

## THESIS ABSTRACT

Master of Arts in Biblical and Theological Studies

Adventist University of Africa

Theological Seminary

Title: NAKEDNESS, SHAME AND COVERING IN GENESIS 3:1-21:  
EXEGETICAL AND THEOLOGICAL STUDY

Researcher: Stephen Makuku

Primary Advisor: Mzonzima Gwala, D. Litt.

Date of Completion: October 2023

A surface reading of Genesis 2:25 and Genesis 3:1-21 leaves the reader with a dilemma over the use, understanding of the words, naked, shame and covering/garment prior and after sin. It further requires an understanding on the nature of nakedness Adam and Eve when they were created against the nakedness that resulted from sin. What nature of covering was fit for this nakedness? Therefore, the exegetical study seeks to investigate the distinctive nature and experience of עֲרוּמָיִם with בִּישׁ in Genesis 2:25 and עֵירָם in Genesis 3:1-21. It will aid to identify the serpent's nature and his role on the couple's nakedness in Genesis 3:1-21 and the reason of God's choice of garment to cover human's nakedness.

The conclusion is that nakedness without shame in Genesis 2:25 עָרוּמִים and בּוֹשׁ meant that Adam and Eve were created perfect in the image of God, wise, honourable, undefeated, not humiliated before each other, before God and before the enemy. The word עֵרָם describes sinful condition that has changed Adam's identity from the image of God to the Satan's identity. God has provided a restorative garment which mankind could not afford for itself.

Adventist University of Africa

Theological Seminary

NAKEDNESS, SHAME AND COVERING IN GENESIS 3:1-21:

EXEGETICAL AND THEOLOGICAL STUDY

A thesis

presented in partial fulfilment

of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts in Biblical and Theological Studies

by

Stephen Makuku

October 2023



NAKEDNESS, SHAME AND COVERING IN GENESIS 3:1-21:  
EXEGETICAL AND THEOLOGICAL STUDY

A thesis  
presented in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the degree  
Master of Arts in Biblical and Theological Studies

by  
Stephen Makuku

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

---

Primary Adviser:  
Mzonzima Gwala, D. Litt.

---

Program Coordinator, MABTS  
Malak Alemayehu Tsegaw, PhD.

---

Secondary Adviser:  
Malak Alemayehu Tsegaw, PhD.

---

Dean, Theological Seminary  
Feliks Poniatowski, PhD.

---

External Examiner:  
Afolarin Olutunde Ojewole, PhD.

Date: October 2023

## Dedication

Dedicated to the Biblical and Theological seminary and Bible students of the Seventh-day Adventist church.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	vii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Purpose of the Study .....	3
Justification of the study .....	3
Delimitation .....	4
Methodology and Overview of the Paper .....	4
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	7
Human Vulnerability Views .....	7
Critical Review .....	15
Human Vulnerability View – Critical Review.....	16
Sexual Desire View.....	20
Sexual Desire View-Critical Review .....	22
Human Development View.....	23
Human Development View- Critical Review .....	24
HISTORICAL AND LITERARY ANALYSIS.....	26
Authorship.....	26
Historical Background .....	30
Clothing Custom .....	31
Literary Context .....	32
Larger Context .....	32
Immediate Literary Context.....	34
Literary Structure .....	36
The selected Hebrew Text: Genesis 2:25 and 3:1-11, 21 .....	38
Selected Greek Septuagint text of Genesis 2:25 and 3:1-11, 21.....	38
Translation of the Main Verses of the Text .....	39
Genesis 2:25.....	40
Genesis 3:1-7 .....	40
Genesis 3:8-11 .....	40
Genesis 3:21 .....	41
Interpretative Problems .....	41
Grammatical Analysis.....	42
Discourse Analysis of Genesis 3:1-7 .....	47
Identity of the Serpent.....	47
The Adjectival Identity .....	48

Nature of Nakedness עירום .....	50
Meaning of עירום in Genesis 3:7 .....	52
Meaning of חגור in Genesis 3:7 .....	53
Discourse Analysis of Genesis 3:8-11 .....	54
Function of עירום in Genesis 3:8-11 .....	54
Analysis of Genesis 3:21 .....	54
The Function of לבש with כְּתָנֹת .....	54
Chapter Summary .....	55
THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS .....	57
The Theological Implication of “Naked but not Ashamed” ערוּמִים... וְלֹא יִתְבַשְּׂשׁוּ .....	57
The Theological Implication of the Serpent’s Identity .....	58
The Theological Implication of עירום on Nature of Sin .....	59
The Change from the Image of God .....	60
Naked and Slavery in Theological motif .....	62
Shame.....	63
The Garment and the Covering.....	65
Garment of skin.....	66
Covering/ Clothing.....	67
The Message and Application to Israel.....	69
The Primary Message .....	69
The Hebrew Initial Status .....	70
Hope for the Slaves at Micro Level .....	71
Hope at Macro- level .....	73
Application Today .....	74
Nakedness עירום .....	75
The Message to End Time Church.....	76
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....	78
Conclusion .....	82
Contribution .....	83
Recommendation .....	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	86
VITA.....	92

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank God for the opening of resources and leading me to through this study. I further thank my family: my wife Hildah Makuku and children (Tebo, Pono and Itumeleng) who gave support and light moments during my study. It with priceless gratitude to my primary Advisor Dr M. Gwala, secondary Advisor Dr M. Tsegaw and the external Examiner Dr A.O, Ojewole who contributed to the in-depth study of this thesis with so much patience.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

The topic of the origin of sin, its nature and effects on human beings has been studied by John Fowler and other Old Testament scholars.<sup>1</sup> The study of this topic has shaped the people's conception of salvation, human's relationship with God, the relationship between man and woman. There are many words that describe the above concepts, however, the following words: 'naked/ nakedness', shame' and 'clothing/tunic and covering' have been used by various Bible scholars as shall be indicated in this thesis. The above words are the points of focus for this exegesis. The word naked appears four(4) times in Genesis, and in different linguistic forms with same root though. It is עָרוּמִים in Genesis 2:25, and עִירָמָם in Genesis 3:7,10,11. It has its cognate in Genesis.3:1 as עָרוֹם The word 'shame' does appear only once in Genesis 2:25 as בוֹשׁ. The word "covering" appears as a verb in Genesis 3:21 לָבַשׁ , and tunic as כְּתֹנֶת.

There are three major textual interpretations shared around the meaning of these words, and are as follows:

1. Words refer to sexual desire from the original sin and modesty; this is represented by Mackenzie. He is one of the proponents advocating that clothing originates from feeling of shame and sexual desire which came from effect of the Original sin (Gen 3:7, 21) and thus clothing is used

---

<sup>1</sup> John M. Fowler, "Humanity before Sin" *Handbook of the Seventh-day Adventist Theology: Commentary Reference Series (HSAT)* ed., Raoul Dederen (Washington, DC: Review & Herald,2000),12:235.

mainly for modesty.<sup>2</sup> The argument advanced by Mackenzie and his contemporaries does not go beyond the human physical realm.

2. The second interpretation refers to Human development from childhood to Adulthood. Gibson associates shame with natural development from childhood to adulthood. A child starts with innocence of nakedness and when the eyes get opened is ashamed of the nakedness and feels guilty.<sup>3</sup>
3. Another group see these words to mean that sin is a spiritual death and alienation from God. Nakedness means openness in marriage and in man's relationship with God.<sup>4</sup> Nakedness is the state of vulnerability.<sup>5</sup> Shame is more than a feeling. It is a personal knowledge of guilt.<sup>6</sup> This view goes beyond physical human's sphere.

### **Statement of the Problem**

There is a use of the words עָרוּמִים translated “naked” and בוֹשׁ translated “shame” in Genesis 2:25 and עֵרָם which is also translated “naked” in Genesis 3:1-21, though “shame” in the latter is not directly mentioned but it is seemingly implied. It is acknowledgeable that there is an emergence of the crafty serpent which introduced sin in Genesis 3, under which Adam and Eve felt naked and a need to cover themselves

---

<sup>2</sup> John L. Mackenzie, *Dictionary of the Bible* (London: Touchstone,1995), 143.

<sup>3</sup> C. L John Gibson, ed., *Genesis* vol. 1, Daily Study Bible series (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1981),126.

<sup>4</sup> Bruce K. Waltke, *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical and Thematic Approach*, (Grand Rapids, MI : Zondervan, 2007), 263, 267.

<sup>5</sup> *Seventh-day Adventist, International Bible Commentary: Genesis(SDAIBC)*, ed. Jacques B. Doukhan (Washington DC: Review and Herald, 2016), 87. Nakedness is the state of vulnerability only when one is exposed to all kinds of possible attacks. It is significant that in all Old testament passages where nakedness is associated with shame it is in the context of war.

<sup>6</sup> Kenneth A. Matthews, *The New American Commentary: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture, Genesis, vol. 1A*, (Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing Group, 1996), 225.

with leaves. It raises a question on the kind of nakedness which could not be satisfactorily covered with leaves. There seems to be a change of nakedness experienced by Adam and Eve. The behaviour of the naked human couple in Genesis 3 seems to be a replicate identity of the crafty serpent. Why does the text use words from the similar root word from which nakedness of the couple prior sin, the crafty serpent and naked Adam and Eve after sin has been derived? The study seeks to investigate the distinctive nature and experience of עֲרוּמִים with בּוֹשׁ in Genesis 2:25 and עִירָם in Genesis 3:1-21. It will aid to identify the serpent's nature and his role on the couple's nakedness in Genesis 3:1-21 and the reason of God's choice of garment to cover human's nakedness.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to investigate and exegete the syntactical meaning of “nakedness”, “shame” and “clothing or covering” in Genesis 3:1-21 as a seeming antithesis of Genesis 2:25. It will further attempt to clarify serpent and who it is personifying with its characteristics. It will contribute to the existing body of knowledge.

### **Justification of the study**

There have been some studies conducted by various scholars on Genesis 2 and 3, but all those studies have not focused on the interpretive disunity of עֲרוּמִים and בּוֹשׁ in Genesis 2:25, עִירָם in Genesis 3:1, with עִירָם and תְּגַלְתָּ in 3:7-11, לְבַשׁ and כְּתָנוּת in Genesis 3:21 . The study will contribute to the Biblical understanding of the ‘nakedness’, ‘shame’ and ‘covering’ in view of how God relates to mankind. It will further contribute to the theological understanding of the Seventh-day Adventist doctrine six (#6) on Creation, The Nature of Humanity, doctrine seven (#7) the Great

Controversy, doctrine eight (#8), the Experience of Salvation, doctrine ten (#10) and Christ's Ministry in the Heavenly Sanctuary, doctrine twenty-four(#24).

### **Delimitation**

There are some verses in the text of the entire Genesis 3:1-21 which will be translated, namely: Genesis 3:1-11, 3:21 and Genesis 2:25 will be translated because it contains the words to be examined under this study. The study will not even examine every word found in the above translated selected text. It will offer intertextual reference of those words in other related texts of the Old Testament. It will not go in depth on the theological development of doctrine of Judgment.

### **Methodology and Overview of the Paper**

The method of study in this paper will be guided by the exegetical steps suggested by Stuart, where He recommends, that it is important to study the historical context, Literary context and Biblical context.<sup>7</sup> Under Literary analysis the thesis will follow what Vogt suggested on narrative analysis, and marking where speech is introduced in the narrative.<sup>8</sup> Genesis 3:1-7, 10-11, 21 will be translated from Hebrew to English, then consider the grammatical data. This study will pay attention to lexical meanings of the five Hebrew words. This will be done through the use of Hebrew Lexicons, together with Hebrew word dictionaries.

---

<sup>7</sup> Douglass Stuart, *Old Testament Exegesis: A Handbook for Student and Pastors* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), 18-23.

<sup>8</sup> Peter T. Vogt, *Interpreting the Pentateuch: An Exegetical Handbook* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 2009), 56-57.

The exegesis will further use Stuart's proposed procedure for word study.<sup>9</sup>

This research will consider the above procedure for the word study aspect.

The study will endeavour to find word etymologies and observe their changes if any, at the time of Moses. The Hebrew word dictionaries and lexicons will be the primary tools to achieve this objective. Hebrew grammar and Syntax references books will be used as tools for the grammatical analysis. Eventually the exegetical study will seek to find the intended theological meaning of the passage and its selected words and its application today. This exegetical thesis has Four Chapters. The primary method of study will be a selective Exegesis of the subsections of Genesis 3:1-21; where the weight of the words and their implications are correlated. The Thesis will develop over four chapters beginning with Chapter One which presents the thesis proposal. It defines and names the text being examined, it states what the problem and the purpose of exegeting Genesis 3:1-21 in view of the selected words of concern.

Chapter Two is the literature review, of the work done on the passage and those attempted to address almost similar concern this research raises. The research will pay attention to some other relevantly selected work done on this passage. The review will be organized and grouped according to persuasion and point of view.

Chapter Three will look at the passage based on its historical and literary background. The historical context will include the identity of the author. The choice of literary style and motifs employed by the author.<sup>10</sup> The chapter will further cover the identity of the primary audience which the message was intended to address. It will study historical situation when the text was written with the people surrounding the audience. It will have exegetical section of the text under examination. It will

---

<sup>9</sup> Douglass, 114-115.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, 21

determine and establish the limits of the passages, and analyse the textual problems and its translation. The study will distinguish between simple narratives and dialogues hence also genres of the passages will be identified. This research will study the literary context of the passage. Chapter four will be the theological meaning and application of the message as derived from the exegetical study. It will contextualize the message to today's situation and audience. Chapter 5 will be the summary and conclusion of the thesis. It precisely points out solutions to the statement problem. It will also outline the contribution of the exegesis of the world of knowledge and make recommendations.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The Literature review will be organized according to point of view and persuasion based on the three views: Human vulnerability view, Human Development view, and Sexual Desire view. Then under each view there will be a critical review. The above views hold different opinions on the meanings of nakedness, shame, identity of the serpent and covering.

#### **Human Vulnerability Views**

The Human vulnerability view scholars perceive nakedness as Spiritual and of physical experience which has a psychological effect. Nakedness is a sign of defeat by the enemy. Under this view shame is identified with self-consciousness of Adam and Eve. It is not the author's intention to identify details of the serpent.

Bill Jackson describes nakedness as physical phenomenon, and comments on nakedness as associated with the moral guilt the current person has today as a reflection of Adam's sinful consequences. Explaining the kind of the answer Adam gave to the question "where are you?" is the fear of being seen who we are, and thus human beings relating to each other through masks that hide our shame as a protection. Bill Jackson intimates that both nakedness and true moral guilt are the products of disobedience<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bill Jackson, *The Biblical Metanarrative* (CA: Radical Middle Press, 2014), 44.

James Barr adds that before sin, the naked pair were like animals which were not embarrassed by their nakedness. It is the knowledge of good and evil that brought about the difference for their last experience. He describes shame, as not a matter of the sin committed that caused shame but of self-consciousness.<sup>2</sup> Ouro Roberto relates the covering of Adam's nakedness by God as conferring of priestly function.<sup>3</sup>

Richard Davidson contends against the interpretation of sexuality by differentiating the word for nakedness in Genesis 2:25 and Genesis 3; to mean lightly clothed and unmasked respectively. The latter is associated with consciousness of guilt. The argument admits the physical nature of nakedness. The concept of clothing after fall is related to Eden as a sanctuary and Adam and Eve were dressed as priests.<sup>4</sup>

Gordon Wenham suggest that the word *בִּיָּשׁ* does not carry personal guilt overtones instead should be translated "unabased". He expresses nakedness as a symbol of poverty and need and not associated with sexual guilt.<sup>5</sup> Jacques Doukhan associates nakedness with shame "Where nakedness is associated with shame in the Old Testament is in the context of war. it's the state of being uncovered, unprotected and unsheltered." He further comments on shame "*bosh*" that it refers to physical condition of disgrace resulting from defeat at the hands of the enemy" and as a hitpael

---

<sup>2</sup> James Barr, *The Garden of Eden and The Hope of Immortality* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993), 62-63.

