as the cosmic waters of Canaanite cosmology do. See Morales, The Tabernacle Pre-Figured, 29-30. More to the point, some of the assumed ordeals (Exod 14) are not in actuality a trial/judgment. Besides this fact, water is not the only natural means God uses to accomplish his judgments (for example, fire in Gen 19), and when God uses and/or has dominion over the elements of nature (cf. Gen 1; Pss 66:12; 77:18 [Eng. 77:17]; 78:13; 104:10; Isa 41:18; Joel 4:18 [Eng. 3:18]; Hab 3:8-12), he does so not confronting a divine equal, but executing his sovereign power over creation/creatures.

between Eden, Jerusalem, Mount Zion, God’s presence, and the life-giving waters of rivers. For example, in the theological framework of the Promised Land, the notion of Zion/Jerusalem as Eden recognizes a common motif of waters flowing from the temple, where the loss of Jerusalem is conceived as the loss of Eden, and it is restored as Eden. In view of these connections, the river motif becomes central to the description of the גַּן-עִֵ֔דֶן in Gen 2, and in the rest of the Bible. Fundamentally, the river in later biblical passages is an illustrative reminiscence of a source of beauty and fruitfulness. Gen 13:10 exemplifies this fact when Lot compares, as well watered lands,

139 Ps 46:5 [Eng. 46:4] indicates that there is a river in the city where God dwells; Ps 65:10 [Eng. Ps 65:9] describes that God purposefully waters his land to provide food); Ps 36:9 [Eng. 36:8] shows that there is a river of delights [literally Eden] at the house of God; Isa 33:21-22 portrays Mount Zion as Jerusalem, the holy city like a place of rivers where God reigns. See also Pss 133:3; 134:3.

140 Lawrence E. Stager, “Jerusalem as Eden,” BAR 26.3 (2000): 41. Terje Stordalen provides convincing evidence for intertextual associations on this matter; T. Stordalen, “Heaven on Earth—Or Not?: Jerusalem as Eden in Biblical Literature,” in Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2-3) and Its Reception History, eds. Christoph Riedweg and Konrad Schmid (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 31-41. However, contrary to this notion and ironically to most commentators, in examining the topography of Eden and the Temple, Stordalen calls the Eden narrative utopian, asserting that “biblical Eden is a place that never ‘really’ existed, but that nevertheless is conceivable through its echoes (blueprints) in the human world.”


143 Warren A. Gage comments that “this original Eden speaks in figure of the heavenly sanctuary paradise, for the new edenic mountain (cf. Rev 21:10) is watered by the river of the water of life. The source of these springs is the throne of God, and its streams give drink to the tree of life (cf. Rev 22:1, 2; Zech 14:8-11).” Gage, The Gospel of Genesis, 87.
the Jordan valley, the fertile Nile delta, and the Garden of the Lord (כְּגַן־יְּהוָה), “a veritable Eden, perennially watered.”  

A second observation is that the literary arrangement of Gen 2 is centered on the presence of God. William H. Shea observes the significance of the literary arrangement of the pre-Fall Eden narrative. He writes that “at the center of the creation narrative in Genesis 2 lies the description of the four rivers which flowed from the Garden of Eden.” This literary feature underlining Gen 2:10 is strengthened by the fact that the connection between the trees and the rivers is noticeable in Gen 2:9. The intertextual relationship between the trees and rivers points to God’s presence. Davidson has put it like this:

The tree of life was “in the midst” (בֵּיתוֹק) of the garden (Gen 2:9), and this is the precise term for the living presence of God “in the midst” (בֵּיתוֹק) of his people in the sanctuary (Exod 25:8; Lev 26:12). In the Mosaic sanctuary and Solomonic Temple, the ark (symbolizing the Presence of God on his throne, Ps 80:1), was located at the exact center of the quadrangle of holy space containing the sanctuary building proper.

The implicit functional centrality of the rivers that flow from the center of Eden (Gen 2:10) discloses the life-giving presence of God as it progressively flows/expands from Eden to the ends of the earth. Shea notes this literary centrality as follows:

The description of these rivers has been outlined in a decrescendo form, and each of the successive descriptions becomes shorter and shorter. The first description names the river, states its location, and describes the precious metals and stones that were present. The second description names the river and the land around which it flowed, but no detailed information about that land is given. The third description also names

the river and its location, but even this description is shorter than that of the previous river. The fourth river is only named; the country or countries by which it flowed are not named, and no description is given.\textsuperscript{148}

The life-giving presence of the river is also shown via intertextual connections with the Hebrew Psalter. The picture drawn by the inspired psalmist in Ps 36:6-10 [Eng. 36:5-9] is a remarkable example. The Hebrew text and its translation read:

\begin{verbatim}
36:5 Your mercy, O Lord, is in the heavens; Your faithfulness reaches to the clouds.
36:6 Your righteousness is like the great mountains; Your judgments are a great deep; O Lord, You preserve\textsuperscript{149} man and beast.
36:7 How precious is Your lovingkindness, O God! Therefore the children of men put their trust under the shadow of Your wings.\textsuperscript{151}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{148} Shea, “Literary Structural Parallels,” 49-50. Shea explains this literary decrescendo form like this:

The section begins with a general observation: “And a river went out from Eden to water the garden, and from there it was divided and became four heads” (v. 10). The identification and description of each river follows:

1. “The name of the first was Pishon; it was the one which went around the whole land of Havilah where there is gold — and the gold of that land is good — there is (also) bdellium and onyx stone.”
2. “The name of the second river was Gihon; it went around the whole land of Cush.”
3. “The third river was the Tigris; it went east of Assyria”,
4. “The fourth river was the Euphrates” (vv. 11-14).

\textsuperscript{149} Literally “saved,” a hiphil form of the verb יָשַע.

\textsuperscript{150} It is notable that the characteristics of good kingship/rulership (mercy, faithfulness, and righteousness) are described in cosmic dimensions, encompassing the heavens and earth, as the entire creation includes men and beasts: the totality of creation. The following verses would point to the center of God’s sovereignty and salvation.

\textsuperscript{151} Cf. Ps 91:1. Craigie and Tate, not unreasonably, remark that “God’s provision of protection is expressed by the words ‘shadow of your wings’ (v 8), sometimes taken to allude to the wings of the seraphim in the temple.” In other words, this would allude to the most holy place of the sanctuary/temple. See Peter C. Craigie and Marvin E. Tate, Psalms I-50, WBC 19 (Waco: Word Books, 2004), 292.
36:8 They are abundantly satisfied with
the fullness of Your house, and You
give them drink from the river of Your
pleasures.

36:9 For with You is the fountain of life;
In Your light we see light.

The linkages in Ps 36:6-10 [Eng. 36:5-9] between the flowing river, Eden, the
sanctuary/temple, and life reveal that “true life and sustenance are found in the presence
of God.” The psalmist highlights the cosmic central distinctiveness of God’s presence
as the life-giving water fountain. Jerome F. D. Creach identifies this very notion in Ps
1:3. The Hebrew text and its translation read:

1:3 He shall be like a tree
Planted by the rivers of water,
That brings forth its fruit in its season,
Whose leaf also shall not wither;
And whatever he does shall prosper

Creach’s linguistic analysis of the Hebrew word פֶֶ֥לֶג [péle; “canal”]
demonstrates that four of the nine appearances of a word derived from this root designate

152 Literally “drink copiously,” a qal form of the verb רָוָה.
153 The context indicates that the Hebrew expression בֵֶ֬יתֶּך refers to God’s sanctuary/temple. Cf.
Pss 23:6; 27:4. This sanctuary/temple, according to the previous verse, is alluding to the most holy place.
See Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown, A Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the
Whole Bible (New York: George H. Doran, 1921), 1:358.
154 The abundance of God’s sanctuary/temple from which creation drinks copiously is the life-
giving water of his נַָ֫חַל river (literally meaning a “torrent” or “stream”).
155 The expression עֲדָנֶֶ֣יך וְּנַָ֖חַל (literally “river of your Edens”) may allude subtly to the
concept/reality of גַן עִֵ֔דֶן.
156 Indeed, God himself is the fountain of living waters (Jer 2:13; cf. John 4:10, 14).
157 Beale and Kim, God Dwells Among Us, 23.
water channels flowing from the holy mountain (cf. Isa 30:25; 32:2; Pss 46:5; 65:10). He writes:

These data on the location of peleg in these four texts viewed alone would be inconclusive; however, they are suggestive in light of the parallels between Ps 1:3a and Ezek 47:12. The fact that the word "streams" and the vocabulary used to describe the leaves and fruit of the tree occur most prominently (and in some cases exclusively) in descriptions of the temple mountain seems more than accidental. Indeed, it seems probable that the writer of the psalm includes the particular image of "streams of water," as well as the description of the tree as fruitful and evergreen, in order to portray the righteous person as a tree firmly rooted because it is planted in the temple and is made secure by the temple stream.158

Ps 1:3 pertains to the conceptual framework of God’s presence as the life-giving water fountain, implicitly connected with the sanctuary/temple as the only place where the righteous are secure (cf. Pss 50:10; 92:13-15 [Eng. 92:12-14]).159

This textual and conceptual centrality is further confirmed when the Eden narrative describes the river as fructifying the four corners of the earth, meaning the totality of creation. The life-giving waters are to be the source of sustenance for the whole earth, as the number four (Gen 2:10-14)160 in the Bible symbolizes the entire terrestrial dimension,161 and divides the earth into various regions.162 This is indeed observed, as demonstrated by Doukhan, in the seven literary rhythmic and thematic


159 Other psalms seem to depict the same notion without the simile of the tree (cf. Pss 11, 15, 23, 24, 29, 46, 48, 61, 63, 73, 122, and 132).

160 Nira Stone traces the history of interpretation of the number four in this passage during medieval times; see Nira Stone, “The Four Rivers that Flowed from Eden,” in Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2-3) and Its Reception History, ed. Christoph Riedweg and Konrad Schmid (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 227-47, especially 229-34.

161 Doukhan, Secrets of Revelation, 53. Cf. Jer 49:36; Dan 7:2; Zech 6:5; Rev 7:1; 20:8. See also Boyer, Divine Presence, especially chap. 2 entitled “Sacred Numbers,” p. 12, also 10-25.

correspondences between Gen 1 and 2, where Gen 1:9-13 and 2:9-15 are concerned with the ideas of waters and land delimitation.\textsuperscript{163} The above would imply, as Walton and Beale have labored to demonstrate, that Gen 2 shows a gradation of holiness. Just as in Gen 2 the river flows from God’s presence to water the garden, and then to the rest of the earth, in the eschatological temple (cf. Ezek 47:1; Rev 22:1) the river flows from God’s throne into the temple, and then to the nations outside.\textsuperscript{164} Although the lands outside the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן are not yet populated, the parallelism seems reasonable.

The גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן “is not only the dwelling place of God. It is also the source of all the creative forces that flow forth from the Divine Presence, that energize and give life to the creation in a constant, unceasing outflow of vivifying power.”\textsuperscript{165} Therefore, the presence of the river is not an incidental or auxiliary detail in the parklike landscape of the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן.\textsuperscript{166} Gen 2:10-14 is not an excursus, as suggested by C. John Collins.\textsuperscript{167} Canonical biblical intertextuality provides evidence that the cultic connection between the flowing

\textsuperscript{163} Doukhan, “Literary Structure,” 42.

\textsuperscript{164} Beale and Kim, God Dwells Among Us, 21. Cf. Walton, Genesis, 167-68, 182-83. This is a common perception among biblical scholars. For example, Richard S. Hess observes this gradation of holiness in Israelite daily life in three concentric spheres: at the center the priests, at the next level the Israelites, and at the outer fringe the nations of the world. Richard S. Hess, Israelite Religions: An Archaeological and Biblical Survey (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 183-84. Perhaps the most comprehensive study on this theme is found in Seth D. Kunin, God’s Place in the World: Sacred Space and Sacred Place in Judaism (London: Cassell, 1998), 9-45.


\textsuperscript{166} Anderson, “The Cosmic Mountain,” 197.

\textsuperscript{167} Collins, Genesis 1-4, 102-3, 119. Cf. John Scullion, Genesis: A Commentary for Students, Teachers, and Preachers, OTS 6 (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1992), 36. However, it should be admitted that grammatically vv. 10-14 present a different verbal emphasis. This is not to be considered a sort of parenthesis: instead, this textual nuance shows the opposite. The participle, the infinitive, and weqatal in vv. 10-14 appear to be highlighted over the rest of the narrative. As demonstrated by Shea, vv. 10-14 stand at the center of the narrative. Shea, “Literary Structural Parallels,” 49.
waters, Eden, and the sanctuary/temple forms a semantic framework that constitutes sacred space.

A third observation concerns the flowing river in Gen 2:10 as a giver of life in the גַּן־עִדֶּנ. Gregory K. Beale and Mitchell Kim put it like this:

This river in Eden gives life to many trees growing on its banks, including the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and the tree of life (Gen 2:10, 17; 3:24). This water flows out of Eden to water the garden before flowing outward to give life to the rest of the earth and places where nations would reside (Gen 2:10-14). Similarly, in later depictions of the temple, a river flows with trees of life on its banks.¹⁶⁸

The two most commonly known passages in the Bible that describe a river flowing from God’s presence are Ezek 47:5-12¹⁶⁹ and Rev 22:1-2. In these two texts, many scholars have read concomitant echoes, allusions, and/or references to each other.¹⁷⁰ “The answer to this phenomenon is not to be found in borrowing but is evidence that there are two independent witnesses each with its vision describing the same area.”¹⁷¹ Both passages

¹⁶⁸ Beale and Kim, God Dwells Among Us, 20.


¹⁷¹ Cooper, Ezekiel, 409-10.
refer to Jerusalem as the source of life and nourishment,\textsuperscript{172} and in them the Zion-river association conforms to a central characteristic of the temple (cf. Ps 46:5 [Eng. 46:4] and Ps 36:9-10 [Eng. 8-9]; Zech 14:5-11).\textsuperscript{173} The water coming from the river is indeed associated with the trees of the garden. Doukhan has observed this: “the tree was represented in the tabernacle through the shape of the menorah (the stylized golden candlestick) whose light symbolized the gift of life to Israel.”\textsuperscript{174}

However, the intriguing question that remains is this: Do the passages Ezek 47:5-12 and Rev 22:1-2 indicate a valid intertextual theological/conceptual relationship with Gen 2? Is it legitimate to view Gen 2:10, Ezek 47:5-12, and Rev 22:1-2 as pertaining to the same semantic framework? Block writes that “few doubt that Ezekiel’s vision of a life-giving stream has been influenced, at least in part, by Gen. 2:10-14, which portrays paradise as a garden, rendered fruitful by a river flowing out of Eden and dividing into four branches, and which Yahweh visits daily (3:8).”\textsuperscript{175} Inasmuch as the fruits and leaves of the tree of life in Rev 22:1-4 recreate this, the river gives life and nourishes the trees around it, just as in Gen 2 (cf. Ezek 47:12).\textsuperscript{176} Thus, there seems to be meaningful

\textsuperscript{172} Just as the waters of rivers in the biblical narrative are the source that nourishes the natural world, they symbolize God’s fellowship with his people (cf. Isa 35:6-9; 41:17-20; 43:18-20; Joel 3:18).

\textsuperscript{173} Scholars favor the interpretation that this text is neither wholly symbolic nor wholly literal, meaning that the best approach is to consider this text as both literal and symbolic. See A. B. Davidson, \textit{Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: With Notes and Introduction} (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1892), 349-50. Cf. Cooper, \textit{Ezekiel}, 407. For example, taking the literal approach, it has been argued that the prophet Ezekiel might have been familiar with the Gihon spring in the Kidron Valley, an important source of water in Jerusalem (cf. 1 Kgs 1:38). However, nowhere is it associated with the temple, according to Zimmerli, \textit{Ezekiel}, 511. Cf. Block, \textit{The Book of Ezekiel}, 696-97.


\textsuperscript{175} Block, \textit{The Book of Ezekiel}, 696.

\textsuperscript{176} Doukhan, \textit{Secrets of Revelation}, 196.
evidence to confirm the presence of a sacred motif in these three passages, especially the common references to fruitfulness, food, and healing, altogether substantially connected with God’s throne in the garden-temple.

In view of this semantic framework of life-sustaining similarities, this scenario endowed with the most glorious fertility, it is possible to determine that “the sufficiency of this life-giving water from the throne of God is portrayed in language reminiscent of the Garden of Eden and is similar to that of Rev 22:1-4.”\(^{177}\) The aspect of water serves as a unifying conceptual framework, and we may already begin to see how the pre-Fall Eden narrative is constructed upon a sanctuary/temple motif.

The Hebrew Verbs וָבָד and שָמַר in Genesis 2:15

The Garden of Eden “was not only a luxurious place to be enjoyed, it was a place where man had work to do.”\(^ {178}\) However, what kind of “work” was supposed to be done in the pre-Fall state of humankind? Certainly, this is an intriguing statement.

The terms describing this work and seemingly associated with the underlying sanctuary/temple motif are the verbs וָבָד [‘āḇād; “serve”] and שָמַר [šāmār; “keep watch,” “guard”]. Critics of the sanctuary/temple motif, on the one hand, often argue that the combination of these two verbs is better translated in the context of cultivation, as some English translations have rendered them.\(^ {179}\) Undoubtedly, this would be nonsensical

---

\(^{177}\) Cooper, Ezekiel, 411. Cf. Cooke, Book of Ezekiel, 521-22. The theological implication that seems to be substantiated here, as Beale and Kim argue, is that “Eden is a place of God’s presence, and the place of God’s presence is a place of worship.” See more in Beale and Kim, God Dwells Among Us, 29.

\(^{178}\) Schultz, “עֵדֶן,” TWOT 647.

\(^{179}\) Note the similarities and differences in the following English versions concerning this nuance: ASV “to dress it and to keep it,” CJB “to cultivate and care for it,” CEB “to farm it and to take care of it,”
in a sanctuary/temple motif, as Block has rightly observed.\textsuperscript{180} On the other hand, supporters of the sanctuary/temple motif reason that “since the garden is, inferentially, a temple, human beings are inferentially priests.”\textsuperscript{181}

Nevertheless, there is one aspect that calls for reevaluation. The collocation of the semantic framework of עָבַד and שָמַר exclusively in the context of cultivation seems to leave an even starker paradox. This particular collocation would be reasonable if the object were הַגְּנוֹן ['גון; “ground”] (cf. Gen 4:2; 4:12; 2 Sam 9:10; Zech 13:5; Prov 12:11; 28:19),\textsuperscript{182} and not הֵאָדָמָה, as the text of Gen 2:15 states. Since the הֵאָדָמָה is more than soil, it appears that the verbal idea of cultivation is not the only warranted rendition. Additionally Block considers, admittedly, that the conjunction of these two verbs in association with the tabernacle suggesting priestly functions “were reminiscence of humankind’s role in the garden, but the reverse is unwarranted.”\textsuperscript{183} The historical correlation approach for exegesis, which is a diachronic concern, should not invalidate the theological significance of synchronic intertextuality.\textsuperscript{184} Therefore, if the priestly functions of the Levites echo/allude to Adam and Eve’s status/role, it is also exegetically

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{NASB} “to cultivate it and keep it,” \textit{NIV} “to tend and watch over it,” \textit{NRSV} “to till it and keep it,” \textit{YLT} “to serve it, and to keep it.”
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{180} Block, “Eden: A Temple?,” 11.

\textsuperscript{181} Waltke, \textit{An Old Testament Theology}, 259. This conclusion has been reached from several perspectives; see Margaret Barker, \textit{Creation: A Biblical Vision for the Environment} (London: T & T Clark, 2010), especially chap. 5 entitled “The Highpriest of Creation,” 193-236.


\textsuperscript{183} Block, “Eden: A Temple?,” 12.

\textsuperscript{184} See methodology in chapter I of this research.
legitimate to explore the theological meaning of Adam and Eve’s status/roles in light of the Levites.

Scholars often find connections through intertextual linkages with later sanctuary/temple narratives.¹⁸⁵ For example, Doukhan affirms that “the juxtaposition of these two verbs is associated with the priestly role in the tabernacle (Num 3:7-8; 8:26; 18:5-6; cf. Exod 12:25).”¹⁸⁶ Evidently, Doukhan’s observation implies a foundational notion, namely, the priestly function in the pre-Fall Eden narrative. Yet, one may query: What would be the textual/conceptual hints in the text of Genesis to ascribe priestly functions to Adam and Eve’s work? In order to determine if the “work” assigned to Adam and Eve in Eden relates to the priestly “work” of later sanctuaries/temples, it is necessary to establish and reevaluate its terminological framework.

The objection to the notion of priestly functions in the pre-Fall Eden narrative seems clear: if none had sinned, they had no need of a substitutionary sacrifice or an intercessory priest. Scholars advocating the priestly roles of Adam and Eve often argue that “the absence of references to sacrifices and altars should not detract from seeing temple imagery in the opening chapters of Genesis.”¹⁸⁷ The terminological connections (Gen 2:15; cf. Num 3:7-8; 8:26; 18:5-6; Exod 12:25) have distinct strengths/weaknesses, and useful information can be derived from a semantic study of these verbs. Therefore, if

¹⁸⁵ See full discussion in Walton, Genesis, 172-74, 185-87.

¹⁸⁶ Doukhan, Genesis, 78-79; Doukhan, “Literary Structure,” 42n1. See also Cassuto, Commentary on the Book of Genesis, 122-23.

¹⁸⁷ Alexander, From Eden, 25.
the Garden of Eden narrative uses the terminological framework of the sanctuary/temple, at least four considerations might be offered concerning the alleged verbal connections.

First, the verb יָ֫בָד in Gen 2:15 appears only here with this morphology as an infinitive construct (לְּעָבְּדָ), having a third-person singular feminine suffix, which functions to point out the direct object and nearest antecedent גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן. It is significant that most of its occurrences as infinitive construct in the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua indicate “to honor” YHWH and/or “to serve” at the tent of meeting. Moreover, the Hebrew noun ‘ָ֫בֹדָה (עֲבֹּדָה) that appears five times in the Old Testament with the preposition lamed, thus mirroring the infinitive construct of Gen 2:15, is sometimes used in cultic settings. This usage would indicate that part of its semantic range applies to cultic settings. This does not prove that the infinitive construct of Gen 2:15 should be understood with cultic connotations, but it raises the possibility, depending on contextual factors. Although it may not be immediately apparent, the intertextual relationship seems to allow for such consideration when the objects of יָ֫בָד are put in perspective. The

188 The grammatical problem is evident: the pronominal suffix is feminine and the nearest antecedent is the masculine גַּן. There is no clear solution to this dilemma unless the expression גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן is considered feminine. See Paul Jouon and T. Muraoka, A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew (Roma: Gregorian and Biblical, 2006), 134-35. Gregor suggests that this grammatical anomaly indicates a subtle reference to the Hebrew feminine noun אֶָ֫רֶץ “earth,” meaning that Adam and Eve’s service “would gradually be extended to the entire earth.” Paul Gregor, “Creation Revisited: Echoes of Genesis 1 and 2 in the Pentateuch,” in The Genesis Creation Account and Its Reverberations in the Old Testament, ed. Gerald A. Klingbeil (Berrien Springs: Andrews University, 2015), 143.


191 Perhaps it is not coincidence that the Hebrew word ‘ָ֫בֹדָה (יָ֫בָדָה), sometimes used to mean “cultic service” (cf. 1 Chr 9:28; Num 4:25; Exod 12:25), has the same root consonants as the infinite construct of the verb יָ֫בָד.
semantic framework formed by “to honor” YHWH, “to serve” at the tent of meeting, and to “work” the גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן reflects a unifying theme in the book of Genesis and a foundational belief in canonical biblical theology. God created Adam and Eve with the purpose of serving him, and with the aim of fulfilling this role, God himself provided a paradisiacal place for human happiness: גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן. In light of this observation, Doukhan stresses the importance of the usage of אֶָ֫רֶץ ['éreṣ; “earth”] in Gen 1 and 2 and suggests a connection between the cosmic dimension of אֶָ֫רֶץ and the particular chosen place for the גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן. He explains:

This means that in the book of Genesis the theology of the land is more than a mere nationalistic concept. God, the Creator, the owner of the earth, is behind that special land, whether the Garden of Eden or the Promised Land. Interestingly, this is the very lesson that is suggested by the structure of Genesis. The book begins in Eden and ends with the prospect of the Promised Land.192

This implies, as Doukhan further comments, that “the biblical worldview has no room for a secular place where the divine reference would be absent. Work is a part of religious life.”193 God’s creation of the גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן, God’s planting of the גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן, and God’s solemn covenant of the Promised Land include the implicit command that humankind serve (עָבַד) him, and this at its core indicates a cultic function/role.

Second, similarly, the verb שָמַר appears only in Gen 2:15 with the morphology of an infinitive construct (הּ ָֽלְּשָמְּרָ) having a third-person singular feminine suffix, which functions to point out the direct object and nearest antecedent גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן. The semantic scope of this verb, according to the Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament, carries the sense of watchfulness and an office that is bestowed, implicitly and explicitly indicating

192 Doukhan, Genesis, 37.
193 Doukhan, Genesis, 79.
religious connotations. “It involves primarily the duty of the Levites in Lev (e.g. 8:35) and in Num (e.g. 1:35).”\textsuperscript{194} If one accepts the notion that there is no dichotomy between sacred and profane/secular in Scripture, it seems clear that sacred duties are involved in almost all portions of the Old Testament when שָמַר is present. For example, to mention a few passages related to sacred duties: protection of the sanctuary/ark (Num 18:5-6, cf. 1 Sam 7:1), fulfilling the work of the tabernacle (Num 3:7-8), performing the responsibilities of the tent of meeting (Num 8:26), an attitude toward the covenant (Gen 17:9), responsibility toward the law (Isa 56:1; cf. Deut 5:12), duties of love and justice (Hos 12:7), and keeping the commandments, statutes, and instructions of God (Gen 26:5). The semantic framework of שָמַר, due to a considerable number of occurrences exhibiting religious language, probably may be attributed to the sacred realm.\textsuperscript{195} Walton puts it like this: עָבַד and שָמַר “are terms most frequently encountered in discussions of human service to God rather than descriptions of agricultural tasks.”\textsuperscript{196}

Third, one key difficulty in observing priestly roles assigned to Adam and Eve is to define this concept only in light of atonement sacrifices. Evidently, Adam and Eve’s appointment was basically to עָבַד and שָמַר the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן so that it would remain holy. Does this mean that a holy assignment is connected with sanctuary/temple roles? If one concedes that “in ancient thinking, caring for sacred space was a way of upholding creation,”\textsuperscript{197} in all likelihood, a divine appointment to preserve a place in terms of

\textsuperscript{194} G. Sauer, “שָמַר,” \textit{TLOT} 3:1382.
\textsuperscript{195} Sauer, “שָמַר,” \textit{TLOT} 3:1383-84.
\textsuperscript{197} Walton, “Garden of Eden,” \textit{DOTP} 206.
holiness “was a normal task associated with any sanctuary.”198 Naturally, although some priestly and cultic functions were associated with atonement sacrifices, all priestly and cultic notions of serving/worshiping God cannot be relegated exclusively to a post-Fall place/realm/time.199 If this is correct, Walton seems to appropriately assert that Adam’s role should be understood in light of the common priestly work that was performed in the ancient world. He writes that “when we read the Bible, we often think of priests as ritual experts and as those instructing the people in the ways of the Lord and the law. That is true, but those tasks fit into the larger picture. The main task of the priest was the preservation of sacred space.”200

While it should be clear that the main purpose of the writer of the pre-Fall Eden narrative is not to introduce sin or its consequences, nevertheless, as Doukhan has noted, Gen 2 “has been written from the perspective of a writer who already knows the effects of death and suffering.”201 This implies that the depiction of the scenes of Gen 2 as “not

---

198 Alexander, From Eden, 26.

199 Bruce K. Waltke writes: “Assuming the given particularity of all Scripture, the two creation narratives (Gen 1:1-2:3 and 2:4-25) should be regarded as normative because they describe God’s ideal for his creation. The rest of Scripture reflects conditions after the fall of humanity, a state of accursedness and corruption, in which God acts and reacts to human heart-heartedness.” Waltke, An Old Testament Theology, 233.


yet” means that the verbs עָבַד and שָמַר reveal the eventual risk of losing the גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן and anticipate the fall event of Gen 3.202

What kind of “work” was supposed to be done in the pre-Fall state of humankind? In accordance with the foregoing discussion, one may suggest that the function/role divinely assigned to Adam and Eve in their pre-Fall state (a function/role that transcended that of post-Fall humankind) should be understood in light of the ancient priestly role of preserving sacred space. One may ponder ample biblical evidence of this reality in the Old Testament and in the religious framework of the ANE.203 Regardless of the state of humankind, the most significant priestly role was teaching the Scriptures to the people (cf. Deut 33:10; Ezra 7:10; Neh 8:7). Such a cultic role (ministering in a sacred place or guarding it in order to keep it holy) could be performed in a pre-Fall place/realm/time, and indeed, God has bestowed such roles.204 Walton offers a helpful definition of Adam and Eve’s role: “Their role is to mediate knowledge of God, and their end goal is ultimately not to restrict access to the presence of God but to mediate access


203 Jared L. Miller and Mauro Giorgieri, Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts, SBL 31 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 244-65.

204 See, for example, the cultic role and grandeur of the guardian cherub (Ezek 28:11-19; cf. Isa 14:4-21); worshipping/singing at the creation moment (Job 38:4-7); princes of planets (Job 1:6; cf. Gen 1:28); and the heavenly temple as the cosmic center of service/worship for innumerable intelligent beings (Ps 89:5-6; 103:19; Dan 7:9-10; cf. Rev 4:2-7). Although one may not agree with all interpretations of Michael Heiser’s book, the subject deserves careful study; see especially references to the Psalms in Michael S. Heiser, The Unseen Realm: Recovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible (Bellingham: Lexham, 2015), 14-126.
through instruction.” In any case, in a pre-Fall place/realm/time, according to Isa 14:13, the heavenly sanctuary/temple is called the mount of the congregation, permitting access to God and thus revealing its primary worship function. Davidson points out that “before the entrance of sin in the universe the heavenly sanctuary did not function to solve the sin problem, but served primarily as a place of worship.”

Fourth, perhaps a complementary observation to be reconsidered: there are elements describing עֵדֶן in relation to Gen 2 (and Gen 3) that also envisage a palatial royal setting. Rev 20:6 (cf. Rev 1:6; 5:10; 7:15; 22:3; Col 1:16) describes (among post-sin humankind) the redeemed not only with cultic functions as “priests,” but also as “kings.” This royal depiction may be compared with God’s original plan in Gen 2. As a case in point, one could refer to the function of the verb רָדָה [rāḏâ; “rule”] in Gen 1:26 in describing the role of humanity. “While its etymology is uncertain, it appears that elsewhere it is mostly used in connection with royalty (1 Kings 4:24; Ps 8:5, 6; 72:8; 110:2; Isa 14:2).” If this is correct, as the biblical evidence seems to confirm, then it would make sense that by obeying the serpent, Adam and Eve failed in their royal role to preserve the holiness of the גַּןְ-עִֵ֔דֶן, and thus “they are deprived of their priestly status

205 Walton, *Lost World of Adam*, 112.
207 Davidson, “Earth’s First Sanctuary,” 68-69.
209 In this sense, it seems theologically unfeasible to discuss in this context the mythological and traditional motif of chaoskampf. The biblical text of the Eden narrative shows that Adam and Eve’s kingly role was to preserve the holiness of the גַּןְ-עִֵ֔דֶן via communion and interaction with the Holy God. This, of course, would not imply any sort of chaos or combat. *Contra Morales, The Tabernacle Pre-Figured*, 80.
and expelled from the sanctuary complex.”

Adam and Eve’s status was subject to their obedience to the Creator. Furthermore, another key verb that seems to set forward the semantic framework of Adam and Eve’s role and/or work in the גן-עִֵ֔דֶן is the verb [שִים; “set,” “place”]. The second part of Gen 2:8 states that “there He put [שִים] the man whom He had formed.” Paul Gregor’s analysis regarding this verb is important:

Among the wide range of its usage, šîm is used in the context of appointing someone to an office of authority whether they are taskmasters (Exod 1:11; 5:14), elders in the community of Israel (Exod 18:21), judges (Judg 11:11), or military commanders (1 Sam 8:11, 12; 2 Sam 17:25). It is also used in the context of setting a king upon a throne as a symbol of rulership and an indicator of power (Deut 17:14, 15; 1 Sam 8:5; 10:19). Deuteronomy uses the word šîm four times in this sense, which unmistakably reflects this significance. Furthermore, the language of appointing kings is ultimately connected to the coronation ceremony.

A more important issue is whether the verb בָּשִּֽם carries such a meaning in Gen 2.

According to Gregor’s explanation, the purpose of Gen 2:8 is found in Gen 1:26 “where rulership and dominion over all creation was given to humanity.” This is an indication that Adam and Eve were given a kind of kingly role and/or an official/cultic appointment.

Lastly, the only other occasion where עָבַד and שָמַר appear as a pair is in the context of ministering at the tabernacle and service to God (Num 8:26; cf. Exod 19:6). On this basis, I would venture to point out that the verbs עָבַד and שָמַר in the pre-Fall Eden narrative likely echo and pertain to a cultic/royal semantic framework rather than

---

211 Alexander, From Eden, 27.
212 Gregor, “Creation Revisited,” 137-38.
214 Gregor, “Creation Revisited,” 143.
merely to landscaping and agrarian responsibilities. In order to enable Adam and Eve’s work of הָָֽאָדָּ֑ם and שָמַר, “they are given royal authority alongside their priestly status.”

The Hebrew Word צֵלָע and the Verb בָנָה in Genesis 2:21, 22

The function/role divinely assigned to הָָֽאָדָּ֑ם in Gen 2:15 is so fundamental to the created order that הָָֽאָדָּ֑ם could not accomplish it alone. Adam and Eve’s pre-Fall function/role of preserving sacred space was to be performed through partnership. The next questions to consider are these: Does this indicate that according to the divine command, women were to serve as some kind of priestesses? If we conclude that the answer to this query is yes, how does Eve’s function/role fit within the framework of the sanctuary/temple motif? To understand the background of this inquiry, it is necessary to reconsider the Hebrew vocabulary employed in Gen 2:21-22 in its semantic framework.

The semantic combination of the Hebrew word צֵלָע [sēlāʾ; “rib,” “side”] and the Hebrew verb בָנָה [bānâʾ; “to build”] used in the creation of the woman (Gen 2:21-22) is a point of discussion. The Hebrew text and its translation read:

215 Alexander, From Eden, 125.

216 Note in Exod 18:14 Jethro’s advice to Moses about maintaining the holiness of a nation alone.

217 Davidson observes that in Gen 2:15 the woman was not yet created, but the command was given in fact to the couple, just as in Gen 3:2, 3 Eve refers to the prohibition of eating from the tree (Gen 2:17) in the masculine plural. See Davidson, “Earth’s First Sanctuary,” 71. Cf. Collins, Genesis 1-4, 140.

218 Although this question will be treated later from a historical/grammatical perspective, it is important that the reader be aware that the so-called feminist scholars have endeavored to understand this text within a socio/cultural context in ancient Israel. See for example, Ronald A. Simkins, “Gender Construction in the Yahwist Creation Myth,” in Genesis: The Feminist Companion to the Bible, ed. Athalya Brenner, Feminist Companion to the Bible (Second Series) 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), 32-51.
2:21 And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall on Adam, and he slept; and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh in its place.

2:22 Then the rib which the Lord God had taken from man He made into a woman, and He brought her to the man.

Does the Hebrew text describe that God created/built Eve from Adam’s rib? Although the answer appears to be straightforward, the Hebrew word צֵלָע in v. 21 can mean either “rib” or “side.” It is interesting that צֵלָע, which is used in the Old Testament approximately forty times, is translated only in Gen 2:21-22 with reference to a part of the human anatomy (rib). In the rest of its occurrences צֵלָע is often associated architecturally with the sanctuary/temple. Keeping in mind that the meaning of a word derives primarily from its context and also from its semantic usage, one may suggest that the author selected a word capable of transmitting both a literal and a symbolic meaning.

Probably the Greek translators of the Old Testament also understood this fact. The LXX prefers to render צֵלָע as πλευρά, a Greek word that retains the idea of “side of the temple” (cf. 1 Kgs 6:5, 8, 15; 7:40; Ezek 41:5-8), and in the New Testament the word denotes the “side” of the human anatomy, where the ribs are located (cf. John 19:34; 20:20, 25, 27; Acts 12:7). The text leaves the reader with both options, and both are

---

219 As some English translations have translated it: ASV “and he took one of his ribs,” CEV “and he took out one of the man’s ribs,” CEB “and took one of his ribs,” CJB “he took one of his ribs,” NASB “then He took one of his ribs,” NIV “he took one of the man’s ribs,” NRSV “then he took one of his ribs.”

220 For example: “a side of a road” (1 Sam 16:13); “a longer side of the Ark” (Exod 25:12, 14; 37:3, 5); “a longer side of the tabernacle” (Exod 26:20, 26-27, 35); “a longer side of the altar” (Exod 27:7; 38:7). See Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, “צֵלָע,” HALOT 2:1030.

221 See Exod 25-38; 1 Kgs 6-7; Ezek 4. An exception is 1 Sam 16:13, where it could refer to “the side of the road” or “the side of the hill.”
grammatically possible. God indeed took “something” from one of Adam’s sides (מִצַלְעֹּתִָ֔יו) in order to create/build the woman, as “a surgical act of God.”

It is interesting that there are several Hebrew verbs available to use within the semantic framework of creation. In those contexts the verbs בָּרָא [bārā́]; “to create”], עָשָּה [ʽāśâʼ]; “to make, “to do”], יָצַר [yāṣár; “to form,” “to shape,” “to fashion”] are usually employed to describe the divine action of bringing into existence. Yet, here, the Bible writer selected the verb בָּנָה, though it is still framed within the notion of creation. This verb is often found in connection to erecting, construction, and/or manufacturing, in other words, in contexts of sacred space. The idea that God “built

222 This observation does not mean that the Hebrew expression יָשָּׁר על וַיַּפֵּלָ֩ יְּהוָ֙ה אֱלֹהִ֧ים׀ תַרְּדֵמָ֛ה ("and the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall on Adam") describes God cutting Adam in half, thus requiring some sort of anesthesia (implying the existence of pain), as proposed in Batto, Slaying the Dragon, 54. Similarly, this expression does not warrant the notion that Adam had a visionary experience, as Walton has argued. Walton, Lost World of Adam, 79. I think that Walton presses the meaning of this expression too far in order to accommodate his archetypal view of human creation. Walton bases his argument on the assumption that the Hebrew word אָדָם is an archetype for humanity, depending on the presence or absence of the definite article. This is dubious and unnecessary, and encounters several difficulties. For example, in the generic sense (meaning “humankind”), אָדָם sometimes takes the definite article and sometimes does not (cf. Gen 1:26, 27). See Walton, Lost World of Adam, 58-62; Walton, Ancient Near Eastern Thought, 208-9. Although in the New Testament the word אָדָם takes some salvation-historical distinctiveness, in general terms, “this sense does not conform to the common usage of the word in the OT.” See Claus Westermann, "אָדָם, " TLOT 1:42.

223 Mathews explains this eventful moment: “The ‘sleep’ preserves for the man the mystery of her creation and the subsequent surprise at her appearance. ‘Deep sleep’ is commonly used of a night’s sleep (Job 4:13; 33:15; Prov 19:15), but here it is the special work of God as with Abraham’s slumber (15:12; cf. 1 Sam 26:12 and fig. use Isa 29:10 with Rom 11:8.” Mathews, Genesis 1-11:26, 216. This divine surgical act portrays an image of intimacy. See Doukhan, Genesis, 82. Clearly Adam’s first words, “this is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh,” identify the kind of ideal relationship God wanted between the new created couple (cf. Eph 5:28-31; 1 Kgs 8:19).

224 See Amos 9:6. The verb בָּנָה is a common word to describe divine creation in the ANE, according to Westermann, Genesis 1-11, 230-31.
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architecturally” the woman from a “piece of a building” (צֵלָע) highlights the writer’s purpose, namely, to put the text into a suitable literary form and to draw up or frame the narrative with a particular motif. What framework did the author of Gen 2 want to suggest by employing this vocabulary? Advocates of the sanctuary/temple motif would find textual/conceptual evidence here for a cultic framework. However, is there another explanation capable of doing justice to this biblical data? Obviously, many things can be built besides the sanctuary/temple. By way of addressing this question, let us reevaluate three key central issues.

The first common objection to the interpretation just described is that only men serve as priests among the Israelites in the Old Testament (Exod 29:9, 29-30; 40:13-15). Doukhan notes that “this feature was all the more striking as it was probably a unique case in the ancient Near East.” 226 Walton recognizes correctly that “it may seem odd, therefore, that Genesis 2 presents a woman as a colaborer within the sacred space along with the man—especially if the narrative scenario is an Israelite authority figure (such as Moses) talking to an Israelite audience.” 227 How does the Old Testament depict women in relation to sacred space? Is this function/role exemplified as priesthood? 228 In discussing this question, a precautionary approach should be invoked. Unquestionably, as shown above, Adam and Eve’s appointment to עָבַד and שָמַר the גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן should be understood


227 Walton, Lost World of Adam, 112.

228 For a survey of theological approaches to particular roles of women in Genesis from the perspective of early extra-biblical literature (Pseudepigrapha and Rabbinitic), see David J. Zucker, Matriarchs of Genesis: Seven Women, Five Views (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2015), especially 1-28.
as occurring in a pre-Fall state, where the divine command was bestowed upon both of them equally. Not only did Adam and Eve have equal ontological value (Gen 1:26-28), but their charge to כָּרְבֹּד and פֶּסַע was analogous (Gen 2:15). Interpreters should give priority to the pre-Fall narrative in order to establish the primal covenantal function/role of men and women in sacred space.229 Waltke prompts us to cautiously consider this:

It is more problematic to use these later texts [all Scripture except Gen 1-2] to establish what is ideal for the church, a people living in the ‘already’ aspect of the kingdom of God, thus seeking an ethics and praxis redeemed from the Fall. Therefore, I turn to that portion of Scripture that transcends fallen historical and cultural particularities and that is intended to describe God perfect intentions in the pristine realm.230

Thus, it is likely that any attempt to interpret the role of women in sacred space from a post-Fall point of reference would not reach a conclusive answer.231 In any case, the two most common references (post-Fall) to women possibly serving at the tabernacle (cf. Exod 38:8; 1 Sam 2:22) do not describe them as priestesses.232 There is no evidence

229 God’s call to preserve and to live in holiness (sacred space) is not limited by gender. Yet, it is interesting to note that the holiest people in the Old Testament were married: the high priest (Lev 21:13-15); the Nazirites (Num 6:1-21). On the other hand, singleness, which is not celibacy, according to the apostle Paul in 1 Cor 7, is related to a higher standard of morality (holiness).


232 The key verb of these two passages is צָבָא. [ṣāḇā‘; “service in war,” “host,” “army”]. In relation to the Levites, this verb generally means “be on duty.” Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, “צָבָא,” HALOT 2:294. The meaning of Exod 38:8 is highly disputed, especially in light of 1 Sam 2:22, where צָבָא seems to refer to cultic prostitution. Yet, this role is unthinkable in the context of Exod 38. See Durham, Exodus, 486. Douglas K. Stuart suggests that women at the entrance of the tabernacle helped
that women performed any officiatory ritual or cultic function at the tent of meeting, which at that time was not yet built. Therefore, scholars agree that only men served as priests in ancient Israel. This may have been a deliberate choice to create a difference from Israel’s neighbors and keep sexual activities, which were ritually impure (Lev 15:18), out of the sacred tabernacle.

“with utensil cleanup, general courtyard cleanup, water resupply, ancillary food preparation, guiding and assisting other women worshipers, washing priests’ clothes, and the like.” Stuart, Exodus, 767-68.


Some commentators have proposed that the tent in view is the temporary tent Moses built (Exod 37:3). However, it appears unlikely that such a tent would need the services of women. See Noel D. Osborn and Howard Hatton, A Handbook on Exodus (New York: United Bible Societies, 1999), 867.

Roy E. Gane explores seven reasons why the Israelite priesthood had to be male. For example, the culture was patriarchal, the nature of priestly duties demanded male upper body strength, and maybe more importantly, women could become ritually impure (through menstruation) without knowing it. See Roy E. Gane, Leviticus, Numbers, NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004), 375-77. All of these factors, however, would be irrelevant in the pre-Fall edenic setting.


See Marsman, Women in Ugarit and Israel, 544-47. These immoral rituals involved goddess worship, fertility cults, and sacred prostitution. Doukhan, “Women Priests in Israel,” 31. Cf. Georges Barrois, “Women and the Priestly Office According to the Scriptures,” in Women and the Priesthood, ed. Kallistos and Thomas Hopko (Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary, 1983), 53. It should be recognized that some interpreters distrust this approach and its implications, arguing that “conclusions on this subject depend on the methods scholars use. Commentators who base their conclusions only on the Bible fail to see temple prostitutions as a reason for the absence of female priests.” See P. Gerard Damsteegt, “Eve a Priest in Eden?,” in Prove All Things: A Response to Women in Ministry, ed. Mercedes H. Dyer (Berrien Springs: Adventists Affirm, 2000), 124. Cf. Eugene J. Fisher, “Cultic Prostitution in the Ancient Near East: A Reassessment,” BTB 6.2-3 (1976): 225-36. I would argue that the opposite is true. Commentators who base their conclusions only in the Bible indeed find temple prostitution (sacred prostitution or fertility rites) to be one of the reasons for the absence of female priests. Comparative studies with extra-biblical historical records are helpful and valid within the historical grammatical approach to the Bible, and this seems to be the case here. The Hebrew word קָדֵָ֖ש, translated as “ritual harlot” (Deut 23:17-18 NKJV [Eng. 23:18-19]; cf. Hos 4:14), and labeled as תוֹעֵבָה (“abomination”), has linguistic connections with Canaanite and Ugaritic vocabulary for cultic immoral practices. This legislation constructs prohibitions against those practices antithetical to covenant law. Cf. Joe M. Sprinkle, Biblical Law and its Relevance: A Christian Understanding and Ethical Application for Today of the Mosaic Regulations (Lanham: University Press of America, 2006), 166-67; Peter C. Craigie, The Book of Deuteronomy, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 301-2; Eugene H. Merrill, Deuteronomy, NAC 4 (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994), 312-14. Thus, the biblical text itself corroborates the conceptual/linguistic association with pagan rites; it is not the extra-biblical sources that become the hermeneutical norm. See also William J. Webb, Slaves, Women and
Admittedly, women in the Old Testament are not described as having a post-Fall priestly function/role equal to a small minority of the men—Aaron and his descendants, who were given special occupational responsibility for officiating sacrifices to intercede on behalf of others and maintaining the sanctuary/temple as God’s “house-servants.”

However, the rest of the Old Testament depicts women as having other responsibilities that are well fitted within the pre-Fall (and post-sin) human state, that is, in harmony with the principal function/role of the sanctuary/temple: a place/realm/time of worship.

Doukhan considers that the priestly roles/functions included some duties open to both men and women, but others were restricted only to men. He has identified three essential categories of priestly duties: didactic (Deut 17:9; cf. 17:9; 21:5; 33:10); prophetic (Num

---

238 I think that Waltke has correctly written a helpful, condensed statement about equality, leadership, and government. He affirms:

The sexual, social and economic equality of all believers will be obliterated in the eschaton, but until the redemption of our bodies, believers still participate in the first creation with its sexual, social, and economic distinctions. The biblical instructions regarding the distinctive roles of men and women, of husbands and wives, address that obvious reality and serve the best interests of both sexes. As a result of the Fall and God’s judgment on the man and on the woman, the woman desires to rule her husband and he seeks to dominate her (Gen 3:16). The solution to this tragic power struggle that divides the home is the new creation in Christ, in which the husband humbles himself and in love serves his wife, and the wife voluntarily submits herself to him in faithful obedience (Eph 5:22). The rest of Scripture sustains a loving hierarchy, not democracy or matriarchy.