<sup>3</sup> Roberto, Ouro. "The Garden of Eden Account: The Chiastic Structure of Genesis 2-3," *Andrews University Seminary studies* 40, no. 2 (2002): 235.

<sup>4</sup> Richard Davidson, *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 56-57. "*erom*" is explained as total shameful exposure, with the loss of garment of light. The garden of Eden is to be considered the original sanctuary on earth before the fall...representing the garden of Eden as the precursor to the mosaic sanctuary. He differs with evangelical on meaning of animal skin to not to be interpreted for animal sacrifices though in the context of the sanctuary but to priesthood. On the sense of being unmasked, see also Claus Westermann, *Creation* (London: SPCK, 1974), 95.

<sup>5</sup> Gordon J. Wenham, *Word Biblical Commentary: Genesis 1-15* (Dallas, TX: Thomas Nelson, 1987), 71.

then it suggests the reciprocity that they were not ashamed of each other. So, “naked” in Genesis 2:25 is the use of *prolepsis* to relate the serpent’s cunning (*arum*) and naked עָרֹם.<sup>6</sup>

Mark Snoeberger confirms that Adam and Eve’s *shame* was a case of embarrassment at having been exposed in their person and actions, and then adds that their response of making covering come from the sense of vulnerability, insecurity and self-consciousness.<sup>7</sup> The function of clothing was not strictly symbolic of removal of guilt but rather of mitigating shame and thus making tunic a superior to loincloth.<sup>8</sup> The clothing was a literal and actual mitigation of practical effects of sin. It was not symbolic for remedying the legal effects of sin.<sup>9</sup>

Kenneth Matthews says that nakedness among the Hebrews was shameful because it was associated with guilt. Commenting on the word naked in Genesis 3:7, he sees it serving as a reminder of the crafty serpent who exchanged their innocence in to embarrassing knowledge of nakedness.<sup>10</sup> He sees the use of the word translated ‘made’ עָשָׂה with תָּגַדְתָּ anticipates Genesis 3:21 where God makes more durable apparel.<sup>11</sup>

When providing a rationale for man’s fear before God in Genesis 3:10, he says that “In the Ancient Near East nakedness in the public was a disgrace and that

---

<sup>6</sup> Jacques Doukhan, *Seventh-day Adventist International Commentary: Genesis* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2016), 87.

<sup>7</sup> Mark A. Snoeberger, “Nakedness and Covering in Genesis 3: What They Are and Why they Matter,” *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 22 (2017): 21–33, accessed 7 February 2023, <http://www.dbts.edu/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/E.-Snoeberger-2.2-Final.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.

<sup>10</sup> Kenneth A. Matthews, *The New American Commentary: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of the Holy Scripture, Genesis* (Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing Group, 1996), 225-254.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 239.

Adam's humiliation affected his covering up before the human partner and before God. So the fear of Adam was a response to the presence of God lest he appeared naked.<sup>12</sup>

The language of setting of *כְּתִנּוֹת* and *לְבָשׁ* in Genesis 3:21 serve as reminders of priestly garment and as link for the symbols of the tabernacle for the whole of Pentateuch, and hence the garden narrative sharing the tabernacle pictures and pointers to animal sacrifices.<sup>13</sup>

When discussing *עֲרִימ* of the serpent, Terrence Fretheim contends that Genesis 3:1 accepts the identity of the serpent but it is neither the concern of the text nor of the Old Testament to identify the serpent. It does not have such a “metaphysical” impression for the nature of the serpent. He asserts that there is resonance of *עֲרִימ* of Genesis 3:1 and *אָרַר* of the curse in Genesis 3:14.<sup>14</sup>

Fretheim further says that nakedness has more than bodily reference; so when nakedness is related with vulnerability, shame and exposure, then God's making clothes for them had triple role; it had to do with salvation, recognition of their estranged relationship and cover their defencelessness and shame.<sup>15</sup>

John Hartley disputes on serpent's identity that the “serpent's reasoning ability and its hostility toward God outdistance itself from being just the creature in the garden” it is not the purpose of the text to discuss the origin of evil or its invasion, he avoids any “cosmic dualism” and denies any “cosmic force to be responsible for

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 241.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 255.

<sup>14</sup> Terence E. Fretheim, *Genesis, The New Interpreter's Bible, A Commentary in Twelve volumes* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1994) 1:364.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. 364

disobedience.”<sup>16</sup> and further commented on the garment as a replacement to provide them with warmth against the harsh weather conditions outside the garden, and also the appropriated covering to be in His presence. A sign of God’s continued support and fellowship.<sup>17</sup>

Emily Toler draws עָרִים in Genesis 2:25 that “nakedness is neither consequential of human fall nor of violation of the law of God, but actually what constitutes the ‘Image of God’. It is the condition Adam was created with from God.”<sup>18</sup> When describing עֵרֶם in Genesis 3:7, Toler says that it is disobedience that set nakedness to the rhythm of poverty and vulnerability. Any emotional or moral response to nakedness is vectored from Adam to God and not between Adam and Eve, suggesting that it is the fear of God not nakedness that stimulates shame. Adam and Eve’s sin has initiated humanity’s new perspective in relation to nakedness. Though changes on nakedness may not be physical but their alteration may be existential and theological.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> John E. Hartley, *New International Biblical Commentary: Genesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2000), 73.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 72.

<sup>18</sup> Emily Toler, “A Recuperative Theology of the Body: Nakedness in Genesis 3 and 9.20-2,” *Denison Journal of Religion* 6 (2008): 54. Davidson and Gottstein provide helpful frameworks for mapping these changes, acknowledging that, even if human nakedness is originally good and created in the image of God, the nakedness in Gen. 3.7 is different from the luminous nakedness of Gen. 2.25. pg 53. See also Richard M. Davidson, “The Theology of Sexuality in the Beginning: Genesis 3,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 26, no. 2 (1988): 121-31. Alon Goshen Gottstein, “The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature.” *The Harvard Theological Review* 87, no. 2 (1994): 171-95. Toler adds that in Genesis 3.7, the phrase and were opened almost undoubtedly has a symbolic meaning that refers to the achievement of knowledge rather than a literal achievement of sight. Moreover, the metaphor of seeing/ sight is used frequently in the rest of the Hebrew Bible and New Testament to describe knowledge or understanding, and that meaning may very well be at work in Genesis 9. Pg. 59. On poverty and vulnerability see also Michael L. Satlow, “Jewish Constructions of Nakedness in Late Antiquity,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116, no. 3 (1997): 429-454. This suggests that nakedness, even imperfect nakedness, is an integral part of the created human condition that God so consistently affirm, protects and loves without condition. Toler, 64.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 54.

Rodriguez observes that nakedness and clothing are crucial “motifs in the creation and fall narratives.” Before the fall was nakedness mankind’s natural condition, they needed no mediation of vesture with God and with each other. The act of clothing them was a figure of transformation to raise them from alienation to interaction with God. Death and sacrifice of animals are hinted in theological context of Genesis 3:21. The concepts dovetails in to ideas of the sanctuary and officiating priestly garments.<sup>20</sup>

John Sailhamer impress that naked and not shamed in Genesis 2:25 expects a central problem in the Genesis 3 account. The play of words in 2:25 and 3:1 are a sign of the possible link between the serpent and the implicit innocence in the nakedness of the couple. The author used the neutral word עָרָו to relate the fall and quest for wisdom. However, עָרָו in Genesis 3:7 is associated with Deuteronomy 28:48. “The effect of the fall” was based on the “naked” of Genesis 3:7 in a sense that they were under God’s judgment as in Deuteronomy 28:48.<sup>21</sup>

Victor Hamilton states that the imperfect form of a verb יתְבַשְׁשׁוּ for shame is frequentative and the use of hitpael denotes reciprocity, while nakedness through the assembly of other Old Testament text is a symbol of guilt. Loincloth as an abbreviated dress was a sign of slaves and prisoners of war. He uses the word תָּפַר for sewing to associate it with sackcloth so close to the skin. Commenting on clothing; Genesis 3:21 is to be at parallel with Genesis 3:7, animal skin versus fig leaves, covering oneself

---

<sup>20</sup> Angel Manuel Rodriguez, Eden and Israelite Sanctuary, *Biblical Research Institute*, (April 2002), 1-5, accessed on 8 February 2023, [https://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/eden-israelite-sanctuary\\_0.pdf](https://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/eden-israelite-sanctuary_0.pdf).

<sup>21</sup> John H. Sailhamer, *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, ed, Frank, E. Gaebalein,(Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1990), 49-50.

compared with covering from another, clothing precedes the expulsion and they are not sent beyond the garden vulnerable.<sup>22</sup>

Bruce Waltke says that in Genesis 2:25 unawareness of nakedness symbolised openness and trust in marriage relationship while awareness indicates the fear of exposure in an unsafe environment. Genesis 3:7 presents consequence of sin and that it is spiritual death marked by alienation from God with guilty consciences and from each other which was symbolised by wearing of fig leaves barrier. On the covering of Genesis 3:21 states that spouses do not want to commit to a relationship of shame but rather they cover themselves where they cannot be abused, criticized or victimized, thus clothing symbolizes barrier of protection.<sup>23</sup>

Borges Jason reflects on a creation narrative in Genesis 1:26 as the extension of honour on Adam and Eve which included “arrangement of a spouse and unashamed nakedness.”<sup>24</sup> The assessment of Genesis 3 unveils the disloyal behaviour, which resulted in the “depth of humanity’s shame,”<sup>25</sup> thus shame itself is associated with “internalized sense of unworthiness” which eventually became the basis of Adam’s position before God.<sup>26</sup>

Georges Jayson identify shame with guilt in terms of its “subjective and objective dimensions.”<sup>27</sup> shame is beyond psychological deviation, it is a theological

---

<sup>22</sup> Victor P. Hamilton, *The New International Commentary of the Old Testament: The Book of Genesis chapters 1-17* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990), 181-207.

<sup>23</sup> Bruce K. Waltke, 263-268.

<sup>24</sup> Borges Jason, “Dignified’: An Exegetical Soteriology of Divine Honour,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 66, no. 1 (2013): 74-87.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Georges Jayson, and Mark D. Baker. *Ministering in Honor-Shame Cultures: Biblical Foundations and Practical Essentials* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2016), accessed 10

problem in a sense of its being fundamental in the relationship between God and Man. “Shame is the loss of honour, death is the ultimate shame when man return to the dust they came from.”<sup>28</sup>

Beverly Stratton differentiates between Genesis 2:25 עָרֹם and Genesis 3:7 עִירָם on the change vectored from verbally to physically active. These changes are seen as happening in a man, such as from naïve to consciousness, from nakedness to an act of sewing fig leaves together.<sup>29</sup> Ziony Zevit argues Adam’s partial concealment as resulting from shame not guilt, the response he gave to God’s call in Genesis 3:10 proves the separation of hiding before Man against hiding before God. He advocates for physical nakedness in a sense that they experienced seeing each other’s “genitalia and buttocks” being conscious of their own.<sup>30</sup> Stephen Lambden profess non-duality of the serpent by saying that “The purpose of the statement ‘beast of the field’ is to exclude the notion that it was a supernatural being. The serpent is none other than the serpent.”<sup>31</sup>

Mieke Bal when commenting on the knowledge after the eating the tree denies the immediate relations of shame to awareness. Bal admits the shame in Genesis 3:10

---

February 2023, *ProQuest Ebook Central*,  
<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=4689221>.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> Beverly J. Stratton, *Out of Eden: Reading, Rhetoric, and Ideology in Genesis 2-3* (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2009), *ProQuest Ebook Central*, accessed 10 February 2023, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=436946>.

<sup>30</sup> Ziony Zevit, *What Really Happened in the Garden of Eden?* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013), accessed 13 February 2023, *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=3421339>. Created from aua on 2023-02-13 07:09:46.

<sup>31</sup> Stephen N. Lambden, *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden*, edited by Paul Morris, and Deborah Sawyer (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1992), 75, accessed 13 February 2023, *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=436140>.

is vague though present but its Yahweh's arrival that brought shame.<sup>32</sup> Jerome Walsh sets serpent as in contest against God by saying that "The snake has, in this scene, uncompromisingly pitted his knowledge against God's. At the end of the first scene, the question was, 'To eat or not to eat?' And this question meant, 'To die or not to die?' At the end of this scene, the question has become, 'To eat or not to eat?' that is, 'To believe the snake or to believe God?'"<sup>33</sup>

Augustine in Pârvan debates covering of Genesis 3:7 as a form of lying thus 'hiding from oneself behind oneself.' He further explains that hiding was how Adam abandoned God and exalted himself above the God's love, thus 'covering in the veils of lies' about nakedness of Genesis 2:25 he contends that Adam was naked of deceit and clothed with light while after sin he moved away from the light. On receiving the garments of skin that meant the restoration of their vesture before sin.<sup>34</sup>

### Critical Review

The critical review will be organised as follows: it will discuss each views' perspective on עֲרוּמִים and בּוֹשׁ prior the fall, the identity of the serpent in עֲרוּם

---

<sup>32</sup> Mieke Bal, "Sexuality, Sin and Sorrow: The Emergence of the Female Character (A Reading of Genesis 1-3)," *Poetics Today* 6, no. 1/2 (1984), 31.

<sup>33</sup> Jerome T. Walsh, "Genesis 2:4b-3:24: A Synchronic Approach," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96, no. 2 (1977): 165.

<sup>34</sup> Alexandra Pârvan, "Genesis 1-3: Augustine and Origen on the coats of Skin," *Vigiliae Christianae* 66, no. 1 (2012) : (2012): 56-92. Augustine elaborated on the motive of lying as a form of covering and hiding from oneself and behind oneself. After having sinned, Adam hides from God, and this hiding means to abandon God by placing the love for himself above the love for God, it signifies the abandonment of the light of Truth, and thus a covering in the veils of lies. Prior to sin, says Augustine, man was naked of deceitfulness (*nudus a simulatione*) and clothed in the divine light (*vestiebatur luce divina*), while post-sin, moving away from this light, man finds himself naked in learning that he has nothing of himself, but lies. Notably, Augustine depicts the first man as being clothed in light, with sin coming as a coarse covering to hide and distort his true being. The ancient Jewish aversion to nakedness, later inherited by the early church, inspired the rabbinic speculation on the coats of skins to develop two different traditions of interpretation according to which Adam and Eve wore garments of light before their expulsion from Paradise: they were either clothed in light, and received the garments of skins after their sin, or the reception of the skin tunics simply referred to their being clad by God prior to sin.

, implication of shame and עִירָם in Genesis 3:7-11, the covering which is the תְּגִית of Genesis 3:7 and the קְתָנוֹת of Genesis 3:21.

### **Human Vulnerability View – Critical Review**

This view perceives that the use of ‘naked and not ashamed’ as in:

1. Genesis 2:25.
  - a. The narrator uses the literary tool of prolepsis which emphasizes ‘not yet perspective’. The words anticipate what is to come in Genesis 3 and what comes is the couple’s defeat and shame. Though shame is mentioned but is non-existent, it is only anticipated.
  - b. It used from a standpoint of war where defence is required. The context is within the purview of Adam and Eve’s marriage relationship. The use of hitpael for naked has reciprocity meaning. So, the couple were open and defenceless of each other, innocent without threat and exploitation.
  - c. The view further admits the image of God for mankind in Genesis 1:26 to have a status meaning. The intertextual use of Psalm 104:1-2 explains the couple dressed with light, glory, majesty.
  - d. It also admits the natural and physical nature of nakedness through which they could be present with God.

#### 2. Identity of the serpent in Genesis 3:1

The proponents holds a shade difference on the motive identity of the serpent and its nature. The first position is that the use of the word שָׂרֵפָה is with a definite article as it opens Genesis 3. It shows that the author is intentional about the identity of the serpent as more than just a mere creature. The serpent is presented as a subject in Genesis 3:1 and presented with universalistic connotations and superiority in the

text. The narrator makes it obvious that the reader knows the serpent. This position pinpoints the serpent as Satan through the use of intertextual evidences of Isaiah 27:1, Psalm 74:13-14 with Revelation 12.

The second proponents recognize the reasoning ability and hostility of the serpent as the enemy but it is not the intention of the author to reveal its identity, character and origin. The proof of the above position is the author's use of the phrase "the beast of the field" to serve the purpose of excluding the idea of the serpent being a supernatural being. He simply avoids 'cosmic dualism'.

What is generally accepted is that the serpent's cunning serves to tempt the couple. The word עָרוּמִים in Genesis 2:25 echoes and links with the cunningness of the serpent in Genesis 3:1.

#### 5. Nakedness and shame in Genesis 3:7-11

Nakedness and shame are paired together. They are experienced as physical, psychological and spiritual phenomenon. Nakedness post the fall is understood as the departure of the light that formed part of God's image in man. It is that nakedness of Genesis 2:25 but now inflected by disobedience. It is now resourced from the alienated relationship with God. In Genesis 3:7 is a reminder of the crafty serpent in Genesis 3:1, now to be known as the embarrassing nakedness.

Nakedness of Genesis 3:7-11 is associated with moral guilt resulting from disobedience in the context of the Hebrew culture. It is linked to nakedness with the perspective of Deuteronomy 28:48. Its effect therefore was known in the sense of being under God's judgment. It is an undoing of the web of relationship that God had woven earlier; relationship between man and God and between Adam and Eve. This alteration on nakedness became both theological and existential. Signs of nakedness

were visible to them. It is a loss of social dignity, honour both before God and creation.

The concept of shame is implied in the actions and behaviour of Adam and Eve. Shame was a psychological problem because of the following reasons: it became a case of embarrassment due to personal exposure and action, it resulted from opening of eyes thus they had an abased self-perception. Shame was a matter of self-consciousness.

Shame became a Theological problem because It was a result of a defeat in the hands of the spiritual enemy. At the depth of the man's shame is when Adam violated the covenant and was disloyal to God, such a conduct produced an internalised notion of unworthiness. It warranted a public evaluation of Adams status before God. Shame is an integral part of human's broken relationship with God, it became loss of honour before God and eventually death became shame itself.

#### 4. Covering of fig leaves; תְּגִלָּת

The exponents here describe the covering as just loincloth which anticipates the covering in Genesis 3:21. The verb **וַיִּתְּפֹרֵר** translated 'sewed' is associated with sackcloth akin to the skin. A sense of humiliation impacted Adam's covering up before God and before the woman. It is an imperfect concealment motivated by shame. It is the first illustration of righteousness by works.

#### 5. Garment of skin כְּתֹנֶת

Clothes of animal skin coats are explained as real and physical. The coat was provided by God as contrasted with Adam and Eve's self-covering in Genesis 3:7. They were provided in preparation of the hush weather conditions beyond the borders of the garden of Eden. The Coats are explained in context of the sanctuary and the priestly function. The view observes the frequent use of the sanctuary terms and ideas

in the passage such as the contextual idea of sin; it suggests, the skin provided was as result of response to the sin problem in the Genesis 3:1-21, hence giving a significance of an implicit sacrifice. The use of the sanctuary term for ‘tunic’ is used variously throughout the Old Testament. The term in Genesis 3:21 is used together with the verb  $\text{שָׁבַע}$  which is in the causative form; that is its usage when dressing of the priest in the sanctuary is implied. This notion suggests that since both of them male and female were dressed in view of priestly function they both functioned as such immediately.

Some under this view however suggest the metaphysical dimension of covering; that the function of clothing was not strictly symbolic of the removal of guilt but rather of mitigating shame. The view further suggest that the clothes had a triple purpose for salvation, recognition of their estranged relationship and cover their defencelessness and shame. It prepared the sinner for the presence of God. The conclude of the above argument is consistent with original vulnerability, psychological shame and physical exposure explained in Genesis 3:7-11.

Under this view the following are challenges observed:

The undecided agreement is observed under this view on the place and timing of the sacrifice and clothing. The first idea suggest that clothing was performed prior expulsion inside the garden. It was a considerably merciful act of God to send them beyond the garden covered and protected against harsh conditions. The major concern here is the physical covering of the sinner.

The second idea is that they were covered after expulsion. The argument is that the report is not given to recognize the chronology of events but the provision of a Theological solution. Even if there is more of Theological consideration the weight of the argument still leans back on the felt new extreme condition outside the garden.

The marked commencement of their priestly function arises; suggesting that they could not start their sacrificial atonement inside and before expulsion. Then the garden was not the relevant sanctuary for sacrifices.

The act of covering does not provide the immediate restoration of the said initial covering of light Adam and Eve. It leaves the gap for either that covering of light was set as gradual process to be attained in the future or the restoration of the initial light covering is abandoned and not in view.

The purpose of covering in relation to the serpent does not surface but dies with the narrative when serpent's head is crushed by the seed in Genesis 3:15. It suggests that the serpent ceases to exist beyond the garden.

The concept of the light as the initial covering in Genesis 2:25 seems to lack intra-textual evidence and heavily leans on intertextual inferences and extra Biblical information. What surfaces prominently is the fact that Adam and Eve were naked, no form of any covering is mentioned.

### **Sexual Desire View**

The group on Sexual Desire intimates that nakedness, shame and the fall had to do more with sex and sexual connotation. David Carr denies the personal existence of the serpent but just a serpent without personality. Even if the later Jewish interpretations identified serpent as Satan, he disputes that there is no textual evidence to that effect, and on the contrary serpent was an old symbol of immortality and wisdom. He further asserts that the eating of the fruit simply set in motion the relationship God had made before.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> David M. Carr, *The Erotic Word: Sexuality, Spirituality, and the Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 41-42, accessed 13 February *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=4700678>.

John Marks says that in Genesis 2:25 “man’s sexual drive results from God’s creative activity, and the couple was naked before each other unself-conscious and unashamed, so nudity here is the symbol of mutually frank and honest self-giving. The interpretation of Gen 3:7 is not sexual but the knowledge about the increase and mastery of life was preserved for God.”<sup>36</sup>

Cuthbert Simpson suggests that in nakedness and unashamed in Genesis 2:25 implicit was the notion of sex awareness. The crafty serpent origin is not presented as a demon is unknown but as from beast of the field which the Lord God created, who knew all the time that the result will be consciousness of sex and its misery. Nakedness which they were not ashamed of now in Genesis 3:7-11 became intolerable indecency, demanding that it be covered that sexual consciousness has sprung to life.<sup>37</sup>

Ryan Hanley sees the use of nakedness as imagery in Gen 2-3. He understands the knowledge of evil to be an act of equating oneself with God. He talks of Idyllic environment as where exposure of sexual organs poses no threat, nor do they evoke any feeling of shame. That defined their state before the fall. This state is perceived like of the young child’s innocence of consensual intimacy of the married couple. They lacked on how they may sexually exploit each other.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> John H. Marks, *The Interpreter’s One-volume Commentary on the Bible* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1971), 5.

<sup>37</sup> Cuthbert A. Simpson, *The Interpreter’s Bible: Genesis* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1952), 501-506.

<sup>38</sup> Ryan Cole Hanley, “The Use of Nakedness Imagery as Theological Language in The Old Testament” (PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2019), 91-95, accessed 9 February 2023, [https://repository.sbts.edu/bitstream/handle/10392/5818/Hanley\\_sbts\\_0207D\\_10517.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://repository.sbts.edu/bitstream/handle/10392/5818/Hanley_sbts_0207D_10517.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y). See also Contra Sasson, “Gen 2:25,” 418-21,

## **Sexual Desire View-Critical Review**

Nakedness in Genesis 2:25 is understood to be idyllic before sin where sexual organs posed neither threat nor feeling of shame. The couple's perception was like of the childlike innocent of consensual intimacy common to married couples. Because of the good created order there was no threat of sexual exploitation. Sexual organs are the physical centre closest intimacy of human experience. Naked and not ashamed meant that they were not conscious of sex. Man's sexual drive is presented as God's natural creative activity. Nudity was a symbol of mutual candidness and honest self-giving to each other.

The emergence of the serpent in the narrative is not seen as a demon but as merely one of the beast of the field, however, was invested with the knowledge of consciousness of sex and misery. The serpent was an ancient symbol of immortality and wisdom. The view negates any textual hint of the serpent as Satan. The act of eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is the key cause of every problem under this view. It is the accession of the knowledge of the increase and mastery of life that is inordinate. It sets in motion an unravelling of the connected web of relationships that God had woven earlier. Adam and Eve acquired prerogative set for God alone. The nakedness experienced here is physical and a psychological shame. They were ashamed of the exposure of their sexual organs as they needed covering from each other. This is response about each other is different from their behaviour before God. The arrival of God was feared because of the sexual intimacy, which is known to be one of the intimate human relations. Now that sexual consciousness has sprung to life nakedness has become intolerable indecency which demanded covering.

The challenge with Sexual desire view is of the narrowed nature of sin. Sin is related to sexuality rather than violation of any divine law. It poses sin of sexuality as the mother of all sins.

### **Human Development View**

This view observes the experience of nakedness shame and covering as a developmental process. Walton posits that based on the interpretation of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, Adam and Eve prior the fall possessed childlike view and preadolescent mind frame which made them be aware of their sexuality and its limits, hence having autonomy and be unashamed of nakedness. In Genesis 3:6,7 they were passing through adolescent stage with its curiosity and quest for independence. Post eating the fruit they had new nakedness that gained them independence and maturity. For Adam timing was the factor to avoid eating the fruit ahead of their maturity rate as it is with adolescent who should not be sexually active ahead of themselves. The view is justified by the coinciding experience of each individual when growing up.<sup>39</sup>

Sawyer talks of the image of God. Genesis 2-3 details the image found on Genesis 1. Nakedness of Genesis 3 is the agent whereby Adam and Eve were transformed from mere 'living beings' (Gen. 2.7) into creatures 'in the image of God. . . like one of us, knowing good and evil' (Gen. 3:22). The serpent is attributed with wisdom with which he is credited for wisdom image in man, which Adam attained in the process of temptation.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> John H. Walton, *The NIV Application Commentary: From Biblical to Contemporary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2001), 215-216.

<sup>40</sup> John F. A. Sawyer, *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden*, edited by Paul Morris, and Deborah Sawyer (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1992), 68, accessed 13 February 2023, *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=436140>. By eating from the tree of knowledge the man and the woman become aware of their differences and acquire insight, which turns out to be the start of their adult life. One

## Human Development View- Critical Review

This view observes that based on the Tree of the knowledge of Good and Evil, Adam and Eve were presented with a childlike perspective before the fall. They were like preadolescent mind set growing towards autonomy. The ultimate goal of the view is for Adam and Eve to obtain the image of God. This view does not characterize the serpent as an enemy rather as an agent of development possessed with wisdom. The wisdom is obtained from eating of the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The textual context is set such that Genesis 2-3 are the detail explanation of Genesis 1.

The Eve's experience of "seeing the fruit pleasant to the eyes, desirable to make one wise and good for food" (Gen. 3:6) is equated to adolescent's curiosity to be independent, while partaking is now the knowledge of nakedness in Genesis 3:7 is a transitional experience of maturity and independence. Timing of eating the tree in this view is a factor. Adam and Eve's eating time was not to be too early as when translated to human growth, Adolescent are not supposed to have intimacy ahead of their age. In this purview it seems sexual experience is seen as part of growing process toward desired maturity.

The final experience is not recognized in Genesis 3:21 but in verse 22 when God declared the accomplished objective of the image of God' "now man is like one of us." The view maintains the image motif consistently. It can trace the image from Genesis 1 through to Genesis 3. The sad human experience does not emanate for

---

might infer from this that in Genesis 2-3 the eating from the tree of knowledge and the woman's and the man's becoming aware of their nakedness represents their growth towards maturity in Genesis 3:21, Thus Genesis 2:24 sketches in a nutshell a man's process of development in the same way as Genesis 2-3 presents the human process of maturation in more detail: the garden of Eden (2.7-25) represents this harmonious period of infancy, 3.1-7 represents the transition period to maturity, and 3.8-24 the adult life of the human beings: they have got their procreative capacity. See also Van Wolde on this view. Van Wolde, *The World of Genesis: Persons, Places, Perspectives*, edited by Philip R. Davies, et al., (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1998), *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=436026>.  
Created from aua on 2023-02-13 11:56:48.

Genesis 3. The Human Development view does not account for the emergence of sin in Genesis 3. What is perceived as discomforts of the Edenic duo such as covering with fig leaves is not such. The method of interpretation seems to be more inclined to allegorical method of interpretation.

## CHAPTER 3

### HISTORICAL AND LITERARY ANALYSIS

Chapter 3 will seek to establish historical background of the book of Genesis and literary analysis. The following topics will be covered under the section, Historical Background: the author, audience and time setting of the Book of Genesis. Geographical setting surrounding the audience addressed by Genesis will be explored. There seems to be a relationship between historical slavery of the Hebrew people in Egypt and the slavery to sin for Adam and Eve with the entire human race. Since the exegesis will also address the aspect of nakedness and covering, the historical background will relate clothing custom of the Israelites while under slavery in Egypt. There will be a literary analysis of Genesis 2:25 and Genesis 3:1-21. The focal point to be engaged is textual exegesis.

#### **Authorship**

The Authorship book of Genesis authorship has been under scrutiny by both Conservative scholars and the Critical scholars of the Old-Testament. The established authorship may by default also determine the audience and the nature of the message intended by the author. Such aspects mentioned above will later be discussed in this chapter. The Conservative scholarship argues for the Mosaic authorship (Moses as the author), while Critical scholarship offers different author/s other than the Mosaic authorship and it is believed that the unknown sources to have contributed different parts of Genesis (Documentary Hypothesis).

Walton contends for the mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch which by default makes him the author of Genesis.<sup>1</sup> Matthews says that “essentially there is one mind that has shaped the book, whom we believe to have been Moses, therefore we are comfortable of speaking that mind as the ‘author.’”<sup>2</sup> He says so to accommodate those for Moses as the compiler. He further uses a compound phrase ‘mosaic community’ to tie Genesis to Moses. He says the “mosaic community was defined by formative events of Sinai and the desert narration”<sup>3</sup> which also form the Pentateuch structure with eschatological view; an attribute which Genesis also has as the “interpretation of the past with an eye on Israel’s future.”<sup>4</sup>

Sailhamer uses part of the above argument for the mosaic block authorship of the Pentateuch. He disputes that even if the claim of the “common view” is that Moses used the written sources, Moses would have been no different from other accepted authors of other books of the Bible who used written resources to compile what they produced. Logically Moses should be accepted as the author of Genesis which is part of the Pentateuch. He further uses the compositional shape of the Pentateuch and relationship of its book to affirm Moses as the author of Genesis.<sup>5</sup>

When rebutting the critical point raised by Graf-Wellhausen; that by the time of Moses writing was not existent, Harrison argues that “numerous archaeological discoveries have demonstrated that several literary means of communication were

---

<sup>1</sup> John H. Walton, 41-42.