Scholars are divided on the precise meaning of the Hebrew expression נְשַׁעְקָתָה (“your desire” NKJV) in Gen 3:16. Some interpreters observe in this word a positive sense, as in Cant 7:11 [Eng. 7:10], or a negative sense, as in Gen 4:7. Cf. David Talley, “ UIImageView,” NIDOTTE 4:341-42; Susan T. Foh, “What is the Woman's Desire,” WTJ 37.3 (1975); Susan T. Foh, Women and the Word of God: A Response to Biblical Feminism (Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1979), 68-69. See especially Davidson’s comprehensive and careful study in Davidson, Flame of Yahweh, 73-75.
27:21; 1 Sam 28:6); and cultic (Lev 1-16). Two of the three were permitted to women: didactic and prophetic.239

It is outside the immediate interest of this chapter to deal with the theological implications of the above discussion. Suffice it to say for the moment that evidently cultic duties included the sacrificial functions, but were not limited to performing sacrifices. The biblical evidence for this cultic framework allowed to women may be seen in prophetic and spiritual leadership roles (cf. Exod 15:20; Mic 6:4; Judg 4:3-6; 4:4; 5:28-30; 2 Sam 14:2; 20:16; 2 Kgs 11:3; 22:14-20; Joel 2:28).

The second noticeable fact is the common vocabulary. The pairing of צֵלָע and בָנָה in Gen 2 seems to indicate a purposeful literary intent—not coincidence or a lack of compositional capabilities on the part of the inspired writer. Souza explains the similar language linking creation and the sanctuary/temple in the following way:

239 Doukhan explains the absence of cultic duties for women in the Old Testament as follows:

The Bible does not record any woman priest in Israel, not because the office of priesthood implied prophetic functions (there were women prophets in Israel), or because it implied leadership or teaching functions (there were women judges and “wise” women in Israel), but rather because of the sacrificial function, the only priestly act denied to women (there is no biblical evidence of women performing sacrifices in Israel). This absence may be explained by the incompatibility of the sacrifice, normally associated with death and sin, and the physiological nature of the woman traditionally associated in the Bible with life and messianic pregnancy.


However, the conclusion that there is no biblical evidence of women performing sacrifices in Israel is debatable. According to Roy Gane, the Old Testament presents women offering their own sacrifices as offerers (but not officiants), like non-Aaronic men. The fact that women could offer sacrifices is indicated, for example, by generic language in ritual prescriptions (see, e.g., נֶפֶש, “a person,” “anyone,” in Lev 2:1; 4:2, 27; 5:1-2, 4, 15, 17; 6:2 [Heb. 5:21], etc.); expiatory sacrifices in Lev 4:1-6:7 [Heb. 5:26] were mandatory if a person had committed a sin. Moreover, some passages explicitly refer to requirements for women to offer sacrifices (Lev 12:6-8; 15:29-30; cf. Num 6:10-12, 14-20—if a Nazirite is a woman; cf. v. 2). See Roy E. Gane, “The Nature of the Human Being in Leviticus,” in “What Are Human Beings that You Remember Them?”. Proceedings of the Third International Bible Conference, Nof Ginosar and Jerusalem, June 11-21, 2012, ed. Clinton Wahlen (Silver Spring: Review and Herald, 2015), 53-57.
We should note at first that some of the links between the Creation account and the construction of the Tabernacle might be explained on the basis that both works share some obvious commonalities. Both are material constructions, both are based on the authority of God, and both are artistic works in their own right. So it should not be surprising that words and expressions used to narrate the creation of the world are also employed to describe the construction of the tabernacle. 240

It is true that both works share some obvious commonalities. Nevertheless, this line of reasoning suggests that the shared features are obvious coincidences. I would further pursue this observation and ask: Is there any other case in Scripture where the presence of the same semantic framework in different passages is not an indication of a theological relationship? Clearly, a couple of words or phrases do not substantiate a relationship. However, when a semantic framework establishes a common motif in different passages, the shared features are not merely happenstances. Besides, it is a viable and common exegetical practice to construe theological implications upon double intertextual directionalities. 241

Third, the only probable reference to women’s role in the pre-Fall state of creation is found in Gen 2:18. The Hebrew text and its translation read:

241 Intertextuality in the larger canonical context seems to warrant the presence of a sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 2. Israel was designated as “kingdom of priests” in Exod 19:6 (cf. Isa 61:6; 66:20-21; Rom:15:16; 1 Pet 2:5, 9; Rev 1:6; 5:10; 20:6). These passages are usually framed within what scholars call “the priesthood of all believers.” See further in Raoul Dederen, “The Priesthood of All Believers,” in Women in Ministry: Biblical and Historical Perspectives, ed. Nancy J. Vyhmeister (Berrien Springs: Andrews University, 1998), 9-27. In Exod 19:6, clearly the official sacred space (tabernacle) was not yet instituted, probably signifying that the function/role of the priesthood was not to be simply dedicated or framed within the lawful cultic duties of the tabernacle.
2:18 And the Lord God said, “It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a helper comparable to him.”

At the outset, a caveat is in order: “The text comments only on her ontological identity as man’s other half rather than delineating her role in sacred space.” This passage is often cited in order to highlight the subordinated or un-subordinated role of women. The...
discussion of both views centers on the key Hebrew noun עֵָ֖זֶר, coming from the verb עָזַר [ʼāzár; “to help,” “to assist”]. For the purpose of our investigation, even if the advocates or critics of these views were proved to be in the right, the problem before us would still remain unsolved. That is, the woman’s role in the pre-Fall state of creation described in Gen 2:18 does not explicitly establish cultic responsibilities for her in the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן. The passage that describes these functions is Gen 2:15, with the verbs עָבַד and שָמַר, as we saw above. Walton rightly points out that “the role of Adam and Eve in the garden, I would propose, has less to do with how the priests operated within Israel and more to do with Israel’s role (and later, that of the believers, 1 Pet 2:9) as priests to the world.”

Finally, one may agree with Souza on the basis that the shared elements required for both constructions do not necessarily indicate “a cosmological view of the sanctuary in the sense of the latter being a microcosm or type of the universe/world.” But the pairing of צֵלָע and בָנָה in Gen 2 seems to warrant two complementary and inseparable theological readings of the narrative, both literal and symbolic, where the sanctuary/temple semantic framework is the leitmotif.

246 Walton, Lost World of Adam, 113. On this matter Eugene H. Merrill aptly comments that Israel’s role “thenceforth would be to mediate or intercede as priests between the holy God and the wayward nations of the world, with the end in view not only of declaring his salvation but also of providing the human channel in and through whom this salvation would be effected.” Eugene H. Merrill, Kingdom of Priests: A History of Old Testament Israel (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 98. Cf. Walther Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961), 1:36-45; 1:481-85. However, the first couple would likely have a special spiritual leadership role within the community of humans formed by their descendants.

Summary and Conclusions

This chapter has reevaluated the most prominent syntactic and literary characteristics of the pre-Fall narrative of Eden that appear to substantiate the sanctuary/temple motif. These conceptual and textual indicators are: the Hebrew word "עֵדֶן"; the garden as a mountain in Gen 2:10; the river of Eden; the Hebrew verbs "עָבַד" and "שָמַר" in Gen 2:15; and the Hebrew word "צֵלָע" and the verb "בָנָה" in Gen 2:21-22. The reassessment of the scholarly arguments at this point leads us to the following two preliminary conclusions.

First, the earthly sanctuary/temple (the wilderness tabernacle/Solomon’s Temple) is not the only type of the heavenly counterpart: the narrative of Gen 2 also portrays a similar typology. Just as it was noted that the earthly sanctuary/temple existed in structural and functional relationship to its heavenly גַּן-עִֵ֔דֶן antitype in vertical typology (as shown by comparison with Ezek 28), the first earthly גַּן-עִֵ֔דֶן (the protological model of Gen 2) also existed in structural and functional relationship to its heavenly counterpart.

Second, the conclusions reached at this point lead us to understand that Gen 2 seems to be grounded in the sanctuary/temple motif.248 This does not mean that allusions to the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 2 substantiate the notion that creation is subordinated to soteriological considerations, as Von Rad has argued.249 Rather, due to the encompassing nature of God’s sanctuary/temple throughout the Heilsgeschichte, that is, in the pre-Fall and post-Fall stages of human history (and eventually at the

248 This may explain why some scholars consider the concept of creation to be grounded in salvation. Similarly, Sailhamer, Meaning of the Pentateuch, 579.

249 Cf. Von Rad, Problem of the Hexateuch, 131-43; Westermann, Creation, 113-23; Brueggemann, Reverberations of Faith, 40-43.
eschatological re-creation), a more precise statement would be that allusions to the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 2 speak about an eternal covenantal and sovereign relationship that God seeks with humankind. In other words, the sanctuary/temple system/framework is the theological foundation for the created cosmos. This semantic macrostructure, which may be seen as a literary intertwined arrangement in the biblical narrative, enhances the notion of the blessings of eternal life and does not obliterate the redemptive framework and its typological relationship between heaven and earth. In fact, this conclusion reinforces it.

Thus, as Wenham has noted, “Genesis is much more interested in the cult than is normally realized,” particularly in view of the growing acknowledgment of the sanctuary/temple motifs in its narratives. The theological implication that purportedly stands out is to reconsider the possibility of perceiving Gen 2 as a cultic text in view of the necessity of worship and/or the significance of communion with God as the religious purpose of the pre-Fall Eden narrative.

250 Souza thinks otherwise. He writes: “The pervasive occurrences of creation concepts and terminology associated to sanctuary function to stress the idea that creation operates as the foundational and overarching concept from which the theology of redemption articulated in the sanctuary finds its ultimate justification.” Souza, “Sanctuary: Cosmos, Covenant, and Creation,” 40.


252 Morales, The Tabernacle Pre-Figured, 74.

253 Morales, The Tabernacle Pre-Figured, 88-90.
CHAPTER III

THE POST-FALL NARRATIVE OF EDEN

Introduction

In this chapter, I will review the scholarly literature and reevaluate the biblical data allegedly related to the sanctuary/temple in the post-Fall narrative of Eden (Gen 3:1-3:24). Our review of literature has suggested that the most significant syntactic and literary characteristics of this narrative associated with the sanctuary/temple motif are the Hebrew participleךְֵּמִתְהַל in Gen 3:8; the Hebrew wordכֻּתֹּנֶת and the verbלבש in Gen 3:21; the Hebrew wordכְּרֻּבִים in Gen 3:24; and the eastern entrance to the Garden in Gen 3:24.

Genesis 3:1-3:24 and the Sanctuary/Temple Motif

The effects that sin brought into the newly created world are significant in the context of the post-Fall Eden narrative. There are structural/linguistic connections and parallelisms between Gen 1, 2, and 3, but, because of the presence of sin, the post-Fall Eden narrative provides contrasting and unique features.¹ With this idea in mind and in harmony with the concerns of this dissertation, I will reevaluate the biblical data possibly pertaining to the sanctuary/temple motif in order to determine its semantic framework.

¹ Some scholars observe that this division is artificial, as the Hebrew text seems to have no indicators of a significant division (the first word of the post-Fall Eden narrative begins with the conjunction ו). See further Jonathan Magonet, “The Themes of Genesis 2-3,” in A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden, ed. Deborah Sawyer and Paul Morris, JSOTSup 136 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), 39.
The Hebrew Participle מִתְּהַלֵ in Genesis 3:8

The presence of God in Gen 3 is significant, especially in view of the sin problem. God’s presence in the גַן-עִֵ֔דֶן has been construed from the participle מִתְּהַלֵ, derived from the verb דָּלַ to “go,” “walk.” Advocates of the sanctuary/temple motif argue that מִתְּהַלֵ denotes a manifestation of God’s presence similar to that in later sanctuaries (cf. Lev 26:12; Deut 23:15 [Eng. 23:14]; 2 Sam 7:6-7). “The Lord walked in Eden as he subsequently walked in the tabernacle.” On the other hand, critics of this interpretation maintain that none of the occurrences of מִתְּהַלֵ depicts God’s residence in the sanctuary. In order to reconcile these conflicting views, if possible, let us carefully reconsider four critical aspects of the semantic framework of מִתְּהַלֵ in Gen 3:8.

The Hebrew text and its translation read:

3:8 וַַָֽֽיִשְּמְּעַו וּ אֶת־ק֙וֹל יְּהוָ֧ה אֱלֹהִ֛ים מִתְּהַלֵ֥ךְ בַגַָָֽ֖ן לְּרֶ֣וּחַ הַיּ֑וֹם וַיִתְּחַבֵ֙א הָָֽאָדִָ֜ם וְּאִשְּתּ֗וֹ מִפְּנֵי יְּהוֶָ֣ה אֱלֹהִ֗ים בְּתָ֖וֹךְ עֵ֥ץ הַגַָָֽֽן׃

3 The same hitpa‘el participle form of the verb מִתְּהַלֵ appears in the following passages: Deut 23:15; 1 Sam 12:2; 2 Sam 7:6; Esth 2:11; Ps 68:22; Prov 20:7; 24:34. All these references have a common nuance of “going to and fro.” Lev 26:11-12 is also included, although here מִתְּהַלֵ is only a hitpa‘el and not a hitpa‘el participle.


7 The Hebrew word קֹו probably refers to the sound of steps walking (cf. 2 Sam 5:24; 1 Kgs 14:6; 2 Kgs 6:32; 11:13). See Ouro, “Garden of Eden Account,” 231.

the Lord God among the trees of the 
garden.

First, it must be acknowledged that critics of the sanctuary/temple motif seem to
be right in the sense that none of the occurrences of ħōlah explicitly depicts God’s
residence in the sanctuary. However, this inference seems unnecessary, at least in part.
The hitpa’el of ħōlah has the common meaning of “going to and fro,” suggesting the
repeated or habitual presence of someone.9 In Gen 3:8, as in its other occurrences,
ḥōlah is used with a specific purpose and context. This is helpful in determining
ḥōlah’s conceptual frame and contextual nuance10 because “the meaning of a text must
be viewed as a ‘meaning effect’ produced by the interrelation of the various elements of
the text.”11 So what is the meaning effect of ħōlah in Gen 3:8? The argument for the
sanctity of the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן is dependent upon the meaning of ħōlah, where the “primary
evidence for the garden’s sanctity is the presence of the deity.”12 The semantic domain
that surrounds God’s pervasive presence (going to and fro) describes a repeated or
habitual action in the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן. God’s presence is known and manifested by his walking.
The walking motif is later employed in the Old Testament when Israel acknowledges that
God requires holiness and obedience if he is to continue to “walk” among his people (cf.

10 Scholars generally agree that “the meaning of the word depends ultimately on the context in
which it is used; the word study provides just an orientation within which we have to seek the specific
meaning. The absolute meaning of the word does not exist as such.” See Jacques B. Doukhan, Hebrew for
Theologians: A Textbook for the Study of Biblical Hebrew in Relation to Hebrew Thinking (Lanham:
125.
Lev 26:12; Deut 23:15 [Eng. 23:14]; 2 Sam 7:6-7). Consequently, the walking motif seems to be associated with the sacred character of the גַן־עִֵ֔דֶן, and thus with humankind’s creative call to holiness, conceptualizing a contextual frame where God’s pervasive presence is the central locus.

Second, the hitpa‘el of יָלָּל is related to God’s sacred dwelling, and therefore to God’s presence. Lev 26:11-12 shows this reality. The Hebrew text and its translation read:

\[
\begin{align*}
26:11 & \text{ I will set my tabernacle among you, and my soul shall not abhor you.} \\
26:12 & \text{ I will walk among you and be your God, and you shall be my people.}
\end{align*}
\]

The Hebrew expression מִשְּכָן, a suffixed form of מִשְּכָן [miškān; “dwelling,” “tabernacle”], refers elsewhere to God’s dwelling place. The parallel expressions “I will

---

13 Mathews, Genesis 1-11:26, 239. Cf. Walter Brueggemann, “Walk Humbly with Your God: Micah 6:8,” JP 33.4 (2010): 15. For New Testament connections on the walking motif, see Andrew E. Steinmann and Michael A. Eschelbach, “Walk This Way: A Theme from Proverbs Reflected and Extended in Paul’s Letters,” CTQ 70.1 (2006): especially 53-61. Note also that the same motif is used of the patriarchs’ walk with God (cf. Gen. 5:22, 24; 6:9; 17:1; 24:40; 48:15). It is of greater significance that the hitpa‘el of יָלָּל occurs in 1 Sam 2:35 (cf. Deut 18:15; note also that the language of “walking before” YHWH is used often in connection with the Davidic covenant in 2 Kgs 2:4; 8:23, 25; 9:4; 2 Chr 6:14, 16; 7:17). This passage speaks about the promise of the coming priest-king, characterized by the hitpa‘el of יָלָּל, indicating that he would walk (or minister) and perform the most sacred duties of the sanctuary/temple. In an outstanding article, Karl Deenick demonstrates that neither David nor Solomon ultimately meets all the criteria of the promised priest. Neither will live forever, and neither will be perfect. Nevertheless, the strong connections between the promise of 1 Sam 2:35 and the Davidic covenant do suggest that God intends to fulfill the promise of 1 Sam 2:35 through David and his line.” Deenick, “Priest and King,” 335. According to the New Testament, this prophecy is fulfilled in Christ, the priest-king that through his “walking motif” would minister in the heavenly sanctuary/temple (cf. Rom 1:1-6; Heb 7:1-8:2). David T. Tsumura, The First Book of Samuel, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 171.

14 Wright, “Holiness, Sex, and Death,” 307.

15 The Hebrew מִשְּכָן is the technical term to refer to the tent of meeting in Exod 25-27; 35-40. Cf. also Lev 8:10; 15:31; 17:4; Num 1-3; Josh 22:19; 1 Chr 6:17 [Eng. 6:32]; Ps 26:8; 74:7; 132:7.
set my tabernacle” and “I will walk among you” (note the hitpa’el of חָלָּ֗ה) seem to imply that the walking motif is God’s means by which the מִשְּכָּ֨ן becomes in effect the dwelling place. In other words, God’s presence becomes known and manifested by his walking 골 his people. The connection between the repetitive divine presence (God’s walking) and the establishment of worship places (sanctuaries/temples) was a common feature in the ANE. Robertson Smith explains this matter:

That the gods haunted certain spots, which in consequence of this were holy places and fit places of worship, was to the ancients not a theory but a matter of fact, handed down by tradition from one generation to another, and accepted with unquestioning faith. Accordingly, we find that new sanctuaries can be formed and new altars or temples erected, only where the godhead has given unmistakable evidence of his presence. All that is necessary to constitute a Semitic sanctuary is a precedent; it is assumed that where the god has once manifested himself and shown favour to his worshippers he will do so again, and when the precedent has been strengthened by frequent repetition the holiness of the place is fully established. Thus in the earlier parts of the Old Testament a theophany is always taken to be a good reason for sacrificing on the spot.

Therefore the hitpa’el of חָלָּה, describing God’s customary action in the גַּן עִֵ֔דֶן and therefore even before the entrance of sin, speaks of God’s presence and/or God’s dwelling, not as a motionless manifestation, but as a מִשְּכָּן known by his walking.

Third, consequently the walking motif that emerges from God’s מִשְּכָּן is in fact not limited/circumscribed to a particular location. Deut 23:15 [Eng. 23:14] explicitly states that יהוה אלהיך מתהלך בקר מחנהך (“God walks in the midst of your camp”). Eugene H. Merrill observes as follows in this regard:

16 Lev 26:11-12 describes the essential blessings of the covenantal relationship between God and his people. See Gane, Leviticus, Numbers, 452. Thus, the fulfillment of this covenant becomes the restoration of the edenic communion. “God will walk with his people, as he did in the Garden of Eden before the fall.” See Gordon J. Wenham, The Book of Leviticus, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 330. Cf. John E. Hartley, Leviticus, WBC 4 (Dallas: Word Books, 1992), 463.

17 Smith, Religion of the Semites, 115.
The rationale for the legislation in both kinds of impure practices lies in the fact that the Lord was there in the camp with his army, “moving about” (mithallēk) as its commander to bring deliverance and victory. This stem of the verb speaks of the Lord’s intimacy with his people, his face-to-face encounter with them (cf. Gen 3:8) and desire to have fellowship with them (cf. Lev 26:12).  

According to this law, the army camp may be understood as a sacred space seemingly in reference to the presence of the ark of the tabernacle. Thus, Deut 23:15 [Eng. 23:14] is in actuality concerned with the purity of God’s מִשְּכָן, since in the military camp the Israelites walk to and fro, and up and down.

Fourth, divine presence is known and manifested in the Israelite camp via the interconnectedness between the walking motif and the dwelling place of God. According to 2 Sam 7:6-7, “the ‘walking’ denotes the self-witness of the divine presence.” Block correctly writes that “the real issue is not a building in which he walks about but the means by which he relates to his people.” The hitpa‘el of כָּלַ does not explicitly describe YHWH’s activity within the tabernacle, but it certainly alludes to the divine presence manifested by God’s מִשְּכָן. The sacred space that מְתַהַל creates in Gen 3:8 simply signifies the holy status of the God-humankind relationship, a motif that after the Fall “is the reward for covenantal fidelity (Lev 26:11-12), which is a prerequisite to a return to edenic circumstances.”

---

18 Merrill, Deuteronomy, 310-11. Cf. Duane L. Christensen also comments that “the assembly of YHWH is to be understood in the imagery of a military camp and YHWH himself is the Divine Warrior.” Duane L. Christensen, Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12, WBC 6b (Dallas: Word Books, 2002), 542.


The question that remains to be answered explicitly is whether כְֵּּמִתְהַל can be considered an unequivocal indication of a sanctuary/temple setting. The answer that I would suggest admittedly carries the semantic logic presupposed above in relation to its context and domain: there is nothing in the post-Fall Eden narrative (and in the rest of the Old Testament) that would exclude כְֵּּמִתְהַל from the semantic framework of the holiness of the sanctuary/temple motif. As an illustration of the common use of כְֵּּמִתְהַל pertaining to the semantic framework of the holiness of the sanctuary/temple motif, one may consider Ezek 28:14.22 The intertextual analysis has shown that the writer of Ezekiel places the king of Tyre far above any royal dignitary on earth, “in the holy mountain of God,” and portrays this personage’s presence with the hitpa’el of כְֵּּמִתְהַל (יהִתְּהַלָּכְּתָ) (“You walked around,” Ezek 28:14). This is a depiction of the origin of evil in Eden, specifically in the context of the heavenly sanctuary/temple. It is obvious that the imagery employed here does not refer to God; it describes the cherub, an angelic being who attempted to usurp the holy throne of the heavenly sanctuary/temple. This language is not simply an embellishment arbitrarily inserted by the prophet, in reference to a “common walking”: Ezekiel’s depiction of the cherub matches the semantic framework elsewhere employed in the Old Testament connecting the “walking motif” with the holiness of the sanctuary/temple setting. I would argue that כְֵּּמִתְהַל is associated with the sanctuary/temple motif as long as the divine presence is in view.

22 See additional details in chapter II of this dissertation.
The Hebrew Word כֻּתֹּנֶת and the Verb לָבַשׁ in Genesis 3:21

The post-Fall narrative of Eden (Gen 3:1-3:24) prominently describes divine actions anticipating the consequences that sin would bring to the newly created earth, specifically the consequences in Adam and Eve’s life and home. Usually scholars find the garments of skins provided by God to be a contrasting image with Gen 3:7, where Adam and Eve “sewed fig leaves together and made themselves coverings” in order to provide a solution for bodily nakedness. Thus, there is a threefold transition of status or condition for Adam and Eve: (1) Gen 2:25—naked and unashamed; (2) Gen 3:7—being clothed with fig-leaf “aprons”; and (3) Gen 3:21—being clothed with “coats of skins.” This progression prompts to consider a literary unity and a theological purpose in the Eden narratives (Gen 2:4b-3:24).

This narrative portrays the awareness of nakedness as a response to the guilt of sin, a nakedness of soul intrinsically connected with a physical state. Adam confesses that “I was afraid because I was naked; and I hid myself” (v. 10), though he and Eve had “sewed fig leaves together and made themselves coverings” (v. 7). For the Hebrew mind nakedness is often associated with guilt (the discovery of Noah’s nakedness by his son brought family disgrace, Gen 9:22–23; cf. Exod 20:26; 28:42-43; Lev 18:6, 10; 20:17; 20:18–19; Ezek 16:22, 37, 39; Hos 2:3; Amos 2:16; Mic 1:8). Following God’s


pronouncement of judgment in Gen 3, there is one tangible sign of mercy and therefore hope for restoration: in v. 21 God intervenes by giving Adam and Eve the physical protection of durable garments.  

Although Gen 3:21 does not state it explicitly, the word עור ['ôr; “skin,” “leather”] implies the death of one or more animals. In the Bible, when the skin/hide of an animal is mentioned, whether in a cultic or non-cultic context, it is usually implied that the animal has been killed (cf. Gen 27:16; Lev 5:13; 7:8; 2 Kgs 1:8, but not in Job 40:31 [Eng 41:7]), and this would certainly be the case when animal skin provides a garment for a human being.

Many scholars have seen the implied death of one or more animals in Gen 3:21 as anticipating the sacrificial system. This aspect of cultic anticipation is reinforced by the


26 Gen 3 does not explicitly report when the death of the animals took place or the precise moment when God dressed Adam or Eve. The event of v. 21 could have taken place just before or after the expulsion from the Garden (vv. 22-24). Some interpreters may think that due to being taken from animals through death, the skins were associated with the realm of mortality away from the tree of life in Eden (Gen 3:22-24). Mortality is opposed to holiness in Eden, as we also see later in relation to the Israelite cult centered at the sanctuary, from which physical ritual impurities, symptomatic of the birth-to-death cycle of mortality, had to be kept separate (cf. Lev 12-15, 22; Num 19). See Hyam Maccoby, Ritual and Morality: The Ritual Purity System and Its Place in Judaism (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1999), 60. In any case, since there is no internal textual evidence to suggest that v. 21 occurs before or after Adam and Eve’s expulsion, these two options should not be emphasized. However, the use of animal skin may suggest that the death of an animal was some sort of “ritual” with a special kind of cultic purpose attached, since the presence of sin in Gen 3 leads one to expect significance in animal death. Considerable attention should be given to God’s purpose in using the skins of animals.

literary and thematic connections between the narratives of Eden (Gen 2:4b-2:25 and 3:1-3:24), in view of the textual features of Gen 2:4b-2:25 and the intertextual connections between this pericope and other sanctuary/temple cultic settings (e.g., Ezek 28, see chapter II of this dissertation). In other words, since the pre-Fall Garden of Eden narrative incorporates sanctuary/temple cultic imagery, it would not be surprising if the post-Fall Garden of Eden narrative (Gen 3:1-3:24) points forward to animal sacrifice in the sense that God initiates the death of one or more animals for the benefit of human beings.

Thus, it is reasonable to consider whether the divine action in Gen 3:21 is portrayed with cultic imagery, attaching some spiritual meaning to the garments of skins. This interpretation provoked much commentary in Jewish and early Christian circles. Does Gen 3:21 go beyond anticipating animal sacrifice to actually recording the dressing in garments of skins as a priestly appointment? The logic of those who answer in the

28 These connections are also established by certain contrasting reversals in these pericopes: (1) Fruit of tree not given to Adam in 2:17, woman gives fruit of tree to her husband in 3:6; (2) Man/woman not ashamed in 2:25, later recognized nakedness and were ashamed in 3:7; (3) Serpent most crafty animal in 3:1, becomes the most cursed animal in 3:14; (4) Fruit pleasing to woman in 3:6, causes labor pain of the woman in 3:16; (5) Man eats fruit of forbidden tree in 3:6, bread from sweat and thorns in 3:18-19; (6) Humans made leaf aprons in 3:7, God made skin garments for them in 3:21; (7) Woman’s fascination for the serpent in 3:13, woman’s enmity for the serpent in 3:15; (8) Man “ruling” woman in 3:16, man listening to woman in 3:17. See Patte and Parker, “A Structural Exegesis,” 55-75; Zdravko Stefanovic, “The Great Reversal: Thematic Links Between Genesis 2 and 3,” AUSS 32 (1994): 47-56; Laurence A. Turner, Announcements of Plot in Genesis (Sheffield: England, 1990), 45-46; Ouro, “Garden of Eden Account,” 219-43.

affirmative rests on their assessment of an implicit connection with later references to God dressing his people for cultic duties (cf. Exod 28:41; 29:8; 40; Lev 8:13; 2 Chr 6:41; Ps 132:16).30 Accordingly, Robert A. Oden Jr. asserts that the contextual use of the common word שָלָב [lāḇāš; “to put on,” “clothe”] hints at an investiture scene happening in Gen 3:21, in contrast to the theological tradition that has interpreted God’s action either merely as a sign of his grace31 or as a permanent reminder of the cause for human shame.32

However, in Ps 132:18; Isa 22:21; 61:10; Ezek 16:10, God clothes (hiph ‘il of שָלָב) non-priestly humans, so it is not accurate to argue that when God dresses people in the Old Testament they are always priests, and there is nothing inherent in this divine action that would limit its function to clothing priests. Even if they were always priests outside Gen 3:21, it would be methodologically unjustified (as “illegitimate totality transfer”) to assume merely on this basis that God invested Adam and Eve as priests in this verse, although that possibility remains open to be evaluated on additional contextual grounds in the rest of the Eden narratives (Gen 2:4b-3:24), which may nuance the vocabulary employed in v. 21.

The reading of Gen 3:21 as containing cultic imagery pertaining to the sanctuary/temple motif is problematic for some scholars because it involves biblical

31 Alexander, From Eden, 152.
32 There seems to be a relationship between human nakedness and God’s initiative of providing worthy clothing. Note, for example, the priestly prohibition of the exposure of genitalia in the areas of YHWH’s presence (Exod 20:26).
arguments derived apparently from extra-biblical literature. Hamilton objects to this approach and thinks that “it is probably reading too much into this verse to see in the coats of skin a hint of the use of animals and blood in the sacrificial system of the OT cultus.” Block argues that the garments of skins “offer no evidence for ascribing a priestly role to Adam.” Certainly, the Bible gives no indication that priests wore garments made of skins of the animals they sacrificed. Priests wore fine linen garments (Exod 28:39, 42; 39:27; 39:28; cf. Lev 6:10).

Nevertheless, is there evidence that the divine act of dressing in Gen 3:21 signifies at least something regarding the status of Adam and Eve? Let us look more closely at three textual characteristics of this verse. The Hebrew text and its translation read:

3:21 Also for Adam and his wife the Lord God made tunics of skin, and clothed them.


37 Note here the *lamed* of interest marking Adam and Eve, toward whom the action is directed. The term *benefactive dative* is sometimes used of this *lamed*. See Waltke and O’Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, 207-8. This means that the theological significance of *כָתְנ֥וֹת עָ֖וֹר* is not only for Adam, but indeed also for Eve.

38 The verb שָלַב is the *hiph ‘il* stem. This expression has the semantic value of being a causative action. In other words, God himself caused the event: it was not Adam and Eve’s own initiative or capacity.
As pointed out above, at least the primary meaning of YHWH’s provision of garments to Adam and Eve is divine benevolence toward human frailty. Three reasons advance the concept that YHWH’s act of grace seems motivated by a profound theological purpose.

First, the Hebrew word כֻּתֹ֫נֶת [kuttōnet; “tunic”] generally designates an outer garment that is often associated with social functions/roles.39 This word occurs in the Old Testament about twenty-nine times. Fourteen times it has a cultic connotation in reference to the garments of priests (cf. Exod 28:4, 39-40; 29:5, 8; 39:27; 40:14; Lev 8:7, 13; 10:5; 16:4; Ezra 2:69; Neh 7:69, 71); thirteen times it is employed for garments of non-priestly persons (cf. Gen 37:3, 23, 31-33; 2 Sam 13:18-19; 15:32; Cant 5:3; Isa 22:21); and only once is this word used in a metaphorical sense (Job 30:18). Thus, the word is not employed exclusively in cultic contexts where special garments indicate priestly status. Additional contextual factors accompanying כֻּתֹ֫נֶת are needed to indicate its cultic significance.

In addition to the priestly functions that כֻּתֹ֫נֶת could signify, particular occurrences of this word can also represent a kind of social status of the wearer, whether as a favorite son (Gen 37:3, 23, 31-33), a virgin princess (2 Sam 13:18-19), or an important official (Isa 22:21). In 2 Sam 15:32 and Cant 5:3, the social status of the wearer is not the point of mentioning the כֻּתֹ֫נֶת. But, given that a כֻּתֹ֫נֶת can function as “an emblem of status,”40 especially when it is a gift from a superior to an inferior person (as

to clothe themselves, it was God’s own authority to clothe them. See Waltke and O’Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, 433; Jouon and Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 148.

39 “… clothing, besides its obvious protective function, is one of the most pervasive of human symbols through which a person’s position and role in society is signaled.” Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 84.

40 Oden, *The Bible Without Theology*, 98, 104.
in Gen 37:3; Isa 22:21), it is possible that the garments that God gave to Adam and Eve could carry a similar function in the context of Gen 3:21.

Second, the verb שָׁלַב in the hiph’il stem meaning “cause to wear,” i.e., “dress/clothe (someone),” occurs approximately thirty times in the Old Testament, often when the purpose of dressing (including re-clothing) a person is to signify assignment of status/identity so that the one dressed can fulfill a certain honored role in society (Gen 27:15, 16—deceptive; cf. implicit in 2 Sam 1:24; Ezek 16:10 from the quality of clothing; contrast Prov 23:21), government (Gen 41:42; Esth 6:9, 11; Isa 22:21), the cultic system (Exod 28:41; 29:5, 8; 40:13, 14; Lev 8:7, 13; Num 20:26, 28; cf. Zech 3:4 of purification for continued high priestly function), or an army (1 Sam 17:38). Thus far, the instances of the verb involve markers of status, not merely clothing to meet physical needs. However, elsewhere the hiph’il of שָׁלַב refers to clothing people to solve the problem that they are naked or have inadequate clothing (2 Chr 28:15; Esth 4:4; Ezek 41:22).

苦恼 distressed

This is a scene of Egyptian investiture, symbolic of position. Cf. Mathews, Genesis 11:27-50:26, 762; Hamilton, The Book of Genesis, 505; Sarna, Genesis, 286.

42 “The vesting of the priests is specified as the first part of a three-part procedure establishing priestly authority: the other two steps are anointing and ordination, and such texts as Ps 133:2 and Lev 8:12 imply that the ritual of authorization may have been carried out in just such a sequence.” See Durham, Exodus, 389.

43 Here the sons of Aaron are appointed to the priesthood. In all previous references, the presence of oil is prominent. Mark F. Rooker observes with reason that the anointing of the high priest echoes the investiture event of a king to serve as ruler of the people (cf. 1 Sam 10:1; 2 Kgs 9:6). This connection goes further because the royal and priestly garments had common features. The Hebrew word for the priest’s diadem נֵּזֶר [nēzer; “consecration,” “crown,” “head-ban”] also refers to a king’s crown (cf. 2 Sam 1:10; 2 Kgs 11:12; Zech 9:16; Pss 89:39 [Eng. 89:40]; 132:18; Prov 27:24; 2 Chr 23:11). See Menahem Stern, “Priestly Vestments,” EncJud 16:513. Cf. T. McComisky, “נֵּזֶר,” TWOT 567-68.

16:10), as in Gen 3:21. In Job, the verb refers to God as Creator clothing a man with skin and flesh (10:11), and clothing a horse’s neck with a mane (39:19). In other occurrences of the verb, the clothing is metaphorical (Ps 132:16, 18; Isa. 50:3; 61:10).

From the foregoing semantic analysis of שָׁלַב, it is clear that the usage in Gen 3:21 is closest to instances where the verb refers to clothing people because they are naked or have inadequate clothing, which, as pointed out above, is clearly at least the primary function in Gen 3:21. But what about the fact that apart from Gen 3:21, the case in question, when the hiph'il of שָׁלַב takes חָמִית as the direct object, the action is almost always the investiture of a priest (cf. Exod 29:5, 8; 40:14; Lev 8:13)? There is an exception in Isa 22:21, where YHWH promises to invest Eliakim as overseer of the palace. This shows that the combination of שָׁלַב with the noun חָמִית does not always have the technical meaning that is restricted to priestly investiture, but it does tend to be used in contexts that involve conferral of status.45

Consequently, the vocabulary employed in Gen 3:21 (שָׁלַב and חָמִית) has a semantic affinity that involves markers of status or restoration of status (re-clothing). It remains possible that Gen 3:21 could refer to a kind of investiture of Adam and Eve as priests, but this would need to be established on a contextual basis going beyond the verb שָׁלַב, the noun חָמִית, or their combination. In light of the connection between Gen 3:21 and other passages in which שָׁלַב refers to clothing naked or re-clothing inadequately

45 Cf. Davidson, “Earth’s First Sanctuary,” 77. Wilder argues: “The particular Hebrew words used in this passage—for ‘garments’ and to ‘clothe’—are most often found in contexts in which a subordinate is being honored in some way by his superior. The main emphasis of the passage, then, is not on God’s response to Adam and Eve’s physical needs; rather, it is on the new status which God confers on Adam and Eve by his act of investiture, despite their sin.” See Wilder, “Illumination and Investiture,” 60, 67; cf. Oden, The Bible Without Theology, 101.
dressed individuals (see above), one possible interpretation would be that the benevolent divine action in Gen 3:21 reflects conferral of some kind of status associated with substantial and durable clothing. This action would elevate Adam and Eve above the status indicated by their *ad hoc*, skimpy, and fragile fig leaves.\(^4^6\)

In view that a conferral of status is established in Gen 3:21 by the combination of the verb לָבַשׁ and the noun כֻּתֹ֫נֶת (see above), important questions remain unanswered: Did YHWH elevate Adam and Eve in status just for the sake of their bodily needs? Is there anything more in the context that would indicate an elevation (restoration) of status for their spiritual needs and/or for their creation role on earth? The fact that in Gen 3:21 YHWH dresses Adam and Eve specifically with animal skins, rather than with fine fabric, still suggests that his intent is to raise them from the degraded spiritual status resulting from their fall into sin to a restored spiritual status that enables them to have a relationship to him (spiritual needs)\(^4^7\) and fulfill the original plan of creation (עָבַד and שָמַר see Gen 2:15, cf. Gen 1:26-27, function/role on earth). The presence of two substantial canonical/biblical concepts—sin and the implied death of one or more animals—demands further consideration in Gen 3.

\(^{4^6}\) In 2 Chr 28:15, clothing naked captives restores them to the status of ordinary citizens, rather than captives of lower degraded status. In Esth 4:4, Esther attempts to give clothes to Mordecai in order to raise him to normality, rather than his sub-normal state of mourning. In the allegory of Ezek 16:10, YHWH clothes naked Jerusalem in order to civilize her as he takes her to be his wife. Thus he normalizes her, but because of his high status, he gives her fine-quality clothing that raises her to a high status.

\(^{4^7}\) Cf. the restoration of sonship, as indicated by clothing, in Jesus’ parable of the lost son: “But the father said to his servants, ‘Bring quickly the best robe, and put it on him, and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet … For this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found.’ And they began to celebrate” (Luke 15:22-24 ESV).
Clearly, the original plan of creation was altered, since Adam and Eve lost their
dominion over the “sanctuary” of Eden, from which they were expelled (Gen 3:22-24).
But, two acts of YHWH in Gen 3 (vv. 15 and 21, see below) were for the benefit of
Adam and Eve (and humanity) and sought to restore them in an altered earthly realm,
including both spiritual/functional as well as physical/material domains. Of course, if
they were loyal to God in their fallen state, they would enjoy holiness of life and
represent God to others (i.e., their descendants), as the nation of Israel was called to be “a
kingdom of priests and a holy nation” (Exod 19:6). Their special status in Eden does not
continue, but the Creator’s plan for them does continue. The fact that God re-clothes
them with animal skins does signify, at least symbolically, the promise of future complete
restoration of this status, which enables them to live with hope outside of their
“sanctuary” of Eden and fulfill the Creator’s design for humanity.

What kind of conferral of status could the garments of skins represent in this
context? What meaning is attached to this event that enables the couple to fulfill God’s
purpose? The answers to these questions take us to the third reason that YHWH’s act of
grace seems motivated by a profound theological purpose. God’s concern in Gen 3:1-
3:24, at least in the second half (vv. 14-24), is redemption. Not all interpreters, however,
endorse the messianic/atonement perspective of the promised “seed” in Gen 3:15. On the
contrary, some scholars reject any Christological message. For example, for Westermann
this view fails to respect the original meaning by reading into the text a notion alien from
the context.48

48 Westermann, Creation, 100; cf. Von Rad, Genesis, 90; Jack P. Lewis, “The Woman’s Seed
(Gen 3:15),” JETS 34.3 (September 1991): 299-319. McConville comments that “modern Old Testament
For the purpose of this dissertation, there is no need to repeat all the biblical evidence for and against this messianic interpretation, since the reader may find it elsewhere. However, it is appropriate to briefly delineate how the immediate context of Gen 3:21 (i.e., the post-Fall narrative of Eden) introduces salvific categories to the biblical canon.

Let us consider the immediate context of Gen 3:21, which can be observed from the literary structure of the post-Fall narrative of Eden. The immediate context of Gen 3 shows that vv. 14-15 are the center of a chiastic structure. Accordingly, Gen 3:15 describes the central divine act of the post-Fall narrative of Eden. It is noticeable that scholarship has been largely informed by the belief that traditional Christian messianic interpretations of Old Testament passages have been exegetically indefensible.” J. Gordon McConville, “Messianic Interpretation of the Old Testament in Modern Context,” The Lord’s Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 2.


The following structure has been adapted from Ojewole, “Seed in Genesis 3:15,” 98; see also Wilfred G. E. Watson, Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse, JSOTSup 170 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1994), 17.

A Serpent and Woman alone. God absent. Prohibition of eating from the tree. Eve enticed to “knowing good and evil” (vss. 1-5).

B Adam and Eve naked, clothed themselves (vv. 6-7).

C God walks in the garden and “called unto Adam” (vv. 8-9a).

D God speaks to Adam (vv. 9a-12).

E God speaks to the woman (v. 13).

F God speaks to the Serpent (vv. 14-15).

E’ God speaks to the woman (v. 16).

D’ God speaks to Adam (vv. 17-19).

C’ Still in the garden, “Adam calls his wife’s name Eve” (v. 20).
for each line of the chiastic structure there is a divine action that redemptively
reverses/addresses the spiritual/physical consequences of sin; the presence of sin affects
both the spiritual/functional and physical/material domains. The intended structure and
the central message of Gen 3:15 as the core of this narrative suggest literary and
theological significance in the other pronouncements and actions. Each of these lines of
the chiastic structure (including v. 21) is interwoven with the prophecy anticipating the
salvific mission of the Messiah.51

Christian tradition has explained Gen 3:15 as the *protevangelium*, “since it has
been taken as the prototype for the Christian gospel.”52 The enmity between the serpent’s
seed and the woman’s seed shows that the curse upon the serpent53 signals its ultimate

B’ God clothed Adam and Eve (v. 21).
A’ God alone. Prohibition of eating from the tree. Humans “knowing good and
evil.”

51 A number of elements indicate that Gen 3:15 refers to a prophecy anticipating the salvific
mission of the Messiah: (1) The identity of the prophetic figure. The Hebrew word לְזֶּרַע*translated as “seed”
alludes to an individual and not to a group entity. (2) The pronoun וּו for “he” indicates that the prophecy
points to a specific person. (3) Divine involvement is implied in Ps 110:1, which identifies the Lord himself
as the One who crushes in Gen 3:15. (4) The messianic application is attested to in the Hebrew Scriptures
(2 Sam 7:11-13; Ps 110). (5) The New Testament application of Gen 3:15 to Jesus Christ (Rom 16:20; Heb
with the death of the “he.” The substitutionary salvific mission of the Messiah was typified by the Levitical
priesthood. The officiating priests had a mediatorial role that involved bearing the iniquity
resulting from people’s sins (cf. Exod 28:38; Lev 10:17; Num 18:1, 23). The Suffering Servant of Isa 53 in the New
human sins and as “victim” died for those sins. See Gane, *Leviticus, Numbers*, 196-97; Gane, *Cult and
and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law and Literature in Honor of
102-3; Jared M. August, “The Messianic Hope of Genesis: The Protoevangelium and Patriarchal


53 The identity of the serpent [שׁנָחָ; nāḥāš] is crucial to the interpretation of this verse. The
Hebrew word לְזֶּרַע is used figuratively in the Old Testament to describe an oppressor (Isa 14:29), the
treacherous Dan (Gen 49:17), a symbol of worldly powers (Isa 27:1). It is also employed to portray the life
of the wicked (Pss 58:5; 140:4) and the effect of wine (Prov 22:32). This usage indicates the negative
connotation of the שׁנָחָ as representing an evil power. Since God recognized the שׁנָחָ as an individual
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The Hebrew word יֶֽזֶרַע (zéraʼ; “seed”) sometimes refers to an immediate offspring rather than a distant descendant. On the other hand, יֶֽזֶרַע on various occasions also denotes a distant offspring or a large group of descendants, although the Hebrew itself never uses the plural (Gen. 9:9; cf. 12:7; 13:16; 15:5, 13, 18; 16:10; 17:7-10, 12; 21:12; 22:17-18). Interestingly, יֶֽזֶרַע occurs fifty-nine times in the book of Genesis, and specifically forty-seven of these are in patriarchal narratives where it refers to the genealogical lineage of the chosen family. Whether the “seed” of Gen 3:15 alludes to an individual or to a group is indicated by the personal pronoun הוּא (hû; “he”) that points being, addressing him separately from the couple (Gen 3:14-15), the שַׁנָחָי is not a mythical figure. The New Testament identified the being represented by the שַׁנָחָי in Gen 3:15 as Satan in Rom 16:20 (cf. 2 Cor 11:3, 14; Rev 12:9). Evidently, the שַׁנָחָי’s intelligence, speech, and knowledge are more advanced than those of the man or the woman. Kaiser explains that there are hints in the text that this being is more than a reptile: The tempter speaks as if he has access to the mind of God—or at least to the supernatural world. “The Serpent” is clearly individualized, for the pronoun used of him in Hebrew is the second person masculine singular pronoun. Furthermore, the serpent of the temptation is the serpent of the final conflict; he is someone whom a future male descendant of the woman will strike with a crushing blow to his skull. Thus, the designation “the serpent” is probably a title, not the particular shape he assumed or the instrument he borrowed to manifest himself to the original pair. Even the alleged demotion of the means of locomotion for reptiles from an upright walking position to that of crawling on one’s belly and eating dust (Gen 3:14) is insufficient to demonstrate that this being had a reptilian form when he appeared to the first couple. Had not God made creeping things that crawled on their bellies in the first chapter of Genesis and called them “good” (1:24-25)? The words of the curse on the serpent, therefore, must be figures of speech, vividly picturing those who had been vanquished and who must now lie face down in the dirt while the conquering king literally makes these enemies his footstool. When all these details are taken into account, the identity of the tempter can be none other than Satan, that old dragon, the serpent.


See, for example, Seth as Eve’s “other seed” (Gen 4:25). Abram regrets that he is still without “seed” (Gen 15:3). Lot’s daughters design a plan to bear their father’s “seed” (Gen 19:32, 34). Ishmael becomes Abraham’s “seed” (Gen 21:13). Samuel becomes Hannah’s “seed” (1 Sam 1:11; 2:20). Solomon is David’s “seed” in 2 Sam 7:12; however, 2 Sam 7:12 in the New Testament is applied to Jesus, and not only to Solomon (Heb 1:5; cf. Rom 1:3; 2 Tim 2:8).