<sup>2</sup> Kenneth A. Matthews, 24,42.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> John H. Sailhamer, “Genesis”, *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary: Genesis to Leviticus*, ed. Tremper Longman III and David E. Garland, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan,2008), 25-34.

available in Mosaic age”<sup>6</sup> thus he cited Egyptian hieroglyphic scrip, Ras Shamrah tablets in the native Ugaritic and Babylonian cuneiform of Amarna. Harrison recognizes the ancient eleven tablets with portions of thirty-six chapter under archaeological excavations. He attributes the skillful elegant literary compilation of those tablets only to Moses.<sup>7</sup>

Leupold sees difficulties in standing by hypothesis of sources by saying that “ in the meantime the search after sources had produced findings that gave even the adherents of these hypothesis of sources some serious misgivings.”<sup>8</sup> Says literary criticism is in danger of it loosing on the very important consideration of the text and such “ focus reduces the Pentateuch to the unrelated fragments and results in the

---

<sup>6</sup> R. K, Harrison, “Genesis” *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia (ISBE)*, completely rev. ed., (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1915-1982), 2:436-437. First tablet; Genesis 1:1-2:4, describing the origin of the cosmos. In the Masoretic Text called ‘merismus’, the title of the tablet is repeated in the colophon. The Second Tablet; 2:5-5:2- which is the origin of mankind, it believed that the title has been lost either through damage or error of deletion. Third tablet: Genesis 5:3-6:9, which is called Noachian histories. It is entitled “When Adam.” It had Noah in the colophon, perhaps as the owner of the material. Fourth tablet: Genesis 6:9b-10:1, it was dealing with the treatment of Noah’s sons. It was titled “Shem, Ham, Japheth” it ended with a colophon in Genesis 10:1 which repeated the title in a manner familiar with the other Mesopotamian text as “after the flood”. It was a scribal attempt of dating the material. Fifth tablet :entitled “Sons of Japheth” which dealt with the table of nations and the incident in the land of Shanar. It colophon shows it in the possession of Shem. The sixth tablet: it the genealogy of Terah, the title was “Shem” it mentions the age of Terah. Seventh tablet: Family histories in the possession of Ishmael. Genesis 11:27b-25:12.it has details of the activities of Abraham , the title was “Abram, Nahor and Haran” it reference Isaac living in Beer-lahai-roi. Eighth tablet is was originally written Isaac. Activities end with the death of Isaac. It covers Genesis 25:23- 19a. it mentions that Isaac survived Ishmael by 50 years. The ninth tablet: title “Abraham beget Isaac”, it had the details of Jacob with Esau conducting the burial of Isaac. They were of Edomites origin. The tenth tablet: Genesis 36:2-9, it was also of Edomite origin, it had the descendants of Esau. It has a statement” at that time Esau was living in the land of Seir” (Gen.36:31). The eleventh tablet provided the Edomite background. It encribes that Jacob was then living in the land of Canaan after he migrated to Egypt. It has the material that completes the book of Genesis; material in Genesis 37:2b- 50:26. The Egyptological research illumined this cultural background of this narratives ( P. Montet, *Egypt and the Bible*,1968, J. Vogotes, *Joseph en Egypte*, K. A Kitchen, *Tyndale House Bulletin*, Joseph and his brothers during Hyksos period.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> H. C Leupold, “Genesis” *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopaedia of the Bible (ZPEB)*, Merril C. Tenney, ed., (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975), 679.

drainage of the power of its message.”<sup>9</sup> The above effect leaves the argument without enough strength to substantiate the unity, message and the purpose of the book of Genesis.

On the contrary Doukhan uses threefold evidences to affirm the Mosaic authorship. The first is the testimony of scripture. The proof of the Mosaic authorship to the Pentateuch is by default asking him the author of Genesis, the evidence that Moses was instructed to write for memorial (Exod. 17:14), that Moses wrote the Law and handed it to the priest (Deut. 31:9), Jesus’ reference to Pentateuch as the law of Moses (Luke 16:29, 24:27). He adds the proof of tradition; that it called Pentateuch “torah.” The rabbinic tradition assigns the authorship of Pentateuch to Moses.<sup>10</sup>

This Thesis agrees to the Mosaic authorship. The Mosaic authorship will aid to follow the life, education and place of the author, which leads to the aspect of the audience.

Given that even if Genesis has been authored by Moses this thesis asserts that Moses lived way later than the historical narratives in Genesis 1-50. As stated above that the work of Genesis is a result skillful compiler of carefully selected events or work of literature. It is important to note the objectivity of selection as Vogt says “Narratives are a selective record of events... the author chose to include those things that would help communicate what they wanted the reader to understand.”<sup>11</sup> Moses chose and selected according to what his audience needed to read.

---

<sup>9</sup> John E. Heartley, *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdemans,1996), 22.

<sup>10</sup> Jacques Doukhan, *Seventh-day Adventist International Commentary: Genesis* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2016), 25-26.

<sup>11</sup> Peter, T. Vogt, *Interpreting Pentateuch: An Exegetical Handbook*, ed., David, M. Haward Jr., (Grand Rapids: Kregel,2009), 49.

## Historical Background

As many scholars seek to ascertain the historical background of events recorded in Genesis; they seek to determine the world behind each of those events such as world of the Sumerians and ancient Babylonians which existed ahead of the author. This research will narrow on the world of author or the compiler. It will not necessarily neglect historical background that existed prior Moses.

Doukhan uses the following elements to lead us to the probable world of the composition of the book of Genesis: 1. The underlying theological purpose of the book, 2. Mosaic- Exodus bridge and 3. Moses' encounter at the burning bush. The first evidence is on the pattern and the language of the creation story. That creation story follows the pattern of ten words and the Exodus decalogue at Sinai; in that they echo each other and bring the sense of God as the Creator and the universal application of the decalogue. This places Genesis as the first book of the Pentateuch ahead of Exodus. The Mosaic-Exodus bridge is found in how the book of Genesis ends and Exodus begins. He points out the promise stated by Joseph that God promised: "surely God will visit you and bring to the which He swore to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." (Gen. 50:24-25); So, the message pointed to event before exodus. Finally, Moses' experience with God at the burning bush in Exodus 3 when God calls him under the same promise. What lies in between these two chapters (Gen 50 and Exod. 3) is the oppression, slavery of Israel and the birth of Moses. With these three above makers he concludes the author of Genesis had Israelites slavery, hope of and longing of returning from Egypt in mind.<sup>12</sup> The book of Exodus 3:1 places the

---

<sup>12</sup> Doukhan, 27-28.

encounter at the burning bush in Midian. It is conclusive that Genesis 3 was written and compiled during Moses' exile in Midian and with slaves in mind.

Seventh-day Adventist Bible commentary brackets this period from the base time when Abram was told that his seed or descendants will be strangers, servants and will be afflicted four hundred years (Gen.15:13). Moses closes it in Exodus 12:40-41 as the children of Israel were marching out of Egypt at the end of four hundred and thirty.<sup>13</sup> The whole duration will in summary cover the movement of Israel in to Egypt, the time of Joseph in the palace until his death, the rise of the Egyptian king who did not know Joseph (Exod. 1:8-10), which then marked the life of affliction and time setting for the birth of Moses until he was in exile at the age of eighty.

It is believed the Pharaohs associated with Hebrew slavery and exodus were Thutmose I through to Amenhotep II reigns. Thutmose I and Thutmose III carried out building operations that engaged Asian slave labor, Thutmose III was the Pharaoh from whom Moses fled and Amenhotep II was the Exodus Pharaoh. The period is estimated between 1482-1425 BC.<sup>14</sup>

### **Clothing Custom**

It is important to discuss the clothing custom and how covering was considered in Egypt and even covering for the slaves and the lower class. Vos picks the clothing culture worn during middle age which is dated to time of Joseph. The clothing for men was just the belt around the waist and for covering genitalia and sometimes a short kilt. The kilt was triangular that is wrapped around the buttocks.

---

<sup>13</sup> "Four hundred and the four hundred and thirty years", *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary (SDABC)*, rev. ed., ed. Francis D. Nichol (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1976-1978), 1:184-186.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 189. See also Doukhan, 28.

Those who work as fishermen, farming and papyrus gatherers wore nothing at all. He says among the poor this remained unchanged for a long time. He presumes that the upper class like Moses when he appeared before Pharaoh would put on the tunic with a longer kilt.<sup>15</sup>

Douglass and Tenney gave summary on a historical dress of the ancient people, they said that “the clothing worn by the Hebrew people during biblical time were considered a part of those who wore them, they not only told who and what they were, but were intended as external symbols of individuals innermost feelings and deepest desires and, his or her moral urge to represent God aright.”<sup>16</sup>

### **Literary Context**

This section of the thesis is the study of the text within its literary context. It will study both the larger literary context and immediate literary context. The text under examination as stated above is Genesis 3:1-21. It will narrow to selected sections within its length though that will be discussed a little later.

### **Larger Context**

The book of Genesis is classified as first part of the Pentateuch. Sailhamer considers the Pentateuch as one book. He says, “Though we think of the Pentateuch as collection of five book viz, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, it

---

<sup>15</sup> Haward, F. Vos, *Nelson's New Illustrated Bible Manner and Customs: How the People of the Bible Really lived*, (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999), 65-66.

<sup>16</sup> J. D. Douglas and Merrill C. Tenney, *The Zondervan Illustrated Bible Dictionary (ZIB)*, rev. (2011) “dress.” They further discuss “Inner-tunic” or undershirt, which in cooler weather males of the oriental families wore next to the body. It was made in to a shirt like garment. Sometimes it was a little more than a loincloth. Then there was “the tunic coat” a close-fitting shirt like garment. It mostly worn on the home and street. In ancient times it was often of one solid colour. pg.373

was originally intended to be read as one book...The New Testament also considered Pentateuch a single book.”<sup>17</sup>

The book of Genesis is distinguished from the rest of Pentateuch as the book about the origins or the beginnings. “Recounts the beginning of the physical creation of all plant, animal, and human life, as well as human institutions and social relationships... the Fall, the Flood, the call of Abraham, and mention of the promised Redeemer (3:15–16; 12:1– 3; 49:10).”<sup>18</sup>

Genesis is majorly divided into sections namely Genesis 1-11; which is dominated by the genealogies and Genesis 12- 50; which has narrowed on selected Abraham and his descendants. The book has a literary motifs marker that characterize its makeup. One of them is “generations” תולדות אלה motif. It is suggested by many scholars to be of significance as it appears in eleven sections from Genesis 2:4a – Genesis 37:2a . The above marker may give impression that Genesis is all about Genealogies because it does not account for the narratives that are found with the sections.

Another motif-based structure is of “go” -לך לך. The motif marker is combined with תולדות אלה to have an outcome of traces the movement of God’s people from Garden of Eden (Gen. 1-2) to Babel(Gen. 3-11), to the promised land (Gen. 12-22:19), From Canaan to Egypt(Gen. 22:20-48:20) and back to the prospective land of Canaan (Gen. 48:21- 50:26). There are two features observed based on Genesis 12-22:19. The first is the narrowing and selection of Abraham as one of the main characters, from whom the next covenant narratives will look back on. The second is

---

<sup>17</sup> John H. Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative: A Biblical- Theological Commentary*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 1.

<sup>18</sup> Merrill F. Unger, “Genesis”, *The New Unger’s Bible Dictionary*, ed., R. K. Harrison, (Chicago: Moody Press,1988), 630.

chiastic structure that positions Abrahams call, covenant, his movements and sacrifice of Isaac at the centre of the book of Genesis. The book of Genesis tells more than just the genealogies and their movements but more also about their experiences.

Herbert Wolf discusses the literary structure of Genesis that chapter 1-11 dealing with the origin of the universe, creation of mankind and his fall stands on the similar geographical setting as chapters of Genesis 12-50. He cites similar names and geographical terms as Genesis 12-50 which is accepted to be historical.<sup>19</sup> Doukhan argues for the historical Genesis 1-11 using the textual evidence of “*elleh toledot*” as it is translated “this is the history of.”<sup>20</sup> The New testament outlines the genealogy of Jesus based on their historical existence in Luke 3. Romans 5:14 recounts reigning of death from Adam to Moses. Based the above argument this thesis perceives events of Genesis 2 and 3 as historical and the appearance of the serpent as purely historical than just a myth.

The focus of the first half of Genesis; the following sub-divisions are observed: Genesis 1-2 is about the origin of creation, Genesis 3 is the fall of mankind. Genesis 4-5 is their genealogies. Genesis 6-9 is the story of the flood and Genesis 10-11 is the humankind post-flood.

### **Immediate Literary Context**

Genre. The whole of Pentateuch is predominantly narrative and law.<sup>21</sup> The study undertaken by this exegesis is based on a narrative in Genesis 3 with a specific

---

<sup>19</sup> Herbert Wolf, *Introductions to the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, (Chicago: Moody Publishers, 1991), 95.

<sup>20</sup> Doukhan, 29

<sup>21</sup> Vogt, 61.

purpose.<sup>22</sup>; Which immediately follows the 2 creation accounts both in Genesis 1 and 2. The Genesis 3 narrative is about the fall on first humankind. It is noteworthy to mention that in Genesis 3 narrative there are dialogue and poetic sections.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid, 94-96.

<sup>23</sup> Sailhamer, 35, 81.

## Literary Structure

There are several literary structures suggested by various scholars. This thesis adopts the structure that links Genesis 3 to Genesis 1- 2 as proposed by Ojewele. He thematically links Genesis 1-3 with the following demonstration: 1. order of creation as seen in Genesis 2:16-8 is disrupted in Gen 3:3:1-7, 2. The use of  $\text{עָרֵב}$  in 3:1 and  $\text{עָרֵבִים}$  in 2:253. Use of the names of God the LORD God both in chapter 2 and 3. He further suggest the chiasmic structure that links Genesis 2 and 3 that climaxes at 2:24-25.<sup>24</sup>

The thesis observes that Genesis 3:1-21 is a narrative in which the author introduces description of the character such as “serpent”, “man and his wife” and “The LORD God.” The narrative has features such as dialogue is identified (Gen 3:1-5 and Gen 3:9-11). There is a plot that begins with the conflicting interactions between the Serpent and the woman (Gen. 3:1-5) that engages the reader to the escalating observation of whether Eve will yield to eat the fruit of the tree ( Gen 3:6). The thesis recognises Genesis 3:15 for the following reasons as raised by Kempf.1: the audience is given and detailed account of the main character. 2. All major character are present (The LORD God, Man, Woman and Serpent). 3. The discourse has moved from narrative to a dialogue. It is where the tension intensifies, it reaches highest point and the release of the tension also begins. He submits that It has its climax in Genesis 3:15 where the main character of the narrative, The LORD God; meets His Antagonist (the Serpent).<sup>25</sup> Though the study of Genesis 3:15 does not form

---

<sup>24</sup> Afolarin Olutunde, Ojewole, “The Seed in Genesis 3:15—An Exegetical and Intertextual Study” (PhD Dissertation, Andrews University, 2002), 92-96.

<sup>25</sup> Stephen Kempf, “A Discourse Analysis of Genesis 2:4b- 3:24 With Implication for interpretation and Bible Translation,”( Ph.D. Dissertation, Laval University, Quebec, Canada, 1995), 673-679.

the main centre of examination of this thesis but will serve as reference point. The exegetical study of the selected sections and words are laid on the rising slope leading to the climax and on the slope after the climax as releasing the tension. On rising slope the implied tension questions are: Will Adam and Eve be defeated by eating the fruit?, if they are defeated will what will be the response of the main character (The LORD God) or will they left defeated? Respectively.

The climax is The LORD God addresses the Serpent head-on and the seed is promised crush the head of the Serpent (*the proto-eungelion*) on behalf of the defeated couple. They are eventually covered and reinstated though living with consequences of the previous defeat. The scene is the garden of Eden where the tree discussed by the serpent in Genesis 3:1, 6 and the LORD God joins the plot as “walking in the garden” (Gen. 3:8).

Textual Limit. Several guides advise that before exegeting the text its limits must be determined, Vogt suggest to “establish the co-text of the passage... And some new breaks in the author’s thought that gives some indications that a new section in the narrative have begun.”<sup>26</sup>

The thesis will exegete Genesis 3:1-21 because its start and end limits are based on the following considerations: 1. The thematic content of the story of the temptation, the fall and how God handled the results of the fall of mankind. 2. The introduction of the new character and new scene in Genesis 3:1 which is the serpent,<sup>27</sup> and, 3. The scene is introduced with a verb-less clause<sup>28</sup> הָיָה וְהָיָה שֶׁ, which is a strong

---

<sup>26</sup> Vogt, 147.

<sup>27</sup> Bruce, K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, (IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 722.

<sup>28</sup> Matthew H. Patton and Frederic Clarke Putnam, *Basics of Hebrew Discourse A Guide to Working with Hebrew Prose and Poetry*, ed., Miles V. Van Pelt, (Grand Raids: Zondervan, 2019), 90.

introduction of the new scene and its new character. The preceding chapter (Gen 2) ends with the last sub-section of the creation of the woman (Gen 2:20-24). Some suggest Genesis 2:25 serves as an epilogue of Genesis 2 and others see it as bridging text between Genesis 2 and 3. that will be discussed later in this paper.

### The selected Hebrew Text: Genesis 2:25 and 3:1-11, 21

2:25 וַיְהִי עֲרוּמֵיהֶם עֲרוּמֵיהֶם וְאִשְׁתּוֹ וְלֹא יִתְבַּשְׁשׁוּ: 2:25

- 1 והנחש הנה ערום מפלי תינת השודה אשר עשה והנה אלהים ויאמר אליהאשה אף כִּי־אמר אלהים לֹא תאכלו מכל עץ הגן:
  - 2 ותאמר האשה אל־הנחש מפרי עץ־הגן נאכל:
  - 3 ומפרי העץ אשר בתוך־הגן אמר אלהים לֹא תאכלו ממנו וְלֹא תגעו בו פֶּן־תִּמְתּוּן:
  - 4 ויאמר הנחש אל־האשה לא־מות תִּמְתּוּן:
  - 5 כִּי ידע אלהים כִּי ביום אכלכם ממנו ונִפְקְחוּ עֵינֵיכֶם וְהִייתֶם כְּאֱלֹהִים ידעי טוב ורע:
  - 6 ותרא האשה כִּי טוב העץ למאכל וכִּי תאנה־הוא לעינים וְנִחְמַד העץ להשפיל ותקח מפריו ותאכל ותתן גם־לאישה עמה ויאכל:
  - 7 ותפקחנה עיני שניהם וידעו כִּי עירום הם ויתפרו עליה תאנה ויעשו להם חגורת:
  - 8 וישמעו את־קול הנה אלהים מתהלך בגן לרום היום ויתסבא האדם ואשתו מפני הנה אלהים בתוך עץ הגן:
  - 9 ויקרא הנה אלהים ויאמר לו איפה:
  - 10 ויאמר את־קולך שמעתי בגן ואיבא כִּי־עירם אנכי ואחבא:
  - 11 ויאמר מי הגיד לך כִּי עירם אתה המוֹדֵעַץ אשר צויתיד לבלתי אכל־ממנו אכלת
- 21 ויעש הנה אלהים לאדם ולאשתו פתנות עור וילבשם: פ<sup>29</sup>

### Selected Greek Septuagint text of Genesis 2:25 and 3:1-11, 21

2:25 και ἦσαν οἱ δύο γυμνοί, ὁ τε Ἄδὰμ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἦσχύνοντο.

1. Ὁ δὲ ὄφις ἦν φρονημώτατος πάντων τῶν θηρίων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὧν ἐποίησεν Κύριος ὁ θεός· καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ὄφις τῇ γυναικί· Τί ὅτι εἶπεν ὁ θεός· Οὐ μὴ φάγητε ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου τοῦ παραδείσου;

2. καὶ εἶπεν ἡ γυνὴ τῷ ὄφει· Ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου τοῦ παραδείσου φαγόμεθα·

3. ἀπὸ δὲ καρποῦ τοῦ ξύλου ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ παραδείσου, εἶπεν ὁ θεός· Οὐ φάγεσθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ μὴ ἄψησθε αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ ἀποθάνητε.

<sup>29</sup> *The Lexham Hebrew Bible* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2012). And all Hebrew verses that will be used in the exegesis will be excerpts from the Lexham Hebrew Bible.

4. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ὄφεις τῇ γυναικί Οὐ θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε·
5. ἤδει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐν ἧ ἂν ἡμέρᾳ φάγησθε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, διανοιχθήσονται ὑμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, καὶ ἔσεσθε ὡς θεοί, γινώσκοντες καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν.
6. καὶ ἶδεν ἡ γυνὴ ὅτι καλὸν τὸ ξύλον εἰς βρῶσιν, καὶ ὅτι ἀρεστὸν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἰδεῖν καὶ ὠραῖόν ἐστιν τοῦ κατανοῆσαι, καὶ λαβοῦσα τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ ἔφαγεν· καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς μετ’ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔφαγον.
7. καὶ διηνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῶν δύο, καὶ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι γυμνοὶ ἦσαν· καὶ ἔρραψαν φύλλα συκῆς καὶ ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς περιζώματα.
8. Καὶ ἤκουσαν τὴν φωνὴν Κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ περιπατοῦντος ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τὸ δειλινόν· καὶ ἐκρύβησαν ὃ τε Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ προσώπου Κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ παραδείσου.
9. καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν Ἀδὰμ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἀδὰμ, ποῦ εἶ;
10. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Τὴν φωνὴν σου ἤκουσα περιπατοῦντος ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ, καὶ ἐφοβήθην, ὅτι γυμνός εἰμι, καὶ ἐκρύβην.
11. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Τίς ἀνήγγειλέν σοι ὅτι γυμνός εἶ, εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου οὗ ἐνετειλάμην σοι τούτου μόνου μὴ φαγεῖν, ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἔφαγες;
21. καὶ ἐποίησεν Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἀδὰμ καὶ τῇ γυναικί αὐτοῦ χιτῶνας δερματίνους, καὶ ἐνέδυσεν αὐτούς<sup>30</sup>

### Translation of the Main Verses of the Text

There are four main sections of the entire Genesis 2:25 and 3:1-21 which will be translated, namely: Genesis 2:25, where similar words are mentioned, Genesis 3:1-7 indicates the dialogue section between the serpent and the woman. Genesis 3:8-11 which introduces God as new character who personally comes in to the scene. It indicates a dialogue between God and the couple which also used the word “naked”. After the dialogue, and Genesis 3:21 that shows God’s actions to cover nakedness. Below is a record of own translation of the text to be exegeted.

---

<sup>30</sup> *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Edited by Henry Barclay Swete. (Cambridge University Press, 1930). <https://biblehub.com/sepd/genesis/3.htm>

**Genesis 2:25**

And they were both of them naked, the man and his wife and not ashamed of themselves.

**Genesis 3:1-7**

1. Now the Serpent became cunning of all the living of the field which the LORD God made. And he said to the woman, surely God did not say you shall eat of every tree of the garden.
2. And the woman said to the serpent, from the fruit of the tree of the garden we will eat.
3. But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden God said you shall not eat from it and you shall not touch it lest you die.
4. And the serpent said to the woman you will not surely die.
5. For God knows certainly in the day you eat from it your eyes will be opened then and be like God knowing (who knows) good and evil.
6. And when the woman perceived that the tree was good for food and a pleasure to the eyes and desirable to make one wise then she took of the fruit and ate and gave also to her husband with her and he ate.
7. And the eyes of both of them were opened and they knew that they were naked and they sewed fig leaves and made themselves coverings.

**Genesis 3:8-11**

8. And they heard the sound of the LORD God walking in the garden during the breeze of the day and they hid themselves man and his wife from the face of the LORD God among the trees of the garden.
9. And the LORD God called the man and said to him where are you?

10. So he said I heard your sound in the garden and was afraid because I was naked and hid myself.

11. And he said who declared to you that you are naked ? from the tree which I commanded you not to eat have you eaten from it?

### **Genesis 3:21**

And the LORD God made to Adam and his wife a garment of skin and covered them.

It is important to state the witness of The Aramaic Bible ; The Targums. The keys words : ערוּמִים, is translated “both naked”, וְתִבְשָׁשׁוּ is translated “yet were not ashamed.” In Genesis 3:1 the serpent’s עָרוּם is translated “ cunning” with an addition of “smarter”, עֵירָם is translated “naked”, חֲגָרֹת is “girdles” and כְּתָנֹת as “garment of honor for the skin of their flesh.”<sup>31</sup>

### **Interpretative Problems**

When reading Genesis 2:25 the word ערוּמִים which is commonly translated bare naked, and in Genesis 3:7 עֵירָם is introduced which is also translated naked. It is quiet unclear as to what form of nakedness is being referred to here, because Genesis 2:25 seems to suggest that Adam and Eve were in their perfectly created status which was before sin. Even if there is emergence of sin in between Genesis 2:25 and 3:7, the text does not seem to explicitly state the change of nakedness instead it records reaction to nakedness in Genesis 3:7. The narrative leaves the reader with an idea that

---

<sup>31</sup> Bernard Grossfeld, trans, The Aramaic Bible: The Targum Onqelos, (MN: Liturgical Press,1990),46. The Hebrew: “skin” is here rendered “honor” for a Hebrew “light” (’or), coinciding with Rabbi Meir’s interpretation in Gen Rab XX:12, p 196; “light” and “honor” appear in association with each other in Esther 8:16 Cf BZ Berkowitz *Ote Or Wilna* 1843, p 9; L. Ginberg, *Legend of the Jews Philadelphia*(Jewish Publication Society),1911-1938, Vol V, p 103, n 93 With the note on Genesis 3:21 is an addition due to a reconsideration of the traditional reading ’or- “skin” which is here blended in to the earlier reading ’or – light/honor.

what is understood as nakedness to the modern person is what mankind was created with.

The reaction of both mankind and God to nakedness of Genesis 3:7, suggest more than physical nakedness which the surface reading of the text does not seem to give.

Another textual problem is of the serpent's role. What is known about the serpent as a creature is totally opposite of the one in Genesis 3 which can talk and rationalize. It leads to a thinking that this passage is a myth or just epic story which never happened.

### Grammatical Analysis

This section will start by discussing the discourse analysis in the passage and differentiate it from the rest of narrative. This study will start with Genesis 2:25 because of word similarities found in the next chapter.

Genesis 2:25

וַיְהִי עֶרְוָתָם לְעֵינֵי יְהוָה וַאֲשַׁתּוֹ וְלֹא יִתְבַּשְׂשׁוּ:

The verb: וַיְהִי “*and they were*” as a wayyiqtol, introduces a new idea which follows the epilogue (Gen. 2:24) coming after poetic ending of Genesis 2:23. Sailhamer observed the sequence as a literary technique.<sup>32</sup> Van der Merwe when commenting on Buth's non-sequential function of wayyiqtol, that it “ begins a series of several events the author introduces as part of the main story, even though it is out of sequence with the introductory clauses.”<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Sailhamer, 35

<sup>33</sup> Robert, D. Bergen, ed., *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, (Eisenbraunns: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994), 25.

The Hebrew dual שְׁנֵיהֶם is joined by וְאִשְׁתּוֹ in the main clause to give force to the dual theme picked from the previous epilogue (Gen.2:24) בָּאִשְׁתּוֹ ... אִישׁ “man... to his wife.” Though it does not carry its idea it retains the dual character presentation of the subject. Van de Merwe further hints “repetition of participant” as a way to mark the main character.<sup>34</sup> Man and his Wife become the main marked characters in Genesis 2:25.

The עֲרוּמִים as an absolute modifies the dual subject. It is observed here that at this stage the adjective is simply plural to emphasize its attribute function to the *man and his wife*.

It is important to explore on the etymology and cognate meanings behind the word עֲרוּמִים. Schultz points that the word עָרוֹם (naked), is either from the root *ûr*, which means to “be exposed” or from *ârâ* rendered “be naked” or nudity in Genesis 2:25. It indicates lack of concealment and disguise. It also translated prudent, crafty, wisdom.<sup>35</sup> The research traces its roots from two ancient languages, first in Akkadian; *erû /erium* : means naked, destitute and then Ugaritic language ; *’rh* : translated naked, and subst. nakedness.<sup>36</sup>

Egyptian: *h̄jy*, "the naked (one)," in the ancient Egyptian language had conceptions of “ I gave bread to the hungry, beer to the thirsty, and clothes to the

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.,35.

<sup>35</sup> Carl Schultz, "arowm" *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament (TWOT)*, ed. R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jnr. and Bruce, K. Waltke, (Chicago: Moody Press,1980), 2:656.

<sup>36</sup> H. Niehr, "ârôm" *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament (TDOT)*, ed. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,2001), 11: 349-350. The Akkadian language was anciently used in Mesopotamia; in their view clothing is the second self of its wearer whose power is transferred to their clothing...the majority of the population probably possessed only a single garment, which they wore at all times. Clothing could be stripped from the body of a person guilty of misconduct or serving as hostage. In the ancient Sumer the cult was practiced by priest who were naked to emphasize purity.

naked.” Among other meaning of nakedness the Egyptian reliefs showed dead enemies of the king stripped naked and bound as a sign of defeat.<sup>37</sup>

#### The Use of עָרוֹם in the Biblical Context

In 1Samuel 19:24 it is used in relation to Saul when he lay naked before the Prophet Samuel. It is used in Isaiah 20:2 when Isaiah literally demonstrated or acted the prophetic captivity of Egyptians by the Assyrians. In Micah 1:8 used together with “stripped” in context of the mourning. It is a physical nakedness. In Job 26:6 it used to means exposed and Amos 2:16 is given in the context of God’s judgment when mighty flee probably defenceless.

Shame: וְלֹא יִתְבַּשְׁשׁוּ “ And they were not ashamed of themselves.”

Hebrew Strong’s dictionary translate it from a primitive root as pale, to be ashamed, disappointed or delayed.<sup>38</sup> When in hithpolel is translated to be ashamed before one another.<sup>39</sup> Saebass says

From other Semitic languages, the most interesting data for an analysis of OT words built from the roots *bosh* are to be found in Akkadian. In Ugaritic is exemplified by the noun *btt*, which is also “shame”... *bosh* expresses the idea that someone, a person, a city, a professional organization... underwent an experience in which his former respected position and importance were overthrown. Someone risked something to a power, whether it be to another person or a god and thus undertook a daring venture. And now he receives the consequences of that venture so that he must suffer the opposite of what he sought, namely dishonour and be put to shame, not because of some subjective act but because of something that was inherent in the risk. In short *bosh* always has a passive connotation even in the causative form.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Ogden Goelet, “Nudity in Ancient Egypt”, *University of Chicago Journal*, winter,12 (1993):22.

<sup>38</sup> “בִּישׁ” (*BDB*).

<sup>39</sup> Brown Driver Briggs Lexicon

<sup>40</sup> Horst Seabass, “shame.” *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament(TDOT)*, ed. Botterweck Johannes and Ringgren Helmer. Trans, T. John Wills, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 2: 50,52.

Given that the verb בּוֹשׁ in the text is a hithpolel in plural, it may provide the reflexive nuance with passive connotations. The emphasis is that shame is an action that came from outside both of them and directed to both of them. It follows the parallel in Genesis 1:27; זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה, “male and female” That is both Man and his wife were not ashamed. In view of Seabass’ rendition, the hithpolel ends on reflexive verb; with an emphasis on the enemy from outside both of and besides them, while the inclusion of reciprocity suggest themselves to be the source of shame upon each other.

When applying Doukhan’s argument that Genesis 2 account is written on “not yet” perspective,<sup>41</sup> and the literary method of prolepsis or foreshadowing,<sup>42</sup> nakedness is understood in two ways: firstly, that Man and his wife were absolutely exposed without concealment and disguise, secondly that they were not yet defeated by the anticipated enemy. On the aspect of shame, it is noted that they were not humiliated, dishonoured nor attracted disgrace to themselves.

Given that עָרוֹם is translated with two perspectives; the first being exposed, naked, bare, and the second being prudent, crafty and wisdom then the application of the second is possible. That is Man and his wife were naked (prudent, crafty and wise). The nuance derived is that they were naturally equipped with knowledge and wisdom. Such that they were created perfect; lacking nothing on the part of necessary knowledge.