The LXX renders the identity of this “seed” as αὐτός “he,” even though the antecedent is σπέρματος, which is neuter in Greek. If the LXX offers a messianic understanding of Gen 3:15, one must decide how much authority should be given to this ancient Greek translation of the Hebrew text.
to a specific person.\textsuperscript{57} Christian tradition has identified in this נַחֲלַת the salvific mission of the Messiah,\textsuperscript{58} who suffers the serpent’s attack. But the enmity is put to an end when this messianic נַחֲלַת “bruises” the serpent’s head.\textsuperscript{59}

There is a soteriological connection between Gen 3:15 and Gen 3:21 in v. 20. Adam’s name for his wife, Eve (חַוָָּּ֑ה), is etymologically derived from the word “life” (חַי).\textsuperscript{60} After God’s announcement of the enmity between the woman’s posterity and that of the serpent in v. 15, severe pain in childbirth in v. 16, and man’s mortality in v. 19, the naming in v. 20 and God’s clothing of Adam and Eve in v. 21 signal hope and restoration in spite of the Fall and its consequences (i.e., lowering the quality of life in both spiritual/functional and physical/material domains). Eve will be “the mother of all the living” (v. 20) and thus will have “seed”/posterity (v. 15) because humanity will survive through the merciful intervention of God. Thus, the original plan of creation—“Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth” (Gen 1:28)—is not undone. The two actions are associated because God himself prepares them for their life to come as they

\textsuperscript{57} It is remarkable that the nearest biblical use of בְּנָךְ is found in Gen 4:25. In this verse Eve states about Seth that “God has appointed another seed [בְּנָךְ] for me instead of Abel.” Clearly, בְּנָךְ refers to an individual in Gen 4:25.

\textsuperscript{58} The salvific mission of Christ is alluded to by Paul in Gal 4:4, which says God’s Son was “born of a woman.” Paul’s understanding of this fulfillment is confirmed in Gal 3:16: “Now to Abraham and his Seed were the promises made. He does not say, ‘And to seeds,’ as of many, but as of one, ‘And to your Seed,’ who is Christ.”

\textsuperscript{59} The verbal actions employed seem to come from two different verbs, but with the same root form. Thus, [I] שָׁוף would mean “to bruise someone’s head” and [II] שָׁוף would mean “to snap at,” “snatch,” implying the idea of “biting.” See Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, “שָׁוף,” HALOT 2:1446. Although the imagery of the mutual attack is described differently (head versus heel), it seems that each opponent suffers in the totality of his person, meaning that both attacks are mortal. This possibility emerges from the idea that the serpent is hit on his head, while the messianic נַחֲלַת is hit on his heel. The extremities involved (head/heel) may refer to totality. In other words, the serpent dies because it was hit on the head, while the messianic נַחֲלַת dies because he was hit on the heel.

\textsuperscript{60} The LXX associates חַוָָּּ֑ה in translation with ζωή (life). See Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, “חַוָָּּ֑ה,” HALOT 1:296.
anticipate the future “seed” through whom salvation will arise. Just as Adam renames his wife in hope of the future, God re-clothes the couple not only for their bodily needs, but also to restore their spiritual status, enabling their relationship to him, maintaining the original plan of creation. Therefore, the literary purpose of the post-Fall narrative of Eden emerges from the abovementioned redemptive imagery.

God’s redemptive action in v. 21 addresses more than the bodily nakedness of the couple. The divine action of clothing in v. 21 parallels the human action of clothing in v. 7. The verb יָשָׁה [‘āšâ; “to make,” “to do”] is employed in the same wayyiqtol form of conjugation (יָשָׁה / יָשָׂה, “and they made”/“and he made”). This parallelism not only points to God as the only “maker” of redemption, it also underlines the substitutionary sacrifice as the mechanism of his redemptive action just described in v. 15. The presence of the canonical/biblical concept of sin and the redemptive centrality of v. 15 give substitutionary significance to the death of one or more animals in v. 21.

More contextual factors may nuance the cultic understanding of this conferral of status via the garments of skins. The narratives of Eden (Gen 2:4b-2:25 and 3:1-3:24) begin and end with sanctuary/temple imagery: specifically, Gen 2:8 states that God planted the Garden of Eden and Gen 3:24 states that God placed cherubim at the east of Eden. These two divine actions are connected through vertical typology with the sanctuary/temple imagery of Ezek 28:13-14 (see the section “The Hebrew Word עֵדֶן in

61 Moskala explains this post-lapsarian bodily nakedness as a sense of guilt. He writes: “For the first time Adam and Eve felt that burning bitter insight of themselves. It was more than a sentiment of shame, because their cover made out of fig leaves could not help them. The nakedness after sin signifies inner nakedness, being unmasked, a consciousness of guilt, total shame, loss of integrity, feelings of degradation, defeat, ruined innocence, and disappearance of light.” Moskala, “Reflections on the Concept,” 33. Cf. Magonet, “Themes of Genesis 2-3,” 43-44.
Gen 3:24” in chapter II of this dissertation). The linkage between “Eden” and the “cherubim” constitutes a frame that encloses the Eden narratives with a sanctuary/temple setting, including v. 21.

As a result of Adam and Eve’s expulsion from their “sanctuary” of Eden, God secured and anticipated in Gen 3:21 the post-lapsarian confidence that they and their descendants ought to maintain when approaching the sacred space of God’s presence. In due time God showed Moses a heavenly model (Exod 25:8-9, 40) and ordered him to build a tabernacle that evoked the Garden of Eden (Gen 2:8), which contained the foundational elements of sacred space, that is, the first “sanctuary” on earth.

The post-Fall narrative of Eden from its beginning to its end introduces salvific categories through the sanctuary/temple motif that later biblical narratives develop in more detail, including the priestly roles. This contextual feature locates the divine action of dressing Adam and Eve with garments of skins in a cultic/salvific context. The vocabulary employed in v. 21, conceptualizing the same literary and theological purpose, should be interpreted within the same cultic framework. Therefore, the sanctuary/temple context of Gen 2-3 implicitly lays out foundational cultic concepts such as the initiation of the sacrificial system in Gen 3:21. Some scholars go beyond the basic salvific categories and find in v. 21 a hint at priestly post-lapsarian status for Adam and Eve.

62 The cherubim are the beings associated with God’s throne in the heavenly sanctuary (Rev 4-5; Ezek 1:10; cf. 28:14) and with the earthly sanctuary (Exod 25:18-22; 26:31; 37:7-9; cf. 1 Kgs 6:23-28). See also the following section entitled “The Hebrew Word כְּרֻּבִים in Gen 3:24.”

This particular issue calls for a comprehensive study outside the scope of this dissertation; thus, it will not be pursued further in this section.

To sum up, the vocabulary of Gen 3:15 in its context prefigures the redemptive/sacrificial act of the Messiah, implying a cultic/salvific perspective of the entire narrative. The semantic framework of the Eden narratives (Gen 2:4b-2:25 and 3:1-3:24) conceptualizes in Gen 3:21 the profound redemptive purpose of God. As Moskala correctly observes:

If nakedness is more than a physical nakedness, having the meaning of guilt because Adam and Eve transgressed God’s command (Gen 2:16, 17), so also the garment must be more than just a physical garment! A garment out of fig leaves represents salvation by works, and a garment out of skins given by God points to righteousness by faith because only the acceptance of Christ’s sacrifice for humans can take away guilt and save sinners.64

Several important questions remain nonetheless unaddressed, and additional studies are clearly required to better understand Gen 3:21.65 Until now, the debae is still

Investiture,” 60; Wenham, Genesis 1-15, 84-85; Mathews, Genesis 1-11:26, 254-55. The word “priest” would refer in this post-lapsarian context to people serving in the cultic function/role of mediator in order to reestablish and maintain a relationship with God. (Note that God gave to Adam and Eve in a pre-lapsarian context the “priestly” function/role of preserving the sacred space. See Chapter II of this dissertation the section entitled “The verbs עָבַד and שָמַר in Gen 2:15”). However, as the Israelites developed a more structured religion and society, God called a special class to preside over the increasingly complex needs that their religion entailed. In addition to presiding over the sacrifices, the priests are given the responsibility of distinguishing between what is clean and unclean and teaching the people of Israel about the Torah (Lev 10:10-11; cf. Deut 17:8-13; 31:9-13; 33:8-10). Thus the pre-Israelite priestly role did not deal with the complexity of the sacrificial system later developed in the wilderness tabernacle.

64 Moskala, “Reflections on the Concept,” 35.

65 Scholars find literary and thematic connections between Gen 3:21 and Gen 4:1-16. For example: (1) The principal characters in both stories are introduced in terms of their functions. Adam’s function was to till the ground and keep the garden (2:5, 15, 19, 23), while Eve was his companion (2:18-25) and child-bearer (3:16, 20; 4:1-2, 25). Abel is presented as a keeper of sheep (4:2) while Cain is a tiller of the ground (4:2). (2) Each story contains two primary intimate contemporary human beings created or born close together in time. Their harmony is soon tragically broken in each case, and they are severely alienated from one another (3:7-14; 4:8-9). (3) In both stories, God issues a word of warning before the disobedient acts are perpetrated (2:17; 4:7). (4) The guilty principal characters are confronted by God with their sinful deeds by means of leading questions. God interrogates Cain (4:6, 10) and also interrogates the first sinners (3:9, 11, 13). Their responses in each instance give the climax of their alienation from God and from each other (3:9-13; 4:9). (5) God pronounces the sentences and curses brought by their offenses (3:16-19; 4:11-12).
going on without compelling evidence. Therefore, I will not pursue further this discussion here. However, the above paragraphs provided a preliminary study indicating that there has been a gradual unfolding of the purposes of God in the plan of redemption.

The Hebrew Word כְּרֻּבִים in Genesis 3:24

The theological significance of the presence of the כְּרֻּבִים in the כְּרֻבִים is still a matter of discussion, although certain aspects have become clearer recently.66

Adam and Cain were alienated from the ground, which would no longer be friendly but rather hostile and hazardous to them (3:17-19; 4:12). (6) They are driven from their original abode and livelihood: Adam and Eve from the garden (3:24), Cain from the ground, the source of his livelihood (4:14). (7) The guilty persons hide from the face of God as a direct result of their sinful acts (3:8; 4:14, 16). (8) In the aftermath of each episode, the guilty parties dwell east of Eden (3:24; 4:16). See a detailed discussion in Ojewole, “Seed in Genesis 3:15,” 106-7; Alan J. Hauser, “Linguistic and Thematic Links between Genesis 4:1-16 and Genesis 2-3,” JETS 23.4 (1980): 297-305.

It is noteworthy that near the end of the post-Fall narrative of Eden (v. 21), the reader is left with the implicit idea that one or more animals were killed for the benefit of Adam and Eve. This anticipated component of the narrative seems to be introduced again near the beginning of Gen 4: “Cain brought an offering of the fruit of the ground to the Lord. Abel also brought of the firstborn of his flock and of their fat” (vv. 3-4a). Moskala comments that “Cain’s sacrifice was a vegetation sacrifice (from the produce of the land), but Abel’s sacrifice was an animal (bloody) sacrifice. A similar concept is found in the garments of the first couple, out of fig leaves (vegetation), correlating with the vegetation sacrifice of Cain; however, the garments out of skins (an animal product) points to the animal sacrifice of Abel.” Moskala, “Reflections on the Concept,” 35. Although Gen 4:1-16 does not explicitly state the exact location to which the two brothers brought their offerings, scholars argue that a location may be implied in v. 7. The Hebrew word פֶתַח [pēṭah; “gate,” “opening,” “entrance”) likely refers to the “gate” of Eden guarded by cherubim. If this is so, this reference is in accordance with the uses of פֶתַח describing the door of the tabernacle (Exod 29:4, 11, 32, 42; 33:9-10), where individuals brought their sacrifices/offerings in order to obtain expiation. Thus, after Adam and Eve are expelled from the Garden of Eden, they could still come to its east entrance to worship where cherubim were guarding the “sanctuary” realm. Cf. Joaquim Azvedo, “At the Door of Paradise: A Contextual Interpretation of Gen 4.7,” BN 100 (1999): 54-55; L. Michael Morales, “Crouching Demon, Hidden Lamb: Resurrecting an Exegetical Fossil in Genesis 4.7,” BT 63.4 (2012): 185-91.

However, this particular interpretation in v. 7 is not totally free from objections, because it requires rendering the Hebrew word הֲעִנִּי [hattāʾ] as “sin-offering” or “expiation.” The word הֲעִנִּי is a broad term that also denotes “a deed that violates an existing relationship/partnership. When one of the partners is YHWH, it is a general word for sin, whether intentional or not.” See Gane, Cult and Character, 292. This discussion implies a reference to the concept of sacred space (“sanctuary”) at the gate of the garden where the brothers brought their offerings. Therefore, the literary and thematic connections between Gen 3:21 and Gen 4:1-16 clearly require further and thorough study, including a definition for “priest” (priesthood) and “sacrifice” outside the Garden and before the installment of the wilderness tabernacle.

Sanctuary/temple advocates elaborate their case from the notion that כְּרֻּבִים, the plural form of the word כְרוּב [kərûḇ; “cherub”], in Gen 3:24 is associated with Israel’s sanctuary. For example, some scholars observe a possible connection with the sculpted images above the Ark of the Covenant. Hurowitz, among others, pioneered this idea, writing that “these cherubs were the private honor guard of the temple’s divine residence.” Yet, this argument is not free from criticism: some scholars have advanced the notion that the כְּרֻּבִים were not restricted to sacred space, since they appear with frequency “supporting human thrones and guarding royal palaces and gardens.”

Let us explore three key issues that appears to be subject to criticism in Gen 3:24.

The Hebrew text and its translation read:

---


68 Cf. Sculptured images above the ark of the covenant (Exod 25:18-22; 26:31; 37:7-9; Num 7:8-9; 1 Chr 28:18); inside the holy of holies (1 Kgs 6:23-28; 8:6-7; 1 Chr 3:10-13); beneath the massive sea (1 Kgs 7:29, 36); decoration on the curtains of the tabernacle (Exod 26:1, 31; 36:8, 35; 2 Chr 3:14); the walls of the Temple (1 Kgs 6:29, 32, 35; 2 Chr 3:7; Ezek 41:18, 20, 25); the guardian cherub in the edenic sanctuary/temple (Ezek 28:14).


3:24 So He drove 71 out the man; and He placed 72 cherubim at the east of the garden of Eden, and a flaming sword which turned every way, 73 to guard the way to the tree of life.

First, the status and nature of the presence of the כְּרֻּבִים in Gen 3:24 have provided a fertile field for study. 74 The common conceptual perception of כְּרֻּבִים in the ancient world as related to temples and palaces is worth considering. 75 For this reason, among others, one can discard the critics’ idea that the כְּרֻּבִים were not restricted to sacred space. Although it is correct that they often appear supporting human thrones and guarding royal palaces and gardens, in the ANE those royal realms were commonly intertwined with cultic functions. This royal terminology used in the text indicates that it may bespeak sanctuary/temple overtones.

Second, let us reconsider the use of the word כְּרוּב in the Old Testament. Martin Dibelius was one of the first scholars to provide a comprehensive conceptual/textual...
analysis concerning the meaning of כְּרוּב in the Old Testament. Dibelius’s study focused on the theological implications of the throne-conception of the ark, in which the nature and significance of the כְּרֻּבִים form an important piece of evidence. It was suggested by Dibelius, with a good measure of likelihood, that YHWH’s throne was literally the ark itself. For Clements this is highly improbable because the presence of YHWH is primarily related to the כַפֹּ֫רֶת [kaḇpōret; “(performance of) reconciliation,” “cover,” “lid”] and the כְּרֻּבִים. However, the biblical description of God as enthroned between the כְּרֻּבִים occurs several times (cf. 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 2 Kgs 19:15; Isa 37:16; Ps 80:1; 99:1). This common portrayal of God sitting on his throne, in addition to the explicit evidence that God encounters Moses from between the two כְּרֻּבִים (cf. Exod 25:22; 30:6; Lev 26:2; Num 7:89) conclusively confirms the conceptual framework that the presence of כְּרֻּבִים symbolizes. The כְּרֻּבִים “were conceived as the supporters of God's seat, and hence that the ark was his throne.” In Clements’ words: “Where the ark is, YHWH is.” Additionally, the biblical evidence, according to 1 Chr 28:18; Deut

76 Martin Dibelius, Lade Jahves: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (Norderstedt: Vero Verlag, 1906; repr. 2014), see especially 72-85. Dibelius’s analysis of the text was carefully reexamined by Clements, God and Temple, 28-30, to whom I am indebted for the references to Dibelius’s book.

77 Dibelius’s arguments may be outlined as follows:

a. The location of the ark indicates the presence of YHWH (cf. 1 Sam 4:1-7; 2 Sam 6).

b. The ark is related to YHWH’s enthronement upon the כְּרֻּבִים (cf. 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 2 Kgs 19:15; 1 Chr 13:6).

c. YHWH is present with the ark, through which He dwells with Israel (Num 10:35-36).

d. YHWH’s ark, which is considered YHWH’s throne, will be replaced by the city of Jerusalem (Jer 3:16-17).

78 See Clements, God and Temple, 30-31.


81 Clements, God and Temple, 29.
33:26; Ps 18:11 [Eng. 18:10]; Ps 68:5, 34 [Eng. 68:4, 33]; 99:1; Hab 3:8, seems to show that the presence of כְּרֻּבִים represents the cloud-chariot of YHWH on which he rides in the heavens.82

The connection between God’s presence and כְּרֻּבִים’s presence seems clear in the Old Testament. For example, Solomon’s temple had two כְּרֻּבִים, carved of olive wood and plated with gold, covering the whole width of the most holy place with their outspread wings (1 Kgs 8:7).83 The analogy with Gen 3:24 proves sufficiently that the position and function/role of the two angelic beings (לִשְׁמֵר אֶת־דֶּרֶךְ עֵ֥ץ הַַֽחַיִַֽים) construct and evoke the cultic semantic framework already found in the rest of the Old Testament.84 Namely, that the כְּרֻּבִים dwell in the presence of the sanctuary/temple’s throne as they guard the access to God.85

Third, the כְרוּב in Ezek 28:14 and 16 is also found in a sanctuary/temple setting, a corresponding and original model of the earthly dwelling of God.86 As we saw before, the characterization of the כְרוּב, the supernatural ruler of Tyre, evidently involves two

---

82 The notion of a moving throne seems to be in accordance with the biblical view of sacred space. Particularly, the Old Testament develops two models of sacred space: a dynamic model and a static model. According to Kunin, the dynamic model is primarily presented in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. It centers on the tent of meeting, and as the camp moves the sacred place moves. The static model is a fixed unique location such as the temple mount in Jerusalem. “In spite of this difference both variations share the same underlying structure.” Kunin, God’s Place, 10.


86 See the section entitled “The Garden as a Mountain in Gen 2:10” in chapter II of this dissertation.
forms of status: cultic and royal. This imagery seems to depict the sanctuary/temple motif, especially in view of biblical descriptions of God as enthroned between the כְּרֻּבִים. 87 “One could argue that the notion of enthronement is closely connected to the idea of sanctuary/temple and not exclusively to the concept of palace.” 88 This royal/priestly portrayal may lead to the conclusion that the demise of the כְּרֻּבִים was caused not only by his failure as YHWH’s vice-regent, but also by his failure to perform priestly duties as guardian of the garden. 89 Block writes:

[The interpretation of the cherub as a guardian] accords with the sense of Gen. 3:24, which has Yahweh strategically stationing sword-wielding cherubim to guard (šāmar) the way to the tree of life. Even so, the equation is not total; Ezekiel’s cherub is singular, not a plurality, and he walks about in the garden, rather than being stationed at the entrance east of the garden. 90 Thus, one is informed by Ezek 28:14 and 16 that the כְּרֻּבִים are angelic beings and servants of YHWH who inhabit the Eden of the heavenly sanctuary/temple. 91 In general

87 Cf. 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 2 Kgs 19:15; Isa 37:16; Ps 80:1; 99:1.

88 Souza concludes in his study of 1 Kgs 22:19-23 that the sanctuary and throne of God are inseparable concepts. Cf. Daegeuk Nam, “The Throne of God Motif in the Hebrew Bible” (ThD diss., Andrews University, 1989), 157. If this observation is correct, then it follows to assume that the presence of cherubim evokes a cultic context. Souza, “The Heavenly Sanctuary/Temple,” 227.

89 Contra Block, “Eden: A Temple?,” 10. It seems to me that Block overstates in Ezek 28 an apparent dichotomy between the roles of a כְּרֻּב and a מֶלֶך, as well as the roles of kings and priests, since ancient heads of state often combined priestly and kingship functions.

90 Block, The Book of Ezekiel, 113. On the guardian (or boundary keeper) role/function of the כְּרֻּב see Dale Launderville, “Ezekiel’s Cherub: A Promising Symbol or a Dangerous Idol?,” CBQ 65.2 (2003): 167-75; James E. Miller, “The mēlak of Tyre (Ezekiel 28,11-19),” ZAW 105.3 (1993): 499; Wood, Of Wings and Wheels, 53; Wyatt, “A Royal Garden,” 18. Hamilton mistakenly rejects the role/function of boundary keepers of the כְּרֻּב as he fails to recognize that their ultimate purpose was to guard the way to the tree of life. Certainly, Hamilton is right to think that “they guard the Garden of Eden, but they do not guard God.” Hamilton, The Book of Genesis, 210. Nevertheless, the canonical biblical concept encompassing the location of the tree of life conveys that true sustenance is found in the presence of God. This is corroborated by the linkages between the flowing river from the center of the garden, Eden, and sanctuary/temple motifs. See the section of this dissertation entitled “The River of Eden in Gen 2:10.”

91 Note the occurrences of כְּרֻּבִים as fitting representations of the divine presence in Solomon’s temple decoration (1 Kgs 6:29) and in Ezekiel’s vision of the temple (Ezek 41:18).
terms, the biblical data offers a common conception: the companionship of כְּרֻּבִים is a direct reference to YHWH’s presence (cf. the visions of Ezek 1:5-10 and 10:1-20). One of Souza’s fundamental conclusions confirms this observation from the perspective of vertical typology:

The reference to the “covering” cherub in the heavenly sanctuary seems to indicate that the heavenly sanctuary/temple would be served by a “covering” cherub corresponding to the golden cherubim in the holy of holies of the sanctuary/temple, and the cherubim stationed at the entrance of the Garden of Eden (Gen 3:24). That being the case, one can reasonably infer a structural correspondence between the heavenly temple and its earthly counterparts. One should note, however, that while the earthly sanctuary temple would contain a golden cherubim, the heavenly counterparts were living beings. Thus it becomes apparent that an intensification or escalation from the type to its antitype obtains in regards to this vertical typology.

These three considerations, taken together, provide serious evidence that the companionship of כְּרֻּבִים represents the imminence of YHWH’s presence, whose natural place is the sanctuary/temple. Specifically, the כְּרֻּבִים in the Holy of Holies connects the most holy place to Eden. The semantic functional coherence of Gen 3:22-24 enhanced by the imagery indicated by the piel verb שָׁנָה [gārāš; “banish,” “divorce,” “drive out,” “toss up”] and the hiph’il verb שָׁכֵן [šāḵán; “cause to settle down,” “abide,”

92 Regardless of the identification of these spirit beings, the common feature shared with Ezek 28 is the imminent presence and service at the throne of God. Cf. Block, The Book of Ezekiel, 314-16; Cooper, Ezekiel, 132-34.


94 Carol L. Meyers, “Temple, Jerusalem,” ABD 6:358. See also Scullion, Genesis, 48-49.

95 Bertoluci, “Son of the Morning,” 136.


97 This observation might be considered a valid reason to decline Westermann’s idea that Gen 3:22, 24 and Gen 3:23 form two different endings. Westermann, Genesis 1-11, 270-75.
“dwell”] “effectively depicts the excommunication of the man and woman from the 
presence of God.”

To conclude, then, one may propose the following line of interpretation. While 
the primary function of the כְּרֻּבִים is to guard, they also make known YHWH’s 
presence. Therefore, one may suggest that Eden is an enclosed space with only one 
entrance. Otherwise, the כְּרֻּבִים “could not have successfully guarded access to the tree 
in the center of the Garden.”

“The cherubim functioned as divine sentinels, guarding the 
path leading to the presence of God, preventing the trespass of unauthorized persons.”

The Eastern Entrance to the Garden of Eden

One current scholarly argument suggests that the Garden of Eden was entered 
from the east and that this substantiates the sanctuary/temple motif. In the process of this 
reevaluation, I will delimit discussion of this argument primarily to Gen 3:24 and the 
expression מִקֶ֙דֶם. Wenham, in harmony with David Chilton’s conclusion, contends that 
the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן was entered from the east just like later sanctuaries,

However, scholars have objected by noting that the

---

100 Parry, “Garden of Eden,” 139. As Collins has noted: “It would be a sad mistake to think of the 
cute cherubs of popular art. These were apparently a terrifying race of warrior angels; compare Ezek 9:3.” 
101 Cf. Num 3:38; Ezek 10:9; 47:1; Wenham, “Sanctuary Symbolism,” 20; Jamieson, Fausset, and 
Brown, *A Commentary Critical*, 20; Walton, Matthews, and Chavalas, *IVP Bible Background Commentary*, 
31-34. Cf. Chilton, *Paradise Restored*, 29. See also references to the east in Exod 27:13-16; 38:13-18 and 
102 Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis*, 209-12; Waltke and Fredricks, *Genesis*, 96; Lange and Schaff, 
*Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, 241-43; Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Record: A Scientific and 
Devotional Commentary on the Book of Beginnings* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1976), 132; Samuel D. 
53-55; Derek Kidner, *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1975), 66-
text does not refer explicitly to the Garden’s entrance, nor to the exact location of the guardian cherubs.\textsuperscript{103}

Let us consider the following four aspects. The Hebrew text and its translation read:

3:24 So He drove out the man; and He placed cherubim at the east\textsuperscript{104} of the garden of Eden, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to guard the way to the tree of life.

First, does Gen 3:24 indicate that the entryway to the garden was on the east side? Alternatively, does Gen 3:24 mention an entrance at all? Admittedly, the text states explicitly that the cherubim were “to guard the way to the tree of life,” and not that they were stationed at the entrance of the garden. The text of Gen 3:24 does not contain the common Hebrew words for entrance, gate, or door.\textsuperscript{105} Sanctuary/temple narratives in the Old Testament use the word פֶתַח (Exod 29:4, 11, 32, 42; 33:9-10) and the word שַעַר (Exod 27:16; 35:17; 38:15, 18, 31; 39:40; 40:8, 33; Num 40:26) to refer to the courtyard entrance of the tabernacle, and in 1 Chr 9:23; Ezek 40:6; 41:24-25, among other references, associated with the sanctuary/temple building or with Zion’s gates. Then, Gen


\textsuperscript{104} The Hebrew word קֶדֶם refers “to what was before or in front of one. Thus east was the direction a person faced in order to get his/her orientation.” Joel F. Drinkard Jr., “East,” \textit{ABD} 248.

\textsuperscript{105} The common Hebrew words are פֶתַח [pēṭah; “gate,” “opening,” “entrance”]; דֶלֶת [dēlet; “door”]; שַעַר [ša’ar; “gate”].
3:24 does not explicitly speak of an entrance. As in earlier engagements with this topic, I argue that perhaps the presence of an entrance can be inferred from the role/function of the cherubim stationed at the east of the Garden of Eden. There, as Umberto Cassuto has anticipated, “apparently, was the entrance” to the garden.\textsuperscript{106}

Second, the semantic domain of the expression מִקֶּדֶם (at the east) in Gen 3:24 is also found in Gen 2:8. This expression provides evidence to conclude that “the Garden is not a symbol. It is presented as [a] real place, situated in geographic terms.”\textsuperscript{107} While the later passage states that God planted a גַּן on the east side of עֵֽֽדֶן, the former passage indicates that when God drove out Adam and Eve the כְּרֻּבִים were placed מִקֶּדֶם (at the east) of the newly planted גַּן. Furthermore, Gen 4:16 states plainly that Cain “went out from the presence of the Lord and dwelt in the land of Nod on the east of Eden (קִדְמַת עֵַֽדֶן), supporting the notion that God’s presence was manifested in the גַּן–עֵֵ֔דֶן.\textsuperscript{108} In fact, it is often the case that scholars observe in the Old Testament a directional motif “east.”\textsuperscript{109} Sailhamer explains:

Throughout the book of Genesis, the author carefully apprises the reader of the direction of man’s movement. In doing so he drops a narrative clue to the meaning of the events he is recounting. At this point in the narrative, “east” has only the significance of “outside the garden.” Later in the book the author will carry this significance further by showing “east” to be the direction of the “city of Babylon”

\textsuperscript{106} Cassuto, \textit{Commentary on the Book of Genesis}, 174. See also the section of this dissertation entitled “The Word כְּרֻּבִים in Gen 3:24.”

\textsuperscript{107} Doukhan, \textit{Genesis}, 75.


\textsuperscript{109} Mathews cites, for example, the expulsion of Cain (Gen 4:14); the locale of the Tower of Babel (Gen 11:2); the dismissal of Keturah’s sons by Abraham (Gen 25:6); and Lot’s departure from Abraham. It is important to note here Lot’s election to settle in the fruitful plains of the Jordan, which were like the “garden of the Lord” (Gen 13:8–13). These references seem to have in common a relationship between the east and the presence of YHWH. Mathews, \textit{Genesis 1-11:26}, 257-58. Cf. Miller, “Aetiology of the Tabernacle/Temple,” 151-60.
Thus, the expression מִקֶּדֶם indicates that if someone wanted to enter the גַּן־עִִ֔דֶן, the only way to God’s presence was guarded by כְּרֻּבִים. The absence of the common Hebrew words for entrance, gate, or door in this narrative does not preclude this inferred notion, since a literal entrance, gate, or door was unnecessary in an arboreal landscape.

Third, there seems to be no strong objection to the fact that the tabernacle and the Jerusalem temple were evidently constructed with eastern entrances. “The east-west alignment is one of the basic architectural elements of sacred buildings in Israel,” as purportedly confirmed by archeological discoveries. As expected from the study of this directional motif “east,” this architectural orientation has prompted scholars to recognize the גַּן־עִִ֔דֶן as a sort of sanctuary.

Four, returning to the notion of the sanctuary/temple (and tabernacle) as a representation of the heavenly court where YHWH dwells, we will gain more insight if we look at the larger paradigm of the canonical biblical narrative. The connection derived from the cherubim and the eastern entrance is commonly identified as a structural

---


111 It should be remembered that the Old Testament often presents moving eastward as meaning moving away from God (cf. Gen 11:2; 13:8-13).

112 Kang, “Creation, Eden, Temple and Mountain,” 76-77.


correspondence between the heavenly temple and its earthly counterpart, as it is corroborated by subsequent passages of the Hebrew Bible. At this point of our study, one may concur with Doukhan that “the strong allusions to the sanctuary in the garden of Eden presents a cosmic dimension indicating the other sanctuary, the heavenly abode of God, which precedes and transcends the Garden of Eden.” Thus, the sanctuary/temple (and tabernacle), the earthly one and even more the heavenly one, may be seen as a way to return to the lost garden through worship. One is led on to the conclusion: it was the wilderness tabernacle and later sanctuaries that were shaped to represent the garden, and not that the garden material was shaped to explain the wilderness tabernacle and later sanctuaries.

Finally, one may adduce from the geographical orientation that the recognition of the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן as a sort of sanctuary/temple becomes even clearer at the end of Gen 3, when Adam and Eve are expelled from the sacred space, that is to say, from the sanctuary/temple framework.

**Summary and Conclusions**

This chapter has reevaluated the most prominent syntactic and literary characteristics of the post-Fall narrative of Eden that appear to validate the sanctuary/temple motif, including the Hebrew participle נִתְהַלְתָּ בַּתְּחֵן in Gen 3:8; the Hebrew word כֻּתֹּנֶת and the verb לָבֹא in Gen 3:21; the Hebrew word כְּרֻּבִים in Gen 3:24; and

117 Doukhan, *Genesis*, 113.
118 Miller, “Aetiology of the Tabernacle/Temple,” 158.
the eastern entrance to the Garden. The reassessment of the scholarly arguments at this point has led us to the following two preliminary conclusions.

First, the sanctuary/temple motif is an overarching worldview/shaping narrative/story that enhances the hermeneutical approach to the Bible. This further suggests that the pre-Fall Eden narrative (Gen 2:4b-25) shares the same composition intent\textsuperscript{119} with the post-Fall Eden narrative; both narratives embrace the same literary purpose.\textsuperscript{120} The theological significance of the Gen 2-3 narratives can be fully appreciated by examining the conceptual/textual relationships from a historical canonical perspective. “The creation of the planet earth is given as a part, a blueprint, of the greater cosmos.”\textsuperscript{121} Beale’s great contribution is that from a canonical theological perspective the sanctuary/temple is the interpretative key to unlock the meaning of the Bible. As Collins rightly writes: “This means that the image of the sanctuary from Genesis 2-3, from which humans are exiled and to which they need to return—a return that God provides purely by his grace—is a controlling image for the entire Bible story.”\textsuperscript{122} Therefore, the biblical evidence studied so far provides a “hermeneutical dashboard” to visualize, characterize, character

\textsuperscript{119} These accounts contain complementary perspectives of God’s creation in contrast to each other. See Doukhan, \textit{Genesis}, 72.

\textsuperscript{120} The literary purpose of the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 2-3 is particularly interested in holy time and holy space. See Laurence A. Turner, \textit{Genesis} (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 34-35.

\textsuperscript{121} Doukhan, \textit{Genesis}, 114.

\textsuperscript{122} Collins, \textit{Did Adam and Eve}, 69.
and thereby construe the sanctuary/temple semantic framework in the rest of the biblical narrative.\textsuperscript{123} It is an “open door” to explore temple theology.\textsuperscript{124}

Second, the Garden of Eden did not have an architectural structure, unlike later sanctuary/temple buildings, but it had correspondences with a preexisting heavenly sacred space. Thus, it was the wilderness tabernacle and later sanctuaries that were shaped to represent the garden, and not that the garden material was shaped to explain the wilderness tabernacle and later sanctuaries. Lea Mazor has summarized our findings in this way:

\begin{quote}
Biblical thought reveals a correlation between the Garden of Eden and the Temple: descriptions of the Temple show affinities to traditions of the Garden of Eden, and descriptions of the Garden of Eden show affinities to Temple traditions. These affinities, expressed in language, style, theme, and concept, are rooted in the cultural tradition of the Ancient Near East, and carry over into post-biblical literature as well. The persistence of the belief in a connection between the Garden of Eden and the Temple over many generations, and its dispersal over many different types of literature deriving from different schools of thought, testify to this belief as one of the fundamentals of biblical thought.\textsuperscript{125}
\end{quote}

The narratives of Eden are a canonical introduction to or harbinger of the sanctuary/temple motif in Scripture, which, “while testifying to the memory of God’s heavenly temple, at the same time points forward to the promise[d] land, the future place of the earthly temple.”\textsuperscript{126}

\textsuperscript{123} Morales, \textit{The Tabernacle Pre-Figured}, 75. None of the arguments brought forward against the sanctuary/temple motif takes into account the conceptual semantic framework of its vocabulary, and thus they are not decisive and conclusive.


\textsuperscript{126} Doukhan, \textit{Genesis}, 78.
CHAPTER IV

THE CREATION ACCOUNT IN GENESIS 1:1-2:4a

Introduction

In this chapter I will review the scholarly literature and reevaluate the textual evidence regarding two prominent syntactic and literary characteristics of the creation narrative (Gen 1:1-2:4a)1 purportedly related to the sanctuary/temple. But before embarking on this discussion, we should take into account the structural/linguistic connection and parallelism present between the creation narrative and the pre-Fall narrative of Eden. “Taken together these two perspectives present God as transcendent and separate while, at the same time, caring and involved.”2 The theological significance of this can be fully appreciated by considering their interconnectedness.3 The textual and conceptual evidence so far explored points to the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 2-3

---

1 Gen 1-3 has been considered as an original stylistic and syntactic unity. This research follows the compositional units that have been distinguished by some scholars: Gen 1:1-2:4a (the creation narrative) and Gen 2:4b-3:24 (the Eden narrative). This common demarcation can be observed in some English translations with Gen 2:4a located at the end of the creation narrative and Gen 2:4b at the beginning of the Eden narrative, for example, TJB 1966; BLE 1979; NRS 1989; NLT 1996; CEB 2011; See, more specifically, the arguments for the division between v. 4a and 4b: Vervenne, “Genesis 1:1-2:4,” 45-47; E. J. Van Wolde, “The Text as an Eloquent Guide: Rhetorical, Linguistic and Literary Features in Genesis 1,” in Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible, ed. L. J. de Regt, Jan de Waard, and J. P. Fokkelman (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996), 134-39; E. A. Speiser, Genesis: Introduction, Translation, and Notes (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981), 3-13; Claus Westermann, Genesis 1-11: A Commentary, trans. John Scullion (London: SPCK, 1984), 78, 178, 197. A detailed study of the unity of Gen 2:4a and Gen 2:4b can be found in T. Stordalen, “Genesis 2:4: Restudying a Locus Classicus,” ZAW 104.2 (1992): 163-77. Reference should also be made to the convincing arguments in Doukhan, “Literary Structure,” 51-76.

2 McKeown, Genesis, 30.

functioning as the operational system from which the entire framework of biblical canonical theology is derived. Therefore, the connection between Gen 1 and 2 does not mean the two narratives are exact parallel accounts of creation, but two complementary perspectives in contrast to each other. “The first pericope gives the overview, while the second provides more details.” Doukhan demonstrated that “both creation pericopes were in fact revealing a parallelism which manifested itself not only in the literary structure but also in the agreement of the thematic content.” This connection suggests the author’s intention to communicate his report on the creation of the universe as an

---

4 The semantic framework of the sanctuary/temple motif “helps us focus on the positive image of Eden as God's first dwelling, a place anchored in close contact and communion between God and human beings, which prompts us to think of what is needed to restore that relationship. See Schachter, “Garden of Eden,” 76.


6 The main features are summarized here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Introduction (1:1-2)</td>
<td>1. Introduction (2:4b-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Light/darkness (1:3-5)</td>
<td>2. Man/dust (s:7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Luminaries separate days and seasons (1:14-19)</td>
<td>5. Tree of knowledge of good and evil separated from other trees (2:16-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>First creation of animal</td>
<td>6. First concern for a companion life (1:20-23) for man (2:18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Creation of animals and man</td>
<td>7. Concern for a companion for man continued (1:24-31) continued (2:19-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Conclusion (2:4a)</td>
<td>9. Conclusion (2:25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

event of the same historical nature and with the same theological purpose as the pre-Fall narrative of Eden.\(^7\) If the narratives of Gen 1-3 in fact have these associations, then “it should be possible to find coherence, concordance, and linguistic, literary, and thematic consistencies between them.”\(^8\) This particularity of the narratives directs the interpreter to consider the theological flow of the writers’ discourse and thought “as complementary perspectives of God’s creation in contrast to each other.”\(^9\) Consequently, the discussion in this chapter regarding the creation narrative must also reconsider whether the controlling motif of Gen 2-3 (sanctuary/temple) is present.

Admittedly, there are no verses in the creation account of Gen 1:1-2:4a that explicitly support the sanctuary/temple thesis.\(^10\) Indeed, the Hebrew text of the creation narrative does not include the word “temple” or “sanctuary.”\(^11\) However, two prominent syntactic/semantic and literary aspects of the text have been widely regarded as indicating the presence of sanctuary/temple imagery: the temple-building motif (including divine rest), and the fourth day of creation (in reference to two Hebrew key words). An overview and summary of the scholarly literature was already provided in chapter I, but it will now be helpful to reconsider the insights gained from that survey in more detail. Thus, the primary task of the following section is to examine how the temple-building

\(^7\) Two additional examples: (1) Gen 2 fleshes out the sixth day of creation, see Collins, *Genesis 1-4*, 101-40. (2) The creation narrative (Gen 1:1-2:1-4a) ends where the pre-fall narrative of Eden begins (Gen 2:4b-2:25): with the earth, see Fishbane, *Text and Texture*, 16.


\(^9\) Doukhan, *Genesis*, 72.

\(^10\) See Beale, *Temple and the Church’s Mission*, 49.

motif relates to the sanctuary/temple (more specifically to the sabbatical rest in Gen 2:1-3).

**Genesis 1:1-2:4a and the Temple-Building Motif**

It is indisputable that Gen 1:1,\(^{12}\) as the most important biblical text about creation, continues to be controversial.\(^{13}\) This verse is so well studied elsewhere that further reassessment here is not necessary for the purpose of our study. Yet, it seems pertinent to briefly mention an interesting perception of the text’s scope. Some scholars find that Gen 1:1 has two foci: the creation of the cosmos and the creation of this world.\(^{14}\) The following points provide a compelling argument for a double reading of “the beginning of the heavens and the earth.” (1) The expression בְּרֵאשִׁית, although grammatically in construct state (genitive relationship), should be read with the disjunctive accent (cf. Jer 26:1; 27:1; 28:1; 49:34). (2) The direct object הָאָָֽרֶץ אֵ֥ת הַשָמַָ֖יִם וְּאֵ֥ת not only refers to the human world (Lev 26:19; Isa 65:17; Jer 7:33; Deut 11:11), but also hints at the idea that this world is part of a universe (הַשָמַָ֖יִם) that existed before the human world (Deut 4:39; Neh 9:6; 1 Kgs 8:27; Job 16:19; Ps 11:4; Matt 5:16). (3) The word וְּהָאָָֽרֶץ in Gen 1:2 is prefixed with a conjunction waw depicting a contrast with the preceding הַשָמַָ֖יִם in Gen 1:1. This contrast would indicate that הָאָָֽרֶץ in Gen 1:1 refers to a place where life

\(^{12}\) בְּרֵאשִׁית בָרֶָ֣א אֱלֹהִֿ֑ים אֵ֥ת הַשָמַָ֖יִם וְּאֵ֥ת הָאָָֽרֶץ ("In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth").


\(^{14}\) Some scholars go even further and suggest that the word הָאָָֽרֶץ frequently translated as “the earth” can also be translated as “the land”—presumably an allusion to the land of Israel. See George L. Klein, “Reading Genesis 1,” *SwJT* 44.1 (2001): 36.
and light were already present and created (the first heavens, the abode of God). It seems that this double reading makes good sense for perceiving that “God created planet earth, having in mind the beauty and goodness of the great heavens in which He dwelt (see Exod 25:9, 40; Ps 78:69), a methodology that will reach its climax with God’s rest on the Sabbath (2:2-3).”

This notion would further suggest that Gen 1:1 introduces the canonical/biblical notion that וּלְאָדָם is not the only reality/creation having the divine-given image and likeness (cf. Gen 1:1; Ps 78:69), since there was a greater archetypal pattern in God’s plan when creating the heavens and the earth. This is not conclusive evidence that Gen 1:1 alludes to a temple-building motif, but it has the merit of harmonizing two dimensions: the absolute transcendence and cosmic perspective (Gen 1:1-2:4a) and the relative, immanent, and personal perspective (Gen 2:4b-25), a cosmic (heavenly) reality and an earthly reality.

More specifically, the most recognized connection between the sanctuary/temple and the creation narrative comes from the motif of temple building. As will be shown later, the motif of temple building connects the creation narrative and the divine instructions for the building of later sanctuaries/temples through parallel language/style.

This notion has led to the conclusion that “the temple and the world were considered


16 Doukhan, Genesis, 51.

17 See, for example, linguistic parallelism between Dan 8 and Gen 1 in Jacques B. Doukhan, Daniel: The Vision of the End (Berrien Springs: Andrews University, 1987), 61-62. See also the discussion below.
Congeneric in the days of the Hebrew Bible itself.”¹⁸ Scholars who advocate and explore the motif of temple building propose numerous links to support an intertextual relationship. In the following paragraphs, I will review these arguments with the purpose of determining crucial objections against a sanctuary/temple allusion in the creation account and/or the required biblical evidence to confirm such an allusion.

It must be recognized at the outset that allusions/references to particular narratives resonate through the Pentateuch.¹⁹ Literary/thematic parallels between the creation narrative and the book of Exodus have led to several inferences.²⁰ Joseph Blenkinsopp provided one of the first seminal studies in 1976. He observed two parallel expressions in what he called “the priestly-scribal” material (namely, the creation of the world, the construction of the sanctuary, the establishment of the sanctuary in the land, and the division of the land between the tribes). Blenkinsopp called these parallels (linguistic similarities) execution formulae and conclusion formulae.²¹ Yet, the first

---


¹⁹ See, for example, Clines’s proposal of the prefatory theme of Gen 1-11 that permeates the entire Pentateuch. David J. A. Clines, The Theme of the Pentateuch, JSOT (Sheffield: University of Sheffield, 1978), 66-86.

²⁰ To illustrate this point, divine speech seems to substantiate the relationship between the ten words (speeches) of Gen 1 and Exod 20. Dempster explains that “the next time God speaks ten words, it is at the creation, not of the world, but of a nation (Ex. 20:1-17). The echo of these world-creating words each resounds in the giving of the Torah. The cloud of glory covers the mountain for 6 days after which Moses is enabled to enter on the Sabbath to hear the instructions for the building of a tabernacle (Ex. 24:16-18), which itself is built in six stages culminating in the Sabbath rest, a clear echo of the seven-day pattern used in Genesis 1:1-2:3 (Ex. 25-31). And it is the building of the tabernacle, certainly an early form of the temple, which is the goal of the liberation of Israel, the presence of God with the people.” Stephen Dempster, “An ‘Extraordinary Fact’: Torah and Temple and the Contours of the Hebrew Canon,” TynBul 48.1 (1997): 50. Cf. Sarna, Exploring Exodus, 213ff.

²¹ See Blenkinsopp, “The Structure of P,” 275-80. The execution formulae would be as follows: “X did according to all that YHWH commanded him.” The linguistic similarities of the conclusion formulae would be as follows:
objection is that actual parallelism between the creation narrative and the construction of the wilderness sanctuary can be attested only for the conclusion formulae. He explains that “the creation of the world was not carried out according to specifications received from a higher source and therefore could not end with the usual formulaic expression.”

Blenkinsopp lists more than thirty instances in the Pentateuch (two in the book of Joshua) to illustrate how the priestly writer was concerned about the exact fulfillment of a divine pre-established plan. In addition, it should be noted that the wording, despite its similar style, does not follow a linguistic parallel/pattern in the strict sense of a literary arrangement. It could well be argued that equivalent wording/expressions were part of the editorial tradition, with no intention to associate both narratives. From the point of view of the historical order of the biblical narrative, it may be presumed that linguistic parallels/patterns had their origins, it terms of spatial and temporal aspects, in the words first spoken at creation. For our present purpose, it is important to bear in mind that the physical construction of the sanctuary and Noah’s Ark seem not to be the only construction projects that followed a divine specification (cf. Gen 6:14-16; Exod 25:2-9).

Certainly, the linguistic similarities proposed by Blenkinsopp prompt the reader to consider the existence of an archetype: creation prefiguring a sanctuary or a sanctuary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creation of the World</th>
<th>Construction of the Wilderness Sanctuary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Then God saw everything that He had made, and indeed it was very good. (Gen 1:31)</td>
<td>Then Moses looked over all the work, and indeed they had done it. (Exod 39:43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thus the heavens and the earth were finished. (Gen 2:1)</td>
<td>Thus all the work of the tabernacle of the tent of meeting was finished. (Exod 39:32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And on the seventh day God ended his work which He had done. (Gen 2:2)</td>
<td>So Moses finished the work. (Exod 40:33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then God blessed the seventh day. (Gen 2:3)</td>
<td>And Moses blessed them. (Exod 39:43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

prefiguring the cosmos. According to Blenkinsopp’s study, there appears to be a level of authorial intentionality to employ a common language in both narratives.