---

<sup>41</sup> Doukhan, 87.

<sup>42</sup> Jerome, T. Walsh, *Old Testament Narrative: A Guide to Interpretation*, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), 58-59. “Foreshadowing” refers to remarks, usually by the narrator, that reveal in advance to the narratee and the reader something about what will happen later in the story. It gives the narratee and the reader the information characters do not have.

There is a possibility of the double meaning in the employment of עֲרִימָה depending on the understanding of the reader. All the above point to description of the serpent and Man in Genesis 3.

### **Discourse Analysis of Genesis 3:1-7**

The new overarching episode (Gen 3:1-21) has a sub-unit of Genesis 3:1-7. It requires the separate analysis based on its uniqueness to the overarching narrative (Gen 3:1-21). The following are the demarcating features: 1. As stated above the surfacing of the Serpent as a new character into the scene introduces new idea. Secondly, Genesis 3:1-7 contain a dialogue between the Woman and the Serpent that raises its own tension and sub climax.

For further structural analysis of the episode, Kempf suggests the following;

Genesis 3:1a-b: Setting- now the Serpent was more cunning than all the living (animals) of the any of the field.

1c-h: Stimulus: Narrative quote; He said to the woman

Genesis 3:2a-3e: Narrative quote; “the woman said”

3:4a-5e : Counter evaluation

3:6a-h : Woman’s response

3:7a-e : Closure.<sup>43</sup>

### **Identity of the Serpent**

The research will carry out lexical analysis of the following words or phrases:

1. שֶׁרֶפֶן “and the serpent”

**Occurrence in the Pentateuch.** Genesis 49:17 as metaphorical description of Dan. Exodus 4:3 Moses stick miraculously turning in to a living serpent. Numbers 21:6; the fiery Serpent in the wilderness, also in Deuteronomy 8:15. In the Pentateuch, the word serpent it used metaphorically, literally or in context of miraculous act of God.

---

<sup>43</sup> Stephen Kempf, 506.

The word **הַנָּחָשׁ**, the root is **נָחַשׁ** translated “Serpent”

The serpent is qualified twice for identity purposes. The serpent is qualified adjectivally and by character participation in the plot of Genesis 3:1-7 episode. The narrator uses the conjunctive way attached to the Serpent (**וְהַנָּחָשׁ**) to serve the disjunctive function for the purpose of introducing the new idea, new episode and the new character. De Regt identifies the “explicit reference of a proper name in a narrative and nominal Participant reference as a proof that participant dominance.”<sup>44</sup> Naccacci highlights the importance of Serpent as an important character that is introduced in the narrative.<sup>45</sup>

### **The Adjectival Identity**

2. **עָרוֹם** “was cunning” The adjective attached to the serpent is **עָרוֹם**. It shares its root with **עָרוֹם** in Genesis 2:25 where its rendered naked, exposed, bare and is here translated “crafty, beware, take crafty counsel, be prudent.(see **עָרוֹם** in Gen 2:25).

The description of the Serpent by association **מִכָּל חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה** of “of all the living (beasts/animals) of the field,” seeks to identify the disguise, concealment and creaturely nature of the Serpent.

The character identity of the Serpent comes out more vividly with what the author paints him to be just as the Serpent starts a dialogue with the woman. Vogt says “the introduction of a dialogue into a narrative will give insight into the character of the speaker or convey thematic elements important to the interpretation of the

---

<sup>44</sup> Van Der Merwe, 34.

<sup>45</sup> Bergen, 189.

story.”<sup>46</sup> There are two occasions in the Old Testament where animals were with speech: the donkey of Balaam in Numbers 22:28; and the Serpent and in Genesis 3:2. In both of the two occurrences there is superhuman manifestation. When the Serpent speaks, the reader’s attention is made to consider “super animal creature” than a mere muted animal. The Serpent start of the dialogue is with reference to what The LORD God said in Genesis 2:16-17; which is the command of God.

The study into what the Serpent said; וְאָמַר אֱלֹהִים לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִכָּל עֵץ הַגָּן ; “surely God did not say you shall eat of every tree of the garden.”(Gen. 3:2c-h); which Kempf called it a “Stimulus” was a distortion of what God said with a quest motive of restatement or reinterpretation of the law. The stimulus stage initiates the tension in the plot.

The comparison of how the command was and what the woman gave indicates that the woman attempted the reinterpretation of the command.

:וַתֹּאמֶר הָאִשָּׁה אֶל-הַנָּחַשׁ מִפְּרֵי עֵץ-הַגָּן נֹאכְלִים;

Translated: And the woman said to the serpent, from the fruit of the tree of the garden we may eat. (Thesis)

:וּמִפְּרֵי הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר בְּתוֹךְ-הַגָּן אָמַר אֱלֹהִים לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִמֶּנּוּ וְלֹא תִגְעוּ בּוֹ פֶן-תָּמוּתוּ;

Translated: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden God said you shall not eat from it and you shall not touch it lest you die.(Antithesis).

While the first part in Genesis 3:2 may be correct but second part of God’s command (Gen. 3:3) shows three alterations from the original statement of God’s command. First, the certainty of death “you will surely die” and secondly, she added “you shall not touch it,” and thirdly the woman calls The אֱלֹהִים (LORD God),

---

<sup>46</sup> Vogt, 58.

אלהים (God) The woman was either paraphrasing or providing the interpretative answer. Wenham submits that the slight modifications on the name of covenant name of God, the Serpent distances himself from God. When the woman altered the command of God, it was a suggestion on her part to move away from God towards the Serpent's frame of mind.<sup>47</sup>

The serpent made a counter evaluation of God's law. יֹאמֶר הַנָּחָשׁ אֶל־הָאִשָּׁה לֹא־ מוֹת תָּמָתוּן: כִּי יֵדַע אֱלֹהִים כִּי בְיוֹם אֲכָלְכֶם מִמֶּנּוּ וְנִפְקַחְו עֵינֵיכֶם וְהִיתֶם כְּאֱלֹהִים יֹדְעֵי טוֹב וָרָע:

And the serpent said to the woman you will not surely die. For God knows certainly in the day you eat from it your eyes will be opened then and be like God knowing (who knows) good and evil (Gen3:4,5). The serpent does not attack the woman but God and His law. The narrator allows the Serpent to give himself omniscience above the woman and places himself directly opposite the LORD God, to evaluate and judge His motives.

In Genesis 3:1-5, the author has helped the reader to identify the Serpent as more than one of the "beast of the field" but the adversary הַשָּׂטָן against the LORD God. The Serpent has not only been named with a strong, skillful literary technique but also has demonstrated the high level of concealment, disguise and wisdom.

### **עִירִים Nature of Nakedness**

On the last part of the episode Genesis 3:1-7, which Kempf labels it "Woman's response" (Gen.3:6,7), centres on the behavior of the second character; the Woman. In this last subsection the narrator moves from dialogue to intrapersonal experience. The reader is invited into the secret chamber of the Woman's mind. Thus, raising the tension of the plot higher. The reader asks a question and observes if the

---

<sup>47</sup> Wenham, 73.

woman will eat the fruit of tree based on what the Serpent has said. When they have eaten word עִרְוֹם “naked” describes the man and his wife.

The origin of the word is also from עור and עָרָה which connotes “being exposed” “naked or nudity” as stated above by Schultz. They derivative together with עָרוּם. To differentiate the nuance will depend on the context of passage. The adjective עִרְוֹם should be studied within the context of Genesis 3:6-7 and how it is acted in Genesis 3:8-11.

וַתִּרְאֵהָ הָאִשָּׁה כִּי טוֹב הָעֵץ לְמֵאֲכָל וְכִי תֹאמְרָהּ הִיא לְעֵינַיִם וְנִחְמַד הָעֵץ לְהַשְׂכִּיל וַתִּקַּח מִפְּרִיָּו וַתֹּאכַל  
וַתִּתֵּן גַּם לְאִישָׁהּ עִמָּהּ וַיֹּאכַל:

Translated: And when the woman *perceived* that the tree was good for food and a *pleasure* to the eyes and *desirable* to make one wise then she *took* of the fruit and *ate* and *gave* also to her husband with her and he *ate*.

The first verb וַתִּרְאֵהָ of the sentence in *wayyqtol* form carries the main action. The subsequent actions of וְנִחְמַד “desirable” and לְהַשְׂכִּיל “to make one wise” are dependent on the “she saw.” This suggests that all was in her imagination or perception. The niphil form וְנִחְמַד which is a participle can be understood that the woman thought eating it she will make a delight for herself that will be forever. As for the hiphil form לְהַשְׂכִּיל she thought the tree (subject) will cause her (object) to indirectly make herself wise. In nutshell, she thought of transforming herself to a better state.

Walsh suggest the narrator’s technique slackening the plot and thus ensuring a decision-making process by using a series of clauses with few verbs. The purpose is

to provide the reader more time to reflect on “unspoken motivations” and “evaluate characters.”<sup>48</sup>

Walsh further notes a sudden explosive speed into successive actions by employing *wayyitqol* forms; she took וַתִּקַּח, she ate וַתֹּאכַל, she gave וַתִּתֵּן, he ate וַיֹּאכַל. This is to accelerate the action to the desired end. This section serves as an increased tension of the plot towards the question if Man and his Wife will eat. They have eaten, disobeyed the command of the LORD God.

### Meaning of עֵרֹם in Genesis 3:7

Genesis 3:7

וַתִּפְתְּחוּן עֵינֵי שְׁנֵיהֶם וַיֵּדְעוּ כִּי עֵרֹמָם הֵם וַיִּתְּפְרוּ עֲלֵהּ תְּאֵנָה וַיַּעֲשׂוּ לָהֶם חִגְרֹת:

And the eyes of both of them were opened and they knew that they were naked and they sewed fig leaves and made themselves coverings.

In the light of what the serpent promised (your eyes will be opened) and in view of what the woman went through before she ate the fruit, (she saw), the eye; עֵינַי, is translated “figuratively for the mental and spiritual faculties.”<sup>49</sup> It then means that both of them Man and his Wife had their perception opened. The word “naked” עֵרֹם has a different form but shares the same root with עָרוֹם. As referred above עֵרֹם is rendered naked (exposed, defeated, vulnerable). The contextual emergence of sin has changed the nature of עָרוֹם in Genesis 2:25 to עֵרֹם. Man and his Wife; who were equipped with wisdom and prudence did not acquire שְׂכֵל, prudence as promised by the Serpent and anticipated in eating of the fruit.

---

<sup>48</sup> Walsh, 54.

<sup>49</sup> Francis Brown, with S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic* (BDB), (2014), s.v. “*ayin*.”

They seem to have lost some protection, perception has departed from their eyes and they are exposed. The next analysis will add more light on the nature of their nakedness.

### **Meaning of חָגוֹר in Genesis 3:7**

Just as the narrator ambiguously described עָרוֹם to the Serpent at the beginning of the episode Genesis 3:1-7 and then allowed the Serpent to act out its identity of עָרוֹם, so at the closure of the episode, the Man and his Wife are allowed to act out their shame and nakedness to themselves since shame is reflexive. When they sewed leaves together and they made חָגוֹר; the word has its cognate with Akkadian *agaru* meaning “to surround” in Ugaritic *hgr* “to gird.”<sup>50</sup> חָגוֹר suggests a scanty covering.

When they seek to cover themselves is a reflection of hiding their identity. They hid their new identity first, from themselves; each from his and her own eyes. They have new shameful (humiliated and disgraced) perception about own self. Secondly, before each other and thirdly before the Serpent; who has turned out to be their enemy and finally in the presence of God.

This research proposes that, not only does Genesis 3:1-7 serve to reveal the identity of the Serpent but also, it demonstrates how the Serpent has successfully duplicated his character on to the Man and his Wife. The main trait of the Serpent is disguise and concealment; so also is the desperate attempt of the couple to conceal their nakedness with fig leaves. The author signalled the anticipated duplication of character by using words with similar root; עָרוֹם (Gen. 2:25) עָרוֹם (Gen.3:1) and עִירְמוֹם (Gen.3:7). The couple is vulnerable to the Serpent’s assaults, and they can no longer resist him. They are his slaves and captives.

---

<sup>50</sup> Yamauchi, “*hagor*” TWOT.

## Discourse Analysis of Genesis 3:8-11

The episode Genesis 3:8-11 becomes a new subsection for two reasons; firstly, because a new active character; יהוה אֱלֹהִים is introduced for the first time since Genesis 3 opened. יהוה אֱלֹהִים has in the previous episode been implicitly referenced, but his emergence in Genesis 3:8-11 proves him to be the main character of the narrative. יהוה אֱלֹהִים appearance is characterized by decisive effect on the previous characters that ever participated and secondly it is a dialogue between יהוה אֱלֹהִים and the couple based on couple's nakedness.

### Function of עֵירֹם in Genesis 3:8-11

The word עֵירֹם appears again in Genesis 3:10,11. First as the reason for the Man's hiding and second when the LORD God asked "who told you that you are naked". The sound; קוֹל of the LORD God and his פָּנִים, translated from the word "face" to express "presence" characterise the coming of יהוה אֱלֹהִים into the scene. The result is put in to action: hiding the naked self. The nakedness is confessed by the victim character show name its permanent impact on his nature and thus has modified their association with the LORD God's presence.

## Analysis of Genesis 3:21

### The Function of לְבַשׁ with כְּתָנֹת

There are two study words in Genesis 3:21, namely: לְבַשׁ and כְּתָנֹת, the reader's question on what will be the LORD God's reaction to the Man. The words are used to express the nature and the quality of His response.

The word כְּתָנֹת is translated "garment." Niehr says "the Akkadian language was anciently used in Mesopotamia; in their view clothing is the second self of its

wearer whose power is transferred to their clothing.”<sup>51</sup> In the text כְּתָנוּת is qualified by another noun עוֹר for “skin.” It is notable that כְּתָנוּת is plural and עוֹר singular. The nuance is that He made garments for each of them from the same type of skin. According to Schultz “ עוֹר is used for both man and animals.”<sup>52</sup> It is probable that LORD God used animal skin for their garments.

The clause וַיִּלְבָּשׁוּם: “ and covered them.” Bowling says “were being clothed as a sign of rank, status and character.”<sup>53</sup> the verb is in the hiphil form. The nuance is that God caused them to also participate in the covering. It understood that God provided to them: who were naked (defeated, humiliated, disgraced and enslaved), to be covered (given rank, status and character) from one same garment of animal skin to restore self in them.

### Chapter Summary

This chapter has explored the historical and grammatical analysis of Genesis 3. The conclusion that Genesis 3 as a narrative is dominated by dialogue. The authorship as attributed to Moses has aided to identify the historical setting for Genesis 3. The Hebrew people who were in Egypt as slaves were the audience of the book of Genesis, thus the chapter appropriating the message of Genesis 3 to the context of Hebrew slavery while in Egypt. The word study and usage of nakedness and shame in Genesis 2:25 is a proleptic literature technique of the author. They used within the context of “not yet” perspective. While עָרִים may mean nakedness on the

---

<sup>51</sup> Niehr “arom” *TDOT*

<sup>52</sup> Schultz, “‘ôr,” *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, (TWOT)* ed., R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr. and Bruce, K. Waltke. ( Chicago: Moody Press,1980), 657.

<sup>53</sup> Andrew Bowling, “lābes” *TWOT*, 469.

other hand it carries with itself the meaning of being wise, crafty and intelligent on the part of Adam and Eve; hence no need of seeking another wisdom as promised by the serpent. Furthermore עָרוֹם anticipated the character of the Serpent yet to manifest itself negatively on Genesis 3:1-5.

Adam's experience in Genesis 3:7 is the resultant effect of defeat and captured as a slave. His behaviour in Genesis 3:7-11 further shows the transfer of the characteristics of עָרוֹם as negatively seeking to disguise and justify himself in the presence of God. The naked of עֵירֹם then suggest a sense of defeat, vulnerability and slavery to the enemy. Akin to nakedness is the shame acted by Adam and Eve to means to be humiliated, dishonoured or attracted disgrace to themselves.

The narrative present God as the ultimate Judge and the redeemer of Adam and Eve. The כְּתָנִים of animal skin suggested equal sacrificial intervention and signified their rank in service to God for both Adam and Eve, and לְבַשׁ as verb is what God did to respond to shame of humiliation and dishonour.

## CHAPTER 4

### THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Chapter Four will present the Theological analysis, and the Theological implication of the words Nakedness, Shame and covering with garment within the framework of Genesis and Biblical canon. The chapter will further draw the message from the text as contributed by the above-mentioned words.

The major theological themes that come from the book of Genesis through the Old into the New Testament are of Creation, Nature of Man, Nature of Sin, the Great Controversy between Christ and Satan, Covenant and Salvation.

#### **The Theological Implication of “Naked but not Ashamed” עָרוּמִים... וְלֹא יִתְבַּשְׁשׁוּ**

God in Genesis 2:25 has at the beginning created and made covenant with Adam and Eve who both were prudent, wise and were not disgraced of themselves. Theological implication of the above phrase is the acknowledgement that God is the Creator of Adam and Eve with purpose on their status and that they were created perfect. They were not yet enslaved nor defeated. It is understood that both Moses and Hebrew people were audience of Genesis 3 after the fall. The message was given in the “not yet” perspective as stated by Doukhan.

It was important for the Hebrew people to reflect on the state of humanity before the sin; an emergence of the ideas of the image of God in man. That “they were naked and not ashamed” should not be studied from a negative perspective only, but rather from “the created image of God” concept also (Gen 1:26-27). Genesis 2:25 is

understood as a further exposition of Genesis 1:26-27, but now from the context of “not yet” experience and from human community relational view. Fowler says “by implication we may affirm that the original image of God must have constituted knowledge, holiness and righteousness, which in their ultimate and purest sense in part defines the nature of God.”<sup>1</sup> Adam and Eve were the reflection of the image of God before they were attacked and captured by the enemy and fell into sin. The Adventist theological perspective agrees that “this human sin resulted in distortion of the image of God in humanity.”<sup>2</sup>

Another point is how the creation of humanity in the image of God has contributed to the need for human’s self-concept in view of God and a need for renewal. The understanding of man being created in the image of God directs us to God as the point of human’s origin and destiny. Kilner and Henry emphasize definitive part the concept of the image of God in man play in man by saying “the image-of-God concept is determinative for the entire gamut of doctrinal affirmation. That includes not just humanity’s creation but also humanity’s redemption and eternal destination.”<sup>3</sup>

### **The Theological Implication of the Serpent’s Identity**

The study of the identity of the Serpent as a creature and his role in the fall of man, suggests the idea of conflict between God and Satan. The arguments the Serpent raises in Genesis 3 present him as opposed to God and His purposes. It is the above

---

<sup>1</sup> John M. Fowler, *HSAT* 12:235.

<sup>2</sup> *Seventh-day Adventists Believe: A Biblical Exposition of Fundamental Doctrines*, (Silver Spring: Review and Herald, 2018), 113.

<sup>3</sup>John F. Kilner. *Dignity and Destiny : Humanity in the Image of God*, (Eerdmans, *ProQuest Ebook Central*, 2015) <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=4859320>. Created from aua on 2023-04-18 15:19:34.

narrative that sets the Biblical foundation for the involvement of humankind in the cosmic war. The LORD God's character was the one mainly under attack.

The Hebrew people needed to know that their slavery and affliction in Egypt was a matter of the cosmic conflict. The disguised and cunning presentation of the Serpent was meant to teach them of the involvement of superhuman power in the affair of the current human status. It is not God to blame, but an adversary; who sought to be like God (Isa. 14:14) and insinuated the same idea to Adam and Eve.

The concept of a deceptive and God-accusing creature appears in the Bible. In the book of Job Satan accused God (Job 1:9-11). Satan also accused Israel (Zach 3:1-2). He is named "the Serpent of old, the Devil, the accuser of our brethren" in the book of Revelation 12:7-10. He uses the ruling nations and kingdoms to attack and oppress the church and God's people wherever they are. In starting with Egypt, Babylon, Medo-Persia (Dan 10:13, Esth 3:8-9) and Papal Rome kingdom (Rev 13:7). Jesus referred to him as the ruler of this or of the world three times in the Gospel of John (John 12:31, 14:30, 16:11).

Mzonzima Gwala uses the comparative characteristics of the serpent in Genesis 3 and of Seraphims of Isaiah 6 to identify the serpent as belonging to the category of Seraphims and Cherubims.<sup>4</sup>

### **The Theological Implication of עֵינָם on Nature of Sin**

Genesis 3 is generally known to be the chapter of the fall. It serves as the springboard for the discussion of the subject of sin throughout the Bible. Genesis 3 does not mention the word "sin" but the Bible refers to the experience of Adam in Eden as the beginning of sin. Kaminsky argues that Genesis 3 "reveals

---

<sup>4</sup> Mzonzima Gwala, "The Reception of Genesis 1-3 in Nguni Culture" (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch, South Africa, 2004), 83

psychologically sophisticated and mythically compelling insights about how humans are led to sin and the ways in which sin distorts human relationships.”<sup>5</sup> The fallen human nature is described as naked; עֵירָם to reflect the major and sudden change that has occurred to the couple. Naked has become the new description of humankind henceforth.

The Bible says “through one man, sin entered the world and death through sin, thus death spread to all men...Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses.” (Rom. 5:12). John specifies the lawlessness when describing sin (1 John 3:4). Though across the Bible canon there is not a specific definition of sin, Fowler defines sin from God’s response in dealing with it. He says “it is a rebellion directed against the lordship and sovereignty of God and a refusal to accept His authority in one’s life, conduct and destiny. A denial of God is at the root of sin...sin came as a result of active attitude and choice on part of the human.”<sup>6</sup> Eating of the fruit in Genesis 3:7 has fundamentally and comprehensively changed the humanity that was created perfect into being naked.

### **The Change from the Image of God**

This research adds to the description of sin from the perspective of the word עֵירָם. Sin as the breaking of the law changed mankind from the image of God to the image of the Serpent. Lim sees a discussion that will end up in to question the

---

<sup>5</sup> Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen, *The Book of Genesis : Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed., (Craig A. Evans, et al., BRILL, 2012), 640, *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=919594>

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, 239.

character of God as a 'Theological conversation' God is seen as 'selfish,' His words not to be taken seriously taken from their meaning.<sup>7</sup>

Robert observes the shift of the image of God in that there is parallelism between the behaviour of the Man, the Woman and the Serpent (naked עֶרְוָה in 3:7; cunning `arum in 3:1a). They are naked and behave like the Snake.<sup>8</sup> And further comments "The Serpent is shrewd, and man becomes cunning too. Man becomes like,/is identified with, the Snake."<sup>9</sup> And concludes "They have become like the Snake."<sup>10</sup> Nakedness is what they pursued from being made in the "likeness of God" Genesis 1:26, through to the words of the Serpent "you will be like God "Genesis. 3:5.

Then when they covered themselves with leaves, it was an indicator that there has been change on their physical, and psychological nature. Also some part of self has been ripped off from each of them. When they hid from God, it was an evidence of the change on their spiritual nature. The Serpent is elevated above them.

When a person sins, there is a tendency to conceal the sin committed and disguise own true self. There is also an inclination of self-justification when a call to account arises. Furthermore, there is a repulsion of God's presence. The guilty are not comfortable in the face of God. Concealment is akin to deceit, it stands as an impediment to salvation and keeps God at a distance in God- human relationship. A

---

<sup>7</sup> Johnson T. K. Lim, *Grace in the Midst of Judgment: Grasping with Genesis 1-11* (De Gruyter, 2002), *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=935771>.

<sup>8</sup> Letellier, Robert. *Creation, Sin and Reconciliation : Reading Primordial and Patriarchal Narrative in the Book of Genesis* Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015),81, *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=4535114>.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

sinner assumes the role of a deceiver. Cain wanted to conceal his sin (Gen 4:8-9), King David hid his sin and it worsened in to murder (2 Sam 11). The Bible teaches of the blessedness sin being covered by God, the person in whose spirit there is no *deceit*. It encourages admission of sin and its confession (Ps 32:1-5, emphasis supplied).

### **Naked and Slavery in Theological motif**

Sin is understood on the basis of its enslaving power. Blazen relates sin as “the product of living under the enslaving rule of an alien power. Sin is like a king to whom humans yield themselves in obedient service...like a hard tyrant or wicked taskmaster, sin holds people in slavery (Rom 6:6, 16-18, 7:14) and pays them wages (Rom 6:23)”<sup>11</sup> Sin has passed to humans from birth (Ps 51:5) and is universally affecting all humanity (Rom. 3:23). Grudem says we are sinner even we are asleep not active in the acts of sin. That is we are sinners by nature.<sup>12</sup> As it can be observed from the ancient geopolitical conquests; during war, citizens were attacked, carried bound as captives, separated from their kings and kingdoms and their temples burnt to demolish a memory their spiritual strength. Sin has ripped humans of their lofty status, wisdom and spiritual strength. As Isaiah puts it “ But your iniquities have separated you from your God; And your sins have hidden His face from you, so that He will not hear” (Isa 59:2), So sin has separated Adam and Eve from the source (God) of their strength and they are defenceless and subservient to the enemy.

They saw themselves humiliated, dishonoured and disgraced as they did not achieve what the Serpent promised. They are now vulnerable to the attacks of the

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, “Nature of Sin,” 275.

<sup>12</sup> Wayne Grudem, *Bible Doctrine: Essential Teaching of the Christian Faith*, ed., Jeff Purswell, (Leicester, England: IVP, 1999), 210.

Serpent. Dyrness impresses the open doorway for a continued defeat by the enemy. He says “ man and woman will be continually exposed to attacks. Nothing people will do will be able to overcome this opposition; there will be no heroism.”<sup>13</sup>

## **Shame**

The word ashamed; בּוֹיֵשׁ has both psychological and theological significance. In Genesis 3 shame is revealed by human’s behaviour in response to his new status and how others (enemies) would make use of it to hurt him. David appeals to God about his enemies and their cruelty, and that God should not allow him to be ashamed (Ps 25:19-20). This suggests that shame can be inflicted by your enemy. While the western cultures emphasize the emotional dimension, Doukhan impresses that shame has more physical attribute than psychological in the perspective of the Hebrew culture. Shame is disgrace and loss of honour.<sup>14</sup> In the majority shame, expressed humiliation or waiting in vain for the expected outcomes; thus end up being disappointed.

Anyone who comes into personal environment when one is ashamed is an intruder. Kaufman says “Phenomenologically, to feel shame is to feel *seen* in a painfully diminished sense... but when others are present shame is an impediment to further communication”<sup>15</sup>

When God came in the garden and Adam hid, this was an indicator that to him God was an intruder if not an enemy. Sin had set him to be a mismatch of God. The

---

<sup>13</sup> William, A. Dyrness, *Themes in the Old Testament Theology*, (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1977), 102-103.

<sup>14</sup> Doukhan, 87

<sup>15</sup> Gershen Kaufman, *The Psychology of Shame: Theory and Treatment of Shame-Based Syndromes*, 2nd ed. (New York: Springer, 1996), 17.

couple in the new disgraced status could no longer accept the omniscience and omnipresence nature of God's personal attributes. There was no place on earth where Adam and Eve could hide from the all-knowing presence of God; which was never consulted nor considered when eating the fruit. The sense of no escape from God's presence is recurred in Psalm 139:1-11. The ashamed Adam and Eve were unable to invent for themselves a peaceful co-existence with all-knowing presence of God, until God had to come with redemptive intervention.

Shame sticks and is deeply rooted in emotion and self-concept of sinner. Shame is connected and based on the deeds committed by its victim. Rennalls discusses the impact of shame on Adam and Eve and says "it was what they did, that changed their conception of who they were before God."<sup>16</sup> In the above sense, though shame can be inflicted from external source it corresponds with what is within the victim. It is undeniable and confirmed by the sinner's acts.

Another sense of shame is the irreparable exposure and uncomfortable recognition of distance Adam had fallen from the ideal God designed for him. The ideal being so close to God. Stephen in the words of Bonhoeffer adds "Shame is man's ineffaceable recollection of his estrangement from the origin; it is grief for this estrangement, and the powerless longing to return to unity with the origin."<sup>17</sup> Paul reveals the condition of man "for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" Romans 3:23. Seventh-day Adventist Commentary uses the Greek word *hustereo* which means "suffer need", "to be destitute" it says "sinners still continue to fall

---

<sup>16</sup> David E. Rennalls, "How Penal Substitution addresses our Shame: The Bible's Shame Dynamics and their Relationships to Evangelical Doctrine," *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology (SBJT)* 23, no. 3 (2019): 81.

<sup>17</sup> Stephen Pattison, *Shame: Theory, Therapy, Theology* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=143892>.

short...and also awareness of the lack...it is this sense of loss that has led men everywhere to establish their own righteousness by works of the law”<sup>18</sup>

God never created the humanity with shame nor to be shamed, and He did not create a circumstance that ashamed man as indicated above in Genesis 2:25. It is only stated as in anticipation. Shame came as a circumstance brought by the disobedience of mankind. In the sense of the word בִּיֹּשׁ, God in most cases did not inflict shame, instead He allowed shame to take its course. God was entreated to allow the enemies of His servants to be shamed (Ps 70:2, 83:17, 97:7). On the other hand God’s servants pleaded with Him not them to be shamed (Ps. 25:2, 31:17), either as a results of their deeds or from the deeds of their enemies. God would permit the consequences of sin that humiliated His people when they disobeyed His warning. This happened to prove His truthfulness, righteousness and faithfulness.

Adam and Eve were now subject to a circumstance of shame which they caused, and would be disgraced by circumstance of shame throughout human’s lifetime. God’s people depended upon God to defend them from shame and to change the evil course of circumstance on their behalf (Ps. 31:17, 22:5). Here in most cases God was appealed to, to disallow or meet and thwart the enemy’s purpose (Ps 71:1, 119:116).

### **The Garment and the Covering**

The act of self-covering and self-justification when dealing with sin in the Bible is considered salvation or righteousness by works. Snoeberger observes that the “act of covering sin apart from expiation/ propitiation is uniformly regarded in

---

<sup>18</sup> “Come short” [Rom 3:23], *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, rev. ed., ed. Francis D. Nichol (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1956-1980) 6:502

scripture as an inappropriate response to sin.” He associates the guilt with shame as carrying an inferred vulnerability.<sup>19</sup>

Sin has affected the heart to a degree of its wicked desperation (Jer 17:9), so much that it is impossible to deal with Sin without God. The human effort of outer covering cannot change a sinner for good who is accustomed to do evil (Jer13:23). The ignominy of the human race cannot be covered by human merits. Death is the most humiliating form of shame ever inflicted on mankind. The Bible says “none of them can by any means redeem his brother...for the redemption of their souls is costly...that he should continue to live and not see the pit” (Ps 49:7-9). Isaiah describes human effort for righteousness and likened it to “filthy rags” Isaiah 64:6. Jesus used the parable of the ‘man without a wedding garment’ to illustrate how unworthy human effort it is to enter God’s presence.

### **Garment of skin**

There are three theological elements from the garments made of skin. The first is the substitutive death. The only possible skinned creatures are to provide a garment is that they were living. The assumption is that the animal had to die before its skin is used to cover humans. Then that is sacrifice. Another living creature dies to provide a dress for humans. This is Biblical teaching of substitution in the theology of Atonement; “then he shall put his hand on the head of the burnt offering, and it will be accepted on his behalf to make atonement for him.” Leviticus 1:4. “Thus the continual sacrifices at the altar of the burnt offering symbolized the availability of continual atonement.”<sup>20</sup> The epistle to the Galatians teaches the putting on of Christ at Baptism

---

<sup>19</sup> Snoeberger, 23-24.