Peter Kearney offers a more detailed examination of the possible linguistic parallels between the creation narrative and Exod 25-40. His proposal emphasizes a framework of seven speeches (Exod 25-31): the first six (Exod 25:1-31:11) contain the instructions to build the wilderness sanctuary, and the seventh a command to observe the Sabbath (Exod 31:12-17). Kearney argues, using Exod 31:12-17 to support the sevenfold temple-building pattern, that “each of the seven speeches alludes to the corresponding day of creation in Gen 1:2:3.” These literary/thematic echoes raise the issue of literary dependence. It is still debated whether Exodus is using creation motifs or Genesis is borrowing temple-building motifs. However, if the creation account (Gen 1:1-2:4a) and the pre-Fall Eden narrative (Gen 2) were composed by the same author, and Gen 2 uses sanctuary/temple imagery, then one would expect to find linguistic coherence, literary concordance, and thematic consistencies. Consequently, the intertextual linkages are not reading back from Exodus to Genesis. The allusions to Gen

---


1-2 in Exod 25-40 are not only allusions to creation (sanctuary as a new creation), but also allusions to the original sanctuary/temple. The wilderness tabernacle is a paradigmatic return to the original sanctuary/temple of Eden, which at the same time is built according to the heavenly model.

For the present purpose, it is not necessary to be unduly concerned with all the diachronic issues involved. It suffices to observe that the literary usage of seven speeches (or sevenfold pattern) by itself does not necessarily indicate a structural role or a thematic association with the creation narrative; in the Old Testament there are several examples of sevenfold patterns that are not related to the sanctuary or to creation. Yet, a closer look reveals that the seventh day is the keystone of this sevenfold pattern.

Interestingly, Kearney limits his study to a rather short comment about the seventh speech (the command to observe the seventh-day Sabbath) and does not explore its significance. However, the contribution of this intertextual analysis seems to indicate that the notion of Sabbath rest in both narratives shows some sort of linkage. For example, in Davidson’s opinion, it is a striking parallel to note an arrangement of “raw materials” (Gen 1:1 and Exod 25:2-7) plus seven sections,29 in which the seventh section refers to the Sabbath.30

Moshe Weinfeld’s study of Gen 2:1-3 clarifies the intertextual relationship with Exod 20:11; 31:12-17 and Ps 132. He concludes that the entrance into God’s

---

29 The seven sections are paralleled with the seven days of creation: Exod 25:1–30; 30:11–16; 30:17–21; 30:22–33; 30:34–37; 31:1–11; and 31:12–17.

30 Davidson, “Earth's First Sanctuary,” 81-82.
sanctuary/temple was interpreted in Israel as “rest.” In other words, the sanctuary/temple is God’s resting place/space. Weinfeld is critical of some aspects of Kearney’s proposal, specifically, that the six commands in Exod 25-31 correspond to the six days of creation. Jon D. Levenson is also skeptical of Kearney’s proposal and considers it implausible. Yet, Levenson states with reference to the seventh-day rest:

Peter Kearney observes that P’s instructions about the Tabernacle in Exod 25-31 occur in seven distinct speeches of YHWH to Moses. Alone, this observation is inadequate to demonstrate a connection between P’s temple building project in the wilderness and P’s world building project in Gen 1:1-2:3. Not every heptad suggests creation; most do not. But Kearney goes on to point out that the sole subject of the seventh address is the high importance of sabbatical observance. Indeed, the conclusion of this last speech is an explicit reference to the sort of etiology of the Sabbath that we find in Gen 1:1-2:3.32.

It seems evident, according to Weinfeld and Levenson, that the real contribution of the temple-building motif, allegedly supported by parallels between the creation narrative and the building of the tabernacle, focuses upon the seventh-day rest. Weinfeld, citing U. Cassuto, further indicates that the relationship between the construction of the wilderness sanctuary and the seventh day is found in the linguistic parallel between Exod 24:15-16 and Exod 40:34-Lev 1:1.33 Moses’ six days of waiting (on Mount Sinai) parallel the six

32 Levenson, Creation and the Persistence, 83.
33 Parallels between the Mount Sinai story and the construction of the tabernacle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mount Sinai</th>
<th>Construction of the Wilderness Sanctuary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Then Moses went up into the mountain, and a cloud covered the mountain. (Exod 24:15)</td>
<td>Then the cloud covered the tabernacle of meeting, and the glory of the LORD filled the tabernacle. (Exod 40:34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now the glory of the LORD rested on Mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it six days. And on the seventh day He called to Moses out of the midst of the cloud. (Exod 24:16)</td>
<td>And Moses was not able to enter the tabernacle of meeting, because the cloud rested above it, and the glory of the LORD filled the tabernacle. (Exod 40:35) Now the LORD called to Moses, and spoke to him from the tabernacle of meeting (Lev 1:1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
days required to complete the creation of the world; thus, he concludes that “the tabernacle is a reflection of Mount Sinai.” For Weinfeld, in the same way that the tabernacle is a reflection of Mount Sinai, the tabernacle is a symbol of the universe. This biblical evidence of the sevenfold pattern leads him to believe that there is a connection between the Sabbath rest of the creation of the world and the so-called enthronement of God (cf. Pss 93, 29, 89). This connection is further supported by the conclusion of the narrative (Exod 40:34-38) when the building project is completed and God has descended from the mountain and taken up his residence in the tabernacle, signifying God’s presence in Gen 2:1-3. Although this correlation does not corroborate a direct allusion to the sanctuary/temple motif, it appears to hint at a kind of functional equivalence between the Sabbath (as a sanctuary/temple in time) and the later physical tabernacle. This parallelism shows that God’s presence in the midst of his people/Israel is a reality; sacred place/space has been instituted.

In his article “The Temple and the World,” Levenson takes a step forward.

Following Blenkinsopp and Weinfeld, he demonstrates additional connections with


35 In his scholarly work, no expression is found to signify the opposite, that is, that the universe is a symbol of the tabernacle, or that Mount Sinai is a reflection of the tabernacle. Weinfeld, “Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement,” 506-8.

36 It must be remembered that in Exod 35-40 the phrase “just as Yahweh had commanded” occurs seven times. Thus, the construction is divided into seven speeches/acts. Equally important, this sevenfold pattern is repeated in Exod 25-31 and Lev 1-7, 8. These patterns are all related to sacred space. See Gorman, The Ideology of Ritual, 48, 50.

37 This concept was advanced by Abraham J. Heschel: “The mythical mind would expect that, after heaven and earth have been established, God would create a holy place—a holy mountain or a holy spring—whereupon a sanctuary is to be established. Yet it seems as if to the Bible it is holiness in time, the Sabbath, which comes first.” Abraham J. Heschel, The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man (New York: Farrar Straus and Young, 1951), 9. Cf. A. J. Swoboda, Subversive Sabbath: The Surprising Power of Rest in a Nonstop World (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2018), see especially the section “Sabbath and Time,” 3-24.
regard to sevenfold patterns in the construction of Solomon’s temple (1 Kgs 6-8).\(^{38}\) One of Levenson’s main objectives seems to be the substantiation of the relationship between the Sabbath and the sanctuary/temple by giving major attention to passages in Exodus, Psalms, and Isaiah. Inexplicably, however, the biblical passage dealing with the Sabbath (Gen 2:1-3), which finalizes the heptadic structure of Gen 1,\(^{39}\) is left unexplored in Levenson’s study. To be sure, Levenson’s critical assessment of Kearney’s proposal demonstrates that “not every heptad suggests creation; most do not.”\(^{40}\) Even if both accounts follow a sevenfold pattern, the interpreter has to look for a valid reason to choose from several structural patterns containing the number seven in the Old Testament.\(^{41}\) Thus, it should be stressed that the presence of a heptadic pattern in Gen 1 would need more textual evidence to corroborate a sanctuary/temple reference.

Critics often argue that there is no explicit mention of the seventh day or the Sabbath when the narration of tabernacle building is completed (Exod 40:33). In response to this objection, Ross Winkle aptly considers that God’s glory filling the tabernacle

---


\(^{39}\) Credit should be given to Cassuto, who considers that this sevenfold pattern in Gen 1 indicates the homogeneity of the text. Cassuto, *Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, 13-14; Umberto Cassuto, “Biblical and Canaanite Literature” [in Hebrew], *Tarbiz* 13 (1942): 206-7.


(Exod 40:34) interconnects the creation and tabernacle with the Sabbath. Nonetheless, the relationship between the creation and the sanctuary/temple is still problematic in view of the fact that the instruction to observe the Sabbath (Exod 31:17) is given before the actual construction of the tabernacle, although it is significant that it comes immediately after the instructions to build the tabernacle. The question, rather, should be: Does the Sabbath rest indicate a divine sanctuary/temple activity or action?

The point of departure for exploring this question is to reassess the role and meaning of the seventh-day rest in the Old Testament’s references to creation. John H. Walton and Gregory K. Beale, summarizing previous research, concur that divine rest links the creation narrative and sanctuary/temple-building accounts. Whereas Beale’s explanation of divine rest seems to follow the conceptual contention that there were forces of chaos in the Genesis cosmology, Walton’s analysis focuses on the actual meaning of divine rest. He argues that “the main connection, however, is the rest motif, for rest is the principal function of a temple, and a temple is always where deity finds rest.” The question remains: What does it mean to “rest”?

---

42 Winkle concludes: “The heptadic pattern in the construction of the tabernacle in Exod 40 does not end with the reference to Moses finishing the work (v. 33), anymore than the account of creation beginning in Gen 1 does not end in 2:2 with the note that God had finished the work of creation. Rather, just as the account in Genesis continues on to show blessing and sanctification in relation to the cessation of God’s work of creation on the seventh day, so the tabernacle account continues—beyond the note of its completion—to show the expansion of YHWH’s glory throughout the tabernacle, while implicitly revealing the sanctification of the tabernacle through the consequent presence of YHWH’s glory (cf. 29:43).” Ross E. Winkle, “Creation and Tabernacle; Sabbath and Glory” (paper presented at Society of Biblical Literature. Boston, MA, November 2008), 15-16.

43 Beale, Temple and the Church’s Mission, 60-63.

Essentially, I have tried to indicate in the above analysis that one aspect of the temple-building motif—the seventh day—is key to dispute or substantiate an allusion to the sanctuary/temple in Gen 1:1-2:4a. Many of the conclusions, which derive from the parallels between the creation narrative and sanctuary/temple-building accounts, illustrate the systematic character of the seventh day. The function of the seventh day allegedly connects both narratives because it represents the same activity: “rest.” Scholars theorize this notion as the motif of divine rest. These reasons highlight the prominent role of the seventh day in view of sanctuary/temple allusions. I will now turn to a more detailed analysis of the creation Sabbath in Gen 2:1-3.

The Motif of Divine Rest

The connection between the narrative of creation and Israel’s construction of the tabernacle appears to be properly recognized, and the seventh-day Sabbath may shed further light on this relationship. The origin, purpose, and meaning of the seventh-day Sabbath have been extensively studied. 45 Recently, scholars have focused their attention on a sanctuary/temple framework to reinterpret the meaning of the creation Sabbath. 46 It must be conceded to sanctuary/temple advocates that the seventh day of the creation


46 Walton, Lost World of Genesis One, 72-77; Walton, Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology, 178-84.
week can be considered the climactic apex of the whole creation narrative and the key to its interpretation.\textsuperscript{47} On this point, Vervenne writes:

The narrative culminates in the creation of the human person with whom the completion of creation is accounted. This completion in fact culminates in the motif of the “seventh day” which, as we shall see, constitutes the climactic apex of the narrative and carries the key to reading the narrative and unlocking the meaning and function of the composition.\textsuperscript{48}

Particularly, the association between the seventh day (Gen 2:1-3) and the sanctuary/temple arises, at least as framed by current advocates, from the idea that “deity rests in a temple, and only in a temple. This is what the temples were built for.”\textsuperscript{49}

Therefore, scholars believe that if there is divine rest in the creation narrative, Gen 1:1-2:3 must be a sanctuary/temple scenario. The biblical evidence for this notion is elaborated in the context of passages that allude to sabbatical rest in the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{50}

This is how the meaning of “rest” in Gen 2:1-3\textsuperscript{51} is interpreted by sanctuary/temple advocates.


\textsuperscript{48} Vervenne, “Genesis 1:1-2:4,” 48. Wenham observes that “the only connection the seventh day has with the preceding days is sequence. Its character and formulae set it apart from the preceding six days. It is pre-eminently the day God ceased his creative work: of all the days the seventh is the only one blessed and sanctified. Its different literary form sets it apart in the narrative, just as the divine rest and sanctification set it apart in fact.” Wenham, \textit{Genesis 1-15}, 37.

\textsuperscript{49} Walton, \textit{Lost World of Genesis One}, 72.

\textsuperscript{50} Cf. Exod 20:11; Ps 132:7-8, 13-14; Isa 66:1.

\textsuperscript{51} In ANE creation myths, divine rest (divine \textit{otiositas}) involves the establishment of world order, by either eliminating obstacles or creating humankind. See further in Samuele Bacchiocchi, \textit{Divine Rest for Human Restlessness: A Theological Study of the Good News of the Sabbath for Today} (Berrien Springs: Samuele Bacchiocchi, 1980), 66. Cf. Raffaele Pettazzoni, \textit{Essays on the History of Religions}, trans. H. T. Rose (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1954), 24-36. Although research in the area of ANE extra-biblical literature is beyond the scope of this dissertation, it must be mentioned that additional lines of argumentation involve comparative studies with ANE texts such as the Enuma Elish story, the Baal Epic, the Atrahasis epic, and some Egyptian sources. See Timmer, \textit{Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath}, 74-79. For the moment, it is
Critics of the interpretation just described observe that “neither Gen 2:1-3 nor any other texts that look back at this moment has God dwelling in the structure just constructed.”

Consequently, in order to reevaluate these objections, I will endeavor to study specific aspects of the divine rest in Gen 2:1-3, and these findings will be explored against the broader backdrop of the Old Testament’s references to this text and God’s activity during the seventh day.

Divine Rest in the Creation Account

The Hebrew text and its translation read:

2:1 Thus the heavens and the earth, and all the host of them, were finished.

2:2 And on the seventh day God ended his work which He had done, and He rested on the seventh day from all his work which He had done.

2:3 Then God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it He rested from all his work which God had created and made.

important to bear in mind what Fishbane observed in a comparative analysis concerning the temple-building motif (divine rest). He writes that “the various non-Genesis creation traditions utilize poetic imagery and diverse sequences for the order of created things. They contain no reference to a set order of ‘days’ and do not mention the Sabbath at all.”


What does divine “Sabbath/rest” entail according to Gen 2:1-3? In the process of reevaluating the divine rest motif, it is important to reconsider specifically the meaning of the Hebrew verb יָשַׁב (šāḇāṯ; “cease,” “rest”) in relation to various related terms in this passage: קָלָה (kālâ‘; “cease,” “come to an end,” “finish”); בֹּרַך (bārāḵ; “bless”); קָדַש (qāḏāš; “set apart,” “consecrate”) and מְלָאכָה (məlā’ḵâ; “work”).

The Hebrew word from which the idea of “rest” derives is the verb יָשַׁב (šāḇāṯ) (in the qal). Generally, lexicographers and commentators concur that the basic meaning of יָשַׁב is “cease” or “come to an end” when it refers to the institution of the Sabbath.

The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament states:

The reference is to that behavior which constitutes the observance of the Sabbath itself or, in the manner of the Sabbath observance, to the conclusion of a specific process. In no instance does the vb. יָשַׁב as such mean ‘rest (from work),” and no evidence suggests that the vb. יָשַׁב itself derives from the noun שַׁבָּת.

However, the Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament suggests that the verb יָשַׁב indeed means “to rest” “when it is used in a Sabbath context, including Gen 2:1-3. The meaning “to celebrate” is also suggested. De Vaux argues that this verb as intransitive means “to stop” or “to cease” (cf. Gen 8:22; Jos 5:12), and as transitive means “to make to cease or stop” (cf. Exod 5:5; Isa 13:11; Jer 7:34). De Vaux further states that “this is


55 E. Haag, יָשַׁב, TDOT 14:385.


57 Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, יָשַׁב, HALOT 2:1407.
the etymology which the Bible itself puts forward in Gen 2:2-3. Did God “cease his work” or “rest from his work” on the seventh day of the creation week? How do these two meanings bear relevance to the motif of divine rest? Does שָבַת imply both meanings? At first glance, the last question can be answered in the affirmative. This alternative opinion is of paramount significance because those who have promoted the sanctuary/temple framework generally emphasize the meaning of “rest.” It may be argued that “cease” or “come to an end” lends a different nuance of meaning, or perhaps, rules out a possible sanctuary/temple allusion. However, it does not matter for our purposes whether or not these two definitions are combined in Gen 2:2-3. The essential question, rather, should be whether שָבַת is a sanctuary/temple activity.

58 De Vaux, Ancient Israel, 475.

59 Cassuto argues that both meanings are incorrect. Instead, he considers that שָבַת has the negative connotation “not to do work” or “to abstain from work” (cf. Exod 23:12; 34:21). See Cassuto, Commentary on the Book of Genesis, 63. The Greek version of the Old Testament (LXX) translates שָבַת as καταπαύω, meaning “to cease some activity, stop, rest.” William Arndt, et al., “καταπαύω,” BDAG, 524. For a study of the rest motif in the LXX see Erhard H. Gallos, “Katapausis and Sabbatismos in Hebrews 4” (PhD diss., Andrews University, 2011), 119-40.

60 A literal translation of the Hebrew יַשָּׁבֶת (Gen 2:2b) would be “And He [God] ceased by the seventh day from all his work which He had made” (my own translation).

61 According to the TLOT the verb יַשָּׁבֶת occurs twenty-seven times in the qal (in direct or indirect relationship with the Sabbath, יַשָּׁבֶת): Gen 2:2f [2x]; Exod 16:30; 23:12; 31:17; 34:21 [2x]; Lev 23:32; 25:2; 26:34, 35 [2x]; 2 Chr 36:21; Also, Gen 8:22; Josh 5:12; Isa 14:4 [2x]; 24:8 [2x]; 33:8; Jer 31:36; Hos 7:4; Job 32:1; Prov 22:10; Lam 5:14f.; Neh 6:3). Stolz, “שָבַת,” TLOT 3:1298-99. The relationship between these two words is evident from their frequent combination throughout the biblical narrative. It is still highly disputed whether שָבַת is derived from שַבָת or vice versa; see North, “The Derivation of Sabbath,” 182ff. Nevertheless, it is linguistically possible that both words derived from the same root. See Gerhard F. Hasel, “The Sabbath in the Pentateuch,” in The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand and Daniel Augsburger (Washington: Review and Herald, 1982), 24.

A structural analysis might be helpful to further elucidate the meaning of שָבַת. The change of literary style and rhythm in Gen 2:1-3 in comparison with the previous six days of creation is well known. Wallace explains the various differences between the weekdays and the seventh-day Sabbath. For example, he explains that Gen 2:1-3 breaks with the set formula established for the other six days. See Howard N. Wallace, “Rest for the Earth,” in The Earth Story in Genesis, ed. Norman C. Habel and Shirley Wurst (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 50-55. Levenson observes that “Gen 2:1-3 consist of thirty five words, twenty one of which form three sentences of seven words, each of which includes the expression
The lexical analysis tells us that the seventh day of the creation week is better understood by the notion of God “ceasing” his work than “resting.” However, the idea that in Sabbath contexts the verb שָבַת usually bears the consequent meaning of rest cannot be rejected. It is in these cases that “the absence of lexical evidence does not ‘the seventh day.’” Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence*, 67. The literary style and rhythm of this passage takes the form of the following chiasm (A-B-C-B’-A’). This structure is adapted from Kenneth A. Strand, “The Sabbath,” in *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, ed. Raoul Dederen (Hagerstown: Review and Herald, 2000), 495. Cf. Andreasen, *The Old Testament Sabbath*, 190; Mathilde Frey, “The Sabbath in the Pentateuch: An Exegetical and Theological Study” (PhD diss., Andrews University, 2011), 37.

A. The heavens and the earth were finished (vv. 1, 2a).
B. . . . He ceased by the seventh day from all his work (v. 2b).
C. God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it (v. 3a).
B’. . . . because in it He ceased from all his work (v. 3b).
A’. . . . which God had created and made (v. 3c).

This form of chiasm indicates that inasmuch as A-B and B’-A’ point out the completeness of the creative work of God, C is the apex of the passage. Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath*, 67. In other words, the center of the passage revolves around the verbal actions בָרַך [bārāḵ; “bless”] and קָדַש [qādāš; “set apart,” “consecrate”]. These two verbal actions strongly suggest a sacred institution. H. Ross Cole, “The Sabbath and Genesis 2:1-3,” *AUSS* 41.1 (2003): 5. This conclusion counters Andreasen’s suggestion (with von Rad, M. Noth, W. H. Schmidt) that Gen 2:1-3 is not concerned with the Sabbath institution at all, but only with God’s rest. Andreasen further writes that “this means that the creation Sabbath is not conceived of as a socio-religious, or cultic phenomenon. . . . It [creation Sabbath] explains the divine otiositas as the seventh day of creation on which the Creator has completed, and therefore, stops, his activity.” Andreasen, *The Old Testament Sabbath*, 194. In a later article Andreasen seems to rephrase this suggestion; see Andreasen, “Recent Studies,” 466-67. The notion behind the verb שָבַת is that “ultimately the Sabbath was assumed to be a day without work.” Laansma, “I Will Give You Rest,” 61-62.

The immediate context (Gen 1:1-2:4a) of שָבַת may also yield crucial hints as to what divine rest entails. From the perspective of the compositional structure of the creation narrative, the linguistic and thematic correspondence between Gen 1:1-3 and Gen 2:1-4a (God is the Creator of all things) denotes a chiastic linkage. “The mood of the prologue now resurfaces in this epilogue” Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis*, 141; Fishbane, *Text and Texture*, 9. Indeed, several structuring elements of the first creation account indicate both similarities and differences between the six weekdays and the seventh day. These characteristics describe the beginning and end conditions of creation. After the sixth day of creation “there is no more work to be added, no more separation to be performed, and no more assessment to be carried out.” See more details in Frey, “Sabbath in the Pentateuch,” 19-23.

English translations often render שָבַת with the meaning of “rest”; see, for example, ASV; NIV; NKJV; WYC; WEB; RSVCE; OJB; NRSV; NLT; NCV; NASB; ESV. The notion of “cease” or “come to an end” is observed in YLT; NET; NOG; TLB; ISV.

constitute evidence of semantic absence.” Thus, what happens afterwards, when God “rested from all his work,” is an implicit subsequent idea/event that, as we will see, the biblical narrative unfolds later. For the moment, it seems safe to perceive that the Sabbath in Gen 2:1-3 is about ceasing completely from work.

In short, Gen 2:1-3 gives the idea that God ceased from his work, but the content of this passage does not explicitly include a reference to rest or refreshment. Although for some scholars the idea that God is inviting humankind to rest or be refreshed is theologically sound, it seems that the focus of the text is beyond this interpretation. The subject is not humankind: it is God. The rendering of שָבַת as the English word “rest” has caused difficulties for biblical scholars. If interpreters want to use “rest” to describe God’s activity, the semantic range of it must be rearticulated. Davidson proposes seven dimensions to understand and describe Sabbath rest. He focuses on the spiritual potential of the seventh day for humans and believes that “in the Sabbath one may see heavenly

64 Timmer, Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath, 68.
66 Mathews, Genesis 1-11:26, 178. Cassuto explains that Gen 2:1-3 “avoids all possible use of anthropomorphic expressions in order to teach us, particularly in the account of creation, how great is the gulf between Creator and the created.” Cassuto, Commentary on the Book of Genesis, 63. The interpretation with the semantic import of the verb שָׁבַת seems more plausible as “God ceased from his creative work” (cf. Gen 8:22; Jer 31:36). It has been shown repeatedly that “ceasing” is a better fit than “resting.” See Samuel R. Driver, The Book of Genesis (London: Methuen, 1904), 18; John Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis (New York: Scribner, 1910), 37; Sigve Tonstad, The Lost Meaning of the Seventh Day (Berrien Springs: Andrews University, 2009), 32; Timmer, Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath, 68; Bacchiocchi, Divine Rest, 66. Cf. Richard M. Davidson, A Love Song for the Sabbath (Washington: Review and Herald, 1988), 27-28; McKeown, Genesis, 28. God does not need to rest (Isa 40:28), in the sense of human fatigue.
light refracted through all the facets of divine rest available to humankind."

Interestingly, Davidson builds this multidimensional experience of the Sabbath upon the experience (or activity) of God himself. One thing, nonetheless, is certain: it can be said that God’s interaction with creation on the seventh day enters a new facet. God is Creator during all seven days, but God’s activity during days one to six differs from that of the seventh day. The challenge resides in the understanding of “rest” as God’s activity. It is precisely the analysis of this concept that may bring forward evidence to perceive שָבַת in Gen 2 as alluding to a sanctuary/temple framework or activity.

Divine Rest in the Old Testament

What do שָבַת and/or divine rest entail according to the Old Testament? The origin of the motif of divine rest is highly disputed. This is a massive subject that covers a very broad range of words, themes, and passages, as indeed Jon Laansma has demonstrated. Among all possible explanations, the biblical evidence is of major importance for our study. Since the meaning of שָבַת is established by its use in a particular context, for the purpose of our research it will suffice to conduct an intertextual study of specific passages connected with the context of Gen 2:1-3. Particular

---

68 The seven dimensions proposed by Davidson are physical (work-free), mental (intellectual), emotional (restorative), creative (celebrative/social), spiritual (Gospel), blessed (empowering), and holy (intimate) rest. See Richard M. Davidson, “Sabbath, Spirituality and Mission: Torah’s Seven Dimensions of Sabbath Rest,” in Encountering God in Life and Mission: A Festschrift Honoring Jon Dybdahl, ed. Maier Rudi (Berrien Springs: Department of Workd Mission, Andrews University, 2010), 17.


70 Laansma, “I Will Give You Rest,” 17-76.

interest must be given to passages linked to the verbal idea of שָבַת. Some of the closest biblical parallels are not found in passages related to creation (Exod 20:11; 31:17), but in passages that portray divine rest in Zion (cf. Ps 132:7-8, 13-14; Isa 66:1, 2a). This fact uncovers two dimensions (perhaps inseparable) of the rest motif in the Old Testament: humankind’s or Israel’s rest and God’s sabbatical rest.

**Humankind’s (Israel’s) Sabbatical Rest**

In Exod 20:11 the verb נֻחַ [$nu^v'h$; “rest,” “settle down”] is a determinant element in divine rest passages connected with the notion of creation. In this regard, the first observation concerning the rest motif is categorical. According to the fourth commandment, found in Exod 20:8-11, the rest motif is as old as creation itself.

Regardless of the intertextual directionality between Gen 2:1-3 and Exod 20:11, which is a diachronic concern, there seems to be no serious objection to the idea that the writer of Exod 20:11 associated its meaning with the Sabbath text of the creation narrative (Gen 2:1-3). The main point here is the literary (verbal and thematic) parallelism in the two passages:

---


73 This verb indicates at least three dimensions of rest: נֻחַ alludes to a place granted by God (Exod 33:14; Deut 3:20; Josh 1:13-15; 22:4; 1 Chr 14:5). נֻחַ alludes also to peace and security from enemies (Deut 12:10; 25:19; Josh 21:44; 23:1; 2 Sam 7:1, 11; 1 Kgs 5:18 [5:4]; 1 Chr 22:9, 18; 23:25; 2 Chr 14:6; 15:15; 20:30; 32:22). נֻחַ may also allude to cessation of sorrow and labor in the future (Isa 14:3; 28:12).

74 However, it should be admitted, with A. T. Lincoln, that Exod 20:8-11 represents a more explicit mandate to rest on the seventh-day Sabbath. A. T. Lincoln, “From Sabbath to Lord’s Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation,” in *From Sabbath to Lord’s Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation*, ed. D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), 351-58.

75 See, for example, Andreasen’s tradition-historical discussion: Andreasen, “Recent Studies,” 465.
The Fourth Commandment (Exod 20)

20:11b And rested the seventh day. Therefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it.

The Sabbath Text in the Creation Narrative (Gen 2)

2:3a Then God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it He ceased.

These passages mirror each other. Yet, it is important to observe that while divine rest is described by שָבַת in Gen 2, Exod 20 describes the same divine activity with the verb נוּחַ along with the same expressions and motifs. These verbs can describe unrelated/different actions, as shown above; they are not synonymous, and their variations must be noted. Bacchiocchi observes that the verb נוּחַ occurs in Exod 20:11 where God’s pattern of work-rest is given in the function of the commandment, but in Gen 2 the verb שָבַת is “used because the function of God’s rest is different. It fulfills a cosmological rather than an anthropological function.” While the cosmological function of divine rest of the creation Sabbath is true, complete differentiation/separation between

76 A number of scholars claim that the seventh day in Gen 2:1-3 does not correspond to the Sabbath. See for example, H. P. Dressler, “The Sabbath in the Old Testament,” in From Sabbath to Lord’s Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation, ed. D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), 23, 28; Gerhard Von Rad, Genesis: A Commentary, 2nd ed., trans. John A. Marks (London: SCM, 1972), 60; Westermann, Genesis 1-11, 237. The tenor of our argument here goes instead to consider that the Sabbath rest, and therefore the Sabbath as cultic institution, is not a later Mosaic idea given only to Israel. Clearly, “the hallowing of the seventh day at Creation cannot be seen as anything other than the consecration of the Sabbath.” Tonstad, Lost Meaning, 25; Hasel, “Sabbath in the Pentateuch,” 23.

77 Bacchiocchi, Divine Rest, 66-67.
the cosmological and the anthropological function of Sabbath rest should not be urged. Divine rest and humankind’s (Israel’s) rest may represent the same motif.\(^{78}\)

The lexical usage of the verb הָנָה also suggests a possible relationship to the noun from the same root, מְנֻחָה [מְנֻהָה; “rest,” “resting place”]. Where is this מְנֻחָה? God’s portentous intervention in Israel’s deliverance from Egypt was intended to confer to the redeemed people a מְנֻחָה (Deut 12:9; cf. Ps 95:11). In memory of this redemptive event, Israel was commanded in Deut 5:15 to rest on (to observe) the Sabbath day (יָמִי הַשַבָָֽת לַעֲשָ֖וֹת).\(^{79}\) Yet, this מְנֻחָה is only reached in the Promised Land (Deut 6:23). Laansma claims that any identification of the מְנֻחָה of Ps 95:11 with the temple is untenable. He asserts that “it is possible that the whole land with Zion at its center was being construed as at once Israel’s and YHWH’s מְנֻחָה. The covenantal blessings of the land as a מְנֻחָה, blessings bound up with God’s presence among them.”\(^{80}\) (Cf. Exod 15:17).

The passages Exod 23:12 and 31:17, according to Cassuto, clearly indicate that notions of “rest” (הָנָה) and “refreshment” (נָפַש) are only the outcome of חָנַף.\(^{81}\)

---

\(^{78}\) Three elements can further support this suggestion. First, both passages describe a literal/historical seven-day week. See Richard M. Davidson, “The Biblical Account of Origins,” JATS 14.1 (2003): 15. Cf. Henry M. Morris, Biblical Cosmology and Modern Science (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1970), 59; Fretheim, “Were the Days,” 19-21; Robert V. McCabe, “A Defense of Literal Days in the Creation Week,” DBSJ 5 (2000): 110-11. Second, both texts state that God שָבַת and/or הָנָה on the seventh day. Third, both texts link שָבַת and מְנֻחָה with the divine activity depicted by חָנַף and/or מְנֻחָה. Additionally, Hebrew syntax points to the idea that the verbal actions indicated by שָבַת and מְנֻחָה in Exod 20:11a should be interpreted in function of and/or in consequence of חָנַף, as the meaning of this clause is governed by מְנֻחָה. It is the action of מְנֻחָה that is the cause for שָבַת and מְנֻחָה, and the cause for חָנַף is מְנֻחָה. Accordingly, the reason for humankind’s keeping the Sabbath (by מְנֻחָה) is that God שָבַת in it at creation.

\(^{79}\) De Vaux, Ancient Israel, 481.

\(^{80}\) Laansma, “I Will Give You Rest,” 59.

\(^{81}\) Cassuto, Commentary on the Book of Genesis, 63.
Wolff proposes that Exod 31:17 should be understood as meaning that the “creator must rest because he had become exhausted from his work of creation.” However, Wolff’s reading of the text distorts the verb נָפַש. This verb speaks rather of God “breathing freely” after he נָשָׁר. Such language had a didactic purpose to impress upon the Israelites the awareness of God’s dominion over creation.

There are themes in the Old Testament that shine a great deal of additional light on this subject. Israel (and humankind) learns to keep the Sabbath holy from the perspective of a historical reference to God’s activity in the creation narrative (Exod 20:11), where holiness is linked to a divine abstention from work. What do the Israelite activities on the Sabbath day reveal about divine rest? The actual practices of Israel during the day of rest/cessation from work may shed light on the first day of rest/cessation from work. The fourth commandment required God’s people to abstain from work activities, which the pentateuchal books specify in more detail (cf. Exod 16:23; 34:21; Lev 24:8; Num 15:32; 28:9). Indeed, this commandment was to be observed even during the construction of the sanctuary (Exod 31:14-17). Yet, Israelites were not expected to abstain (cease/rest) from all activity. Thus, if the Israelites

84 The divine dimension of נָשָׁר and נוּח in this context seems to move away from the notion of relaxation without necessarily excluding God’s ability to do so. Yet, it is the verb נָפַש [nāpāš; “take breath,” “refresh”] that comes close to the notion of “rest,” and it occurs only three times (Exod 23:12; 31:17 and 2 Sam 16:14). Interestingly, Exod 31:17 is the only occurrence in which God is the subject, and it refers to the seventh day.
87 Lev 23:1-3 indicates that the Sabbath is included among the cultic festivals, and therefore all activities during this day are devoted to God in communal worship (cf. Exod 16:23, 25; 20:10; 31:15;
followed the creation pattern but did not cease totally from all activities, it raises the possibility that when God שָבַת during the seventh day, his divine rest may have involved some sort of engagement in sacred activities.

The notion of “rest” in the Old Testament emerging from the idea of rest in the land (Deut 12:10; cf. Josh 21:44; 23:1) carries significance with Israel’s establishment in the Promised Land (Ps 95:11; cf. Exod 15:17). Hasel, drawing from M. Tsevat’s work, comments that “just as the ancient Israelite renounced his sole possession of the land and his right to exploit it, thereby acknowledging the lordship of Yahweh in the Sabbatical year, so on the weekly Sabbath he was to acknowledge Yahweh’s dominion over time and thus over himself.” It is indeed observed by exegetes of the Sabbath texts that YHWH’s act of releasing Israel from Egypt’s bondage and bringing the nation to its מְנוּחָה fulfilled the Sabbath rest. As will be noted below, Israel’s sacred place and time

34:21; 35:2). On this point, Lincoln stresses the idea that “resting itself could be considered an act of worship, but cultic worship was not a major focus of the Sabbath institution for Israel.” Lincoln, “From Sabbath to Lord’s Day,” 352. However, Lincoln does not take into account the dynamic literary relationship in Gen 2:3a between of בָּרַךְ and קָדַשׁ, in which the semantic predominance of שָבַת leads to worship and sacredness of time.


89 Andreasen, “Recent Studies,” 459. Rordorf, among others, proposes that according to Deut 5:12-15 the humanitarian and sociological aspects of the Sabbath lead to the original/primary meaning of the seventh day of cessation/rest. Willy Rordorf, Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church, trans. A. Graham (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), 15-17. Andreasen, on the other hand, considers that these humanitarian and sociological aspects were a later broadening to the fourth commandment. He argues that the original Sabbath law in the Decalogue is addressed to “free Israelites who did not need a Sabbath regulation to take time off from work.” Andreasen, “Recent Studies,” 461. In another article, published in 1974, emphasizing the theological meaning of “rest,” Andreasen concludes that Sabbath is not characterized by the worshiper’s freedom from work: it is better characterized by his freedom for God and his redemption. Niels-Erik A. Andreasen, “Festival and Freedom: A Study of an Old Testament Theme,” Int 28.3 (1974): 296.

90 Laansma, “I Will Give You Rest,” 63.
of rest is referred to in Exod 15:17 as “mountain of your inheritance” and “sanctuary.”

Thus, the sovereign kingship/rulership of God determines the sacred time/place of humankind.

God’s Sabbatical Rest

Gen 2:1-3 is the first passage in the biblical narrative to mention God’s rest. This text focuses on divine rather than human Sabbath-keeping. This rest has a cosmic outlook. Yet, the creation Sabbath is not the only reference to God’s rest. All subsequent references to Israel’s rest in the Old Testament involve and allude to God. In Gen 2:1-3, both God’s place and time of rest are described: the newly created heavens and earth (which are blessed) and the seventh-day Sabbath (which is sanctified). The connection between sacredness and rest pervades place and time, divine and human dimensions. This seems to be the case in Exod 15:17, which is the first occurrence of the word מִקְּדָשׁ [mikdāš; sanctuary, sacred place]. This verse portrays a close relationship between God’s and Israel’s sacred/time of rest. Whatever the origin of this verse, it may be suggested that it is a reference to Zion, as מִקְּדָשׁ is associated with מִקְּדָשׁ כּוֹנְנּוּ בְַהַר נַחֲלָתְךָ מָכ֔וֹן לְשִבְתְך֛ פָעַלָ֖ת יְהוָֽה מִקְדָּשׁ ("in the mountain of your inheritance . . . for your own

91 Exod 15:17: “You will bring them in and plant them in the mountain of your inheritance, in the place, O Lord, which you have made for your own dwelling, the sanctuary, O Lord, which your hands have established.”

92 Andreasen, Rest and Redemption, 75-76.

93 Laansma, “I Will Give You Rest,” 64.


95 Exod 15:17: מִקְּדָשׁ כּוֹנְנּוּ בְַהַר נַחֲלָתְךָ מָכ֔וֹן לְשִבְתְך֛ פָעַלָ֖ת יְהוָֽה מִקְדָּשׁ ("You will bring them in and plant them in the mountain of your inheritance, in the place, O Lord, which you have made for your own dwelling, the sanctuary, O Lord, which your hands have established.”

dwellings. . ."). On this point, Sailhamer stresses that “the allusions to God’s ‘making’ and ‘building’ the place of his habitation and sanctuary in Exod 15:17 point to Gen 2, if not also the whole of the creation narrative in Gen 1:1-2:3.”

Thus three great biblical motifs/realities transcending place and time conclude the victory song in Exod 15:17: “God’s creation of a people, God’s eternal holy dwelling place as the home for that people, and the eternal reign of God supreme over all things.”

It was indicated above that some passages linked to divine rest portray Zion as God’s resting place. In fact, this rest is so special that God calls it his rest. Central to this discussion is Isa 66:1-2a (cf. 2 Chr 6:41; 28:2). The Hebrew text and its translation read:

66:1 Thus says the LORD: "Heaven is my throne, And earth is my footstool. Where is the house that you will build me? And where is the place of my rest?

66:2a For all those things my hand has made, And all those things exist," Says the LORD.

At first glance, this text seems to indicate that the house being built cannot be God’s space/place of rest. Advocates of sanctuary/temple allusions in Gen 1 argue that this passage “refers to a cosmos-sized temple, a connection between temple and rest, and a

connection between creation and temple." Critics of this idea maintain that Isa 66:1-2a does not allude to the creation of the cosmos, but to Zion theology. The juxtaposition of these proposals is not necessarily conflicting. The following observations will show that they intersect with each other in a number of ways.

Divine rest is a central element in the relationship between the creation of the cosmos and Zion theology for several reasons. First, the biblical evidence (Isa 66:1; cf. Ps 132; Isa 11:12) indicates that God’s מְנוּחָה alludes to the sanctuary/temple’s throne. For example, in Isa 11:12 God’s throne is in the temple located on Mount Zion, from where the effect of God’s reign, God’s glorious מְנוּחָה, radiates out to the whole earth.

Second, the only divine rest subsequent to that of Gen 2:1-3 occurs in the creation of Israel, which is instituted on Mount Zion. Third, that God rested after making the world/humankind, but before establishing/creating the nation of Israel, is evidence that divine rest is inherently connected with human affairs (the humankind/God relationship).

In addition to the emphasis on identifying rest with the Promised Land, there is a broader dimension to ponder. This aspect is cosmic, as it is related to the presence of God. Thus rest is associated with the ark of God or the temple via the verb נוּחַ and the


104 For Andreasen the idea “that the Creator should rest after making the world and humankind, but before making his people Israel, is to the Old Testament and to P a preposterous idea.” Andreasen, *The Old Testament Sabbath*, 185. However, this seems to be an assumption, because it is rather consistent with traditional ideas foundational to the belief that “the order of creation is not fully finished until Israelite society and the tabernacle cult are constructed.” Gorman, *The Ideology of Ritual*, 230.
noun מְּנוּחָה. Kaiser aptly observes that “rest is where the presence of God stops (as in the wilderness wanderings, Num 10:33) or dwells (as in Palestine, Ps 132: 8, 14; Isa 66:1; 1 Chr 28:2). It was for this reason, no doubt, that David stressed the aspects of belief and trust for this rest in Ps 95:11.”

Biblical scholars who advocate for sanctuary/temple allusions in Gen 1 find additional evidence in Ps 132:7-8, 13-14. The Hebrew text and its translation read:

132:7 Let us go into his tabernacle; Let us worship at his footstool.

132:8 Arise, O LORD, to Your resting place, You and the ark of Your strength.

132:13 For the LORD has chosen Zion; He has desired it for his dwelling place:

132:14 This is my resting place forever; Here I will dwell, for I have desired it.

This passage refers twice to the מְּנוּחָה of God. Whereas Gen 2:1-3 tells the reader that God ceased (ceased/rested), that his time was the seventh day and his space/place was the heavens and earth, Ps 132:7-8, 13-14 identifies the ark or throne as God’s resting place (מְּנוּחָה). More precisely, in Ps 132:7-8, 13-14 the sanctuary/temple “is designed as the place of rest.” Ps 78:69 seems to indicate a similar idea: “And He built his

---

105 Kaiser, “Theology of Rest,” 140.
sanctuary like the heights, like the earth which He has established forever.” God’s rest occurs in the same sacred time/space.

It is important to note that when divine rest is accomplished in Zion, national and political security is obtained in Israel. Evidently, this sanctuary/temple rest pertains to Israel’s fulfillment of God’s plans in the Promised Land. It should be clear that the creation rest was God’s original plan to govern the heavens and earth and that the later promise of rest reflects and derives from it.108

Therefore, if the creation rest is God’s original plan to govern the heavens and earth, the question would be this: What is the relationship between divine rest (שָבַת and נוּחַ) and the kingship of God? Pss 29, 89, 93 is the only textual evidence for this association, apart from references to rabbinic literature and ANE myths.109 Particularly, Ps 93 relates the creation of the world to the proclamation of God as king. The

108 Advocates of sanctuary/temple allusions argue that the Old Testament idea of the enthronement of God is related to the divine activity described by the verbs נוּחַ and שָבַת (divine rest). The first step to elucidate the significance of this relationship is to validate the meaning of the enthronement of God. Was there a feast of the enthronement of God? There are two biblical passages portraying a ceremony or procession in which God’s sanctuary/temple was installed: 2 Sam 6:1-23 and 1 Kgs 8:1-12. On the basis of 1 Kgs 8:2 (“Therefore all the men of Israel assembled with King Solomon at the feast [בֶחָ֑ג] or at the festival] in the month of Ethanim, which is the seventh month”), this ceremony was probably conducted during the feast of the tents or tabernacles. Simon J. De Vries, 1 Kings, WBC 12 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2003), 124. Interpreters who seek cultic festivals in the Old Testament have matched this ceremony and ascribed such cultic customs to some psalms (Pss 47, 93, 96-99), often termed “psalms of the enthronement of God.” See Sigmund Mowinckel, Psalm Studies, trans. Mark E. Biddle, Society of Biblical Literature History of Biblical Studies 2 (Atlanta: SBL, 2014), 183-306. In view of the fact that there is no biblical text that explicitly establishes a date for a New Year festival, scholars resort to connecting it with the feast of the tabernacles. According to De Vaux, it is paradoxical to argue that the feast of the tabernacles, an agricultural celebration, would also have a historical character in the celebration of creation. De Vaux, Ancient Israel, 504, 506. Moreover, De Vaux notes correctly, according to Israel’s religious concepts, it is impossible to know who has enthroned יְּהוֶָ֣ה מָלָךְ. Consequently, the Hebrew expression יְּהוֶָ֣ה מָלָךְ in these psalms does not mean “the Lord has become King,” but rather, is an acclamation that acknowledges the royal character of God. Therefore, these psalms are not enthronement psalms; rather, one may consider that their function is to acclaim the kingship of God. De Vaux, Ancient Israel, 505.

establishment of God’s throne and the establishment of the earth are paralleled as one event. Moreover, this psalm associates these events with God’s dwelling place or house (ְבַיִת). It is evident, according to Ps 93, that the sovereign kingship/rulership of God is the connection between God’s dwelling place (temple) and creation. God’s kingship/rulership is established and confirmed by the verbal actions שָבַת and נוּחַ. This suggestion follows the idea that “the temple and the world stand in an intimate and intrinsic connection. The two projects cannot be ultimately distinguished or disengaged. Each recounts how God brought about an environment in which he can find rest.”

The connection between Sabbath and temple in Isa 65:17-18 and 66:1-2 further supports the idea of rest as the kingship of God. First, Isa 65:17-18 indicates that the ultimate purpose of כִָֽי־הִנְּנִ֥י בוֹרֵ֛א שָמַ֥יִם חֲדָשִָ֖ים וָאֶָ֣רֶץ חֲדָשָ֑ה “For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth” parallels the kingship of God at Jerusalem (cf. Gen 1:1 and 2 Chr 36:23). The expression בָרָ֥א אֱלֹהִָ֖ים in Gen 1:1 and 2:3 indicates the ultimate authority of creating וָאֶָ֣רֶץ חֲדָשָ֑ה, where God extends his royal dominion during the sabbatical activity of rest. Then, when God promises that the former world will be forgotten by בוֹרֵ֛א שָמַ֥יִם חֲדָשִָ֖ים וָאֶָ֣רֶץ חֲדָשָ֑ה, it reflects his sovereign authority and royal dominion that is revealed from the sanctuary/temple, particularly by divine rest. Second, 66:1-2 is taken to be the most unequivocal evidence of the association between Sabbath and temple (meaning rest as kingship of God). As discussed above, this passage

---


111 Note from these two texts that the Hebrew Bible begins with God’s command to create heaven and earth, and ends with the command of the God of heaven and earth to build a temple.

is not indicating that God does not need a temple.\textsuperscript{113} Isa 66:1-2 is a rhetorical expression underlining the insignificance of the earth and its inhabitants compared with God’s cosmic kingship/rulership.\textsuperscript{114}

**Sabbatical Rest: Engagement or Disengagement**

Thus far it has been observed that the meaning of “rest” is related to the divine prerogative of kingship/rulership. However, scholars disagree on the nature of “rest” in the creation account. They propose two different forms of rest: “disengagement” (inactivity) versus “engagement” (activity). According to Levenson, Gen 2:1-3 gives the impression that God’s rest is a state of mellow euphoria, or disengagement. He writes that “God’s otiosity on the seventh day of the Priestly cosmogony exhibits features that cannot be exhaustively explained by reference to the Sabbath.”\textsuperscript{115} On the other hand, Walton assumes the idea of engagement, suggesting that the only divine rest in the Bible is associated with God’s sovereign/royal presence in his temple.\textsuperscript{116} This notion combines God’s activity of rest and his freedom to rule the world.\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{113} De Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 328-30.

\textsuperscript{114} Additionally, it has been suggested that “the Israelite priesthood dramatized the conclusion of the creation by means of the Sabbath, just as the peoples of the ancient Near East dramatized their creation epics in cultic dramas. This drama [was] perhaps a part of an enthronement festival or New Year celebration, cultic ceremonies for which definitive textual evidence is lacking.” See Walton, *Lost World of Genesis One*, 91; Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence*, 58-75; Andreasen, *The Old Testament Sabbath*, 188; Moshe Weinfeld, “The Creator God in Genesis 1 and in the Prophecy of Second Isaiah,” *Tarbiz* 37.2 (1968): 109-16. Although these hints seem to connect creation, the sanctuary/temple, and the Sabbath rest, they are more likely dependent on extra-biblical culture and literature.

\textsuperscript{115} Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence*, 109.


\textsuperscript{117} There are at least two observations to ponder considering these two notions in a possible sanctuary/temple scenario. First, the nature of divine rest and its implications for humanity tend to affirm Block’s observation: Gen 1:3 “is a royal world, with the man being cast as a king, invested with the status of ‘image of God’ (בְּצֶ֥לֶם אֱלֹהִָ֖ים; Gen 1:26-27) and charged to subdue (כָבַש) and exercise dominion
God’s activity of rest is to govern creation and to maintain the created order. Divine rest in Gen 2:1-3 and Israel’s rest (in the rest of the Old Testament) pertain to the dominion and restoration of sacred time and space. As Bacchiocchi comments, “it is hard to believe that a dynamic God would spend a day in static posture. ... God’s cessation from doing expresses his desire for being with his creation, for giving to his creatures not only things but himself.”

Therefore, divine rest is the sign of kingship/rulership and presence, a notion in basic accordance with the Israelites’ activities on the seventh day.

God’s rest upon completing creation in Gen 2:1-3 “is an archetype of the human Sabbath celebration.” God gave humankind the capacity to enter into God’s sanctuary/temple by acquiring “rest.” When the new created couple were placed within the confines of sacred space and time, Adam and Eve’s distinctive creation, “Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness” (וּנַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כִדְמוּתֵנוּ, רָדָה), reflects God’s supreme authority, and therefore the divine prerogative bestowed upon humanity to maintain God’s order and kingship/rulership. Walton, An Old Testament Theology, 683. Divine activities are engaged in from the sanctuary/temple (Ps 96). Second, God’s rest in Gen 2:1-3 is fundamentally different from that of the gods in other Near Eastern texts. See Doukhan, “Review of John H. Walton,” 87. Doukhan remarks that “unlike the other ANE traditions, which view divine rest as a benefit that the gods enjoyed thanks to human service, the biblical account refers to the Sabbath day as God’s good gift to humankind.”

God’s rest upon completing creation in Gen 2:1-3 “is an archetype of the human Sabbath celebration.” God gave humankind the capacity to enter into God’s sanctuary/temple by acquiring “rest.” When the new created couple were placed within the confines of sacred space and time, Adam and Eve’s distinctive creation, “Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness” (וּנַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כִדְמוּתֵנוּ, רָדָה), reflects God’s supreme authority, and therefore the divine prerogative bestowed upon humanity to maintain God’s order and kingship/rulership. Walton, An Old Testament Theology, 683. Divine activities are engaged in from the sanctuary/temple (Ps 96). Second, God’s rest in Gen 2:1-3 is fundamentally different from that of the gods in other Near Eastern texts. See Doukhan, “Review of John H. Walton,” 87. Doukhan remarks that “unlike the other ANE traditions, which view divine rest as a benefit that the gods enjoyed thanks to human service, the biblical account refers to the Sabbath day as God’s good gift to humankind.”

118 Bacchiocchi, Divine Rest, 67.

119 Walton affirms that divine rest in Gen 2:1-3 means that God is taking up his residence. See Walton, Lost World of Adam, 48. Although this idea harmonizes with God’s kingship/rulership, Walton goes too far in arguing that divine rest is the objective of creation. Walton, Lost World of Adam, 46. God did not create/order the earth primarily for the sake of ruling over it. There is a more profound dimension: relationship with humanity. God created the heavens and earth, sacred space and time, by establishing his cosmic sanctuary/temple as the means to relate with humankind and meet its needs. Matthews aptly observes that “according to the tabernacle narrative (Exod 25–40), Israel’s Sabbath and creation’s rest meet in the holy place: the Creator who sanctified the seventh day because of ‘rest’ (Gen 2:2–3) is the covenant Lord, who sanctifies his people and tabernacles among them (Exod 31:12–17).” Mathews, Genesis 1-11:26, 178. Cf. Wallace, “Genesis 2:1-3,” 235-50.

was intended to reflect God’s royal presence on earth with the purpose of maintaining God’s royal authority.\textsuperscript{121}

Divine rest in creation points to God’s cosmic royal authority over heavens and earth. Although sin alienated sacred space and distorted sacred time on earth, God’s rest in the Israelite sanctuary/temple manifested his sovereignty. One may concede to Walton that “the Sabbath element helps us to recognize the cosmic sacredness of the sanctuary/temple equation and to realize the contextual significance of the functions and functionaries in the creation narrative.”\textsuperscript{122} Therefore, God’s command to rest on the seventh day reminds humankind of the original cosmic dimension of God’s kingship. The Sabbath rest instituted at creation and developed in the later biblical narrative seems to indicate that God’s rulership on earth is patterned after God’s cosmic sovereignty. Accordingly, the Sabbath rest reveals God’s plan to reestablish sacred time and space on earth.

\textbf{The Fourth Day of Creation: Genesis 1:14}

Gen 1:14 contains two key words (ָ֣מָּהוֹר and ְמָּמוּד) purportedly associated with sanctuary/temple language. In this section, I will analyze the arguments in order to establish how these two Hebrew terms fit into the meaning and structure of the whole creation story. Advocates of the sanctuary/temple motif observe in ָ֣מָּהוֹר [môēd; “appointed time,” “place,” “meeting,” “season”] and ְמָּמוּד [mā’ôr; “luminary”] a subtle


\textsuperscript{122} Walton, \textit{Genesis}, 152.
linkage with sanctuary/temple language, primarily by interpreting these two terms and the creation narrative with a cultic character. They often cite Walter Vogels’ study to support three proposals. First, the word מָאוֹר is never used in the Torah to indicate seasons of the year. Second, the meaning of מָאוֹר in most texts of the Old Testament is “festivals.” Third, the word מָאוֹר bears the connotation of meeting.¹²³

Generally, scholars agree that the absence of the Hebrew words for sun (שֶםֶש) and moon (יָרֵח) is intended to avoid confusion with ANE astral deities.¹²⁴ Instead, the author uses the word מָאוֹר, which generally refers (in the Torah always) to the lamps of the sanctuary (cf. Exod 25:6; 27:10; 35:8, 14, 28; 39:37; Lev 24:2; Num 4:9, 16).¹²⁵ “The sun and moon are presented as lamps, which are designated to illuminate the world, just as the lamps of the sanctuary are used to illuminate the sanctuary.”¹²⁶ However, does the author of the creation story merely want to polemicize against ANE culture?

The author carefully selects his Hebrew vocabulary because מָאוֹר is better understood in light of מָאוֹר. The range of meanings and translations of the Hebrew word מָאוֹר varies in the Old Testament: place of meeting, assembly point, meeting, appointed time, festival, time of festivity, and tent for assembly.¹²⁷ The translation “and let them be for signs and seasons, and for days and years”¹²⁸ renders four different

---

¹²⁵ Wenham, Genesis 1-15, 22.
¹²⁶ Doukhan, Genesis, 45.
¹²⁸ Gen 1:14
functions/purposes of the מָאוֹר: signs, seasons, days and years. It should be evident that “signs” (or “indicators”) stands out from this list. The lamed in the prepositional phrase לְאֹתֹת is a lamed of purpose. In some cases, the lamed indicates the goal of the preceding verb. In this case לְאֹתֹת, followed by ל might mean “become” in terms of functionality. Another aspect to consider is the connecting particle ו as explicative: “and let them become signs, that is, seasons, and days and years.” In this case, לְאֹתֹת covers both subcategories: (1) seasons, and (2) days and years.

The Hebrew word מָאוֹר can be reasonably rendered as “appointed time,” which does not necessarily exclude the notion of “festival occasions.” This notion is attested elsewhere in the Old Testament. The translation “and let them become signs of appointed times, and for days and years” preserves the plain meaning of the text. It

---


135 See the following Bible versions: TEV “to show the time when days, years, and religious festivals begin,” NIV “to mark sacred times, and days and years,” MNT “sacred seasons,” FRCL “that they serve to determine festival [days], as well as the days and the years of the calendar.”


138 See the Hebrew word מָאוֹר in Num 15:3; 29:39; 1 Chr 23:31; 2 Chr 2:4; 2:13; 30:22; 31:3; Ezra 3:5; Neh 10:33; Isa 1:14; 14:31; 33:20; Lam 1:4; Ezek 36:38; 44:24; Hos 2:13; Zech 8:19.
should be remembered that אָוֹת, which sometimes conveys religious significance (in לְאֹּתֹת), governs two different subcategories in nature: (1) seasons, and (2) days and years. This is a possible indication that the significance given to the celestial bodies is “to determine the appointed moment of the yearly feast” related to calendars or cycles for cultic, civil, or cultural (agricultural, navigation, travel) purposes. However, before the fall and in the centuries thereafter, there is no biblical evidence for any cultic usage.

The above translation recognizes that the technical vocabulary employed by the author of the creation story is subtle. Indeed, the words מַעֲרָד and מָאוֹר, which are used elsewhere in the context of sanctuary/temple narratives, prompt the reader to consider a semantic framework embedded in two levels of understanding: a literal reading and a symbolic/theological reading, in which “the sun and the moon are like sacred lamps in the sanctuary of the universe.” In light of these observations, Doukhan affirms that the central significance of the fourth day of creation is “due to the intention of the biblical author to highlight the sanctuary connection.”

Just as the Sabbath rest on earth indicates that creation is patterned after God’s cosmic kingship/rulership paradigm, the wording of Gen 1:14 seems to be also finely nuanced to connect linguistically and

---


140 Doukhan, *Genesis*, 58.


142 Vogels, “Cultic and Civil Calendars,” 175; Turner, “Theological Reading of Genesis 1,” 74.

143 Doukhan, *Genesis*, 58.
theologically with the sanctuary/temple framework. Gen 1 is referring integrally to the motif found in Gen 2-3.

**Summary and Conclusions**

This chapter has considered two main aspects of the creation account that seemingly connect the creation and the sanctuary/temple: the notion of divine rest (within the motif of temple building), and two key words in the fourth day of creation. Two main tentative conclusions seem to stand out from the sketch we have traced of the biblical evidence about the possible sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 1:1-2:4a.

First, the biblical evidence leads to the preliminary conclusion that the writer of the creation narrative and the narratives of Eden had a compositional strategy. Specifically, there is an implication here regarding the critical notion of textual and conceptual differentiations between the so-called Yahwist and priestly sources.\(^{144}\) This theory is weakened, among other reasons, by the fact that even though Gen 1 is commonly attributed to the priestly source, paradoxically most of the connections with the sanctuary/temple motif are found in Gen 2-3.\(^{145}\) Furthermore, considering that “the Bible begins with creation for historical, literary, and theological reasons,”\(^{146}\) one of the

\(^{144}\) This theory maintains that the text shows the existence of different literary strata, as argued in Christoph Levin, *Re-Reading the Scriptures: Essays on the Literary History of the Old Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 52. This is highly speculative, and speculation is not our subject.

\(^{145}\) This is a paradox of profound importance that is not explored fully in current scholarship. Generally speaking, critical biblical studies often find sanctuary/temple allusions, echoes, overtones, etc., in the first chapters of Genesis. For example, see Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, “God's Image, His Cosmic Temple and the High Priest: Towards a Historical and Theological Account of the Incarnation,” in *Heaven on Earth*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and Simon J. Gathercole (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004), 81-99. On the other hand, orthodox and conservative scholars are vexed by the possible emergence of sanctuary/temple theology in the creation and Eden narratives.

\(^{146}\) Doukhan, *Genesis*, 39.
purposes of the writer of Genesis in bringing Gen 1:1-2:4a into its final canonical shape was to connect the theme of God’s cosmic kingship/rulership with sacred time and space on earth, where God and humankind convene and are intimate. While it must be admitted that the lexical and contextual information given in the creation narrative does not offer an explicit reference to the concept of God’s resting place (literal sanctuary/temple),\textsuperscript{147} this investigation has found that the preeminence of God’s cosmic kingship/rulership secures sacred space and time on earth; divine rest is a sanctuary/temple activity, and it establishes God’s sovereignty. The Sabbath rest in Gen 2:1-3 is not a “theological appendix,” but “intimates the purpose of creation and of the cosmos.”\textsuperscript{148} In this sense, it could be said that rest on the Sabbath day “reaffirms the fundamental teaching of Scripture, namely, that ‘God himself is personal.’”\textsuperscript{149}

Second, the syntactic and literary characteristics of the fourth day of creation prompt the reader to consider the theological and canonical function of the Hebrew words מָאוֹר and מֹעֵד. “These echoes of language, which evoke the life of the sanctuary, suggest that the blueprint of creation is derived from a greater pattern of a supernatural order.”\textsuperscript{150} This greater pattern of supernatural order seems to be hinted at in Gen 1:1, where the creation of this world echoes the creation of the cosmos.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[147]{It should also be acknowledged that scholars have noted that “there is no ANE culture in which temples and cosmos do not bear a significant relation to one another.” Timmer, \textit{Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath}, 39.}

\footnotetext[148]{Turner, \textit{Back to the Present}, 31.}


\footnotetext[150]{Doukhan, \textit{Genesis}, 58. Cf. Ps 78:69.}
\end{footnotes}
CHAPTER V
THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

In chapters I-IV, I have summarized and reevaluated some of the most important aspects that allude to the sanctuary/temple in Gen 1-3. It was observed that the content of Gen 1-3 introduces the readers to the newly created world of sacred time\(^1\) and space by means of sanctuary/temple vocabulary and a symbolical conceptual framework.\(^2\) In this chapter, I will not seek to further substantiate the association between the creation and the sanctuary/temple, which I believe is already well established on solid ground.\(^3\) Rather, I will move beyond these discussions to the theological implications arising from the text. Particularly, I will suggest how the outworking of the association between creation and sanctuary/temple can contribute to a better understanding of the creation/Eden canonical narratives, in view of the consequent implications that the writer of Gen 1-3 might have perceived the sanctuary/temple motif.

\(^1\) Vogels, “Cultic and Civil Calendars,” 178-79.

\(^3\) The biblical evidence reviewed in this dissertation may be summarized as follows: the motif of temple building (divine rest); the Hebrew words מֹעֵד and מָאוֹר in the fourth day of creation; the Hebrew word מֶלְאָכָה in Gen 2:8; the garden as a mountain in Gen 2:10; the river of Eden in Gen 2:10; the Hebrew verbs עָבַד and שָׁמַר in Gen 2:15; the Hebrew word צֵלָע and the Hebrew verb בָּנָה in Gen 2:21-22; the Hebrew participle כְֵּלַמֵּית in Gen 3:8; the Hebrew word כֻּתֹּנֶת and the Hebrew verb לָבַשׁ in Gen 3:21; the Hebrew word כְּרֻּבִים in Gen 3:24; and the eastern entrance to the garden in Gen 3:24.
A Conceptual Approach for the Sanctuary/Temple Motif

Scholarly literature on the sanctuary/temple motif in the Old Testament should not develop theology exclusively upon the range and uses of a single word. Researching concepts in biblical studies within specific narratives or frames should consider and engage a large enough scope of intertextual relationships to establish the concept meaningfully. Throughout the following sections, I argue that the sanctuary/temple motif should be understood through a conceptual approach, which, in addition to lexeme-based studies, builds upon previous scholarly works to answer the question of whether and how the sanctuary/temple motif is embedded in the creation, pre-Fall, and post-Fall narratives.

A conceptual approach to studying the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 1-3 can be seen as complementary to the lexical-range exegesis and lexical-field exegesis. This

4 While a semantic-range study seeks to understand the range and uses of a single word, a conceptual approach seeks to understand an idea or reality that may be expressed with a variety of lexemes. Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning*, 27. See more details about the distinction between conceptual and lexical research approaches in John F. A. Sawyer, *Semantics in Biblical Research: New Methods of Defining Hebrew Words for Salvation*, SBT (Naperville: A. R. Allenson, 1972).

5 Due to certain methodological restrictions, in this chapter there are several exegetical issues left untouched. As stated in chapter I, this study implemented Ryou and Talstra’s mode of synchronic analysis. Furthermore, our theological task adopted van Wolde’s understanding of synchronic exegetical/intertextual analysis. Thus, the conceptual approach proposed here should not be confused with the so-called “post-critical exegesis” model of criticism, which was explored by Paul Morris, “A Walk in the Garden: Images of Eden,” in *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden*, ed. Deborah Sawyer and Paul Morris, JSOTSup 136 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), 27. I have not followed the presuppositions of critical scholarship in the reevaluation of the biblical evidence for the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 1-3, since they employ a diachronic exegetical analysis, Nevertheless, I have reexamined the critical scholarship carefully because it highlights textual/conceptual features of great significance. Perhaps, the result of this conceptual approach to Gen 1-3 is to link current textual/conceptual strategies with the textual/conceptual contributions of both pre-critical and critical scholarship.

6 Lexical-range exegesis seeks to establish the definition of a lexeme and the extent of its range of meanings. On the other hand, lexical-field exegesis seeks to establish the relationships between lexemes with similar and/or overlapping meanings. See additional details in J. K. Aitken, *The Semantics of Blessing and Cursing in Ancient Hebrew* (Louvain: Peeters, 2007); Gordon R. Clark, *The Word Hesed in the Hebrew Bible*, JSOTSup 157 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993); Milton Eng, *The Days of Our Years: A Lexical
approach may be described in terms of two ideas. First, James F. Jordan explains that studying individual lexemes is a critical component for understanding a biblical concept such as creation. He writes: “Carefully defining each individual word enables an accurate understanding of the relevant passages. But, these types of studies are focused on defining only a single word; they are not intended to represent a full concept.” Second, since this approach requires reviewing, analyzing, and organizing the available canonical concepts, it neutralizes and avoids the so-called illegitimate total transfer, meaning that “a nuance of meaning in one instance can be extrapolated to all other occurrences of a given term.”

In the field of linguistics, a conceptual approach may be associated with Frame Semantics. Charles Fillmore prepared a series of studies in which he proposed a conceptual approach to semantics, contending that “we have here not just a group of individual words, but a ‘domain’ of vocabulary” that constitutes a concept. One may think that, as Fillmore puts it, “the frame structures the word-meanings, and that the word

---


8 Barr, Semantics of Biblical Language, 218.


‘evokes’ the frame.’\textsuperscript{12} I would venture to suggest that one of the theological tasks of exegesis is to pursue those semantic frameworks in the canonical biblical text in order to elaborate and construe holistic concepts.\textsuperscript{13} This conceptual approach counteracts the risk that John Peckham identified. He writes: “I discovered considerable discrepancies between the exegetically apparent usage of terms in canonical context and the depiction of the meaning and semantic range of those terms in some lexicons, theological dictionaries, and commentaries.”\textsuperscript{14}

There is a considerable agreement among scholars that although a concept might be associated with one word more than any other, one single word is not often considered to encompass a concept as a whole. Since the concept of the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 1-3 is composed of related actions and objects, the theological task comprises the analysis of the “selected word groups by way of their usage in the canon in their contexts to provide crucial background for engaging the wider canonical themes.”\textsuperscript{15} This is the reason why the concept of canon plays a central role in the study of Old Testament theology. Clements puts it like this:

At the very basic level we can see that it is because the OT forms a canon, and is not simply a collection of ancient Near Eastern documents, that we can expect to find in it

\textsuperscript{12} Fillmore, “Frame Semantics,” 378.

\textsuperscript{13} I think that Margaret Barker has provided several hermeneutical guidelines to reconsider. She seems to follow a conceptual approach to elaborate the essentials of temple theology. Barker writes: “Words, actions and places were used both to express and to realize temple theology. So closely did the words, actions and places interrelate that it is not possible to separate them. . . . It was this system of temple theology which carried the original Christian message.” Margaret Barker, \textit{On Earth as It Is in Heaven: Temple Symbolism in the New Testament} (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995), 12. Cf. Barker, \textit{Temple Theology}, 17; Barker, \textit{Gate of Heaven}, 16.

\textsuperscript{14} See more details of Peckham’s canonical approach to systematic theology in Peckham, \textit{Canonical Theology}, 250.

\textsuperscript{15} Peckham, \textit{Canonical Theology}, 251.
a “theology,” and not just a report of ancient religious ideas. There is a real
connection between the ideas of “canon” and “theology,” for it is the status of these
writings as a canon of sacred scripture that marks them out as containing a word of
God that it is still believed to be authoritative.16

In this sense, from a canonical context and perspective,17 this dissertation has endeavored
to reevaluate some of the most common arguments for the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen
1-3.

It could be argued, consequently, that the crucial theological question that cuts
across the reevaluation of the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 1-3 is this: What is a
sanctuary/temple? What makes a sanctuary/temple a “sanctuary/temple”?18 In order to
answer this question, the heavenly sanctuary/temple should be considered the
prototypical ideal for any other sacred space or structure/building that performs such
functions. Therefore, the more textual and conceptual correspondences with the heavenly
realm, the more legitimate the interpretation. One might endeavor to understand this
motif through a lexeme/word study. However, this method does not provide an adequate
view of the whole concept. The conceptual approach to this motif undergirds the

17 As stated in the first chapter of this dissertation, we have taken the text in its final canonical
form. Thus, conceptual historic developments and speculative diachronic textual reconstructions (critical
views such as the so-called P source) are not pertinent to our research. Despite considerable diversity,
canonical approaches to Old Testament theology generally focus on the final form of the individual books.
18 There is, I think, much confusion in current scholarly literature regarding these inquiries. See for
example, Jonathan Klawans, Purity. Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the
Study of Ancient Judaism (Oxford: Oxford University, 2006), especially chapter 4 entitled “Temple as
Cosmos or Temple in the Cosmos,” 111-44. It is imperative to explore the theological implications of this
conceptual approach to sanctuary/temple canonical theology, just as the motif was reevaluated in Gen 1-3
in chapters I-IV of this dissertation. The core and substance of this approach reveal that it was the Garden
of Eden, the wilderness tabernacle, and later sanctuaries that were shaped to correspond with and represent
the preexisting heavenly sacred space.
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historical (and therefore adaptable) functionality of the sanctuary/temple in the biblical narrative.

Note, at this juncture, that the concept of the sanctuary/temple will have modifiers/nuances according to its context (or semantic field). For example, the word *park*, on its own, is ambiguous between the senses “moving a vehicle” and “a public area.” Hence, the semantic frame determined by the collocation of words is essential to the conceptual approach. This fact is explained by T. Muraoka:

A word is hardly ever used in isolation and on its own, but normally occurs in conjunction with another word or words. Such collocations help to establish the semantic “profile” of the word concerned. Two words which are closely related may not wholly share their “partners,” each thus gaining its individuality. Such information about collocations a given word enters provides important clues for defining its senses and determining its semantic “contours.”

Perhaps an observation from C. John Collins might be helpful here. He explains that “Genesis never uses any word for sin or disobedience, but it would be foolish indeed to conclude that what Eve and Adam did was not ‘sin’.” In the same way, a reevaluation of the biblical evidence in Gen 1-3 reveals a cluster of words related to sanctuary/temple actions and/or objects, thereby creating a concept/frame. “The patterns and conventions

---

19 “Semantic field theory makes a meaning claim that the meanings of words must be understood, in part, in relation to other words that articulate a given content domain and that stand in the relation of affinity and contrast to the word(s) in question.” See Adrienne Lehrer and Eva Feder Kittay, *Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantic and Lexical Organization* (Hillsdale: L. Erlbaum Associates, 1992), 3-4.

20 T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and Twelve Prophets* (Louvain: Peeters, 2002), XI.

in the ways words are combined—the collocations and idioms in which they participate—are a significant aspect of their meaning.”

Schachter reached the same understanding:

A visual reading of the Eden story leads to dramatic new understandings, but it has an inherent value apart from its relationship to any given story, especially for the reader who has difficulty relating to grand ideas through a verbal message alone. Visualization allows readers to connect more easily and intimately with the Hebrew Bible, facilitating direct access to the Bible's deeper themes without reliance on scholarship, whether traditional or academic. With the insights gained through visualization, readers come to appreciate that the Bible is more complex and multilayered than previously realized.

It is noteworthy to highlight some implications resulting from Davidson’s seven-faceted theological center of Scripture, emerging from Gen 1-3 and unfolding throughout the rest of Scripture. The seventh facet refers to a sanctuary/temple setting as a hermeneutical key to interpret Scripture. Another way to approach Davidson’s proposal is to recognize the conceptual approach while reevaluating the sanctuary/temple motif in Scripture, and particularly in Gen 1-3. Such a study reveals that the sanctuary/temple motif is an overarching worldview or shaping narrative/story in Scripture. Walton has argued correctly that in order to understand the Old Testament, it is vital to consider the connection in the ANE between the creation/cosmos and the sanctuary/temple, which is


24 Davidson, “Back to the Beginning,” 4-8. The seven facets according to Davidson would be: (1) Creation and the divine design for this planet; (2) The character of the Creator; (3) The rise of the moral conflict concerning the character of God; (4) The Gospel covenant promise centered in the Person of the Messianic Seed; (5) The substitutionary atonement worked out by the Messianic Seed; (6) The windup of the Moral Conflict with the end of the serpent and evil; (7) The sanctuary setting of the moral conflict.
an ancient worldview concept. Collins has shown why this is a crucial methodological insight: “The worldview is not an abstraction derived from the story; that is, one cannot treat the story simply as the husk, which we can discard once we have discovered the (perhaps timeless) concepts.” The above discussion does not promote a philosophical or anthropological reading of the text, as some scholars have suggested. Rather, I argue that Gen 1-3 should be read historically, looking for terminological frameworks, which lead to concepts that allow one to build deeply entrenched analogical connections from the biblical canonical perspective.

25 Walton, Ancient Near Eastern Thought, 27, 123-34. One difficulty with Walton’s conclusion that the universe is a cosmic temple is the apparent monolithic religion and/or massive uniform cosmology in the ANE (or in Walton’s words: a cognitive environment) that seems to be implied. It should be kept in mind, as Walton himself emphasizes when doing comparative research studies, that “when literary or cultural elements are borrowed they may in turn be transformed into something quite different by those who borrowed them” (see p. 27). I do not accept the idea that the biblical writer “borrowed” the worldview concept, but rather that the biblical writer’s view shared some common elements.


28 There is no scholarly consensus on whether Gen 1-3 should be read literally, historically, or figuratively. For our study’s purpose, it suffices to state that the author intertwined sanctuary/temple conceptual symbolism into the account of Gen 1-3. Then, this is evidence to reconsider the idea that the only legitimate approach to Genesis 1 is to read it “literally.” Turner has argued correctly that “this position assumes the text to be one-dimensional. Rather, it is a complex and subtle narrative that works at more than one level, rewarding both literal and theological/symbolic readings.” Turner, “Theological Reading of Genesis 1,” 77-78. The conceptual approach to Gen 1-3 requires a literal reading; it is not a shift to a more figurative understanding, as Todd S. Beall seems to observe. Todd S. Beall, “Reading Genesis 1-2: A Literal Approach,” in Reading Genesis 1-2: An Evangelical Conversation, ed. J. Daryl Charles (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2013), 45. On the other hand, I think Tremper Longman refuses to term his method “figurative hermeneutic,” but at the same time he frequently identifies figurative language in a literal/historical narrative, in a genre that he has called “historical theology.” Tremper Longman, “What Genesis 1-2 Teaches (And What It Doesn’t),” in Reading Genesis 1-2: An Evangelical Conversation, ed. J. Daryl Charles (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2013), 110.
Taking conceptual frameworks as a hermeneutical approach to Gen 1-3 concurs partly with Walton’s statement that “in the ancient world they [the Hebrew nation] are more likely to think of the world in terms of symbols and to express their understanding by means of imagery.”\(^{29}\) However, I am not ready to go as far as he does to conclude that this approach to reality indicates that the Hebrews understood creation exclusively in terms of functions. As we will see below, that the ancient peoples expressed their understanding by means of imagery does not prove that their narratives only make sense at the abstract level of functionality. In fact, imagery conveys some sort of physical reality. Undoubtedly, Gen 1-3 contains imagery pertaining to the sanctuary/temple, but this imagery reports the historical and material origins of the cosmos, rather than simply functions for worship. Since Gen 1-3 offers enough evidence to interpret the narrative from a conceptual viewpoint, this should lead us to think of Gen 1-3 in terms of sanctuary/temple thematic imagery ingrained in ancient Hebrew thought.

The conclusion that I advocate, which should be obvious by now, is that the sanctuary/temple motif, as an overarching worldview/shaping narrative/story in Scripture, is an essential approach to biblical canonical theology.\(^{30}\) I will endeavor to explore the main theological implications of this approach in the following sections of this chapter.


\(^{30}\) This does not necessarily mean that the sanctuary/temple motif is embedded in all of the biblical narrative. Admittedly, Hasel says it clearly: “Old Testament is so rich that it does not yield a center for the systematization or organization of an Old Testament theology.” Hasel, *Old Testament Theology*, 168. Rather, using the sanctuary/temple motif as a hermeneutical key allows one to appreciate the overarching worldview/shaping narrative/story of the Bible in more detail. Perhaps a different way to state this is by using the expression sanctuary/temple ideology, where “ideology” is a complex of exegetical/conceptual sanctuary/temple features that function paradigmatically within the canonical biblical narrative. Morales (following Lundquist’s definition) comes near to this notion; see Morales, *The Tabernacle Pre-Figured*, 2.
Canonical Biblical Theology of Genesis 1

The Semantic Framework of the Creation Narrative

Up to this point, this dissertation has reflected on the biblical evidence dealing with the sanctuary/temple. Here, this theological reflection is projected onto the following questions that were posed earlier in our research: Is creation the theological foundation for the entire sanctuary/temple system/framework? Alternatively, is the sanctuary/temple system/framework the theological foundation for the created cosmos? This section will lead us to consider how a canonical biblical theology may develop the sanctuary/temple motif as the theological framework of the creation/cosmos, observing that the theology of creation is advanced in Scripture more in accord with the sanctuary/temple motif. Let us ponder two key theological implications emerging from the premise that the sanctuary/temple system/framework is the theological foundation for the created cosmos, and indeed, a rationale for a canonical biblical theology of Gen 1.

Genesis 1 as a Temple Text

It seems clear after reviewing the biblical evidence in previous chapters of this research that Gen 1 contains cultic terminology. This fact compels the interpreter of the


31 As opposed to creation being the theological foundation for the entire tabernacle system; see Souza, “Sanctuary: Cosmos, Covenant, and Creation,” 36.
creation narrative to inquire whether the literary and theological purpose is arranged according to and centered on the sanctuary/temple motif. The theological implications arising out of considering this motif as a semantic framework may be of help to understand better when Gen 1 is labeled as a temple text.

First, what is implied by the expression “temple text” for the literary genre of Gen 1? Fretheim proposes that “Gen 1 in its present form is not a liturgical piece. It is more probable a prose paraphrase of an older hymn. Originally it had its place in the liturgy, but it was adapted to serve a primary teaching function.” Fretheim recognizes two important aspects of the creation narrative: literary/conceptual artistry and an ancient function in worship. However, the sanctuary/temple literary/conceptual artistry does not necessarily indicate that the prose of Gen 1 is a paraphrase of an older hymn. Admittedly, all Hebrew texts had their place in ancient Israel’s religious life, but this text was not focused exclusively on worship or written primarily for a teaching function. Doukhan has argued convincingly that in the particular case of Gen 1 the literary arrangement implies a historical event. He writes:

This literary genre, however, must not be confused with that of a hymn, or that of a poem which has been composed for recitation. Recitation does not automatically imply hymnic purposes, unless we define differently the notion of hymn. We must not forget that in distinction from a hymn which aims essentially to praise God and which, therefore, expresses a feeling, our text is essentially a story which tells about an event.


Although scholars have seriously questioned whether Gen 1 can be taken as a temple text, the centrality of sacred time and space in the narrative seems to indicate the cultic concern of the writer. This cultic imagery is found in Gen 1 not because of its literary worship purpose or postexilic origin, but rather, because the theological semantic framework is commenced and interwoven at the creation event, thus reverberating throughout the Bible in worship settings where texts were composed and used for recitation purposes. This is not to say, as B. W. Anderson writes (following Paul Humbert), that the narrative of Gen 1 was shaped over a period of many generations to reflect on a festal week rather than an ordinary week. Anderson’s assumption that “the creation story is most at home in a setting of worship” neglects the clear possibility that the festivals celebrated in weekly cycles were reminiscences of the creation week, which set the theological/cultic framework for the later sanctuary/temple services and festivals. The canonical biblical perspective would indicate, rather, that weekly cycles in the Bible are embedded in the theological semantic framework of the sanctuary/temple motif that commenced at the creation event. Hence, it is not the creation story, but the sanctuary/temple semantic framework that arises throughout Scripture, which is most at


home in a setting of worship. It is from this perspective that one must understand that the creation themes (stories) had cultic usages and value throughout the ANE. Moreover, this perspective signals the vertical typological sanctuary/temple framework between the heavens and the earth, already hinted in Gen 1:1 and John 1:1.

Consequently, if the creation narrative (Gen 1) is called a temple text because of the presence of the sanctuary/temple motif, the necessary question that follows is this: does the theological semantic framework of the sanctuary/temple motif require a symbolic reading of the creation narrative? Sanctuary/temple advocates often do not hesitate to acknowledge that a cultic reading of the creation narrative (and Eden narratives) is indeed a symbolic interpretation. Interestingly, the motif arising out of the sanctuary/temple theological framework indicates for some scholars that the text of Gen 1 should be interpreted literally, but the narrative/event is not to be understood as

37 See for example Ps 24 as explained in J. Clinton McCann and Nancy Rowland McCann, A Theological Introduction to the Book of Psalms: The Psalms as Torah (Nashville: Abingdon, 1993), 71-79.


39 See the following discussion in this chapter on the theological implications of the archetypal framework of protology and eschatology.

40 In chapter IV of this dissertation, Gen 1:1 was mentioned as indicating a double reading: the creation of this world and the creation of the cosmos. Similarly, Terry Mortenson explains John 1:1 as follows:

The phrase “from the beginning” (ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς) occurs 20 times in the NT. Of those 20 uses, 5 have the initiation point of the cosmos in view. Never does it clearly refer to the beginning of the human race. It appears three times in 1 John 1:1 and 2:13-14. Comparing the language of these two passages to John 1:1-3 (which uses ἐν ἀρχῇ, “in the beginning”) shows that John is referring to the beginning of creation (not merely the beginning of the human race), for he speaks of Christ being in or from the beginning and the Creator of all things.

See Terry Mortenson, “Jesus’ View of the Age of the Earth,” in Coming to Grips with Genesis: Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth, ed. Terry Mortenson and Thane H. Ury (Green Forest: Master, 2008), 319.
happening in actuality. In Bryan C. Hodge’s words, these temple days, although literal, are representative of a concept, not a measurement of literal temporal units. He writes that “they represent the consecration of what is ordered as a temple in an effort to convey a theological concept about God, humans, and the universe in which they reside.” Walton, in his approach to the cultic terminology of Gen 1, also labeled it as a temple text, meaning that “from the idea that the temple was considered a mini cosmos, it is easy to move to the idea that the cosmos could be viewed as a temple.”

He further contends that “if the seven days refer to the seven days of cosmic temple inauguration, days that concern origins of functions not material, then the seven days and Genesis 1 as a whole have nothing to contribute to the discussion of the age of the earth.” For Walton, the cultic terminology of Gen 1 indicates that the cosmos itself is a temple, and that the days of the creation week were periods of time devoted to the inauguration of the functions of the cosmic temple. Let us explore three relevant issues from the perspective and purpose of this dissertation in order to reevaluate Walton’s temple text interpretation.

First, Walton’s temple text interpretation is certainly an invitation to reexamine a possible figurative approach to the imagery of Gen 1. Indeed, Gen 2-3 more explicitly portends the earthly sanctuary/temple (the wilderness tabernacle/Solomon’s Temple), as it was patterned according to the heavenly model. Yet, Gen 1 seems to be more concerned with the general worldview of sacred time and space, having the purported

---

42 Walton, Lost World of Genesis One, 83.
43 Walton, Lost World of Genesis One, 95.
function of preparing the reader to encounter the sanctuary/temple motif in a more explicit conceptual framework in Gen 2-3. The reevaluation of the biblical evidence points to an interpretation where the sanctuary/temple imagery of Gen 1 is not to be taken as metaphorical or figurative; rather, the cultic terminology, in addition to describing the actual origins of the cosmos, also signals a greater reality: God’s heavenly abode as it was portrayed on earth by sacred space and time. Thus, the theological semantic framework prompts us to think that the literal/historical and symbolic readings of the sanctuary/temple imagery in the text are not mutually exclusive, as Walton proposes. Here the meaning of the expression “a symbolic reading” revolves around the notion that the semantic framework validates the historicity of the text while at the same time being representative, indicative, and/or illustrative of an overarching worldview/shaping narrative/story in Scripture: the sanctuary/temple. Turner seems to ponder this issue as he writes,

The fact that the biblical text weaves sanctuary symbolism into its account of creation also constitutes a significant counter to frequent exhortations from certain quarters that the only legitimate approach to Genesis 1 is to read it “literally.” This position assumes the text to be one-dimensional. Rather, it is a complex and subtle narrative that works at more than one level, rewarding both literal and theological/symbolic readings.45

One should not take Turner’s “theological/symbolic reading” in opposition to “literal reading.” Perhaps it would be more accurate to refer to the theological reading of the

44 It is important to consider the relationship between a “literal” and a “historical” understanding of Gen 1. For some scholars, a historical creation day does not necessarily indicate a literal day. As Walter M. Booth puts it: “The question of literal days is an issue more among conservatives—who accept the creation account as historical but differ among themselves on the time element—than between conservatives and liberals.” Walter M. Booth, “Days of Genesis 1: Literal or Nonliteral?,” JATS 14.1 (2003): 102.

45 Turner, “Theological Reading of Genesis 1,” 77.
cultic terminology of Gen 1 not in terms of abstract symbolism (or temple ideology)\textsuperscript{46} but in the sense of a “conceptual reading,” where the sanctuary/temple motif becomes one hermeneutical frame for its meaning. Admittedly, not all biblical narratives containing the sanctuary/temple motif are symbolic in their literary purpose, yet they are evocative of a higher reality.\textsuperscript{47} Hodge’s reasoning might be helpful. He advocates a symbolic reading of various aspects in Gen 1-11:

Occasionally, one’s misunderstanding of the text stems from one’s misunderstanding of language in general. As discussed before, it is often thought that if the text uses symbolic language, what it conveys is imprecise. This is then further extrapolated to mean that the text cannot answer modern questions at all. The flip side of this view is to see figurative language as untrue and conclude that everything in these passages, therefore, must be literal in order to be true. In short, the use of what is figurative is equated with what is loosely defined and the use of the literal language is equated with what is precisely defined. Hence, if something is not precisely defined, it is not literal, and it is not literal, it is not true.\textsuperscript{48}

In other words, no “literalistic” hermeneutic should be employed exclusively in Gen 1 (and Gen 2-3) that overlooks canonical biblical concepts emerging from intertextuality.\textsuperscript{49}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{46} Contra Walton, \textit{Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology}, 199.
\item \textsuperscript{47} Cf. Gen 2:1-3, Ps 132, and Heb 8. See for example the sanctuary/temple semantic framework of הַשִירִָ֖ים שִ֥יר as it is explored in Christopher Wright Mitchell, \textit{The Song of Songs} (Saint Louis: Concordia, 2003), 104-10, 1188. In a particular sense, the Song of Songs is a return to Eden. See also Davidson, \textit{Flame of Yahweh}, 552-53.
\item \textsuperscript{48} Though there is much to appreciate from Hodge’s discussion, I think that a mere symbolic reading of the text would exclude or marginalize events the biblical author believed to be the actual past. Hodge, \textit{Revisiting the Days}, 14.
\item \textsuperscript{49} The ongoing debate between science and faith should be recognized. Perhaps the most common unsettled topic in this debate is what it means to read a text literally. The current climate of scholarly conversation maintains that a literal/historical reading of Gen 1 is conditioned by the post-Enlightenment demands of scientism. For our case, the sanctuary/temple cultic terminology of Gen 1 does not eliminate or adapt the literal/historical reading; therefore, it does not address issues related to the theodicy dilemma (natural evil, animal suffering, death before the fall, etc.). Scholars usually resort to modifying the reading approach to explain or accommodate these dilemmas. See, for example, this work, with a foreword by Walton: Ronald E. Osborn, \textit{Death Before the Fall: On Literalism and Animal Suffering} (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2014), especially 25-121. Refer to the following dissertation dealing with these issues while maintaining a literal/historical reading of Gen 1: Marco T. Terreros, “Death before the Sin of Adam: A Fundamental Concept in Theistic Evolution and Its Implications for Evangelical Theology” (PhD diss., Andrews University, 1994).
\end{itemize}
Furthermore, the cultic terminology in the creation account does not indicate that the event described is not literal/historical. The literary purpose of the narrative as it emerges from this semantic framework is not merely to be a cultic document for spiritual reflection. Thus, when Gen 1 is labeled as a temple text, it should refer to the conceptual reading of the creation account within the sanctuary/temple semantic framework (via intertextuality).

Second, Walton’s temple text interpretation of Gen 1 orbits around an unwarranted and artificial conceptual description of the so-called “functional ontology.” In fact, according to this view Gen 1 is not an account of creation but an account of “ordering.” While Walton alerted us to the danger of “imposing modern concepts of cosmological ontology onto the ancient world,”50 at the same time he is taking the risk of imposing a foreign ontology onto the biblical text. One should give credit to Walton’s analysis on the semantic range of the verb נָבָא [bārā‘; “create”], which includes functions.51 However, one cannot altogether disregard the literary intent of material origins of נָבָא.52 Indeed, to consider that God would have created something without

50 Walton, Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology, 127.
51 Walton, Lost World of Genesis One, 40-44; Walton, Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology, 128-39.
52 The lexical/semantic contention for an exclusive functional ontology, as Walton himself seems to acknowledge, is uncertain and capable of material ontology. See Walton, Lost World of Genesis One, 41; Walton, Lost World of Adam, 43. Cf. J. Stek, “What Says the Scripture?,” in Portraits of Creation: Biblical and Scientific Perspectives on the World’s Formation, ed. Howard J. Van Till (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 211-13. For example, the following passages using the verb נָבָא allude to/echo the creative action of God with the purpose of establishing a relationship with the creation week, an event already known and registered in a narrative (cf. Exod 34:10; Num 16:30; Deut 4:32; Pss 51:12 [Eng. 51:10]; 102:18 [Eng. 102:19]; 104:30; Isa 4:5; 41:19-20; 42:5). It is not the purpose of this relationship to explain cosmic origins. There are additional aspects to reconsider; see Jacques B. Doukhan, “A Response to John H. Walton's Lost World of Genesis One,” AUSS 49.1 (2011): 200-201; Noel Weeks, “The Bible and the ‘Universal’ Ancient World: A Critique of John Walton,” WTJ 78.1 (2016): 1-28.
intending it to have purpose goes against the overall biblical view on creation. Walton considers the understanding of the Hebrew word יּוֹם [yôm; “day”] as a twenty-four-hour day to be accurate, and in his effort to prove the functional ontology, he regards the ANE texts as the hermeneutical key.

What distinguishes John Walton’s approach from those of others who attempt to explicate the Bible from outside contemporary sources is that rather than comparing specific items attested in some external text or object with a claimed biblical parallel, he sees the biblical text as a product of, and hence explicable in terms of, a mentality that the biblical authors shared with their contemporaries, irrespective of religious differences.

Walton observes correctly that the ANE cosmogonies are more about functionality than material origins. However, the understanding of the biblical creation days as merely functional contradicts not only the literary purpose of Gen 1 (and Gen 2-3), but also

53 Walton, Lost World of Genesis One, 109. In fact, Barr’s assertion is still valid. He was an Old Testament scholar who did not believe in the book of Genesis, which gives his comments special importance because he had no interest in defending any historical accuracy. He wrote: “Probably, so far as I know, there is no professor of Hebrew or Old Testament at any world-class university who does not believe that the writer(s) of Genesis 1-11 intended to convey to their readers the ideas that creation took place in a series of six days which were the same as the days of 24 hours we now experience.” James Barr, letter to David C. C. Watson, 23 April 1984, quoted in Jay Seegert, Creation and Evolution: Compatible or in Conflict? (Green Forest: Master, 2014), 196.


opposes the general accord of the canonical biblical testimony showing that references/allusions to the creation event emphasize its material nature and historicity.

Furthermore, another problem with Walton’s functional ontological view is his proposal that before God bestowed temple/cultic functions there was a “pre-functional cosmos,” meaning that there was life on earth (and therefore death) as part of a long process of development. This is unacceptable theology and a notion closer to the evolutionary theory than to the biblical narrative, because it implies that death is not the consequence of sin.

Third, Walton’s temple text interpretation contradicts the vertical typological/paradigmatical view found in the Bible and in the rest of the ANE. The cosmos is not a


59 Walton, Lost World of Genesis One, 169; Walton, Lost World of Adam, 28. Walton describes this stage of the earth elsewhere as a pre-cosmic condition, and he equates the Hebrew expression וָבִּיהוּ in Gen 1:2 with the state of the cosmos prior to creation in ANE literature. See Walton, Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology, 140-44. The expression וָבִּיהוּ does not indicate a symbolic/non-functional state of the earth; rather, it means emptiness, “characterizing the earth as uninhabitable and inhospitable to human life.” Mathews, Genesis 1-11:26, 131. Cf. Doukhan, Genesis, 51-52; McKeown, Genesis, 20-21. Consider additionally the meaning of emptiness of וָבִּיהוּ via a structural parallelism with Gen 2; Doukhan, “The Genesis Creation Story,” 19.

60 Walton, Lost World of Genesis One, 100, 138-40. One may wonder how he explains Adam and Eve’s status before God bestowed the “functional role” of being humans. Walton’s lost world is one filled with bloodshed, disease, and death. The words of Christ in Mark 10:6 have to be reinterpreted, because in Adam and Eve’s perfect state, their lost world (Walton’s) was presumably surrounded by a cruel and merciless world.

61 Although Walton affirms that God created matter, he denies that Gen 1 has anything to say about how/when matter came into existence. It seems contradictory when Walton argues that his temple text interpretation is not a “dodge to accommodate evolution” while at the same time advancing the notion that his approach is congenial to evolutionary theory. Walton, Lost World of Genesis One, 169-70. Cf. Andrew Steinmann, “Lost World of Genesis One: John H. Walton, American Evangelicals and Creation,” LE (2012): 1-8.

temple, as Walton contends;\(^\text{63}\) rather, the sanctuary/temple motif interwoven in the sacred biblical text implies a creation/re-creation paradigm in salvation history. Then, the basic question that must be answered is this: Does creation precede the temple, or does the temple come before creation? One should notice that while the biblical text of the book of Genesis starts chronologically with the creation event, the unfolding of the canonical biblical narrative ingrains vertical typology as the proper canonical perspective on salvation history. This means that when looking at the sanctuary/temple imagery of Gen 1 (and Gen 2-3), from a canonical biblical perspective, the strong linguistic and conceptual connection\(^\text{64}\) leads us to consider that the notion of the sanctuary/temple precedes the event of creation. Just as the wilderness tabernacle historically had a preceding model (Exod 25:9, 40), the creation narrative and its canonical echoes do not preclude the previous existence of a heavenly sacred time and space, which the Bible plainly indicates has a historical and continuous interaction with its earthly counterpart (1 Kgs 8:30-35, 41-50; 2 Chr 30:27; Isa 6:1-7). The cosmos is not a temple because this view does not harmonize with the biblical view of a cosmic/heavenly realm of sacred space and time.

\(^{63}\) Walton, *Lost World of Genesis One*, 78. See also J. Richard Middleton, “The Role of Human Beings in the Cosmic Temple: The Intersection of Worldviews in Psalms 8 and 104,” *CanTR* 2.1 (2013): 44-58. The idea of perceiving the heavens and the earth as a cosmic temple seems to be taken from Levenson. He argued that “the Temple within the world is absurd because the world is itself a temple.” This observation follows Levenson’s proposal that the temple-building project was foreign to Israelite religion, and therefore unwanted by most people. Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence*, 89. See the discussion below on Isa 66:1-2.

\(^{64}\) Walton is right when he writes that “the only [way] we can move with certainty beyond that which was intended by the Old Testament author is if another authoritative voice (e.g. a New Testament author) gives us an extension of meaning.” Walton, *Lost World of Adam*, 19. This is exactly the case when the sanctuary/temple imagery of Gen 1 is intertextually analyzed with other biblical narratives, for example, with Ezek 28:11-19 and Rev 22:1-5. See chapters II and III of this dissertation.
The sanctuary/temple vertical typology found in the Bible and in the rest of the ANE between heavens and earth is too well known and studied, for example by Souza, to warrant a review here. However, Souza pondered this issue like this:

Are such intertextual relationships an indication that the sanctuary should be interpreted as a type of the cosmos/world/creation? Or is there another explanation capable of doing justice to the biblical data? As noted above, since the Bible portrays the sanctuary and its services as the means by which the Lord would deal with the sins of his people and restore the covenantal relationship, the answer to the first question is a negative one.

It seems implied in Souza’s negative answer that the creation should also not be considered as a type of the sanctuary/temple. From any intertextual directionality, Souza’s conclusion is derived from a post-lapsarian perspective of the sanctuary/temple. He claims that the Bible “portrays the sanctuary and its services as the means by which the Lord would deal with the sins of his people.” Yet, this statement is partly true, because the canonical biblical narrative does not describe the sanctuary and its services exclusively to deal with the problem of sin. Vertical typology from a pre-lapsarian perspective enhances one’s view of the chronological order and function of the

---

65 See for example, Heb 8:1-5; 9:23-26. William L. Lane commenting on Heb 9:23 writes: “The additional statement that the heavenly prototypes of the earthly tabernacle and its cultus required cleansing ‘by better sacrifices than these’ clearly implies that the heavenly sanctuary had also become defiled by the sin of the people. Although this implication has been dismissed as ‘nonsense’ . . . , it is consistent with the conceptual framework presupposed by the writer in 9:1-28. His thinking has been informed by the Levitical conception of the necessity for expiatory purification.” Lane concludes “that the effects of sin also extend to the heavenly world is a corollary of the solidarity that the writer perceives between ultimately reality in heaven and its reflection on earth. The cultus on earth is inseparably linked to the situation in heaven (cf. 8:5; 9:7, 11-12, 23; 12:18-24).” William L. Lane, Hebrews, WBC 47b (Dallas: Word Books, 1998), 247. See also Papaioannou and Giantzaklidis, Earthly Shadows, Heavenly Realities, 31-263.

66 Anderson and Bishop, Contours of Old Testament, 201; Waltke, An Old Testament Theology, 546.


sanctuary/temple system/motif, meaning that the sanctuary/temple system/motif does not necessarily exist solely to deal with the problem of sin. Souza concludes:

Again, the occurrence of verbal, conceptual, and iconic connections between the earthly sanctuary and creation does not appear to portray the latter as the antitype of the former. Rather on the basis of the broad context of the Scriptures, creation as it appears in relation with the sanctuary functions as the operational system according to which the entire ritual system and the theology derived from it can make sense. And this happens when creation is integrated with salvation/redemption.69

Souza points out correctly that the biblical evidence seems to warrant that creation is not an antitype of the sanctuary/temple. However, it is more likely, in considering the intertextual directionality of the biblical/canonical semantic framework through vertical typology, that the operational system is the sanctuary/temple motif. This observation is reasonable not only because of its chronological precedence in the biblical canonical narrative, but also because the creation by itself does not constitute a teleological rationale for salvation/redemption. Accordingly, “it is not creation that speaks about the temple with the intention of conveying ideas of salvation; it is the temple that speaks about creation in order to emphasize the cosmic scope of salvation.”70

Therefore, if it is correct to understand that the heavenly sanctuary/temple concept chronologically and canonically precedes the creation event of Gen 1,71 the theological

---

71 Jer 17:12 says: מיקָדָשִֽנַּ֔ה מִקְּדָשֵּׁ֖נָה מְּקָוֹם מֵרִאָשָׁ֑וֹן כָּבִ֔וֹד כִּסֵֶּ֥א (“A glorious high throne from the beginning is the place of our sanctuary” NKJV). This text deserves special attention because it has been the subject of various interpretations. Critical commentators often suggest that this verse is not Jeremiah’s. On the one hand, they are divided on whether this passage refers to Jerusalem’s Temple or contradicts the prophet’s perception of it (cf. Jer 7:1-15; 26:1-6). See Andrew W. Blackwood, Commentary on Jeremiah: The Word, the Words, and the World (Waco: Word Books, 1977), 147-48; Ronald E. Clements, Jeremiah (Atlanta: John Knox, 1988), 106-7; John L. Mackay, Jeremiah 1-20: An Introduction and Commentary (Fearn: Mentor, 2004), 519. On the other hand, other commentators advance the notion that the vocabulary is related to the heavenly realm. See Douglas R. Jones, Jeremiah: Based on the Revised Standard Version (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 244-45. Although it is disputable, there are four reasons to
implication is that there is a historical correspondence between the Old Testament realities and the New Testament eschatological fulfillment. This intertextual directionality of the biblical semantic framework does not endorse the theory that the creation story originated in postexilic times, this proposal has been already reassessed. The overarching worldview/shaping narrative/story dealing with the sanctuary/temple motif is one of the ways God reveals himself to the human race in history, and thus it is debatable in Walton’s view the notion that the cosmos is a temple. Souza aptly states that “from a prophetic/eschatological perspective, the antitypical/archetypical temple to which the earthly tabernacle pointed is not the earth/world nor the cosmos as a whole—or heavens, for that matter—but the heavenly sanctuary of God located in heaven.”

reconsider Jer 17:12 as describing a primal and heavenly motif/reality that reverberates through Scripture. First, כִּסֵֶּ֣א כָבִ֔וֹד is an expression connected to YHWH’s heavenly throne (Isa 6:1-3; Ezek 1:26-28; 43:2-5; Ps 11:4; Isa 66:1; cf. Exod 33:18-23; Ps 24:7-10). Second, מָרָ֖וֹם is a word that speaks of YHWH’s dwelling place in heaven (Jer 25:30; Isa 24:18; 33:5; Ps 102:20 [Eng 10219]; cf. Job 16:19; 25:2; 31:2; Pss 7:8 [Eng 7:7]; 148:1). Third, מֵָֽרִאשּ֑וֹן seems to echo a point prior to the wilderness tabernacle. William McKane seems to be right when he writes that “מֵָֽרִאשּ֑וֹן does nor refer to a historical beginning, but to a transcendental origin which temporalities cannot contain.” William McKane, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah 1-25, ed. J. A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield, and Graham Stanton, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986), 1:406. If it is correct to relate this word with בְּרֵאשִָ֖ית of Gen 1:1, this relationship would harmonize with the idea that there is only one glorious throne preceding the creation in Gen 1, that is, the heavenly sanctuary/temple (cf. Exod 15:17; Prov 8:22-23). Fourth, consequently מְּקָ֖וֹם would reveal, as Ps 68:34-36 [Eng 68:33-35] seems to imply, that “Jeremiah understood that the Lord, not the temple itself, was Israel’s only hope (cf. 14:8; 50:7).” See F. B. Huey, Jeremiah, Lamentations, NAC 16 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1993), 175. Cf. Jack R. Lundbom, Jeremiah 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 793. Souza’s dissertation has provided further evidence to identify the sanctuary/temple heavenly motif in this passage. Souza, “The Heavenly Sanctuary/Temple,” 338-442.

72 Davidson, Typology in Scripture, 377-88; Davidson, “Cosmic Metanarrative,” 102-19.

73 This view is a foundational premise of higher biblical criticism that claims that “it is now increasingly agreed that the Old Testament in its final form is a product of and response to the Babylonian Exile.” Walter Brueggemann, Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 74-75.


The persistent occurrences of the sanctuary/temple motif (conceptually and linguistically interwoven with creation terminology/imagery) function to stress the idea that the sanctuary/temple motif operates as the foundational and overarching semantic framework from which the theology of redemption articulated in creation/re-creation finds its ultimate rationalization: redemption of humanity from the devastating consequences of sin. Hence, this discussion leads us to the conclusion that the sanctuary/temple system/framework is the theological foundation for the created cosmos, and one of the hermeneutical keys to develop a canonical biblical theology of Gen 1.

The Seventh-Day Sabbath as Theological/Canonical Framework

Scholarly studies about the Sabbath are generally focused on its origin, history, and theological/canonical implications. As the first two are well established and reexamined,76 this reflection will focus on the third aspect. The Sabbath passage in the creation narrative is characterized by a manifold collection of purposeful concepts, encircling God’s initial plan of relationship, love, and presence. The Sabbath, as it is understood through the sanctuary/temple framework, announces neverending blessings to the human family, as well as looking forward to the covenant and redemption. The sanctuary/temple implications of the seventh-day divine rest are often overlooked when scholars focus on the most common characteristics of the creation event. It is said about the creation Sabbath that “God not only provided a divine example for keeping the

76 It is commonly observed that from the middle of the seventh century BCE, military invasions of Israel brought not only destruction but also the introduction of foreign cultural influences that challenged Israel’s religio-historical traditions. While this observation is true, it is not entirely correct that this context gave rise to the creation narrative. Instead, the relationship between the seventh day of the creation week and the sanctuary/temple seems to indicate that this narrative pertains to a religio-historical relationship of antiquity. Contra Vervenne, “Genesis 1:1-2:4,” 54.
seventh day as a day of rest, but also bless[ed] and set apart the seventh day for the use and benefit of man.”

Although this statement is completely true, the bigger picture has been overlooked: God’s cosmic power and sovereignty are God’s indisputable attributes. It is from the perspective of the sanctuary/temple motif that the fullest meaning of God’s rest/cessation on the seventh day can be understood. Hence, the role of the seventh-day Sabbath within the theological framework of the sanctuary/temple motif is helpful to establish its canonical contours. In other words, because the creation narrative and the Eden narratives are transmitted by means of a sanctuary/temple semantic framework intentionally incorporated by the author into these narratives, the literary and theological purpose of divine and human rest becomes the hermeneutical key to their interpretation.

The theological centrality of the seventh-day rest in the creation account becomes more evident from the perspective of the sanctuary/temple motif. For example, Marc Vervenne termed Gen 1:1-2:4a from the point of view of this theological framework “the cosmic liturgy of the seventh day.” Specifically, a canonical theology of the Sabbath rest is better understood when considering the operational framework interwoven in the Old and New Testaments alike. In this particular instance, Walton is correct in observing that the theological import of the seventh day is better observed in the context of a functional account.

---


78 “The first three chapters of the book of Genesis are made up of two compositional units which hinge around Gen 2:4. The units in question generate both their meaning and their function within the context of the composition Gen 1-3. The relationship between both segments is essential since they only disclose their meaning in relationship with one another.” See Vervenne, “Genesis 1:1-2:4,” 52.


80 Walton, Lost World of Genesis One, 72; Walton, Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology, 178-84.
necessarily implicates a theological function. The interpretation of Day Seven should not be limited to a material account of origins. According to Nicholas P. Miller, Walton’s observation seems to contribute appropriately to this issue. Miller writes: “A functional view helps to clarify that the Sabbath is not merely an addition to the six days of creation. Rather, on the Sabbath day God created the ongoing temporal order and organization within which creation operates. Thus the seventh day is firmly a part of the week of creation and not merely an afterthought tacked on to the end.”

Nevertheless, the sanctuary/temple motif does not endorse the notion that “Gen 1-2 is an account of the origins of sacred space rather than an account of the origins of the material cosmos.” For example, intertextual analysis between Gen 1 and sanctuary/temple-building accounts does not follow the same reasoning in the sense of being focused merely on functions. The semantic framework in these two accounts describes material and functional realities. Thus, let us explore three aspects that describe the sacred function of the seventh-day Sabbath within the theological framework of the sanctuary/temple motif.

---


83 Walton’s thesis of functional creation is helpful overall, although it is evident that exclusivity of functional origins over material origins is beyond the text in its theological framework. Walton’s discussion of vocabulary and semantics leads him to see “evidence of a functional orientation in Genesis 1, an orientation in which ‘to create something’ means to give it a function.” Walton, *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*, 139. Walton, *Lost World of Adam*, 35-45. Several aspects call for caution in implementing this view because it tampers with its canonical intent. Gen 2:1-3 indicates that God “ceased . . . from his all work” (*וָֹּ֖וַיִשְּבֹּת֙ . . . מִכָּל־מְּלַאכְּת*), implying a divine activity that involved more than “giving functions”; it required “material activity.” Second, if God’s resting place/space came into existence only after the functions were given, God was neither at rest nor in control. God’s sovereignty and cosmic kingship cannot be limited to the narrative of Gen 1-3. Walton’s contribution is significant in the sense that he has paid scholarly attention to the functional aspect of the creation narrative. The functional dimension of the seventh day is often neglected partly because the account of material origins has been emphasized and apparently “nothing material takes place on day seven.” Walton, *Lost World of Adam*, 46. Walton is right about insisting that God inaugurated a function on the seventh day. Gen 2:1-3 is not an appendix, a postscript, or a mere afterthought. The sanctuary/temple background adds a meaningful theological
First, the notion of sacredness permeates the entire creation account and therefore the entire canonical framework. Indeed, the sanctuary/temple motif offers a subtle connection between the sacred space/time and the stability/governability of the created order. As soon as the sacred space/time is lost in Gen 3, Sabbath rest becomes the redemptive theological framework, with the earthly sanctuary/temple (the wilderness tabernacle/Solomon’s Temple) representing the reality of God’s heavenly abode. This connection demonstrates that the biblical author considered that cosmic order followed a cultic order by God’s institution of sacred place/space. Frank H. Gorman explains how cult is situated in the structure of the cosmos:

The priestly writers have placed the construction and meaning of sacred space in the context of the construction and meaning of cosmic order. Just as Yahweh constructed and created order in seven acts of speech, so Yahweh gave instructions for the construction of sacred space in seven speeches. So also Yahweh gave instructions for the sacrificial activity to be performed in sacred space in seven speeches. Moses constructs the tabernacle in seven acts and ordains the priesthood in seven acts.

Defilement of the sacred space/time (for example, the sanctuary/temple) is of such importance within this theological framework because it threatens the kingship/rulership perspective to the Sabbath rest. In fact, interpreting the seventh day of the creation narrative with no awareness of a cultic framework hinders the message God wanted to convey. The biblical canonical semantic framework of the sanctuary/temple motif seems to mark the divine rest in Gen 2:1-3 as the climax of the creative acts.

84 The role of sacred place/time in Scripture is revealed by several sevenfold patterns: Exod 25-31 (seven speeches: instructions to build the tabernacle); Exod 40:17-33 (seven acts of Moses: the construction of tabernacle); Lev 1-7 (seven speeches: instructions to sacrificial activity); Lev 8 (seven acts: ordination of priesthood). As soon as the sacred place/space becomes operational for the first sacrifices (Lev 9), a problem is raised by two individuals who introduce sin and defile the sacred place/space (Lev 10). It is not a coincidence that seven acts of speech in the creation narrative (Gen 1) are followed by two individuals who introduce sin and defile sacred place/space (Gen 3). See further in Sarah Stokes Musser, “Sacrifice, Sabbath, and the Restoration of Creation” (PhD diss., Duke University, 2015), 97-139.

85 Gorman, The Ideology of Ritual, 52.
of YHWH. In other words, Sabbath rest representing sacred space/time in the creation narrative is one constitutive element of God’s notion of order. Divine rest is the establishment of God’s sovereignty, and the preeminence of God’s kingship/rulership secures sacred space and time. Through the seventh-day Sabbath (rest), God institutes the sacredness of time, and God’s presence transforms the newly created Garden into a sacred place, that is, a sanctuary/temple: a תַבְּנִית [tabni’î]; “shape,” “form,” “pattern”] of the heavenly reality.

The above leads us to an important second point: Sabbath rest reveals God’s plan to establish sacred time and space on earth as it is in the sanctuary/temple model in heaven. The historical and canonical import of the sacred cosmic time/space implies that divine rest is the paradigm for human rest. Divine rest as the model for human rest is better appraised through the semantic framework of the sanctuary/temple motif.

86 Some scholars have ventured proposals about the significance of time and space in Gen 1-3. Critical interpreters argue that with the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem, “holy time” (Sabbath) became more important than “holy space/place” (sanctuary/temple). See Hans-Joachim Kraus, Worship in Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), 87-88; Samuel L. Terrien, The Elusive Presence: The Heart of Biblical Theology (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983), 393. The reasoning behind this proposal is that “holy time has a ‘strongly universal character,’ while holy place has a ‘strongly particular character.’” Wallace, “Genesis 2:1-3,” 248. This distinction is partly correct because divine rest in Gen 1 reveals the cosmic dimension of space/time; it speaks of both universal and particular sanctuary/temple functionality.

87 Skinner, Genesis, 35. In fact, while for our contemporary minds rest follows work, according to the biblical text “the Sabbath as a day of rest, as a day from abstaining from work, is not for the purpose of recovering one’s lost strength and becoming fit for the forthcoming labor. The Sabbath is a day for the sake of life.” See Abraham J. Heschel, The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man (New York: The Noonday, 1994), 14.
Divine Rest

The Sabbath in Gen 2:1-3\textsuperscript{88} is described only in terms of God. The theological implication that emerges is that the text is dealing with the doctrine of God (theology and not anthropology).\textsuperscript{89} “By resting on the seventh day, God is thereby shown to have entered into the time of the created order.”\textsuperscript{90} Divine rest prompts active sacred intimacy through sovereign governance. The traditional understanding of the seventh day neglects that divine rest is a relational marker that enhances the governance purpose of God over creation. This perspective contrasts with the notion that sovereignty implies detachment.\textsuperscript{91} Thus, there is a juxtaposed connection between divine presence, intimacy, rest, and the sanctuary/temple.\textsuperscript{92} “It [Sabbath] is also tied to the notion of the presence of Yahweh. Since the tabernacle, which is patterned on the divine plan, reveals that presence

\textsuperscript{88} As noted in chapter IV of this dissertation, the amount of scholarly literature dealing with the origin of the seventh day and the Sabbath as institution is far too great to review it here. Although it has been observed that the seventh-day Sabbath occurs with significant consistency throughout the Old Testament, there is only one explicit reference to the Sabbath in the Psalms/Wisdom literature: Ps 92. See Richard M. Davidson, “The Sabbath: The Chiastic Structure of Psalm 92” (paper presented at Society of Biblical Literature, Chicago, November, 1988). Cf. Marvin E. Tate, Psalms 51-100, WBC (Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 460-71. According to Andreasen, it is a multifaceted research area where no satisfactory answer has been found: Andreasen, “Recent Studies,” 456. In view of this, it should not be surprising that we turn to the theological task of reconsidering a sanctuary/temple semantic framework for a better understanding of the Sabbath as a cessation/rest day.

\textsuperscript{89} Raoul Dederen, “Reflections on a Theology of the Sabbath,” in The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand and Daniel Augsburger (Washington: Review and Herald, 1982), 296. This leads to the conclusion that the creation and Eden narratives are theocentric. The subject is the Creator God (אֱלֹהִָ֖ים יְּהוָ֥ה), the One who exercises will to create everything, including humanity. “Gen 1:1-2:4a is not anthropocentric.” See Fishbane, Text and Texture, 11.

\textsuperscript{90} Terence E. Fretheim, God and World in the Old Testament: A Relational Theology of Creation (Nashville: Abingdon, 2005), 63.

\textsuperscript{91} Tonstad, Lost Meaning, 33.

and shares in the role of the heavenly temple to proclaim the sovereignty of the deity, so the Sabbath shares in the proclamation of the sovereignty of Yahweh.”

The Old Testament contains some references to the heavenly courts of the sanctuary/temple. These passages (1 Kgs 22:19; cf. Job 1; Ps 82; Isa 6; Ezek 1, 40-48; Zech 3) depict God’s activity in heaven as directly involving human affairs on earth. Andreasen seems correct that in the Old Testament, there are no seasons of rest in the heavenly courts. Moreover, he categorically concludes that “there is nothing in the Old Testament statements about the Sabbath which would warrant their applications to the heavenly situation.” However, God in his heavenly rest should not be viewed as disengaged, but as busily occupied with the universe’s stability. This may be a possible explanation for the origin of the motif of divine rest in the creation account. Inasmuch as God rested when he created the heavens and the earth, God wanted to rest after creating the nation of Israel, which would enjoy rest as well. As Jürgen Moltmann notes, “the God who rests in the face of his creation does not dominate the world on this day: he ‘feels’ the world; he allows himself to be affected, to be touched by each of his creatures, He adopts the community of creation as his own milieu.”

95 Andreasen, The Old Testament Sabbath, 184.
96 Another explanation that is often proposed by scholars is drawn from ANE literature. It has been assumed that the author of Gen 1-3 knew some cosmogonies in which deities rested after their creative activities. However, the idea that the biblical divine rest parallels the ANE myths is not congruent with the biblical notion of rest. While in the biblical account the origin, purpose, and nature of God’s rest are sovereign, the Egyptian and Mesopotamian gods struggle to reach rest. See Walton, Ancient Near Eastern Thought, 114, 157-64, 194, 196-99, 215.
Moreover, divine rest is found in the Bible exclusively within the sanctuary/temple framework. On the seventh day “God ceases to create. Yet God is still active.” The Sabbath rest, being the climax of the creation narrative, is inherently related to a divine cessation/rest from work in a just completed and created world. It should be mentioned that while the creative acts during the first six days were called good, the Sabbath was declared holy. This means that holiness is inherently founded on God’s activity, and not merely on time. Timothy Watson puts it like this:

It would, however, be difficult to support from Scripture the idea that the seventh day was holy simply because the Sabbath involved “time.” Genesis 2:1-3 states that the seventh day was blessed and sanctified “because in it He rested from all His work which God had created and made.” Thus, it is God who sanctifies the day, not its temporal nature. The focus of this narrative is on God, not time. And it is his “finishing” and “resting,” rather than a movement from spatial to temporal realities, that is emphasized.

What is crucial is the cultic nature of the relationship between divine cessation/rest and the recent created world:

This holy seventh day is not part of the heavens and the earth that can be comprehended by the senses. Holy time is a spiritual, not a physical matter. It can only be experienced, not observed. By concluding with God resting, blessing and sanctifying, the account makes it clear that any view of the world that excludes the spiritual is totally inadequate. Without that, God’s work would not be finished.

98 God is the subject of four verbs; see Doukhan, Genesis, 68.
99 The writer of the creation account does not place the Sabbath rest in a vacuum: “the importance of this passage to the creation story is emphasized by its location at its very end.” Isaac Kalimi, Jewish Bible Theology: Perspectives and Case Studies (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 107. Cf. Doukhan, “The Genesis Creation Story,” 31; Norman R. Gulley, Satan’s Trojan Horse: God’s End-Time Victory (Hagerstown: Review and Herald, 2004), 195; Andreasen, Rest and Redemption, 71.
101 Turner, Back to the Present, 30. Dietrich Bonhoeffer coherently expresses this idea: “In the Bible ‘rest’ really means more than ‘having rest.’ It means rest after the work is accomplished, it means completion, it means the perfection and peace in which the world rests, it means transfiguration, it means turning our eyes absolutely upon God’s being God and toward worshiping him.” Bonhoeffer, Creation and Fall, 40.
This conclusion is further supported and confirmed by the literary/thematic emphasis on sacred time in the creation account.\textsuperscript{102} Westermann rightly observes that “by fitting the motif of rest into the creation work, P has given creation the character of an event that moves through time towards its goal.”\textsuperscript{103} Thus, the creation narrative takes the form and meaning of a historical event, implying that the God who acts in history is the same God who acts in creation.\textsuperscript{104} The historicity of God’s Sabbath rest viewed through the sanctuary/temple semantic framework (in biblical canonical narratives) becomes a redemptive covenantal motif.\textsuperscript{105} Specifically, the Sabbath is a palace in time.\textsuperscript{106}

Walton’s suggestion that “rest” in Gen 2:1-3 “is more a matter of engagement without obstacles than disengagement without responsibilities”\textsuperscript{107} might be true. Otherwise, an aesthetic and contemplative definition of “rest,” though it is right, seems to leave the impression that a greater perspective is absent.\textsuperscript{108} God’s rest in the context of the sanctuary/temple semantic framework seems to signify the redemptive hope and the

\textsuperscript{102} The relationship between the created world (space) and time is found from the very beginning of the creation narrative. “The first silence precedes time, the second sanctifies it.” Fishbane, \textit{Text and Texture}, 9.

\textsuperscript{103} Westermann, \textit{Genesis 1-11}, 89-90.

\textsuperscript{104} Westermann, \textit{Genesis 1-11}, 90.

\textsuperscript{105} Timmer, \textit{Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath}, 56.


\textsuperscript{107} Walton, \textit{Lost World of Genesis One}, 73.

\textsuperscript{108} This seems the case in McKeown, \textit{Genesis}, 28.
divine sovereignty of his cosmic kingship/rulership,\textsuperscript{109} a תַבְּנִית [\textit{taḇnîṯ}]: “shape,” “form,” “pattern”) of the heavenly reality.\textsuperscript{110}

Human Rest

In 1933 Von Rad wrote that “among the many benefits of redemption offered to man by Holy Scripture, that of ‘rest’ has been almost overlooked in biblical theology.”\textsuperscript{111} Forty years later, Kaiser’s assessment of Von Rad’s opinion concluded that there had been no substantial progress.\textsuperscript{112} However, today, more than eighty years after Von Rad’s assertion, the motif of rest is regaining a prominent role in biblical theology, particularly from the perspective of sanctuary/temple theology.

The theological locus of human rest should be understood from God’s activity in Gen 2:1-3 and within the sanctuary/temple semantic framework. Although there are some

\textsuperscript{109} In this sense Walton seems to be correct when he insists that Sabbath rest means that God “is taking command, that he is mounting to this throne to assume his rightful place and his proper role.” Walton, \textit{Lost World of Genesis One}, 75. However, it is important to mention two differences that Walton seems to overlook. Doukhan aptly observes: “The ancient Near Eastern cosmos becomes functional after the rest, while in Genesis 1 the world is made functional before the Sabbath rest (a point that Walton consistently makes). Note also that the gods’ rest is only achieved when humans are created for the purpose of working for them, while in the biblical story God rests after he created humans.” See Doukhan, “Review of John H. Walton,” 87.

\textsuperscript{110} Does “divine rest” in the creation account necessarily require the notion that the cosmos is a temple, and thus, that the event of creation was a cosmic-sized cultic act? No. Viewing the Sabbath rest of the creation account in light of the sanctuary/temple motif seems to indicate that God’s creative/sovereign work on earth extends and continues beyond Gen 1-3.

\textsuperscript{111} Von Rad, \textit{Problem of the Hexateuch}, 94.

\textsuperscript{112} Kaiser, “Theology of Rest,” 135.
contextual differences throughout this frame, the original nature and purpose of sabbatical rest are retained for humankind.

The relationship between human observance of the weekly seventh-day Sabbath and the sanctuary/temple motif is indisputable. This relationship is central to understand Sabbath holiness. Divine blessings are usually bestowed upon people and animals, and lead to fruitfulness and prosperity. It is puzzling, then, that the day when God ceased from His work is set apart as holy and blessed. Why did God set apart the seventh day? Wenham writes that “the seventh day is the very first thing to be hallowed in Scripture, to acquire that special status that properly belongs to God alone.” It is precisely divine holiness that makes the human seventh-day rest blessed. Indeed, the textual evidence of the semantic framework equates the Sabbath and the sanctuary/temple

113 There is a clear shift in emphasis from divine work in Gen 1:1-2:1-4a to human work in Exod 25-40. Fishbane observes two indicators of this shift: First, while in the creation narrative the Creator God (אֱלֹהִָ֖ים יְּהוָ֥ה) is the subject of the account, Moses stands out in the construction of the tabernacle; moreover, while in the creation narrative the Spirit of God (וְּרֶ֣וּחַ אֱלֹהִִ֔ים) intervenes at the beginning of the creative process, it is also the Spirit of God (וְּרֶ֣וּחַ אֱלֹהִִ֔ים) who inspires Bezalel’s role in constructing the tabernacle (Exod 31:3). Second, and more important, Sabbath rest in the creation account is a divine prerogative, while in the construction of the tabernacle it is human cessation from labor. See Fishbane, Text and Texture, 12.

114 The Sabbath day, and therefore the cessation/rest, is described in Scripture as a creation ordinance, that is, a mandate given to humanity before its embodiment in the Mosaic covenant with the people of Israel. See Lincoln, “From Sabbath to Lord's Day,” 346. This implies that the cultic cessation/rest was instituted before the building/inauguration of the sanctuary/temple on earth. Thus, the temporary nature of the earthly sanctuary/temple (the wilderness tabernacle/Solomon’s Temple) in Israel would point back to the time of creation, when there was no Israel, but still a cosmic sanctuary/temple where the cultic cessation/rest found its place.

115 For example, Laansma observes that numerous passages depict the Sabbath celebration in the sanctuary/temple (2 Kgs 11:4-12; 16:17; Isa 1:10-14; Lam 2:6). Laansma, “I Will Give You Rest,” 68. This is especially evident in the exilic period. Andreasen writes that “at the time, we learn that the Sabbath was understood to be closely associated with the now lost temple, and we may presume, therefore, that the exiles considered an appropriate Sabbath celebration to be a temple’s celebration.” Andreasen, The Old Testament Sabbath, 241.

116 Wenham, Genesis 1-15, 36.
in holiness, “elevating the sanctity of the Sabbath to the level of the sanctuary.” One further point to recognize is the unique sanctifying character of time. The fact that, before sin, no literal or physical dimension (sanctuary/temple) is explicitly declared as holy “suggests that man can have fellowship with God at any place.” God created an Eden on earth in order to expand his fellowship already prototypically established in the heavenly Eden. However, this rest-fellowship was subject to a crucial reality: a sinless creation. The introduction of sin marred this rest-fellowship, and God manifested himself later throughout the same edenic semantic framework in a particular and physical place: the sanctuary/temple.

Now, what do the blessedness and holiness of the seventh-day Sabbath mean for humankind? In the words of Sakae Kubo, “the Sabbath is first of all a memorial of God’s friendship to man, a monument of God’s presence with him.” Yet, these two attributes, blessedness and holiness, that were given to this period of time do not stem from humankind’s behavior during the Sabbath; instead, the blessedness and holiness of the seventh-day Sabbath depend upon God’s activity of sanctuary/temple rest—God’s tabernacling presence. “The sanctification of the Sabbath institutes an order for humankind according to which time is divided into time and holy time. . . . By sanctifying the seventh day God instituted a polarity between the everyday and the

119 Mathews, Genesis 1:11:26, 176.
solemn, between days of work and days of rest, which was to be determinative for human existence.”

The seventh day is granted to humankind as a sacred space in history, one which is not bound to time or place. “To participate in the rest in the seventh day is to participate in the continuous creative activity of Elohim.” This divine activity reenacts the re-creation of heavens and earth according to the primal order. The sanctuary/temple semantic framework places the Sabbath rest for humans in the perspective of the boundless cosmic kingship/rulership of God. The sovereignty of God’s kingship/rulership encompasses the whole universe; it incorporates the heavens and earth. Specifically, sanctuary/temple rest as portrayed in Gen 2:1-3 (and reflected in the Old Testament) shows a connection between heavenly and earthly activities: human rest teleologically emulates and/or echoes the divine rest. Andreasen argues that the creation narrative does not develop a heavenly Sabbath as the antitype of the earthly Sabbath. Andreasen’s assertion is based upon the assumption that divine rest is only discussed in connection with the creation week because there is no certainty whether “the divine Sabbath rest

121 Westermann, Genesis 1-11, 171. Gane comments that the holiness is available wherever the person is. He writes that “just as the sanctuary was the physical place where the Lord and the Israelites were especially connected, Sabbath was the time that showed in a special way that God made holy the people who were his because He had redeemed them from Egypt.” Roy E. Gane, Altar Call (Berrien Springs: Diadem, 1999), 136.


124 The Sabbath is an important element that connects the divine and human categories of reality. The dynamic interaction of Gen 2:1-3 and Exod 20:8-11 yields the cosmic harmonious relationship between humankind’s rest and God’s; it reveals the structural and functional correspondence between the earthly rest and the heavenly rest. “Just as the tabernacle was built along lines specified by divine decree, so too in the sequence is the human Sabbath institution modeled on the divine pattern (Exod 20:8-11; 31:17).” See Wallace, “Genesis 2:1-3,” 246.
continued henceforth, or whether God returned to some other work on the following first
day.”

It should be admitted, however, that in the strict sense of the term the Sabbath
rest was not a temporary vertical type. Roy Gane explains this issue:

If the Sabbath were a temporary vertical type, we would expect some indication in the
Bible regarding the end of its typical significance as we have in the case of the earthly
sanctuary. The earthly temple lost its significance when the original heavenly temple
took the place of the earthly as the location toward which worship should be directed
(Heb 7-10). But there is no such indication that a similar dynamic applies to the
Sabbath.

The relationship between earthly and heavenly realities is crucial to understand
the seventh-day theological framework of human rest. The goal of human rest follows the
perennial divine rest, meaning that the rationale of human rest on the seventh day goes
beyond Gen 2:1-3 and should be traced back to God’s eternal rest. Davidson notes:

In the Old Testament the main noun for “rest” (Hebrew menuchah; Greek katapausis)
also means “resting place,” and is equated with Mount Zion (the city of Jerusalem),
and in particular, with the place of God’s throne in the sanctuary or temple. Thus it’s
no wonder that in the Epistle to the Hebrews, immediately after mentioning the
Sabbath rest in Hebrews 4, the author invites us to “come boldly to the throne of
grace [in the heavenly sanctuary, God’s “resting place”].

In this sense, some elements in Meredith G. Kline’s interpretation of the creation
account seem to capture the theological significance of the connection between earthly
and heavenly realities. Quite apart from Kline’s conclusion that the creation narrative

125 Andreasen, The Old Testament Sabbath, 186.
128 Meredith G. Kline’s interpretation is known as “literary framework.” This interpretation
proposes that the creation account should be read figuratively with no indicators of its chronology or
duration. See Meredith G. Kline, “Because It Had Not Rained,” WTJ 20 (1958): 146-57. See similar views
in Mark Ross, “The Framework Hypothesis: An Interpretation of Genesis 1:1.2:3,” in Did God Create in
Six Days?, ed. Joseph A. Pipa and David W. Hall (Taylors: Southern Presbyterian, 2005), 113-20; Blocher,
In the Beginning, 49-59; D. F. Payne, Genesis One Reconsidered (London: Tyndale, 1964), 5-29.
does not intend to indicate the chronology or duration of the acts of creation, he proposes a two-register cosmology in which the biblical drama is developed by constant interaction between the heavens and the earth.\textsuperscript{129} Kline’s eschatological development features the Garden of Eden as the sacred center of the earthly reproduction of the heavenly reality; humankind’s fall radically affected the way the replication of holy heaven on earth was to unfold. Considering that the seven days of the creation week are “seven times” the twenty-four hours of a solar day, and if the Garden of Eden follows the sanctuary/temple semantic framework and vertical typology, this would signify that the seventh day on earth emulates and/or echoes a heavenly “time,” not time measured by astronomical signs. “In the Genesis prologue the unending nature of God's Sabbath is signalized by the absence of the evening-morning formula from the account of the seventh day.”\textsuperscript{130} Divine rest is not limited by the time factor (Gen 2:1-3), as opposed to human rest (Exod 20:8-11). Then, the conceptual parallelism between lower and upper registers (in Kline’s words) is evidence that the creation followed a paradigmatic pattern; it does not indicate that the creation week is to be understood figuratively. Nevertheless, one may agree moderately with Kline:

Rounding out the series of acts of spatial and temporal replication in the Genesis prologue is the reproduction of the pattern of the Creator’s time in the instituting of the Sabbath ordinance. This ordinance superimposed a special temporal grid on the calendar of days and seasons marked by astronomical sequences. The Sabbath was designed for symbolic purposes within the covenant community, as a sign calling to consecration and the imitation of God and as a seal promising consummation of the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{129} Kline thinks that “the six days fall naturally into two triads, one dealing with creation kingdoms and the other with the creature kings given dominion over them. . . . The earthly products of the first three days mirror one or another characteristic of the invisible heaven, the above realm.” See Meredith G. Kline, \textit{God, Heaven and Har Magedon: A Covenantal Tale of Cosmos and Telos} (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2006), 232.

\end{footnotesize}
kingdom to the covenant keepers. By this promise the Sabbath reminds us that lower register history as a whole is patterned after upper register time in that it is a consummation-directed eschatological movement. The weekly scheme of the Sabbath ordinance portrays this overall seventh-day-bound design of lower register time while it symbolically mirrors the archetypal heavenly creation week itself.\textsuperscript{131}

Moreover, Doukhan persuasively argues that since the Sabbath is called a sign (Exod 31:13; Ezek 20:12) “the Sabbath is intended to be a language that speaks to believers not only about a reality that involves them now but also a reality that is beyond themselves.”\textsuperscript{132} The Sabbath celebration/keeping/observance is not only a remembrance of creation in the past and an earthly hope for redemption in the future, but does allude to cosmic/universal realities.\textsuperscript{133} Indeed, “the themes of creation, Sabbath, redemption and sanctification are inseparably linked together, and with the Sabbath’s covenant aspect they reach into the eschatological future.”\textsuperscript{134} In this respect, it is important to recognize that the rest promised in the Sinai covenant not only comes to resemble that enjoyed by God upon the completion of his work in Gen 1-3,\textsuperscript{135} but typifies the cosmic nature of the Sabbath as an institution. Human celebration/keeping/observance of weekly rest, echoing God’s rest, is therefore connected theologically with the sanctuary/temple canonical development of \textit{Heilsgeschichte}.\textsuperscript{136} To fully understand Sabbath rest, it is necessary to

\textsuperscript{131} Kline, “Space and Time,” 11-12.


\textsuperscript{134} Hasel, “Sabbath in the Pentateuch,” 21, 33-35. See also Dederen, “Reflections on a Theology,” 297.

\textsuperscript{135} Timmer, \textit{Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath}, 57.

\textsuperscript{136} This theological implication goes against the often argued idea that “there is no indication that men and women participate in God’s Sabbath, either now or in the future.” See Laansma, \textit{“I Will Give You}
explore the eschatological development/fulfillment of the cultic festal cycle of the sanctuary/temple in salvation history and covenant history. Hans K. LaRondelle follows this reasoning and writes that “the connecting link between God’s covenant of creation with his covenant of redemption is God’s Sabbath (Gen 2).” Hence, it should be recognized that divine rest becomes an expression of faith and a holy experience of communion for the covenantal people of God.

To summarize thus far, the divine rest (heavenly “time”) and human rest on the seventh day (earthly time) are among the conceptual cornerstones of the sanctuary/temple semantic framework. Significantly, Sabbath rest regarded in its canonical development becomes the cultic motif/reality that connects heavens and earth, thus protology and eschatology. “The future event of God’s salvation may be actualized in the Sabbath, Rest,” 65. However, it is correct to understand that in the Old and New Testaments, human rest is not God’s rest, but a projection into the eschatological and complete restoration beyond Heilsgeschichte.

137 “The temple was to be the one place on earth where the people could enter into the rest of God and again be in the Sanctuary where the Lord God dwelt.” See Ross, Recalling the Hope, 89. Haran indicates that in priestly terminology any hallowed article or object (in this case, time) can be considered a “sacred place” or “sanctuary.” Menahem Haran, Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1985), 15.


139 De Vaux explains that “its [Sabbath rest] characteristic feature lies not in the regularity with which it recurs, not in the cessation of work, nor in the various prohibitions which the cessation of work implies; all this is found, more or less, in other civilizations. Its distinctive trait lies in the fact that it is a day made holy because of its relation to the God of the covenant; more, it is an element in that covenant.” De Vaux, Ancient Israel, 480.

140 Roy Gane notes that Exod 31:16-17 is one of the two references to “a covenant forever between God and the Israelites as a whole during the period of their wandering in the wilderness.” The other reference is found in Lev 24:8. See Gane, Altar Call, 164-65. See also Brevard S. Childs, The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), 416.

141 The structure of the book of Genesis is valuable to understand elements in protology and eschatology from the perspective of the creation and sanctuary/temple relationship. Doukhan has proposed the following chiastic structure (ABCB₁A₂):

A Eden: Adam (1-2)
the sabbatical year or even in the institution of the Jubilee (Ps 92:4; Jer 25:9-12; Isa 61:1-2; Dan 9:2, 24-27).”\(^{142}\) The sanctuary/temple semantic framework of Gen 1 (and Gen 2-3) definitely shows that there is a divine ordering of history such that as history moves toward its consummation, it moves towards the pivotal goal of God’s sanctuary/temple rest.\(^ {143}\) As Walter Kaiser puts it: “The rest which God gives is at once historical (Canaan), soteriological (salvation), and eschatological (the kingdom and our reign with Christ).”\(^ {144}\) From the Christian perspective, Sabbath rest in the New Testament bears the same theological significance as the weekly Sabbath rest in the Old Testament\(^ {145}\) because “the on-going applicability of the Sabbath, which God instituted at Creation, has not ceased because the Sabbath has never functioned as a temporary type.”\(^ {146}\)

Barcellos notes:

---


143 Lincoln, “From Sabbath to Lord's Day,” 349.


The writer of the Hebrews sees God’s rest from the foundation of the world not as inactivity, or only as God’s enthronement over the world. He sees it as pointing forward and as something for man to enter. It is not only something that points to Christ and then is swallowed up and ceases to exist once He comes to live, die, and be raised from the dead. The author sees God’s rest as a state of existence that could be attained. He sees it as present symbol of a type of life man did not enjoy via creation but is brought to only by redemption. He sees it as eschatological life for man.

In the final restoration to Edenic conditions (re-creation), the eschatological Sabbath reunites the divine and human rest of the Old and New Testaments, as it was originally intended at creation. Only the eschatological Day of Atonement, or Yom Kippur, could accomplish this. “If the Sabbath is a kind of Tabernacle in time, no less is the Tabernacle a Sabbath in space.”

Kaiser, commenting on this topic, concludes:

The rest of God is distinctively his own rest which He offers to share first with Israel and through them with all the sons of men who will also enter into it by faith. While there were antecedent aspects of that final rest to come, chiefly in the divine rest provided by the inheritance of the land of Canaan, because it was not accompanied by the inward response of faith to the whole promise of God, of which this rest was just a part, the land of Canaan still awaits Israel and the people of God. The rest of God, lost in the fall, again rejected by the older wilderness generation and subsequently by their erring children is still future to us in our day.

---


149 Andreasen, *The Old Testament Sabbath*, 225. In the same vein, one might observe through the sanctuary/temple semantic framework that the characterization of God’s Sabbath rest in Gen 2 has a cosmic outlook, related as it is to the creation of the world. See also Robinson, *Origin and Development*, 420. This observation also indicates that the seventh day in Gen 2:1-3 is a creation “ordinance.” Some arguments against this conclusion are set forth in A. T. Lincoln, “Sabbath Rest, and Eschatology in the New Testament,” in *From Sabbath to Lord’s Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation*, ed. D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), 345-60.


152 Kaiser, “Theology of Rest,” 149.
Thus, the Sabbath rest is a symbol of salvation, a return to Eden.\(^{153}\) This does not mean that the creation week was not a historical event. This theological implication is derived from the idea that the biblical way of thinking portrays the theological/spiritual lessons as rooted in historical events, and not vice versa.\(^{154}\) In this sense, one may agree with Barth when he claims that “the history of the covenant was really established in the event of the seventh day.”\(^{155}\) Consequently, the conceptual framework of the Sabbath rest becomes central in God’s redemptive and sacred history (\textit{Heilsgeschichte}) due to the fact that “the Sabbath is the actualization of a past event upon the basis of which can be thought the miracles of tomorrow. Hope is made of memory.”\(^{156}\)

Now, the theological framework of the Sabbath rest would indicate that just as the created sacred space (the Garden of Eden and by extension the whole earth) was modeled according to a heavenly \(\text{תַּבְּנִית}\), the entrance of sin into the world became a cosmic defilement, a state that required purification.\(^{157}\) Since the “sacred space must be protected

---


\(^{154}\) There is a common notion in critical scholarship that the story of creation is told \textit{confessionally}. For example, according to Westermann, this means that “praise of God, the Creator, does not presuppose the creation story. The present narrative is, in fact, a developed and expanded confession of faith in God as Creator.” Claus Westermann, \textit{A Thousand Years and a Day: Our Time in the Old Testament} (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1962), 3. Cf. Anderson, \textit{From Creation to New Creation}, 210-11. Yet, the present position and form of the creation narrative certainly prioritize the historical event over the human worship experience. Doukhan is justified in suggesting: “Hebrew thinking takes the reverse direction and prefers, on the contrary, to place history and existence before spiritual and theological constructions (Exod 24:7).” Doukhan, “Response to John H. Walton,” 202; Doukhan, \textit{Hebrew for Theologians}, 192-93.


\(^{156}\) Doukhan, “Literary Structure,” 229.

\(^{157}\) Events such as the \(\text{מַבּוּל}\) [\textit{mabbûl}; “flood”] should be placed in this theological framework. The entrance of sin into the world did not affect only the \(\text{גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן}\), but in fact the entire created earth (Gen 6:3-6). It is a faulty argument that a local cataclysmic flood would be intentionally described as a global flood for rhetorical purposes and theological reasons. \textit{Contra} Tremper Longman and John H. Walton, \textit{The Lost World of the Flood: Mythology, Theology, and the Deluge Debate} (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2018), 91-99. The sanctuary/temple framework implies a cleansing of the earth’s space as a global event. It
and cleansed when necessary,” biblical narratives describing destruction of the earth/land and purification of the sacred space are correlated by means of the sanctuary/temple motif. This is a rationale for covenant and redemption within the semantic framework of the creation account.

**Creation, Redemption, and Covenant**

It is extremely significant that the biblical narrative starts with Genesis and not with Exodus, with creation and not redemption. This is, the biblical narratives of God’s dealings with his chosen people are preceded by the creation account and the origins of humankind. Similarly, the Bible ends with a new heaven and a new earth. “From a literary point of view, it is the created order that constitutes a grand ‘envelop structure’ for the whole of Scripture with the theme of creation/recreation enclosing everything else.” In this way, the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 1 (and 2-3) reveals the framework of covenantal redemption. A superior perception—and, more importantly, the canonical/biblical theological framework—starts with a preexisting heavenly sanctuary/temple (before creation in Gen 1) and ends with a sanctuary/temple (after re-creation in Rev 21). This is a striking observation because the beginning of the biblical narrative is not about the origin of the nation of Israel, but about human beginnings. At should be noted also that this perspective is taken in Peter’s (2 Pet 2:3-7, 10, 13) and John’s words (Rev 19-22). The dual character of salvation, “it both saves and destroys,” will be explored in the next section, “Creation, Redemption, and Covenant.”


159 Fretheim, God and World, xiv.

the same time, the canonical/biblical theological framework is about God’s cosmic sovereignty. There is no other far-reaching scope possible. Sailhamer explained it in this way:

The opening of the Pentateuch, along with its echo in Exodus 15, moves us in two directions, suggesting an answer to the problem of the relationship between kingdom ideas and covenants. If we view the notions of covenant and kingdom together with the biblical idea of universal (Gen 1:1) and local creation (Gen 2), one might say that creation and preparation of ‘the earth’ (Gen 2), is recounted as the proper context within which one must view the covenant blessings; that is, obedience is required of those who live in the Land (Gen 2:16-17; 3:24), and at the same time all creation (Gen 1:1) is subject to God’s dominion, that is, kingship.161

Indeed, creation and re-creation, the beginning and end of Scripture, strongly suggest the presence of the sanctuary/temple motif. This in turn would indicate that the historical development in the biblical canon of God’s redemptive acts is framed by an overarching worldview/shaping narrative/story in Scripture: the sanctuary/temple.

At this stage of our study, one may inquire about the relationship between sanctuary/temple and covenant (redemption) in a canonical/biblical theology of creation.162 The fact that the tabernacle came to be constructed after God’s people obtained freedom from slavery does not limit either the covenantal relationship between God and his people or the sanctuary/temple framework of functions/purposes prior to Sinai.163 As was stated previously,164 the sanctuary/temple system/framework is the theological/canonical foundation for the created cosmos.165 Thus, in order to explore a

---

161 Sailhamer, *Meaning of the Pentateuch*, 582.
164 See chapters II and III of this dissertation.
165 Margaret Baker has made a valuable contribution on the Old Testament temple theology; see further in Barker, *Temple Theology*, 17. For a New Testament perspective see John W. Welch, *The Sermon*
biblical/canonical theology of the creation narrative in relationship to redemption and covenant, three points of discussion deserve special attention.

First, the argument has already been made that the conceptual backdrop of the creation narrative (and Eden narratives) is the sanctuary/temple motif. Consequently, this leads us to affirm that a canonical biblical theology develops the sanctuary/temple motif as the theological framework of the creation/cosmos, recognizing that the theology of creation is advanced in Scripture more in accord with the sanctuary/temple motif. If this premise is correct, then the sanctuary/temple system/framework is the theological foundation for the history of salvation, and indeed, a rationale for a canonical biblical theology of Gen 1.

Second, creation and redemption should be considered as two different ideas in canonical/biblical theology. Yet, complementary to this affirmation—indeed, more

---

on the Mount in the Light of the Temple (England: Ashgate, 2009), 15-37. In this study, John Welch argues that themes, vocabulary, allusions, and rituals associated with the Jerusalem temple provide the unity and authority for the Sermon on the Mount.


167 As opposed to the creation as the theological foundation for the entire tabernacle system; Souza, “Sanctuary: Cosmos, Covenant, and Creation,” 36.

specifically because of it—they are equally interdependent, as the history of salvation is developed within the sanctuary/temple semantic framework. Furthermore, the historical reality shown by its canonical intertextuality portrays redemption (and

169 This observation goes against the idea that the creation narrative depends on ANE cosmologies, and therefore as a tradition handed down, the biblical account is not saying anything new. This assertion holds the view that creation is never the object of a revelation. For example, Westermann argued that there is a polarity between creation and redemption that can be traced through the whole Bible, that their relationship is extremely varied, and that they cannot be separated from each other. See Westermann, Creation, 123. One cannot agree with Westermann because the rationale for his conclusion assumes that the notion of creation emerged out of a spiritual (soteriological) reflection. Cf. Westermann, Creation, 113-14. Similar positions were held previously by Gerhard Von Rad, “The Theological Problem of the Old Testament Doctrine of Creation,” in Creation in the Old Testament, ed. Bernhard W. Anderson (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 53-64. Cf. also Moyer V. Hubbard, New Creation in Paul’s Letters and Thought (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2002), 12-14. Doukhan observes that this hermeneutical presupposition harmonizes with the Marcionite approach to the Bible, opposing redemption to creation, the Savior to the Creator. Hence, the idea that creation emerged out of a spiritual (soteriological) reflection “betrays the classic Marcionite paradigm that prioritizes spiritual redemption over material creation.” Doukhan, “Literary Structure,” 224, see entire discussion in 217-36; Doukhan, “Response to John H. Walton,” 202. The problem of the subservience of creation to redemption is that, as H. Wayne House has pointed it out, “this view suffers from taking the problems of human beings as a starting point in theological inquiry rather than the purposes of God. It tends toward individualizing faith so that creation is not seen as a corollary of redemption with its different emphases and purposes. This form of interpretation is a result of the secularization of theology and the overemphasis of one theological perspective to the exclusion of others.” H. Wayne House, “Creation and Redemption: A Study of Kingdom Interplay,” JETS 35.1 (1992): 12. This dissertation has found that the biblical semantic framework through vertical typology has as its operational system the sanctuary/temple motif, which precedes the historical event of creation in the biblical canonical narrative. This does not endorse Westermann’s and Von Rad’s idea that creation is subordinated to soteriological considerations (soteriologische Verständnis des Schopfungswerkes). Although from Walton’s temple inauguration view the temple precedes creation, Walton’s historical point of reference for “temple” are the rituals later instituted in ancient Israel (the wilderness tabernacle and/or Solomon’s Temple). Cf. Walton, Lost World of Genesis One, 87-92; Walton, Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology, 187-92. Our findings also indicate that the canonical concept of the sanctuary/temple precedes the creation; however, the theological rationale for this conclusion is based on radically different grounds. Specifically, the sanctuary/temple semantic framework operates within the biblical understanding of the pre-lapsarian and post-sin function and historical reality of the heavenly sanctuary/temple. In view of the fact that the eschatological redemption is understood as a historical re-creation, the creation event described in Gen 1 is not a mere theological reflection, but a real event in history, derived from a higher heavenly reality. Thus, creation and redemption can be understood as two different historical elements. Heilsgeschichte presents them as equally interdependent, though the motif/reality of the sanctuary/temple canonically precedes the creation of the heavens and the earth (Gen 1-3). It should be admitted that it is beyond human theological reflection (and revelation) to place the historical origin of the sanctuary/temple at some moment in God’s eternal existence. See the section above entitled “Genesis 1 as a Temple Text” in reference to Jer 17:12.
covenant) in terms of creation/re-creation, the creation/re-creation events being the canonical frame of the sanctuary/temple motif.

The intertextual directionality of the biblical semantic framework through vertical typology has as its operational system the sanctuary/temple motif. This pattern is established by the fact that the sanctuary/temple reality/motif chronologically precedes the historical event of creation in the biblical canonical narrative (Ezek 28:11-19). Also, it should be mentioned that the creation by itself does not constitute a teleological rationale for salvation/redemption, although “to believe in the actual and future redemptive activity of God presupposes the belief in creation. Redemption implies creation.” On the other hand, creation itself does not entail redemption/covenant because the teleological rationale for creation does not include the atonement of sin.

---

170 In pre-exilic times, for example Exod 34:10, the verb נָּס [nās; “create”] “is occasionally used to refer to God’s redemptive activity in history. See Fretheim, Creation, Fall, and Flood, 55.


172 Scholars have long discussed whether creation implies covenant. For Wellhausen, the answer is affirmative: Julius Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel (New York: Meridian, 1957), 338, 339, 385. However, in contrast, Blenkinsopp remarks that “the Sinaitic stipulations concerning the sanctuary and its appointments end with the injunction to observe Sabbath as a perpetual covenant and a sign of creation which ended with the Sabbath of God (Exod 31:12-17). From the context the inference would appear to be that just as God rested after creating the world so must Israel after constructing the sanctuary. We are not thereby obliged to adopt the view of Wellhausen that creation implies covenant.” Blenkinsopp, “The Structure of P,” 281. De Vaux argues that creation is the first action in the history of salvation, with the Sabbath being the sign of the covenant. This covenant, as understood by De Vaux, was abolished by Jesus’ new covenant, and therefore its sign (the Sabbath) became obsolete. See De Vaux, Ancient Israel, 481, 483. However, it should be considered, against De Vaux but following his reasoning, that from the perspective of the sanctuary/temple semantic framework, the first action of salvation was to elect. In Eph 1:4 (cf. 1 Thess 1:4; 2:13; Rom 8:29; 2 Tim 1:9) the apostle Paul affirms this fact. Peter T. O’Brien explains Paul’s words: “To say that election took place before creation indicates that God’s choice was due to his own free decision and love, which were not dependent on temporal circumstances or human merit. The reasons for his election were rooted in the depths of his gracious, sovereign nature.” Peter T. O’Brien, The Letter to the Ephesians, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 100. Then, the first act of salvation before creation is in actuality an election into eternity, in which only God himself existed and governed from his sanctuary/temple. This election came to be effectuated as covenant when sin marred creation. Cf. Sailhamer, Meaning of the Pentateuch, 582-83.
Yet, the interdependence between these two notions emerges when one realizes that the creation/re-creation is patterned after the sanctuary/temple motif. This is why an isolated study of the notion of creation does not portray or convey ideas of redemption, but the study of creation/re-creation in light of the sanctuary/temple semantic framework does indeed portray and convey these ideas.173

Third, the relationship between creation and redemption is foundational for an eschatological re-creation. This is precisely what Doukhan perceives as he writes:

Thus creation is an eschatological concept in that it teaches that, since the beginning has been the fact of God, the end belongs to him. The eschatological dimension does not lie in the nature of the event of creation but rather in the faith of God as Creator. To believe that God is the Creator leads one to believe in a God who has power over Creation, hence over history, in a God to whom the last word belongs. Faith in the Creator leads to faith in the Savior, not that creation is the same idea as redemption, but rather because both “concepts” make necessary the same quality of faith.174

The sanctuary/temple motif in the Bible portrays the eschatological ultimate event of re-creation as the destruction of the earth and purification of the sacred space: in other words, as judgment. The rationale for this is the dual character of salvation: “it both saves and destroys.”175 This is an anti-creative aspect of biblical judgment. In this regard, Gage claims that the “prophetic judgment sustains an antithetically parallel relationship to the creative word.”176 These two dimensions are canonically interwoven through the biblical

---

173 Thus, the sanctuary/temple motif depicts creation in order to emphasize the cosmic scope of salvation. See Doukhan, “Response to John H. Walton,” 202.


175 Doukhan, Secrets of Revelation, 178.

narratives dealing with judgment: “To truly save, God must create anew, and the creation of the new necessitates the destruction of the old.”¹⁷⁷ John Polkinghorne is surely correct in emphasizing that our hope of purification and redemption lies in the purging fire of judgment. He remarks:

Just as a plant in a darkened cave will respond to the slightest glimmer of light that draws its growth in that direction, so we may hope that the slightest positive response to the light of God’s presence will be enough to initiate in us the final work of salvation. Properly conceived, judgment is the divine antidote to human sin, just as resurrection is the divine antidote to human mortality.¹⁷⁸

Tellingly, it is within the sanctuary/temple semantic framework that the day of the atonement or Kippur¹⁷⁹ reactualizes the eschatological re-creation/heavenly Kippur, which celebrates the cosmic judgment of God.¹⁸⁰ Doukhan’s understanding of the cosmic judgment of God is significant. He correctly establishes the association of judgment and creation as the essence of the Day of Atonement:

Both the rituals of Kippur, as prescribed by Leviticus 16, and the traditional Jewish prayers testify to this dual concern with judgment and creation. The biblical symbolism of the ritual of Kippur has implications that extend beyond individual destiny. Not only are the people of Israel forgiven of “all of their sins” (Lev 16:21-22), but the sanctuary itself is purged of all the sins and declared atoned (verses 16,

---

¹⁷⁷ Doukhan, Secrets of Revelation, 66.


33). For the ancient Israelites, this “atonement” of the sanctuary was more than a spring cleaning. Rather, it symbolized, in biblical thought, the atonement of the whole earth, because the ancient Israelites understood the Temple and the tabernacle as the “microcosm” of creation.181

The sanctuary/temple motif framing the biblical narrative from the book of Genesis to the book of Revelation connects the new heavens and the new earth with the creation of the New Jerusalem (Rev 21:2; cf. Isa 65:17-18).182 The New Jerusalem becomes to the new heavens and the new earth what the Old Jerusalem never succeeded in being to Israel and the world.183

Thus, the historical/canonical development of creation/re-creation theology within the sanctuary/temple semantic framework reaches its climactic stage when the Garden of Eden is once more Adam and Eve’s home (Rev 22:1-5). “Redemption is a way of achieving the original telos of creation despite the Fall.”184 The purpose of eschatological redemption is to re-create humankind by returning the redeemed to an edenic setting. This is already anticipated from the linguistic and conceptual connections with biblical narratives dealing with liberation, particularly the exodus event: a semantic pattern that establishes Bible prophecy.185 George Athas notes the following fact:

183 Stefanovic, Revelation of Jesus Christ, 576.
184 Kline, “Space and Time,” 4. The relationship between creation, redemption, and eschatology is rooted in the same historical reality: “When the New Testament considers the eschatological restoration of all things, it does not speak of this as the eventual realization of Creation but as the final restoration of God’s initial Creation that was marred by sin.” Dederen, “Reflections on a Theology,” 300.
The creation of Israel implies their liberation and, therefore, their distinction from Egypt. Yet, the narrative does not end there. Beyond the Exodus event itself lies Israel’s encounter with Yahweh at Sinai, where they are given the law. It is this law that further defines the function of Israel, giving greater resolution and solidity to the order God was bestowing on them: they are to be a kingdom of priests who serve God and relate to him in a dynamic way. The tabernacle is a physical representation of this relationship. It had defined spaces of specific dimensions within which particular furniture was situated and particular functions took place. It also demonstrated Yahweh’s intention of forging a relationship with Israel, as is seen in the final few verses of Exodus, when Yahweh’s glory fills the tabernacle (Exod 40:34-35).  

The sanctuary/temple semantic framework portrays redemption as re-creation.

The song of the sea in Exod 15:17 offers two foundational theological implications. First, this poem post-figures the Eden narrative (if not the whole of the creation narrative). Second, this poem pre-figures the cultic context of the heavenly sanctuary and foretells God’s original/ultimate plan of “returning to the mountain” where the immense crowd of the redeemed will sing a song of victory (Rev 15:2-4). It is noteworthy that the eschatological redemption also portrays the re-creation of humankind (and of the heavens and the earth) by destroying sin (and unrepentant sinners), thereby inaugurating anew the Garden of Eden and letting the redeemed enter into the eternal sabbatical rest of the holy city.  

---


187 Sailhamer notes that “the author of Exodus 15 understands the garden of Eden in Gen 2 in terms that anticipate the tabernacle sanctuary (Exod 21-31).” Sailhamer, Meaning of the Pentateuch, 577, 581.


189 Interestingly, the theme of creation as re-creation when converged in the same semantic framework may give the impression of simultaneity. Doukhan explains that “the past event of the Exodus will be reactualized in the return from the Exile (Jer 31:1-8). The past event of the return of the exile will be reactualized in the final salvation (Ezek 37:21-28). The more specific battle of Jezreel of the past (2 Kgs 10:11) will be reactualized in another future battle (Hos 1:4-11).” Doukhan, Hebrew for Theologians, 206.
Preliminary Conclusions

The sanctuary/temple semantic framework presents the seventh-day Sabbath as a
covenant sign. Childs is very right in stressing the following:

The tabernacle represents the fulfillment of the covenant promise: “I will make my
dwelling with you . . . I will be your God and you shall be my people.” But the actual
sign of the covenant is the Sabbath. Therefore, the observance of the Sabbath and the
building of the tabernacle are two sides of the same reality. Just as the Sabbath is a
surety of Israel’s sanctity (Exod 31:13), so the meeting of God with his people in the	tabernacle serves the same selfsame end (24:43). There can be no genuine tension
between these two signs. The witness of the tabernacle and that of the Sabbath both
testify of God’s rule over his creation (31:17).

The heavenly sanctuary/temple existing before the creation (at the beginning of the
biblical narrative) and the renewed Eden in the holy city emerging out of the re-creation
(at the end of the biblical narrative) represent the semantic framework of Heilsgeschichte.

In the biblical narrative of salvation history, “the Sabbath is a covenant sign through
which God has pledged that the present proleptic experience of freedom, liberation, joy
and communion on the weekly Sabbath is but a foretaste of the ultimate reality in the
glorious future.” Eugene H. Peterson fittingly concludes:

When we want renewal and restoration of mind and spirit, want to recover intimacies
in family and marriage, our usual practice is to leave the city for the country, or
wilderness, or resort—some variation on Eden or paradise or Arcadia that we are apt
to call “heaven on earth.” And there seems to be biblical precedence for it. Our sin
resulted in expulsion from the garden, shouldn’t salvation be a restoration to it?
Gardens are quiet. In gardens we stroll and contemplate, smell the roses . . . and
commune with God in the cool of the evening. A garden is life blessed and ordered
by God. Paradise is a garden in Genesis. Love is a garden in the Song of Songs.

---

190 Bacchiocchi, Divine Rest, 139.
191 Childs, The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary, 541-42. Cf. Doukhan,
“Loving the Sabbath as a Christian,” 162.
193 Eugene H. Peterson, Reversed Thunder: The Revelation of John and the Praying Imagination
In summary, just as rest was the climactic goal and culmination of the creation narrative, it will also be the eschatological goal and culmination of God’s work of re-creation.\textsuperscript{194}

\textbf{Canonical Biblical Theology of Genesis 2-3}

The Semantic Framework of the Narratives of Eden

The purpose of the present study was to reevaluate major current scholarly arguments for and against allusions to the sanctuary/temple in the creation and Eden narratives. In the process, it was found that a terminological cluster accords with a conceptual semantic framework, particularly in Gen 2-3. In this section, I will explore key implications of the sanctuary/temple semantic framework in Gen 2-3, as this motif can encompass a canonical/biblical theology of the sanctuary/temple in the Old and New Testaments.

The linguistic artistry involved here, on one hand, and its strong conceptual intentionality, on the other hand, call for further study beyond isolated words. The semantic framework allows a theological interpretation of Gen 2-3 that emerges from the sanctuary/temple motif. Therefore, the theological reflection here is projected onto the sanctuary/temple canonical/biblical scenery, following the previous point that the sanctuary/temple system/framework is the theological foundation for the created cosmos. Now, let us contemplate two theological implications emerging from this premise in order to elaborate a canonical/biblical theology from Gen 2-3: the cosmological

framework of the sanctuary/temple motif and the archetypal framework of protology and eschatology.

The Cosmological Framework of the Sanctuary/Temple Motif

The cosmological framework that emerges from Gen 2-3 indicates that the created cosmos and its historical/canonical unfolding follow the תַבְּנִית [tabnîṯ] \(\text{“shape,” “form,” “pattern”}\) of the heavenly reality (Exod 25:9, 40). Thus, the creation of the heavens and the earth and their eschatological re-creation are modeled/connected via the redemptive events to atone for sin, prefigured in the earthly sanctuary/temple services (the wilderness tabernacle/Solomon’s Temple), and accomplished in actuality by Christ in the heavenly sanctuary/temple. The cosmological framework of the sanctuary/temple motif can be explored further from the following three considerations.

First, the sanctuary/temple cosmological framework portrays reality on earth as it is in heaven. On this point, one may partly agree with Beale’s symbolic understanding of the temple. He affirms that the earthly sanctuary/temple (the wilderness tabernacle/Solomon’s Temple) was comparable in symbolic design to the heavens and earth. Yet, it should be mentioned, in contrast to Beale, that heaven and earth are two distinct realities that do not overlap; rather, the heavenly reality is the system that predetermines the earthly one, which reflects it.

---


196 Block’s assessment of Beale’s work on the temple concludes that it is fundamentally sound, but from a particular perspective. Relevant to the purpose of our study, Block concludes that Israel’s sanctuaries were designed, constructed, and decorated as microcosms of YHWH’s heavenly temple. Whether or not Moses was able to gaze into the heavenly throne room on Mount Sinai, the tabernacle represented a replica תַבְּנִית (tabnîṯ) built according to a divinely revealed plan (Ex 25:9, 40). While the temple in Jerusalem had the same basic structure as the tabernacle, it seems the plan revealed to David (1 Chr 28:9-19) also envisioned a replica of the heavenly temple, complete with a throne room (represented by
Second, the biblical evidence discussed in chapters III and IV points to the conclusion that this cosmological framework of the sanctuary/temple motif is inherent in Israel’s religion: properly said, a motif (תַבְּנִית) acquired through revelation. Levenson’s article “The Temple and the World” set forward the idea that the temple was a foreign body largely unrelated to the Israelite religion, and therefore its cosmic symbolism was the result of foreign influence. De Vaux stated that the Israelites indeed distinguished between the temple, where men prayed, and heaven, where God dwelled (1 Kgs 8:30). But he argued, similar to Levenson, that the Israelites’ understanding of the temple as representing the universe (and thus any notion of cosmic symbolism) emerged only long afterwards. De Vaux explains:

If the temple did not have a symbolic value, then we ought to look for the key to it not in myths nor in cosmology, but in Israel’s history, for the religion of Israel is not a religion of myths nor a nature religion, but an historical one: Just as the great liturgical feasts recalled the different events of the Exodus, and the Ark of the Covenant recalled God’s pact with his chosen people, so the temple recalled and signified Yahweh’s choice of Jerusalem. At first glance, De Vaux’s position seems to agree with Levenson’s. However, it is precisely the historical nature of the religion of Israel that argues against De Vaux’s idea (and Levenson’s), that a cosmic symbolism emerged from foreign influence and/or long afterwards. The canonical/biblical history of the sanctuary/temple motif as it emerges from various semantic frameworks of the Holy Scriptures (cf. Gen 2-3; Ezek 28),

the Holy of Holies and a throne (represented by the Ark of the Covenant). Second, while functioning as replicas of YHWH’s heavenly residence, both tabernacle and temple were also constructed as miniature Edens. See Block, “Eden: A Temple?,” 3-4.

197 For example, from Phoenician craftsmen’s iconographic tradition. See Levenson, “Temple and the World,” 279, 281, 286.

198 De Vaux, Ancient Israel, 329.
including creation, contradicts the idea that one has to turn to “ancient Near Eastern parallels” and “early Jewish interpretation” in order to approach and construe a cosmological framework of the sanctuary/temple motif.\textsuperscript{199} The cosmological framework emerges, rather, from the canonical/biblical understanding of the preexisting sanctuary/temple in heaven.\textsuperscript{200}

Third, the cosmological framework interwoven in Scripture assumes that the sanctuary/temple motif is the overarching worldview/shaping narrative/story of \textit{Heilsgeschichte}. In this respect, one should mention Levenson’s idea of a “double directionality of the homology of temple and world.”\textsuperscript{201} Does the semantic framework portray the sanctuary/temple as a world or the world as a sanctuary/temple? Concerning Levenson’s intertextual directionality “temple-world,” there is abundant biblical evidence pointing to the cosmological framework of the earthly sanctuary/temple (Ps 78:69).\textsuperscript{202}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}


\item It should be admitted that, as Ronald E. Clements prudently writes, “Not all of these supposed symbolic references of features of the temple are convincing, but the essential claim that the temple and its furnishings did possess cosmic, or naturalistic symbolism must be upheld. Such features were designed to stress the divine power over the created order, and to establish the temple as a source of blessing for the land and people of Israel. The underlying idea was that the temple was a microcosm of the macrocosm, so that the building gave visual expression to the belief in Yahweh’s dominion over the world” See Clements, \textit{God and Temple}, 67.

\item Levenson, \textit{Creation and the Persistence}, 86-87.

\item The argument that “cosmological perceptions of the sanctuary or temple are not primarily based on the biblical text but, rather, are dependent on extra-canonical writers who most probably borrowed such ideas from their cultural and literary environment” is not necessarily warranted. \textit{Contra} Souza, “Sanctuary: Cosmos, Covenant, and Creation,” 30. See the discussion on Eden in chapter II of this dissertation.

\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
However, the intertextual directionality “world-temple,” which Levenson upholds, fails to follow the same pattern and framework as the “temple-world” relationship. Distinctly, this directionality would entail that the biblical evidence did not support the creation as an antitype of the sanctuary/temple; although the “world-temple” relationship contains linguistic correlations, a “world-temple” conceptual framework seems to be unidentifiable.

There has been scholarly debate about the meaning of Isa 66:1-2. Is this passage conveying the intertextual directionality “world-temple”? Does this comparison

---

203 Two reasons may be offered: first, the chronological/historical precedence of the sanctuary/temple in the biblical canonical narrative, and second, the idea that the creation by itself does not constitute a teleological rationale for salvation/redemption.

204 Scholars often claim that the Sinai covenant played an important role in the compositional purpose of Gen 1. See, for example, Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 28-29. This statement clearly assumes a postexilic origin of the creation narrative, and apparently harmonizes with the idea proposed here that the cosmological framework interwoven in Scripture depicts the sanctuary/temple motif as the overarching worldview/shaping narrative/story. However, the rationale for this intertextual directionality proposed in this study is rather derived from the preexisting heavenly sanctuary/temple (a canonical/biblical reading of Scripture). Thus, regardless of the speculative sources of the documentary hypothesis, Seth D. Postell seems to be correct in affirming this: “Unfortunately, the division of Genesis 1-3 into two different sources (‘P’ and ‘J’) blurs the fact that . . . while Genesis 1 foreshadows the construction the tabernacle, Genesis 2-3 (Eden) anticipates the physical appearance of it.” Postell, *Adam as Israel*, 108. Noticeably, Sailhamer and Postell agree. However, apart from Postell’s theological critical presuppositions, his statement may be assimilated via an understanding of the heavenly sanctuary/temple vertical typology of Scripture. Wenham’s comment is very illustrative on this respect: “Gen 1 has been called a festive overture to P, for it introduces themes that are characteristic of and developed in much greater detail in other priestly material later in the Pentateuch. By tracing back to creation the classificatory system among plants and animals, the Sabbath, and the origins of divine blessing, the writer is giving these institutions the authority of primeval antiquity. Though there is little in the chapter that relates directly to worship, the prime interest of the P material, the references to the fixed times (v 14), and to the seventh day (2:1–3) may be construed as hints of the editor’s preoccupation with the cult.” See Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 38-39.

establish the concept of a cosmic sanctuary/temple? Although this passage has been the focus of various studies, to our knowledge, these specific questions have captured the interest of few commentators.

The Hebrew text and its translation read:

66:1 Thus says the Lord:
“Heaven is My throne,
And earth is My footstool.
Where is the house that you will build me? And where is the place of my rest?

66:2 For all those things my hand has made,
And all those things exist,”
Says the Lord.
“But on this one will I look:
On him who is poor and of a contrite
spirit,
And who trembles at My word.

Let us explore four key issues that appear to be subject to further consideration in relation to our inquiry. First, God’s own dwelling place is located in heaven (1 Kgs 8:30). The entire Bible contains a vertical typology hermeneutical perspective showing plainly that the heaven is not the sanctuary, but that there is a sanctuary in heaven (Ps 11:4; Heb 8:1-2; Rev 5:11). As Melody D. Knowles comments, the prophet Ezekiel presents a special perspective:

In the book of Ezekiel, the prophet attributes to YHWH radical mobility—God can cross the Chebar in a multi-wheeled chariot (Ezek 1), God’s glory can leave and return to the temple (Ezek 9:3; 10:18–19; 11:22–23; 43:1–5), and God can function as

206 Cf. Acts 7:55; Rom 8:5, 34; Eph 1:20; Heb 9:24; Rev. 11:19; 14:17; 15:5). Therefore, passages about the construction of an earthly dwelling place (1 Kgs 8:13, 17) should not be interpreted as conflicting geographies for God’s dwelling. This earthly dwelling is part of God’s plan in sending his Spirit to dwell, guide, and protect his chosen people (Exod 3:2; 14:19; 23:20, 23; 32:34; 33:2). This constitutes the covenantal relationship with the Israelite nation that prefigured the Messiah’s intercessory death and heavenly ministry.
a “sanctuary for a little while” (or “to some extent;” למקדש מִלְצֹא for the people in Babylon (Ezek 11:16b).207

Ezekiel’s perspective does not contradict the rest of the biblical evidence that God’s own dwelling place is in heaven. Indeed, the vocabulary and imagery employed in Isa 66:1 are reminiscent of the Psalter. Westermann identified particular connections locating God’s throne in heaven (Pss 11:4; 103:19; cf. Isa 40:22).208 This observation harmonizes with Isa 66:1. However, although the Bible presents heaven as God’s dwelling place, Isa 66:1 is not addressing or explaining this aspect. Note that the Hebrew expression is כִסְאִי.209

The imagery used in Isa 66:1 is found elsewhere in the Bible as a reference to God’s royal domain. “This imagery presents God as a King on a throne, ruling over all the kingdoms of the earth; he is not limited to any temple made by some king (1 Kgs 8:27–30) or to any one group of people.”210

Second, according to Isa 1:1, the prophet carried on his ministry during the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. This information rules out the possibility that Isa 66:1 is making reference to the building or rebuilding of a temple; on the other hand, Isa 66:1 is not implying that it is wrong for humans to build temples, since Isa 66:6 states


209 From the Hebrew word כִסֵּא, kissê; “seat,” “throne.”

210 Gary Smith explains further that “the idea that God is a king who is enthroned in heaven is a theme found in the preaching of the prophets (6:1-6; 29:11; 37:16; 40:22; 63:15; Jer 10:10-11; Dan 4:17, 25, 32, 37; 5:21; 6:26; 7:9), the narrative stories in the historical literature (Exod 15:18; 1 Kgs 8:23, 30, 34, 36, 39, 43, 45; 22:19), and in the nation’s songs of praise (Pss 2:4, 11:4; 29:10; 47:2, 7–9; 93:3; 95:3–5; 97:1, 9; 99:1–4.” See Gary V. Smith, Isaiah 40-66, NAC 15b (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2009), 728.
that judgment comes out of the temple (cf. Isa 56:7; 66:20-22).\textsuperscript{211} Isa 66:1 is not an anti-temple polemic.\textsuperscript{212}

Third, the imagery employed in Isa 66:1 seems to focus on the transcendence of God’s royal domain. Isa 65:17 is the closest reference to הַשָּ֖מֶַ֣יִם וְּהָאָָ֖רֶץ and speaks of the creation of the new heavens and earth. Both passages have in common the theme of God’s sovereignty. John N. Oswalt offers an acute comment:

> The Creator God who can make a new heaven and earth whenever it suits him is certainly not a sky father or an earth mother who could be housed in some structure made with human hands. This understanding is hardly new to Isaiah. It is part and parcel of Israelite theology from the earliest considerations of the building of a temple (2 Sam 7:4-14; 1 Kgs 8:27) on through its destruction and rebuilding (Jer 7:12-14; 23:24; Pss 11:4; 103:19; Matt 5:34-35; Acts 7:49).\textsuperscript{213}

John Goldingay is of the opinion that Isa 66:1 recalls Solomon’s prayer and seems to reflect on the same fact: that a temple cannot contain God’s glory (1 Kgs 8:27).\textsuperscript{214} Thus, special attention should be given to Stephen’s quotation of Isa 66:1-2, which is in total agreement with Solomon’s prayer by acknowledging the greatness of God the Creator.\textsuperscript{215}

As Peter D. Miscall has well said: “The question, and all of Isaiah by implication, does

\textsuperscript{211} Oswalt, \textit{The Book of Isaiah}, 667.


\textsuperscript{213} Oswalt, \textit{The Book of Isaiah}, 666.


\textsuperscript{215} See Timothy C. G. Thornton, “Stephen's Use of Isaiah 66:1,” \textit{JTS} 25.2 (1974): 432-34; Herbert M. Wolf, \textit{Interpreting Isaiah: The Suffering and Glory of the Messiah} (Grand Rapids: Academie, 1985), 252. Stephen’s quotation of Isa 66:1 criticizes the use of the temple to restrict, confine, and ultimately try to manipulate God. John B. Polhill says that “the concluding quotation from Isa 66:1f. caps off the entire argument. God is transcendent. He cannot be restricted to any ‘house,’ where one can say, ‘This is where God is to be found.’ He is Creator of heaven and earth, and his presence is to be found in all his creation.” John B. Polhill, \textit{Acts}, NAC 26 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1992), 204. In the same vein, Jesus’ usage of this expression in Matt 5:34-35 is termed as “biblical metaphors” thereby meaning that all oath taking implicates God. See Donald A. Hagner, \textit{Matthew}, WBC 33a (Dallas: Word Books, 1998), 128. Cf. Craig Blomberg, \textit{Matthew}, NAC 22 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1992), 112.
not reject a temple or sanctuary in itself; it rejects the theology and ideology that would in any way restrict God’s presence in the world to a particular building or site.”

Fourth, if God’s throne is in heaven, then, what sort of function does the play? And more importantly, where is it located? According to Westermann, Isa 66:1 is the only Old Testament text that portrays God’s footstool as the earth; elsewhere, God’s footstool is the ark (1 Chr 28:2; Ps 132:7; cf. Ps 99:5; 110:1; Lam 2:1). On this respect, I would agree with Watts’ line of reasoning:

The place that demonstrates YHWH’s sovereignty to humankind is Canaan: promised to Abraham, given through Moses and Joshua, secured through David and Solomon. The vision has seen “the land” as the arena for YHWH’s actions. To this place he summoned first the Assyrian to destroy and then the Persian to rebuild. . . . “My rest” in Ps 95:11 refers to Canaan, which was denied to the wilderness generation. This passage presents the same tension between a rebellious generation and God’s sovereign rule over heavens and earth (see vv 3–4). Ps 132:8 relates the term to Zion to stress the permanency of YHWH’s presence there, but the total phrase here seems to be unique in linking YHWH to a “place.” YHWH’s objection lies precisely in that emphasis on a place that can claim exclusive rights to YHWH’s presence when he is the one who has made all things and presumably goes wherever he chooses.

216 Peter D. Miscall, Isaiah (Sheffield: Sheffield, 2006), 177. Similarly, Ben Witherington affirms that “the point is not that God’s presence can’t be found in the temple (clearly Acts 2–4 shows it can), but that God’s presence can’t be confined there.” Ben Witherington, The Acts of the Apostles: A Sociorhetorical Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 273.

217 Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 412. Actually, the idea of a footstool is used seven times in the Old Testament, but only once in a literal sense (2 Chr 9:18, the word used is כֶָ֫בֶש). On the remaining six occasions, the expression הֲדֶֹּ֣ם רַגְּלָ֑י is used in a metaphorical sense (note the use of different pronominal suffixes, 1 Chr 28:2; Pss 99:5; 110:1; 132:7; Isa 66:1; Lam 2:1). These passages make references to the Ark of the Covenant, the Temple (which contains the ark), the earth, and the enemies of his Messiah King. Moreover, M. A. MacLeod reports that “the footstool of Tutankhamun of Egypt is carved with pictures of his enemies, and other Egyptian kings are shown resting their feet on their enemies’ heads.” See M. A. MacLeod, “Footstool,” NBD, 380. Cf. William S. Sailer, “Footstool,” BEB 1:806. The biblical semantic framework that emerges from this imagery is associated with God’s authority (cf. Gen 3:15; Rom 16:20; 1 Cor 15:25; 27; Eph 1:22; Heb 1:13; 2:8; Rev 19:15).

According to Watts, the land of Canaan is הֲדֶֹּ֣ם רַגְּלָ֑י, the particular geographical region where YHWH’s dominion and sovereignty are being threatened; it is from this special geographical region that the whole earth will learn ultimately about God and his cosmic domain. Therefore, it is very likely that the Hebrew expression הַשָמֶַ֣יִם כִסְּאִִ֔י וְּהָאָָ֖רֶץ הֲדֶֹּ֣ם רַגְּלָ֑י speaks of the place and kingly domain of God’s cosmic sovereignty and not of the geographical sphere (or description) of his heavenly sanctuary. Smith remarks:

The experience of seeing a vision of God in his heavenly temple caused him to realize that one day the glory of God would fill the whole earth (6:3), not just the small city of Jerusalem or just the state of Judah. Throughout the book of Isaiah, God reveals his plans for the destruction of all nations of the earth (chaps. 13–23) as well as the salvation of people from all nations (2:1–5; 11:10–16; 14:1–2; 19:18–25; 45:22–25; 60–62; 66:18–23). His plans as King of the heavens and the earth are to transform this world by creating a new heaven, a new earth, a new people, a new Jerusalem, and a new situation without death or the curse (65:17–25). Yes, he is King over the whole heavens and earth.

Finally, these points lead us to ponder that the writer of Isa 66:1-2 did not intend to use the expression הַשָמֶַ֣יִם כִסְּאִִ֔י וְּהָאָָ֖רֶץ הֲדֶֹּ֣ם רַגְּלָ֑י as a literal and/or geographical description of the cosmos. Humankind does not have the capability to build a structure for God’s dwelling. I am in agreement with Blenkinsopp, who reads the statements of Isa 66:1-2 “not against the temple itself, or the project of rebuilding, depending on the date assigned to the paragraph; it was instigated by opposition to those who controlled, or

---

219 The divine rest motif is linked to the sanctuary/temple. Thus, the reference to “the place of my rest” is connected with YHWH’s dominion and sovereignty. See the previous section “Divine Rest” in this dissertation.


221 Contra Walton, Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology, 179, 187; Walton, Genesis, 146, 148; Barker, On Earth as It Is, 8. This does not mean that there is no connection between temple and rest, or between creation and temple. From the biblical perspective, the heavenly temple should be viewed as the center of the cosmos and not as the cosmos itself.
were about to control, the operations of the temple.”

For this reason, I believe that this Hebrew expression is not concerned with a sacred structure (literal sanctuary/temple). It seems rather clearly to portray the divine cosmic kingship in terms of God’s surprising condescension (cf. Isa 6:2; 57:15). Said in different words, this is a rhetorical expression underlining the insignificance of the earth and its inhabitants as compared with God’s cosmic sovereignty.

**The Archetypical Framework of Protology and Eschatology**

The concept of Eden is the archetypical semantic framework from the beginning of the canonical/biblical narrative to the end of it, and even beyond *Heilsgeschichte* into eternity. The concept of Eden is archetypal because the intertextual relationship between protology and eschatology comprehends a correlational semantic framework: the canonical/biblical narrative commences with Eden in heaven (Ezek 28), continues with Eden on Earth (Gen 2-3), and ends with a heavenly Eden on earth (Rev 22). Another way to put it is through the theological concept of the land. O. Palmer Robertson asserts:

> Land did not begin to be theologically significant with the promise given to Abraham. Instead, the patriarch’s hope of possessing a land arose out of the concept of restoration to the original state from which man had fallen. . . . This simple fact, so

---


224 This canonical/biblical understanding of the Eden/sanctuary relationship is a helpful hermeneutical approach to answer, among other things, Bevan’s inquiry: “I do not venture to speculate as to which of these two results came first in order of time, that is to say, whether the legend of the Garden of Eden is older or later than the building of the earliest Semitic temples. In any case it would appear that the two things were closely connected; the legend of the primeval garden served to explain the decorations of the sanctuary, and the sanctuary, in its turn, seemed to an uncritical age a standing witness to the truth of the legend.” See Bevan, “King of Tyre,” 503.
often overlooked, plays a critical role in evaluating the significance of the land throughout redemptive history and its consummate fulfilment.225

Thus, there are at least three points to ponder from this theological implication.

First, Eden can be traced in Scripture through God’s dealings with his creation, in pre-lapsarian and post-lapsarian historical phases of humankind.226 “The fact that Moses alludes to the Promised Land as he is writing about the Garden of Eden (cf. Joel 2:3) suggests that he places the hope of the Promised Land in the perspective of the Garden of Eden.”227 Protology and eschatology substantiate the theological framework of Eden as a literary eschatological unity of Scripture, where creation/re-creation intertextuality reverberates through the sanctuary/temple motif.228 In a special sense, the end of the Bible is the beginning of the Bible brought to its intended goal because temple symbolism is present in Gen 1-3 and Rev 22-23.229 T. D. Alexander puts it in this way:


Indeed, as Michael Fishbane long ago noted (following Martin Buber), through the intertextual allusions in the creation and sanctuary/temple narratives, the “final compositor wished to direct the attentive hearer-reader to a correspondence between world building and shrine building, and therewith convey his theological insight that it is the task of humankind to extend and complete on earth the divine work of creation.” Fishbane, *Text and Texture*, 12.

Doukhan, *Genesis*, 78.

The edenic city upon the cosmic mountain fully expresses the great redemptive hope of biblical eschatology throughout the testaments. See Gage, *The Gospel of Genesis*, 51. Levenson explores this theological aspect. He considers that “the Temple serves, among many other things, as a survival of the primal paradise lost to the ‘profane’ world, the world outside the sanctuary (Latin, *fanum*) and as a prototype of the redeemed world envisioned by some to lie ahead. It connects the protological and the eschatological, the primal and the final, preserving Eden and providing a taste of the World-to-Come.” Jon D. Levenson, *Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel: The Ultimate Victory of the God of Life* (New Haven: Yale University, 2006), 90. I think it could be argued with a good measure of canonical/biblical consistency, as Baker has noted, that “the origins of the relationship between the Jerusalem temple and eschatology that are established upon the links to creation and creation’s link to eschatology display the foundations of why Israel might expect the Jerusalem temple to play a role in coming eschatological matters.” Baker, “Eschatological Role,” 39.

Dumbrell, *The End of the Beginning*, 37. One may reasonably conclude that, as golden cubes, the Holy of Holies and the New Jerusalem are connected. According to their descriptions (for example, the symmetrical dimension, cf. 1 Kgs 6:20; Rev 21:16-18), the apostle John seems to imply that the entire city
“The very strong links between Genesis 1-3 and Revelation 22-23 suggest that these passages frame the entire biblical metastory.”

Davidson called it a “cosmic metanarrative,” connecting the great cosmic conflict between good and evil and the sanctuary/temple motif. Then, Israel drew attention to its exceptional identity among the surrounding nations by articulating and depicting the historical creative deeds of God, not confined to the sanctuary/temple cultic services, but demonstrated in God’s dwelling with his people.

---

230 Alexander further writes that “as is often the case, a story’s conclusion provides a good guide to the themes and ideas dominant throughout. By resolving an intricate plot that runs throughout a story, a good denouement sheds light on the entire story.” Alexander, From Eden, 10.

231 Davidson, “Cosmic Metanarrative,” 102-19.

232 An important element in this historical conceptualization relates to God’s own nature, as the Eden motif may render a glimpse into God’s dwelling in Scripture. The semantic framework of the Eden motif traces in Scripture the main characteristics of God’s reality. Fernando L. Canale elaborates on the idea that the writers of Scripture understood the reality of God as temporal-historical (Job 36:26; Ps 103:15-17; Mic 5:2; Heb 1:10-12; Titus 1:2; cf. 2 Tim 2:9; 1 Cor 2:7), and therefore able to dwell in created/human space and time. For example, he thinks that Mic 5:2 “affirms clearly the infinitude of God’s temporality before the creation of the universe and its limited time and space.” He explains further the meaning of divine temporality:

God’s eternal and infinite reality experiences the flux of time in its fullness, according to His own divine nature. He also is able to directly experience our limited created time without limiting himself to it. The analogical understanding of divine time help us to understand why biblical authors had no problem in speaking of an infinite, eternal, and immutable God that was able to act directly and personally within the flux of created time.

See Fernando L. Canale, Basic Elements of Christian Theology: Scripture Replacing Tradition (Berrien Springs: Andrews University, 2005), 64, 72.

Canale has extensively explored the connection between philosophical principles and the sanctuary/temple motif. For the purpose of our study, it will suffice to cite Canale’s conclusion on the philosophical principle underlying God’s temporality:

When we recognize that biblical reflection on God simultaneously reveals not only his historical presence but also his being, a view of the God principle compatible with our space and time comes into view. We need only formulate that view in technical categories and use it as hermeneutical
Usually when we think of the sanctuary we associate it all the ritual sacrifices, but when God instructed Moses concerning the structure of the sanctuary He did not say, ‘Build me a sanctuary where you can offer sacrifices’ or ‘where you can worship me’. Instead He said, ‘Let them construct a sanctuary for Me, that I may dwell among them’ (Exod 25:8). That was the primary reason for the existence of the sanctuary.²³³

Actually, this edenic dwelling/fellowship identity for salvation transcends the Old Testament covenant with Israel and goes beyond the New Testament church.²³⁴ Levenson also captures the spirit of the protological relationship between creation and sanctuary/temple when he writes that “the world which the Temple incarnates in a tangible way is not the world of history but the world of creation, the world not as it is but as it was meant to be and as it was on the first Sabbath.”²³⁵ Thus the origin of the principle for the interpretation of the biblical sanctuary. This interpretation of the God principle eliminates what has forced classical and modern theologies to various metaphorical interpretations.


Following Canale’s definition of God’s temporality, one may understand Westermann’s recognition that primal time and end time are not the first and the last sections of history. He writes that “they [primal time and end time] constitute a framework for history in such a way that their essence is different from that of history as we know it in our present existence in terms of criteria drawn from present reality.” See Westermann, Beginning and End, 27. Although Westermann terms primal time and end time as “nonhistorical,” I would argue that he is right in the sense that God’s creativity acts share with his creatures the divine temporality, a reality marred by sin and restored at the eschatological re-creation.


²³⁴ A key hermeneutical concept to support this notion is the sanctuary/temple vertical typology viewed from the semantic framework. Morales is one who believes that “the tabernacle/temple cultus, in common with the general sanctuary ideology of the ancient Near East, participated in vertical typology: the tripartite architectural structure related the inner sanctum of the holy of holies to the heavenly sphere (corresponding to the summit of the sacred mountain), so that worship was, to some degree, a participation in the liturgy of heaven.” Morales, The Tabernacle Pre-Figured, 19. Cf. Joseph Blenkinsopp, Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel (Louisville: Westminster, 1995), 113; Blenkinsopp, “The Structure of P,” 286.

relationship between the sanctuary/temple and edenic eschatology is rooted in the creation semantic framework, since the sanctuary/temple is depicted as Eden.²³⁶

Second, consequently, the content of Gen 2-3 (the Garden of Eden narratives) is not just a general introduction to Israel’s history.²³⁷ The canonical/biblical narrative portrays God’s archetypal cosmic order and dealings with humankind in *Heilsgeschichte* within a consistent theological framework, where Israel’s salvation experience is a reminiscence of Adam’s salvation experience, and the Promised Land is a reminiscence of the Garden of Eden. Therefore, Eden is not an “exceedingly marginal text,”²³⁸ nor are the contexts of Gen 2-3 “conspicuously isolated”²³⁹ in the Old Testament, contrary to the critical view that the content of Gen 2-3 is not really Hebrew but a literary corpus dependent upon ANE cosmologies. As Stordalen observes, “it is plainly inconceivable that the religious community behind the Pentateuch would preface its national history with a ‘foreign’ cosmology.”²⁴⁰ The biblical evidence discussed in chapters III and IV of

²³⁶ John Randall Price, “The Desecration and Restoration of the Temple as an Eschatological Motif in the Tanach, Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and the New Testament” (PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1993), 94. Cf. Baker, “Eschatological Role,” 38, see also 27-40. It is to the point here to note that the image of Eden as a sanctuary seems to have disappeared almost completely from Jewish exegesis. Schachter reflects on this possibility and affirms that “this took place because the bearers of Jewish tradition wanted to distance themselves from the Christian view of Jesus as a reincarnation of Adam, the original priest, with Eden as his sanctuary.” Schachter, “Garden of Eden,” 76.


²³⁸ Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 41.


this dissertation has led to the conclusion that the sanctuary/temple semantic framework conceptualizes canonical/biblical theology through the Eden motif. Gen 2-3 is not merely about Israel’s origins; in fact, as an archetypal framework the Eden motif originated before Gen 1 and later became the pattern for *Heilsgeschichte*. Neglecting this fact has generated the idea, among other theories, that the exile of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden in Gen 3 mirrors Israel’s own exile. This implies a later date for the Eden narrative. However, the canonical/biblical approach to the theology of Gen 2-3 indicates the opposite. The sanctuary/temple system/framework, as the theological/canonical foundation for the created cosmos, demonstrates the pattern of God’s archetypal cosmic order and dealings with sin. In the canonical/biblical narrative, Israel’s exilic experience echoes a former exile, Adam’s, while at the same time Adam’s exile echoes the cherub’s exile, not vice versa.

Third, the archetypal framework of Eden also emerges from humankind’s twofold status in Gen 1 and Gen 2-3, eschatologically combined in Rev 5:10; 20:6. Indeed, while Adan and Eve in Gen 1 are characterized as “kingly ambassadors” in relation to the world, in Gen 2-3 they are characterized as “priests” in relation to the Garden of Eden.241 There is no literary and theological disunity between Gen 1 and Gen 2-3 regarding humankind’s two fold status. Kingly and priestly roles are complementary as they describe the holistic design of creation. The fact that the book of Revelation depicts the

redeemed as both kings and priests points to the original plan of creation described in Gen 1-3.

“The ongoing possession of Eden on the basis of obedience to commandments, the theme of curse and blessing, and even the structure of the divine curses in Gen 3:14-19”\textsuperscript{242} demonstrates, among other things, a teleological approaching language to the eschatological salvation and a revelatory function of creation in the biblical narrative.\textsuperscript{243} Dumbrell profoundly elucidates this theological implication:

Both Israel and Adam were placed in divine space: Israel in Canaan and Adam in Eden. Israel was given, as was Adam, law by which the divine space could be retained. Israel transgressed the law, as did Adam. Israel was expelled, as was Adam, from the divine space. . . . Clearly the creation account indicates to Israel the nature and purpose of her special status and role, which once belonged to the man. After Adam, the priest-king, failed to exercise his dominion over the world, the mantle passed to national Israel, a corporate royal priest.\textsuperscript{244}

Preliminary Conclusions

The redemptive and historical developments of the biblical narrative may be explained as proceeding from a תַבְּנִית [\textit{taḇnîṯ}; “shape,” “form,” “pattern”] of the heavenly reality. Whereas God through the seventh-day Sabbath (rest) institutes the sacredness of time, God’s presence in Eden transforms the newly created garden into a sacred place, that is, a sanctuary/temple. As a result of the entrance of sin into the world, the concept of Eden becomes more pervasive as an archetypal semantic framework. “The pre-Fall Garden Eden was God’s ‘exhibit A’ for what he had planned for humanity. It

\textsuperscript{242} Postell, \textit{Adam as Israel}, 109.


\textsuperscript{244} William J. Dumbrell, \textit{The Search for Order: Biblical Eschatology in Focus} (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 29.
was the one time when it could be said that ‘God’s will was done on earth as it was in Heaven.’

Consequently, the conceptual approach to the purpose of the biblical sanctuary/temple narratives finds its canonical framework in Eden. Westermann rightly observes, “In its first pages the Bible speaks of the beginning, and in its last pages, of the end. It is surprising then that in the Christian church so little is said about the beginning and the end in their relationship to each other, and that in Christian theology so little attention is devoted to them.” Therefore, one may advocate the conclusion that archetypically the Garden of Eden was, is, and shall be the ideal place of rest in protology and eschatology.

**Summary and Conclusions**

Chapter V explored some of the most important theological implications emerging from considering the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 1-3. It was observed that a canonical/biblical theology of Gen 1-3 is better construed within a sanctuary/temple semantic framework, which further substantiates the type of relationship between the creation and the sanctuary/temple. Specifically, a canonical biblical theology develops the sanctuary/temple motif as the theological framework of the creation/cosmos. The theological concepts arising from the biblical evidence in Gen 1 and Gen 2-3

---


demonstrated that the semantic outworking of the association between creation and sanctuary/temple can contribute to a better understanding of the creation and Eden narratives as they reverberate throughout the biblical canon.

First, canonical/biblical theology emerging from the sanctuary/temple semantic framework in Gen 1 has led to the conclusion that the cultic terminology of the creation account should be read not in terms of abstract symbolism (or temple ideology), but in the sense of a “conceptual reading,” where the sanctuary/temple motif becomes one hermeneutical frame. A symbolic reading of Gen 1 revolves around the notion that the semantic framework validates the historicity of the text while at the same time being representative, indicative, and/or illustrative of an overarching worldview/shaping narrative/story in Scripture: the sanctuary/temple. Another significant implication is the key role of the seventh day. The Sabbath rest reveals God’s plan to reestablish sacred time and space on earth as it is in the sanctuary/temple model in heaven. “The temple is to space what the Sabbath is to time.”* Divine rest and human rest become the covenantal motif that connects the heavens and the earth and displays the climactic fulfillment of protology in eschatology. Larry L. Lichtenwalter remarks:

The action taken by God on the seventh day gives expression to the total purpose intended for creation. Later biblical connections made between creation, Sabbath, and the sanctuary further nuance God’s intended purpose. As the climax of creation, the Sabbath became “a sanctuary in time,” not space, reflections and recapitulations of the first temple of the Garden of Eden—a unique place of God’s presence where Adam walked and talked with God (Gen 3 8). Revelation’s (21-22) new creation allusions to Genesis 2-3 bring promise of the final presence of God among his people, 

*248 Levenson, Creation and the Persistence, 298. This means that both domains belong to God: time and space. The creation narrative speaks of time, while the Eden narratives speak of space. God’s cosmic divine rest is “to fill time with a content that is uncontaminated by, and distinct from, anything related to natural time. . . . That content, displacing the various ideas and phenomena associated with natural time, is the idea of the absolute sovereignty of God.” See Tsevat, “Basic Meaning,” 458.
who see him face to face (21:3-5, 22: 4). The envisioned sabbatical consummation is fully and gloriously realized (21:3-7). 249

Thus, the Sabbath rest is a symbol of salvation, a return to Eden. Indeed, the purpose of eschatological redemption is to recreate humankind by returning the redeemed to an edenic setting.

Second, canonical/biblical theology emerging from the sanctuary/temple semantic framework of Gen 2-3 has led to the conclusion that its cosmological framework suggests that the events of the creation and its eschatological re-creation are modeled/connected via the redemptive events to atone for sin. This framework is prefigured in the earthly sanctuary/temple services (the wilderness tabernacle/Solomon’s Temple), and accomplished in actuality by Christ in the heavenly sanctuary/temple. This idea entails that the Garden of Eden is an archetypal framework of canonical/biblical theology. The canonical/biblical narrative commences with Eden in heaven, continues with Eden on Earth, and ends with a heavenly Eden on earth. As Fishbane puts it: “The building of the tabernacle has been presented in the image of the creation of the world, and signified as an extension of a process begun at the creation.”250 “The story indicates for us what it means for human beings to be holy people and dwell in a holy land. The holy land is Eden, and the holy people are Adam and Eve.”251

Finally, the sanctuary/temple semantic framework shapes Heilsgeschichte in such a way as to echo the Eden narratives. This approach to biblical/canonical theology of Gen 249


250 Fishbane, Text and Texture, 12.

251 Michael Dauphinais and Matthew Levering, Holy People, Holy Land: A Theological Introduction to the Bible (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2005), 29.
2-3 does not support the notion that the Eden narratives were designed to replicate the preceding story of Israel. Gen 2-3 sets forth the canonical/biblical theology of the land (Garden of Eden) as a central motif in Heilsgeschichte. The fact that this motif is placed at the introduction to the Pentateuch should be given special attention because “it sets the course for the rest of the biblical narrative. In other words, Eden paradoxically both reflects and sets the course for the story of Israel.”

Therefore, as Wenham rightly states: “Simple and majestic, dignified yet unaffected, profound and yet perfectly clear, Genesis [1-3] makes a superb introduction not only to the Book of Genesis itself but to the whole of Scripture.”

---

252 The literary and conceptual interrelatedness indicate that Gen 1-3 was conceived and composed by one single author. The theological implications of the sanctuary/temple semantic framework compel us to abandon the documentary hypothesis, which places the origin of the text around the sixth century BC. So Mark S. Smith, The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010), 41. Furthermore, the question of literary dependence and/or influence concerning Ezek 28 is obvious enough: Gen 2-3 precedes Ezek 28. Cf. Block, The Book of Ezekiel, 118; Madhavi Nevader, “Creating a Deus Non Creator: Divine Sovereignty and Creation in Ezekiel,” in The God Ezekiel Creates, ed. Paul M. Joyce and Dalit Rom-Shiloni (New York: Bloomsbury, 2015), 59.

253 Isaac, “From Land to Lands,” 45.

254 Wenham, Genesis 1-15, 36.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The research reported in this dissertation endeavored to investigate whether the sanctuary/temple motif plays a canonical/theological role in the creation account and Eden narratives. I have dealt with the arguments, taking into consideration the exegetical underpinnings of the association between the concepts of creation and sanctuary/temple. The aforementioned theological task sought to elaborate an introduction to a canonical/biblical theology of Gen 1-3.¹ The findings of this study may be outlined like this:

The first chapter provided a survey of scholarly material written on this issue and how modern investigations substantiate and critique the sanctuary/temple motif. In addition, this chapter projected particular implications related to the interpretation of Gen 1-3 and the theology of the sanctuary/temple. This survey of scholarly literature demonstrated that there is a lack of agreement among biblical scholars who have

1 It is from the association between sanctuary/temple and creation that a very particular canonical/biblical worldview arises. Since the word “creation” can denote either the act or the product of creation, as Herman Bavinck has correctly insisted, “from one’s understanding of the act flows one’s view of the product.” Herman Bavinck and John Bolt, In the Beginning: Foundations of Creation Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 56. Significantly, the main contribution of a canonical/biblical theology of Gen 1-3, as it emerges from the sanctuary/temple semantic framework, is that it opens new dimensions of understanding the Creator God, the act of creation, and the product of it. Many aspects still await further research. If readers of Scripture disregard the overall canonical/biblical structure that emerges from the sanctuary/temple motif, it might cause misunderstandings. J. Richard Middleton aptly asserts that if readers of Scripture fail to understand the initial purpose of creation, they will systematically misread the nature of sin and redemption. See Middleton, A New Heaven, 38.
investigated possible evidence for allusions to the sanctuary/temple in Gen 1-3. The following linguistic and conceptual aspects were distinguished as major arguments: the Hebrew word עֵדֶן in Gen 2:8; the garden as a mountain in Gen 2:10; the river of Eden in Gen 2:10; the Hebrew verbs שָמַר and שָׁמַר in Gen 2:15; the Hebrew word צֵלָע and the Hebrew verb בָּנָה in Gen 2:21-22; the Hebrew participle מִתְהַל in Gen 3:8; the Hebrew word מְדוֹן in Gen 3:24; the eastern entrance to the garden in Gen 3:24; the motif of temple building (divine rest), and the Hebrew words מְדוֹן מָאוֹר in the fourth day of creation. A synchronic approach to biblical exegesis and intertextual theological analysis was employed to ascertain the claims of both sides regarding this biblical evidence. This exegetical approach contrasts with that of reading critical diachronic assumptions or ANE mythology into the creation account and Eden narratives. Consequently, the above key elements led to designing this dissertation to answer the question: Is there evidence for the sanctuary/temple in the creation and Eden narratives, and if so, what are the implications of this evidence?

The second chapter dealt with the pre-Fall narrative of Eden (Gen 2) and reevaluated the arguments arising from the Hebrew word עֵדֶן in Gen 2:8, the garden as a mountain in Gen 2:10, the river of Eden in Gen 2:10, the Hebrew verbs שָמַר and שָׁמַר in Gen 2:15, and the Hebrew word מְדוֹן and the Hebrew verb בָּנָה in Gen 2:21-22.

The Hebrew word עֵדֶן in Gen 2:8 denotes a place of pleasure and delight (Ps 36:8; Isa 51:13; Jer 51:34). The semantic framework of עֵדֶן is especially enhanced in light of Ezek 28:11-19. The intertextual analysis of Gen 2:8 and Ezek 28:13 via vertical typology shows that the term עֵדֶן is used to describe the concept of the sanctuary/temple.
The עֵדֶן of Ezek 28:13 alludes to the covering cherub, an angelic being in the heavenly sanctuary. This text situates the historical context before the creation of the earthly עֵדֶן (Gen 2-3) and the origin of sin in the covering cherub (Ezek 28:16-17; cf. Isa 14:12-15; Rev 12:7-9). Additionally, the interchangeable semantic nature of “heaven,” “Eden,” “the sides of the north,” and “the temple” (cf. Pss 116:19; 135:2; 92:12, 13) further stresses the equivalent functionality of both עֵדֶן. This correlation concurs with the description of Zion, the Temple mountain, “perfect in beauty” (Ps. 50:2; Lam. 2:15), equated with the Garden of Eden. In view of the similar terminological scenery between Gen 2-3 and Ezek 28:11-19, it may be concluded that we are dealing in both passages with a sanctuary/temple framework. Therefore, if the canonical biblical text portrays Zion typologically representing the עֵדֶן/dwelling place of God and his creatures in heaven (Ezek 28:11-19), then ultimately Gen 2-3 would be the עֵדֶן/dwelling place of God and his creatures on earth. Specifically, Eden is portrayed as a royal garden, the special preserve of the divine King. In short, if the vertical movement found from Ezek 28:1-10 to Ezek 28:11-19 is correctly identified, then the writer of Gen 2-3 is building upon a historical retrojection of a preexisting (before Gen 1-3) sanctuary/temple. Thus, the

2 Block argues that although the garden is sacred, “it is not God’s house and there is no hint here of cultic service.” Daniel I. Block, For the Glory of God: Recovering a Biblical Theology of Worship (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2014), 298-99. He further compounds this conclusion by failing to recognize the vertical movement in Ezek 28:11-19. Consequently, Block does not place the עֵדֶן of Ezek 28 in heaven. The garden of עֵדֶן is the dwelling place of God with his creatures on earth, but it is also correct to affirm that there is only one place in the universe that could be called God’s house: this is the עֵדֶן/dwelling place of God with his unfallen creatures in the heavenly sanctuary/temple. The earthly עֵדֶן is a copy of the original עֵדֶן in heaven. Moreover, Adam and Eve’s cultic service should be understood, from a pre-lapsarian perspective, as functionally equivalent to the worship in heaven. Obviously, the post-lapsarian cultic service is developed in the later biblical narrative.
creation of the earth in Scripture consistently follows the pattern of heaven (Gen 1:1; cf. Exod 25:9, 40; Ps 78:69; Heb 8:5).

The garden as a mountain is a concept that arises from the Hebrew expression וְּנָהָר֙ יֹּצֵ֥א מֵעִ֑דֶן לְּהַשְּקָ֖וֹת אֶת־הַגָּּ֑ן (“Now a river went out of Eden to water the garden”) in Gen 2:10. Although the words for “mountain” or “hill” do not occur in the Eden narratives, the phraseology suggests that the river rose in Eden and then flowed into the garden to water it. This implies that the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן was situated on uneven elevated terrain. Furthermore, there is a pattern of “returning to the mountain” in the Hebrew Bible. This pattern incorporates two places as sacred: God’s sacred mountain and the tabernacle (Exod 15:17; Pss 15:1; 24:3; Isa 56:6, 7; cf. Ezek 28:14; Isa 14:12-14; Rev 15:2-4). The semantic framework of the Hebrew word הַר is a case to compare the particular characterization of Jerusalem with the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן (Ps 48:1-2; cf. 78:1-2; 65:10 [65:9]). Vertical typology also presents the earthly mountain as symbolizing the heavenly abode of God (cf. תַבְּנִית in Exod 25:9; Ezek 28:13-16). Just as the wilderness tabernacle was patterned according to the model (the primordial sanctuary/temple “mountain”), the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן was also patterned with the same architectural model.

The river of Eden in Gen 2:10 implies that the גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן was situated on elevated terrain, and the depiction of a river flowing down from a mountain corresponds to the

---


4 The conceptual framework of the “mountain” from the perspective of vertical typology is key for understanding the climax of the great controversy depicted in the biblical narrative (cf. Dan 11:45; Rev 16:16).
theological role of rivers or waters in the sanctuary/temple elsewhere in Scripture (Ezek 47:1-12; Zech 14:8-11; Joel 4:18, 20-21 [Eng. 3:18, 20-21]; Rev 22:1). Therefore, there is a significant theological relationship between waters (or rivers) and sacred mountains that forms a cultic pattern as conceptual backdrop in the Hebrew Bible. The connections between Eden, Jerusalem, Mount Zion, God’s presence, the life-giving waters of rivers flowing from the temple (Gen 13:10; Ps 36:6-10 [Eng. 36:5-9]; cf. Isa 30:25; 32:2; Pss 46:5; 65:10), and God’s presence as the life-giving water fountain implicitly denote the sanctuary/temple as the only place where the righteous are secure (Pss 1:3; 50:10; 92:13-15 [Eng. 92:12-14]). Canonical biblical intertextuality provides evidence that the connections between the flowing waters, Eden, and the sanctuary/temple form a semantic framework that constitutes sacred space.

The Hebrew verbs עָבַד and שָמַר in Gen 2:15 describing Adam and Eve’s work in the Garden of Eden parallel the priestly role of the Levites in the tabernacle (Num 3:7-8; 8:26; 18:5-6; cf. Exod 12:25). The verb עָבַד as infinitive construct (הָֽלְּעָבְּדָ) in the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua indicates “to honor” YHWH and/or “to serve” at the tent of meeting. Moreover, the Hebrew noun ‘āḇōḏā (עֲבֹדָה) that appears five times in the Old Testament with the preposition lamed (cf. Gen. 2:15; Num. 4:35, 39, 43; 1 Chr 25:1, 26:8), thus mirroring the infinitive construct of Gen 2:15, is sometimes used in

---


When the objects of הָעַבְדָה are put in canonical perspective, the semantic framework formed by “to honor” YHWH, “to serve” at the tent of meeting, and to “work” the מָעָבַד shares a unifying theme in the book of Genesis and shares a foundational belief in canonical biblical theology. Similarly, the verb מָעַמֵר is often related to sacred duties: protection of the sanctuary/ark (Num 18:5-6, cf. 1 Sam 7:1), fulfilling the work of the tabernacle (Num 3:7-8), performing the responsibilities of the tent of meeting (Num 8:26), an attitude toward the covenant (Gen 17:9), responsibility toward the law (Isa 56:1; cf. Deut 5:12), duties of love and justice (Hos 12:7), and keeping the commandments, statutes, and instructions of God (Gen 26:5). The semantic framework of מָעַמֵר, due to a considerable number of occurrences exhibiting religious language, may be attributed to the sacred realm. Further connections between the verb מִשְׁמַר [šîm; “set,” “place”] in Gen 2:8, which indicates that Adam and Eve were given a kind of kingly role, and the verb נוּח [nûḥḥ; “rest,” “settle down”] in Gen 2:15, which indicates that God wanted them to rest in a sanctuary setting (cf. Exod 20:9; 23:12; Deut 5:14), hint at the idea of an official/cultic appointment. Thus, the function/role divinely assigned to Adam and Eve in their pre-Fall state (a function/role that transcended that of the post-Fall human state) should be understood in light of the ancient priestly role of preserving sacred space. On this basis, I conclude that it is likely that the verbs הָעַבְדָה and מָעַמֵר in the pre-Fall Eden narrative echo and pertain to a cultic/royal semantic framework rather than merely to landscaping and agrarian responsibilities. In short, God bestows

---

7 Perhaps it is not coincidence that the Hebrew word ‘הַעֲבֹדָה (עֲבֹּדָה), sometimes used to mean “liturgical service” (cf. 1 Chr 9:28; Num 4:25; Exod 12:25), has the same root consonants as the infinite construct of the verb הָעַבְדָה.
royal authority with priestly status in order to enable Adam and Eve’s work of preserving sacred space.

The Hebrew word צֵלָע and the Hebrew verb בָנָה in Gen 2:21-22 belong to the sanctuary/temple conceptual framework. The word צֵלָע is used in the Old Testament approximately forty times; only in Gen 2:21-22 is it translated with reference to a part of the human anatomy (rib), while in the rest of its occurrences צֵלָע is often associated architecturally with the sanctuary/temple. The author intentionally selected a word capable of transmitting both literal and symbolic meaning. The verb בָנָה more frequently conveys the ideas of erecting (construction) and/or manufacturing.8

The reexamination of the biblical evidence has shown the sanctuary/temple motif, as it appears in relation with Gen 2, functioning as the operational system from which the entire framework of biblical canonical theology is derived.9 Moreover, the creation is

8 Note, for example, that in the Pentateuch the object of בָנָה is most often an altar, followed by a city, a family, a house, and a tower. Cf. Gen 2:22; 4:17; 8:20; 10:11; 11:4, 5, 8; 12:7, 8; 13:18; 16:2; 22:9; 26:25; 30:3; 33:17; 35:7; Exod 1:11; 17:15; 20:25; 24:4; 32:5; Num 13:22; 21:27; 23:1, 14, 29; 32:16, 24, 34, 37, 38; Deut 6:10; 8:12; 13:17; 20:5, 20, 22, 8, 25:9; 27:5; 6; 28:30. Clearly, in the Pentateuch בָנָה is not used to refer to the construction of the wilderness tabernacle. Yet, בָנָה is employed in 1 Kgs 5–9 to refer to the construction of Solomon’s temple, “the house of the Lord” (cf. Pss 78:69; 102:17 [Eng. 102:16]; Hag 1:2; 8; Zech 1:16; 6:12-15).

9 Sean M. McDonough, Creation and New Creation: Understanding God’s Creation Project (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2017), see especially the section entitled “The End Is like the Beginning: Creation and New Creation in Scripture and Tradition,” 1-15. However, to say that the end is like the beginning does not suffice and does not harmonize entirely with our findings. I would argue that the sanctuary/temple, as the operational system from which the entire framework of biblical canonical theology emerges, is the grand metanarrative of Scripture. N. T. Wright suggests that creation is the “outer narrative” that control all inner subplots (redemption narratives) in the canon. As the biblical narrative unfolds, subplots shape the canonical/biblical worldview. See N. T. Wright, Paul and the Faithfulness of God (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013), 1:475-85. Cf. Wright, New Testament and the People, 38-44; N. T. Wright, Jesus and the Victory of God (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 2:137-44. Borrowing Wright’s term “outer narrative,” I would suggest that the sanctuary/temple, rather than the creation, is the “outer narrative” motif that controls the redemptive “inner narrative” subplots. Recently, David W. Larsen, following Wright’s proposal, has advanced the notion that the purpose of creation is to become God’s place. He writes: “The purpose of creation was to become a certain type of ‘thing’, the terrestrial place of God. . . . Further, since the time of Genesis 1, the place that God created, has been on a placial journey, heading teleologically toward a future that has worldwide boundaries.” See David W. Larsen, “Two Narratives, Two Missions, One Canon”
predominantly associated with the sanctuary/temple as it was supposed to be, without sin. Accordingly, the earthly sanctuary/temple (wilderness tabernacle/Solomon’s Temple) is not the only type of its heavenly counterpart: the narratives of Gen 1-2 also portray a vertical typology. Just as the earthly sanctuary/temple existed in structural and functional relationship to its heavenly גן-עדן antitype, the first earthly גן-עדן (the protological model of Gen 2) also existed in structural and functional relationship to its heavenly counterpart. One of the key theological implications derived from the first earthly גן-עדן concerns Adam and Eve’s role. Let J. Richard Middleton, whose words are worth quoting in full, round out our conclusion:

In the cosmic sanctuary of God's world, humans have pride of place and supreme responsibility, not just as royal stewards and cultural shapers of the environment, but as priests of creation, actively mediating divine blessing to the nonhuman world and—in a post-Fall situation—interceding on behalf of a groaning creation until the

[paper presented at Evangelical Theological Society, Denver, 2018], 3-5. Larsen’s idea aligns moderately with the findings of this study, except that while he construes the purpose of creation as becoming God’s place, he does not identify the sanctuary/temple motif as the pattern for God’s place.


11 This approach to Gen 1-3 contradicts the common interpretation that “the biblical text nowhere says that the serpent is the devil or that Eden is a heavenly garden where the righteous will live eternally. It does not even present itself as describing the fall of humanity. All of this comes from later interpretation.” See Peter Bouteneff, *Beginnings: Ancient Christian Readings of the Biblical Creation Narratives* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 4. The sanctuary/temple motif helps to harmonize the biblical narrative in a coherent theological framework.

12 The sanctuary/temple motif construes the role of בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (Adam and Eve) as king-priests worshiping in a garden sanctuary. Yet, when this semantic framework echoes in Scripture, particular nuances surface. Adam and Eve’s appointment to עבד and שמר the גן-עדן should be understood as occurring in their pre-Fall state, since the divine command was given then. Not only did Adam and Eve have equal ontological value (Gen 1:26-28), but their charge to עבד and שמר the גן-עדן was analogous (Gen 2:15). Interpreters should give priority to the pre-Fall narrative in order to establish the primal covenantal function/role of men and women in sacred space. See William J. Dumbrell, *Covenant and Creation: A Theology of Old Testament Covenants* (Nashville: Nelson, 1984), 35-36; Peter John Gentry and Stephen J. Wellum, *God's Kingdom through God's Covenants: A Concise Biblical Theology* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2015), 90.
day when heaven and earth are redemptively transformed to fulfilled God's purposes for justice and shalom.\textsuperscript{13}

Thus, this semantic macrostructure suggests that the sanctuary/temple system/framework is the theological foundation for the created cosmos.\textsuperscript{14}

The third chapter dealt with the post-Fall narrative of Eden (Gen 3) and reevaluated the arguments arising from the Hebrew participle $\text{ךְֵּּּמִתְהַל}$ in Gen 3:8, the Hebrew word $\text{ךֻּתֹּנֶת}$ and the Hebrew verb $\text{לָבַש}$ in Gen 3:21, the Hebrew word $\text{כְּרֻּבִים}$ in Gen 3:24, and the eastern entrance to the garden in Gen 3:24.

The Hebrew participle $\text{ךְֵּּּּמִתְהַל}$ in Gen 3:8 denotes God’s presence, as in later sanctuaries (cf. Lev 26:12; Deut 23:15 [Eng. 23:14]; 2 Sam 7:6-7). The hitpa’el of $\text{ךְֵּּּּמִתְהַל}$ has the common meaning of “going to and fro,” suggesting the repeated or habitual presence of someone. This suggests that God’s presence is known and manifested by his walking in the $\text{גַּן־עִֵ֔דֶן}$. This walking motif is later employed in the Old Testament when Israel acknowledged that God required holiness and obedience if he were to continue to “walk” among his people (cf. Lev 26:12; Deut 23:15 [Eng. 23:14]; 2 Sam 7:6-7).\textsuperscript{15} Lev


\textsuperscript{14} Denis Carroll is correct in stating that “it would be excessive to claim that creation in the Old Testament is swallowed up by Israel’s longing for salvation—as if there were no real grasp of creation in pre-testamental and Old Testament times.” See Denis Carroll, \textit{Towards a Story of the Earth: Essays in the Theology of Creation} (St Saviour's: Dominican, 1987), 27. It is reasonable to say that the concept of the sanctuary/temple as the theological foundation of creation does not support the theory that creation is subordinated to soteriological considerations. In fact, creation and salvation are subordinated motifs of the sanctuary/temple theological framework.

\textsuperscript{15} Note that the same motif is used to describe the patriarchs’ walk with God (cf. Gen 5:22, 24; 6:9; 17:1; 24:40; 48:15). It is of greater significance that the hitpa’el of $\text{ךְֵּּּּמִתְהַל}$ occurs in 1 Sam 2:35 (cf. Deut 18:15; note also that the language of “walking before” YHWH is used often in connection with the Davidic covenant in 2 Kgs 2:4; 8:23, 25; 9:4; 2 Chr 6:14, 16; 7:17). This passage speaks about the promise of the coming priest-king. This coming personage is characterized by the hitpa’el of $\text{ךְֵּּּּמִתְהַל}$, indicating that he would walk (or minister) and perform the most sacred duties of the sanctuary/temple. According to the
26:11-12 connects the Hebrew word מִשְּכָן [miškān; “dwelling,” “tabernacle”] with the walking motif. The parallel expressions “I will set My tabernacle” and “I will walk among you” (note the hitpa’el of הָלַךְ) seem to imply that the walking motif is the means by which the מִשְּכָן becomes in effect God’s dwelling place. In other words, God’s presence becomes known and manifested by his walking. There is nothing in the post-Fall Eden narrative (or in the rest of the Old Testament) that would exclude הָלַךְ from the semantic framework of the holiness of the sanctuary/temple motif (Ezek 28:14).

The Hebrew word כֻּתֹּ֫הֶנֶת and the Hebrew verb לָבַשׁ in Gen 3:21 allude to “an emblem of status.” Although the semantic analysis has shown that the combination of לָבַשׁ with the noun כֻּתֹּ֫הֶנֶת does not always have the technical meaning restricted to priestly investiture, this combination of words tends to be used in contexts that involve conferral of status. The pairing of these two words in Gen 3:21 and its messianic connections with Gen 3:15 show that God’s redemptive act in v. 21 addresses more than the bodily nakedness of the couple. The presence of the canonical/biblical concept of sin in the context of the Messianic prophecy of v.15 gives substitutionary significance to the death of one or more animals in v. 21.

It is significant that the narratives of Eden (Gen 2:4b-2:25 and 3:1-3:24) begin and end with sanctuary/temple imagery. Gen 2:8 states that God planted the Garden of Eden, and Gen 3:24 remarks that God placed cherubim at the east of Eden. These two divine actions are connected through vertical typology with the sanctuary/temple imagery in the New Testament, this prophecy is fulfilled in Christ, the priest-king that through his “walking motif” would minister in the heavenly sanctuary/temple (cf. Rom 1:1-6; Heb 7:1-8:2).

The Hebrew מִשְּכָן is the technical term to refer to the tent of meeting in Exod 25-27; 35-40. Cf. also Lev 8:10; 15:31; 17:4; Num 1-3; Josh 22:19; 1 Chr 6:17 [Eng. 6:32]; Ps 26:8; 74:7; 132:7.

New Testament, this prophecy is fulfilled in Christ, the priest-king that through his “walking motif” would minister in the heavenly sanctuary/temple (cf. Rom 1:1-6; Heb 7:1-8:2).

16 The Hebrew מִשְּכָן is the technical term to refer to the tent of meeting in Exod 25-27; 35-40. Cf. also Lev 8:10; 15:31; 17:4; Num 1-3; Josh 22:19; 1 Chr 6:17 [Eng. 6:32]; Ps 26:8; 74:7; 132:7.
of Ezek 28:13-14. The linkage between “Eden” and the “cherubim” constitutes a frame that encloses the Eden narratives with a sanctuary/temple setting, indicating a cultic/salvific interpretation of v. 21. Therefore, the vocabulary, the immediate context, and these intertextual connections show that the pairing of לֵבְשׁ and כֻּת ֹ֫נֶת in the cultic context of the sanctuary/temple motif conceptualizes the profound redemptive purpose of God.

The Hebrew word כְּרֻּבִים in Gen 3:24 is associated with Israel’s sanctuary. The Old Testament shows God as enthroned between the כְּרֻּבִים (cf. 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 2 Kgs 19:15; Isa 37:16; Ps 80:1; 99:1), and God encountering Moses from between the two כְּרֻּבִים (cf. Exod 25:22; 30:6; Lev 26:2; Num 7:89). In addition, the presence of כְּרֻּבִים represents the cloud-chariot of YHWH, on which He rides in the heavens (1 Chr 28:18; Deut 33:26; Ps 18:11 [Eng. 18:10]; Ps 68:5, 34 [Eng. 68:4, 33]; 99:1 and Hab 3:8). In general terms, the biblical data offers a common conception: the companionship of כְּרֻּבִים is a direct reference to YHWH’s presence in the sanctuary/temple (Ezek 28:14; cf. the visions of Ezek 1:5-10 and 10:1-20).

The eastern entrance to the garden in Gen 3:24 (also appearing in Gen 2:8 as מִקֶ֙דֶם) alludes to a similar eastward orientation of later sanctuaries ((Exod 27:13-16; 17)

---

17 Cf. Sculptured images above the ark of the covenant (Exod 25:18-22; 26:31; 37:7-9; Num 7:8-9; 1 Chr 28:18); inside the holy of holies (1 Kgs 6:23-28; 8:6-7; 1 Chr 3:10-13); beneath the massive sea (1 Kgs 7:29, 36); decoration on the curtains of the tabernacle (Exod 26:1, 31; 36:8, 35; 2 Chr 3:14); the walls of the Temple (1 Kgs 6:29, 32, 35; 2 Chr 3:7; Ezek 41:18, 20, 25); and the guardian cherub in the edenic sanctuary/temple (Ezek 28:14).
36:20-30; 38:13-18; Ezek 47:1). The east-west alignment is one of the basic architectural elements of sacred buildings in Israel, as confirmed by archeological discoveries.

The conclusions that have been drawn affirm further that the post-Fall Eden narrative does not exhibit an architectural structure, unlike later sanctuary/temple buildings, but has conceptual equivalences with a preexisting heavenly sacred space. Therefore, the post-Fall Eden narrative was not written to reflect the wilderness and later sanctuaries/temples; rather, this narrative became the precursor of the sanctuary/temple system as the Garden of Eden represented the preexisting heavenly sacred space.

The fourth chapter dealt with the creation account (Gen 1:1–Gen 2:4a) and reevaluated the arguments arising from the motif of temple building (divine rest) and the Hebrew words מֹעֵד and מָאוֹר on the fourth day of creation. The allusion to the sanctuary/temple motif is subtle and indirect. God’s rest on the seventh day (Gen 2:1-3; cf. Exod 20:11; 31:17; Ps 132:7-8, 13-14; Isa 66:1-2) is the keystone connecting the creation account and the temple-building motif via a sevenfold pattern. The theological role of the seventh day connects the creation and sanctuary/temple narratives because it...

18 Kang, “Creation, Eden, Temple and Mountain,” 76-77.


20 According to Kyle R. Greenwood, the general consensus among biblical scholars is that the author of Gen 2-3 drew on temple architecture from Israel and the ANE intentionally to demonstrate Eden’s status as sacred space. Kyle R. Greenwood, “Old Testament Reverberations of Gen 1-2,” in Since the Beginning: Interpreting Genesis 1 and 2 through the Ages, ed. Kyle R. Greenwood (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2018), 18. However, it is the heavenly realm that provided the design for the Garden of Eden and the later earthly sanctuary/temple system, as the biblical vertical typology indicates (cf. Gen 1:1; Exod 25:9, 40; Ps 78:69; Ezek 28:11-19; Heb 8:5).

21 The text contains a framework of seven speeches (Exod 25-31); the first six speeches (Exod 25:1-31:11) contain the instructions to build the wilderness sanctuary, and the seventh speech a command to observe the Sabbath (Exod 31:12-17). See also in 1 Kgs 6:38 the seven years to build Solomon’s Temple.
conveys an equivalence of functionality: “rest.” On the one hand, God’s rest (שָבַת in Gen 2 and נוּחַ in Exod 20:11) alludes to God’s original plan to rule the heavens and earth, and the later promise of humankind’s rest (or Israel’s) reflects and derives from it. God’s resting place (מְנֻכָּה) is associated with his sovereignty from Zion (Isa 66:1-2) and with the ark or throne (Ps 132:7-8, 13-14). While God’s activity of rest is to rule creation and to maintain the created order, the vocabulary describing God’s rest conveys the idea that it is a sanctuary/temple activity. On the other hand, humankind’s rest (or Israel’s; related to the verb נוּחַ and the noun מְנֻכָּה) alludes to the promised freedom and prosperity under God’s kingship (Num 10:33; Deut 3:20; 12: 9-10; 25:19; Josh 1:13, 15; 1 Kgs 5:18; 8:56; 1 Chr 22:9; 28:2). Divine rest in Gen 2:1-3 and Israel’s rest in the remainder of the Old Testament pertain to the dominion and restoration of sacred time and space. God’s intervention in Israel’s deliverance from Egypt was intended to confer on the redeemed people a מַנְעַח (Deut 12:9; cf. Ps 95:11). In memory of this redemptive event, Israel was commanded in Deut 5:15 to rest on (to observe) the Sabbath day. YHWH’s act of releasing Israel from Egypt’s bondage and bringing the nation to its מַנְעַח fulfilled the Sabbath rest. For God’s people, מַנְעַח is the Promised Land, the mountain of his inheritance, God’s sanctuary (Exod 15:17). God’s place of rest becomes the place of Israel’s promised rest (1 Kgs 8:56; cf. Deut 12:5, 9-11). Just as when divine rest was accomplished in Zion and national and political security was obtained in Israel, this redemptive scheme prefigures the end-time redemption when the redeemed will be in God’s holy city (cf. Heb 4:1-9; 12:22; 13:14; Rev 14:1-3; 15:2; 21-22). Therefore, the Sabbath rest at creation is God’s creation pattern for humankind, not just for Israel (Gen 2:1-3; cf. Exod 20:8-11). In sum, the creation account concludes with God resting on the
seventh day, indicating that just as God rules from the sanctuary/temple (in the heavens), he governs the newly created earth; divine rest reminds humankind of the cosmic dimension of God’s kingship. This macro-motif is developed in Gen 2-3’s portrayal of Adam and Eve with God-given royal authority and priestly status to preserve the sacred space of the Garden of Eden. In this way, the sabbatical rest is understood within the sanctuary/temple conceptual framework.

The syntactic and literary characteristics of the fourth day of creation (Gen 1:14-16) suggest the presence of sanctuary/temple language, prompting the reader to consider a symbolic/theological understanding as a backdrop to the historical narrative. The Hebrew word מָאוֹר (Mt 3:17) alludes to a superior reality beyond the “greater light” (sun) and the “lesser light” (moon) because this word is used only for the light of the menorah (Exod 25:6; 27:20; 35:8, 14, 28; 39:27; Lev 24:2; Num 4:9, 16). The Hebrew word מַעַן, in addition to describing one of the functions of the lights in the firmament of the heavens (מְאֹּרֹּת בִרְּקִיעַ הַשָּמִים in Gen 1:14), denotes sanctuary/temple activities, specifically cultic festivals (Lev 23:2, 4, 37, 44; cf. Num 15:3; 29:39; 1 Chr 23:31; 2 Chr 2:4; 8:13; 30:22; 31:3; Ezra 3:5; Neh 10:33; Isa 1:14; 14:31; 33:20; Lam 1:4; Ezek 36:38; 44:24; Hos 2:13; Zech 8:19). This biblical evidence does not substantiate the idea of a cosmos-sized temple. However, it hints at the writer’s intent to imbue the historical narrative within a semantic or conceptual framework.

In short, Gen 1:1-2:4a advances the canonical/biblical concept that הָָֽאָדָם is not the only reality/creation with the divine-given image and likeness (cf. Gen 1:1; Ps 78:69); since there was a greater archetypal pattern in God’s plan when creating the heavens and
earth, and indeed the entire cosmos. Consequently, just as the creation narrative (Gen 1:1-2:4a) and the pre-Fall Eden narrative (Gen 2:4b-25) share the same composition intent, the post-Fall Eden narrative (Gen 3:1-24) also embraces and advances this literary purpose: namely, showing the connections between the historical event of creation and the conceptual world of the sanctuary/temple. The writer of the creation account very likely wanted his readers to visualize God’s creation as patterned in the likeness of the divine realm—to be precise, sacred space/time on earth as it is in heaven.

In the fifth chapter, major theological implications arising from the reevaluation of the biblical evidence were discussed. During this dissertation’s reevaluation, it was found that the biblical evidence for allusions to the sanctuary/temple in Gen 1-3 is better called a motif, thereby framing its meaning as a conceptual approach to the canonical/biblical text. In this chapter a criterion (or a semantic framework approach) was proposed as the hermeneutical control in order to ascertain the extent of the canonical/theological implications of the sanctuary/temple motif in Gen 1-3.

---


23 It is significant to highlight that the seventh-day Sabbath rest following a heavenly pattern is a compelling rationale for human rest. Roy Gane affirms that “when he [God] was setting up patterns for all human life, including cyclical time (Gen 1:14), indicates that he intended for all humans, made in his image (vv. 26-27) to follow his example by enjoying Sabbath rest to celebrate his creation.” Roy E. Gane, *Old Testament Law for Christians: Original Context and Enduring Application* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2017), 250. This cyclical time is the sanctuary/temple pattern after which the eschatological re-creation is fulfilled.

24 The linguistic and conceptual correspondences between the sanctuary/temple and the creation, substantiated by numerous canonical uses of this motif, comprise an interpretative network. Gary E. Schnittjer explains that “networks represent a significant example of scriptural interpretation already built
The canonical biblical theology of the creation narrative (Gen 1:1-2:4a) and the Eden narratives (Gen 2-3), in view of sanctuary/temple (cultic) terminology, develops the sanctuary/temple motif as an overarching worldview/shaping narrative/story that functions as the hermeneutical control key to the Bible. The sanctuary/temple imagery of Gen 1-3 is not to be taken as metaphorical or figurative; rather, in addition to describing the actual origins of the cosmos, it signals a greater reality: God’s heavenly abode as it was portrayed on earth by sacred space and time. The cosmos is not a temple, because the Bible contains a vertical typology hermeneutical perspective showing plainly that heaven is not the sanctuary, but there is a sanctuary in heaven (Isa 66:1-2; cf. Ps 11:4; Heb 8:1-2; Rev 5:11). The cosmological description should be understood as the historical and continuous interaction between the heavenly and earthly sanctuary/temple (1 Kgs 8:30-35, 41-50; 2 Chr 30:27; Isa 6:1-7).

This approach is particularly important to understand soteriology. Matthew Levering expounds on the relationship between creation and atonement in Christian thought. Although I cannot agree with all his conclusions, he is correct in affirming that “we can only understand the cross when we recognize that the Redeemer is none other than the Creator, who from eternity knows and wills the whole of creation in relation to his own goodness.” See Matthew Levering, *Engaging the Doctrine of Creation: Cosmos, Creatures, and the Wise and Good Creator* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2017), 276. In the same vein, it may be argued that when the cross is observed from the perspective of the sanctuary/temple theological framework, protology and eschatology (creation and re-creation/salvation) provide a rewarding and comprehensive understanding of the Creator and Redeemer.
It is fitting to conclude that the sanctuary/temple motif is the unifying rationale between protology and eschatology.²⁶ “This means that the image of the sanctuary from Genesis 2-3, from which humans are exiled and to which they need to return—a return that God provides purely by his grace—is a controlling image for the entire Bible story.”²⁷ In actual fact, as Westermann explains, it is impossible to understand the end of the world without assuming that there was a beginning. He declares that “the primal events and the final events in the Bible correspond to each other in that they both are universal in scope and lie beyond history.”²⁸ Daniel W. Hardy seems to discern the same fundamental insight that the beginning anticipates the end:

Taken in their interrelation, creation and eschatology therefore integrate space and time and the elements and processes by which they are mediated. As elements and processes, creation tells us the preconditions which are “shaped” or “completed” in the other; and eschatology tells us the range of possibilities—and then some—which are latent or manifested in the first, and in the beginning, but appear through the complexities and contingencies of history and its eventual transcendence. So, viewed ontologically, eschatology is the unfolding of what is enfolded in protology, but understood as a novum which appears at each point in the unfolding, even at the end.²⁹

²⁶ One key element that unifies the sanctuary/temple motif framing the canonical/biblical narrative is God’s judgment. This is especially noticeable in the book of Revelation. James M. Hamilton has comprehensively and meticulously established the judgment motif in Scripture, and in short, Hamilton puts it like this: “The story of the Bible is the story of God’s glory in salvation through judgment.” See James M. Hamilton, God’s Glory in Salvation through Judgment: A Biblical Theology (Wheaton: Crossway, 2010), especially 67-107, 541-51. I would agree with Hamilton, though the best or maybe the only way to understand the purpose of judgment is via the sanctuary/temple motif, particularly as it regards eschatological events. This perspective is not completely explored in Hamilton’s analysis.

²⁷ Collins, Did Adam and Eve, 69.

²⁸ See Westermann, Beginning and End, 21. This statement would indicate that in the biblical canonical narrative, protology and eschatology are not confined to salvation history. At this point, our conclusions concur with Westermann’s exposition. He concludes that “the combination of language of God’s saving activity and the language of the beginning and the end has its basis in the fact that the deeds by which God saved his people were so powerful that they had to take in all mankind.” Westermann, Beginning and End, 36. The soteriological narrative of the Bible corresponds significantly and in similar language with the beginning and end of the theologicalcanonical semantic framework.

In other words, the canonical framework for the sanctuary/temple motif in Scripture\textsuperscript{30} comprises the structures and dynamics of protology and eschatology.\textsuperscript{31} In this framework, the theological function of divine rest is to establish God’s sovereignty. Divine rest is found in the Bible exclusively within the sanctuary/temple framework. God’s rest, accordingly, is God’s kingship/rulership securing sacred space and time. The history of the biblical narrative moves toward its consummation, which is the fundamental climactic and eschatological event of God’s sanctuary/temple rest; the Sabbath rest is a symbol of salvation, a return to Eden (cf. Exod 31:13; Ezek 20:12; Rev 22:1-5).

The canonical biblical theology of the creation narrative (Gen 1:1-2:4a) and the Eden narratives (Gen 2-3) develops a cosmological framework of the sanctuary/temple motif portraying the reality on earth as it is in heaven (Exod 25:9, 40). The creation of the earth and its eschatological re-creation are modeled, via vertical typology, after the heavenly realm. The heavens and earth are two distinct entities that do not overlap each other; rather, the heavenly reality is the system that predetermines the earthly one, the latter being the reflection of the former. For this reason, the redemptive events are

\textsuperscript{30} Consider, for example, Ben P. Skipper, “Echoes of Eden: An Intertextual Analysis of Edenic Language in Romans 1:18-32” (PhD diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2017), especially 148-213.

\textsuperscript{31} One aspect that serves as an impetus to further research in wisdom thinking is considering that protology and eschatology actualize the essence of canonical/biblical theology. Zimmerli affirms that “wisdom thinks resolutely within the framework of a theology of creation.” Walther Zimmerli, “Place and Limit of the Wisdom in the Framework of the Old Testament Theology,” in Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom, ed. James L. Crenshaw (New York: Ktav, 1976), 316. Zimmerli is right, but taking creation theology as the exclusive basis of wisdom thinking overlooks the fact that wisdom thinking also considers judgment. An alternative approach to ponder wisdom thinking is to observe the relationship between creation and judgment via a sanctuary/temple semantic framework. See also Tremper Longman, The Fear of the Lord Is Wisdom: A Theological Introduction to Wisdom in Israel (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2017), 130.
prefigured in the earthly sanctuary/temple services and accomplished by Christ in the heavenly sanctuary/temple.

The archetypal framework of protology and eschatology focuses on the concept of Eden. It has been observed that the canonical biblical narrative commences with Eden in heaven (Ezek 28), continues with Eden on earth (Gen 2-3), and ends with a heavenly Eden on earth (Rev 22). This means that the function of Eden, representing the original paradigmatic worship setting in the pre-lapsarian and post-lapsarian historical phases of humankind, defines the biblical concept of the sanctuary/temple. The sanctuary/temple system/framework, as the theological/canonical foundation for the created cosmos, is the pattern for God’s archetypal cosmic order and dealings with sin.

In short, the sanctuary/temple (garden-like) semantic framework is a coherent and consistent pattern all through Scripture, centered on the idea that God intended his creation to be inhabited by a מַמְלֶ֥כֶת כֹּהֲנִָ֖ים (Exod 19:6; cf. Rev 1:6; 5:10; 20:6).

Creation eagerly awaits when the ancient promise may be fulfilled in the eschatological re-creative exclamation: “Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be his people. God himself will be with them and be their God.”
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