<sup>20</sup> *Seventh-day Adventists Believe: A Biblical Exposition of Fundamental Doctrines*, (Silver Spring, Review and Herald, 2018), 61.

(Gal 3:27) while the epistle to the Romans admonishes the church at Rome to clothes themselves with Christ (Rom13:14). The second is that the garment is of the same type for both Man and his Wife. It signifies that God's way of salvation is equal for all male and female. There is no man or female in Christ (Gal 3:28). Humanity needs no other nature of righteousness except of Jesus Christ. Thirdly, the garment of skin is close to the skin. The rhyming of עֹר 'or for skin with אֹר 'or for light, may suggest the pattern of opposite as observed with עָרוֹם (crafty, wisdom and cunning) but on surface the word still retained "naked" but not in negative sense, and עֵרָם (naked, defeat, vulnerable and dishonour) which is negative. Psalm of David declares the state of man at creation " For You have made him a little lower than Angels and crowned him with glory and honor" Psalm 8:5. The first garment which related man to God was the garment of light; a garment of honour and glory.<sup>21</sup>

### **Covering/ Clothing**

Doukhan has observed that the term clothing is used when covering the Priests with priestly garments (Exod 28:4, 39-40, 40:14, Lev 8:7,13, 10:5 and Neh 7:70).<sup>22</sup> When לְבַשׁ is used in the context of the sin and the fall of Adam and Eve, then atonement is implied to have preceded the clothing. Both לְבַשׁ and כָּפַר are translated as "cover". The theological implication is that before Aaron did atonement for the congregation he first did it for himself and his house (Lev 16:4-6). Both the atonement; כָּפַר and covering; לְבַשׁ of and for the priest were performed prior his ministry to the rest of the congregation.

---

<sup>21</sup> Doukhan, 94. See also Tg. Yer. Gen 3:7 and Davidson, *The Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament.* ( Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007), 55-58.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid, 110.

This act of covering; כָּפַר as mentioned above resurfaces through the Bible for the purpose of atonement; that means God's covering goes beyond Priest as David talked about blessedness of a man whose sins are covered, and the blessedness of a man whom the LORD does not impute sin (Ps 32:1-2). This blessedness is echoed in the writings of Paul (Rom.4:7-8). With Paul "*epikalupto*" connotes covering for forgiveness or expiation, almost what the service atonement offers to the sinner.

God covers; כָּפַר anyone for expiation of sin and covers; לָבַשׁ for the redeemed status and presentation before Him for service. Israel as a nation was covered for service post-Babylonian exile. It was an act of defence on behalf of His nation ( Zec. 3:1-3).

The gesture is viewed in the New Testament as Justification by faith. Jesus illustrated it with the Parable of the Wedding (Matt 22:1-14), of the Prodigal son who returned home and was dressed with "the best robe" (Luke 15:11-22). In the Pauline corpus the subject carries a great amount of theological weight in Romans 4.

The act of covering is sanctioned by God himself to man; "and clothed them" signifies there is no one else who can act that official purpose except God. Blazen outlines eight perspectives of Justification from "Justification as a right relationship with God" to "Justification as the reality of righteousness"<sup>23</sup>

As Sumerians understood the function of the garment; " The Akkadian language was anciently used in Mesopotamia; in their view clothing is the second self of its wearer whose power is transferred to their clothing"<sup>24</sup> Biblically and Theologically God dresses the believing mankind with Christ, and there on is putting on Christ as a new creation (2Cori. 5:17). It immediately changes the human's status.

---

<sup>23</sup> Ivin T. Blazen "Facets of Justification" *HSAT*, 280-284.

<sup>24</sup> Niehr, *TDOT*, 350.

There is an elevation from bondage to adopted sons and daughters of God (Rom. 8:14-15).

The Apostle John also admonished the Laodicean; enslaved, poor, blind, naked church to buy garments, that shame of their nakedness may not be revealed (Rev. 3:17,18). The words; *gumnos* in Greek translated nakedness, *aischune* for shame and *himatia* for garment. Revelation 3:17,18 is an allusion of Genesis 3:1-21. The Church at Laodicea is not ready for presentation before the Bridegroom because of her pride. The similar counsel is given for the time during the sixth bowl of the seven last plagues; to keep the garment, avoid walking naked and keeping shame out of sight (Rev 16:15).

### **The Message and Application to Israel**

#### **The Primary Message**

It has been argued by Sailhamer, Harrison and other scholars above and adopted by this study that Genesis was authored by Moses while in the land of Midian. This was the same time when Israelites were still strangers and under slavery in Egypt over four hundred years (Gen 15:13). There has been inter-generational promise from God that he made with their Father; 1. God will give them descendants 2. They will inherit the land of Canaan. Possible questions were; if we are the promised descendants why are we enslaved to the Egyptians? Will God come for their deliverance?

The message is given as such to the possible unbelief as expected by Moses when he said “Indeed, when I come to the children of Israel and say to them, ‘God of your fathers has sent me to you,’ and they say to me, what is His name? What shall I say to them?” in Exodus 3:13 is put together with “Who am I that I should go to Pharaoh and that I should bring children of Israel out of Egypt?” (v11). The names of

God as used in the two creation accounts of Genesis 1 and 2 answer the two sides of the question. He uses the name God; אֱלֹהִים to present His power that created to identify Him and secondly, He uses His covenant name LORD God; יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים. This name is rightly used by the narrator in Genesis 3 to give the message of the promised deliverance. The LORD God sees them as the covenant people promised to Abraham; nation of His relationship.

With the historical background given about slavery and affliction of the Hebrew nation, Genesis 3 present slavery and defeat from microcosm of their slavery and affliction to macrocosm of the sin enslaved humankind. While they see the Egyptians and Pharaoh as their oppressors, God introduces more affliction and defeat at large scale. The reason for the existence slavery and violence is the intrusion of Sin and Satan as the enemy. The Israelites are made aware of the larger conflict between good and evil than the one they have with the Egyptians. They are to know that satanic force is behind their oppression as a chosen nation.

### **The Hebrew Initial Status**

The Israelites are here identified with their fathers: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. They are the promised descendants of Abraham. They held a more prestigious position in the Lord's service for the service of the whole world. In Abraham they were protected and from them would come out the redeemer of the world. They were held to be a wise, understanding and great nation (Deut 4:6-8).

They had land entitlement of Canaan. Throughout the book of Genesis is a consistent theme of inheriting the land. Land promise was given to their Patriarchs. By birth Hebrew people are entitled to own the land. The promise of the land was transferred from generation to generation (Gen 28:3-4), they were promised the land and that they would multiply in it (v 13-14).

## **Hope for the Slaves at Micro Level**

The Hebrew humiliation and disgrace exemplified in the manner of their slavery, scanty dress of nakedness, their lack of right and status in the society, the Hebrew poverty and vulnerability without military or any national identity, represent very well how the entire world was held under the sway of the Egyptians. The God of the entire universe is the same one in a relationship with them. Because of the covenant he made with their fathers, he is coming to deliver them from the hand of the enemy. The LORD God will fight the gods of Egypt and judge its nation by His mighty power. God promises to give them their national integrity and identity. There will be a change of status from being slaves to a nation with independence. They will change from individual slaves without a right of choice to persons with restored opportunity to choose the kind of life for themselves and their descendants.

The possession of the land motif has been observed by Doukhan since the calling of Abram to “go.” The call is to move “out of your country...to a land I will show you” (Gen 12:1-2). The movement of Abraham from Canaan to Egypt and back to Canaan (12:10,13:1) then Isaac also moved from Canaan to the land of the Philistines then back to Canaan (Gen 26:1). The cessation of their slavery meant the repossession of the promised land. Though Adam and Eve lost paradise as their home, Israel was given Canaan for their home. Unlike slaves who did not have a right to own land, Israel’s right was restored.

There is an observable parallel between the return of God to Adam and return to Israel in Egypt. The return and the advent of The LORD God in the “cool of the day” to Adam and Eve after their defeat is significantly gracious. It was a gesture that God would not leave his children under the captivity of the enemy from which they would not deliver themselves. It pointed to the return of The LORD God, in which

Joseph's farewell promise stated "God will surely visit you" (Gen 50:24,26). The LORD God made meaning of His visitation the centre of His message through Moses to the afflicted and enslaved Israel (Exod 3:16-17).

It is further more pointed that when God returned to Adam and Eve he came with Judgment and defeat upon the Serpent (Gen 3:15), so God's return for Israel was with judgment and defeat upon Pharaoh and Egypt.

It is doubtless that God's visitation would be met with some resistance from the people He intends to give freedom. As witnessed by Moses' expected questionings from the Hebrew people, God prepared more efforts of miracles and signs for them to believe.

The initial resistance parallels the resistance of Adam and Eve's justification and shift blame. As stated above; this behaviour is attributed to the change of image from of God to the image of the Serpent. Israel was more accustomed to slavery and affliction that it would cease to surprise them and hope for something better. It would require greater amount of faith on their part to see themselves as greater than what they are. This perception is evidenced by some among them during the journey inclined to return the nation to Egypt. Sin and its addictive nature are manifested in them. The LORD God seemed to be prepared to go all the way for their deliverance.

The message of the 'garment' and 'covering' of Adam is acted by God instead of being verbalized to give a more lasting impression of God's covering for His people as a nation and as individual through atonement. From this start point to all the generations of Israel God demonstrated his covering favor for his covenant people. The subsequent pictures of daily and yearly sanctuary services applied to individual and national dealings with sin problem. As Doukhan highlighted that the act *l'bash* is the also the term used in the sanctuary for the dressing the priests; God did not only

promise to deliver Israel but further elevated them as a special nation for His service above all nations (Exod 19:5,6).

Moses made The LORD God the main and dominant character of Genesis 3. God whom at His coming changed the direction and the conclusion of the narrative. He determined the end of both the Serpent and the couple. His conclusions remained unchallenged to the end of the narrative. Moses sends the message to Israel with The LORD God as the main character who will determine the destination of both Egypt and Israel. That determination would remain unchallenged and changeless throughout earth's history. However, that would be conditioned by their belief. As for the Elders of Israel; they believed (Exod 4:31).

### **Hope at Macro- level**

The macro level perspective presents what happened to Israel while in slavery pointed to what happened to the whole human race at a large scale. Not only was the Serpent an enemy to Adam and Eve but to all mankind. Satan as the usurper of authority replaces the position of man to the universe and dominion over all creatures. In the human history he controlled the kings of the earth and worked through them to attain his evil ends. This is demonstrated how Isaiah described him in the person of King of Babylon (Isa 14:3-21), Prophet Ezekiel described him in the person of the King of Tyre (Ezek 28:11-19) and attendant angel in Daniel associated to have fought him with the kings of Medo-Persia (Dan 10:13). In the book of Job he goes to represent mankind of the earth when 'sons of God gathered' (Job 1:6-7, 2:1-2).

The subjugation to sin and to the Serpent is the reason for the existence of their national bondage. The salvific experience from God should be applied to the world. Israel is freed from Egypt for God's global mission purposes. Their freedom is

the need of the world because the rest of nations are going through the similar bondage of sin and are without God.

Moses' first question that anticipates a controversy in an attempt to deliver Israel, which is also expected by the Hebrew people in affliction. Furthermore, he questions his self-estimation relative to the enemy's (Pharaoh) tyranny and power. This question was an attribute to the Hebrew's state of mind when in slavery, and thus an attribute of the entire human race. God defeated the Serpent in the gods of Egypt and further Satan in person in the *Protoevangelium* (Gen 3:15). Their deliverance would spread to the entire world.

In both micro and macro level perspective of their deliverance, they are to accept and believe the intentions of God to save them. Their refusal to depart from Egypt would forfeit them to be a chosen nation and their salvation.

### **Application Today**

The audience of the message first applies to everyone under the sway of Sin. All humanity struggling with deficient human nature. It further addresses those suffering guilt of wrongs committed in the past. Then this will also apply to those challenged by addiction of drugs, demon possession.

Humanity today should be aware of the perfect initial state of mankind. It was not within purpose of God to have mankind suffering the way human suffers today. Each one consider that all human was made in the image of God. None is superior over the another. All mankind was equally made with a right to represent God.

Humanity has to be informed of the cosmic great controversy between good and evil. The truth about the existence of Satan and sin. The enemy still sneaks into people's lives to change human's course of life for worse. Satan is not a friend of human kind but a hidden enemy. When one thinks is wise besides God can fall as a

prey of the Devil, hence a warning from Apostle Peter, “ Be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary the Devil walk about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour. Resist him...” (1 Pet 5:8-9).

The human denial of sin or wrong act committed by oneself is an effort to conceal one true self. Just as Adam and Eve made a vain attempt to rationalize their sin is a proof of widening proximity from God. The more one conceals own wrong without confessing to God, the more is that person’s transformation in to the character of the deceiver, the Devil. A habitual denial of wrong deceives the doer in to false freedom, while the sin is not removed but transforms its victim and becoming more visible.

Just as Adam and Even tried to hide from God; feeling unfit to be in the presence of God, that is how sin affect believers. When sin is committed it changes one’s self concept and reduces self-esteem. It opens the gate to the lower and debased form of life. Sin diminished the dignity and honour in man. Humans see themselves unworthy of good life.

The meaning of the return of God is meant to redeem our lost battle and status. Confession of the true self and ownership of own wrongs invokes the attitude of asking for mercy from God who visits in mercy. God remembers His people when afflicted by sin and Satan. The messianic prophecy in Isaiah 60:1-2 is fulfilled in Luke 4:18-19. When the Messiah came he set free the captives and comforted the broken hearted. The messiah’s work is relevant today for the end time generation.

### **Nakedness עירום**

Humanity today follows after the fallen previous generation since the fall of Adam and Eve. That means anyone is born naked; defeated by sin. Human degeneracy and perversion is not a new or recent phenomenon, but has been a

perpetual descent of human brokenness. Since human's defeat in Eden almost all resistance against evil is diminished. Humanity has lost its status of glory and honour. The Apostle Paul says " All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God." Romans 3:23.

Inability of governments and society to resist violence, all manner of sexual orientations (LGBTQ+), escalating divorce cases and even joining of satanic cults are an evidence of how we are vulnerable to both evil and Satan's ploy. What used to be the social greatness and moral stability is wilfully repealed from the constitutions of the countries, kingdoms and moral society. It is an indicative of the fact that sin is in force, overwhelming a little remnant of desire to do good.

### **The Message to End Time Church**

The distinctive sign should be found among God's people living just before the Second Advent of Christ. That sign is the pure character of God (the garment of Christ) or His image on their foreheads. The character of the saints is juxtaposed with the character of the world. Those of the world present the name of the beast on their foreheads (Rev 13:16) and the serpent's deceptive power (Rev 16:14).

Of all those that are redeemed in the end-times will not be found naked but dressed with the righteousness of Christ. God's will be presented as victorious over prevailing sinful habits that have chained the inhabitants of the world. They stand before the throne of the Lamb clothed in white robes (Rev7:9). The end time saints will stand with the corresponding likeness to Christ; "the seal of the living God will be placed upon those only who bear a likeness to Christ in Character."<sup>25</sup> It is the sign

---

<sup>25</sup> Ellen, G. White, "Like Christ in Character," *Review and Herald*, May 21, 1895. <https://m.egwwritings.org/en/book/96.893>

of the completed reconciliation with God and a restored status Adam and Eve lost in the beginning of the world.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter Five (5) will serve as the summary and the conclusion of this thesis. As stated in the statement of the problem and the purpose of the study, the thesis has observed incoherent interpretations and meaning of words “naked, shame, clothing/garment and covering” as used in Genesis 2:25 and Genesis 3:1-21.

There are three (3) Biblical schools of thought among Old Testament scholarship and are as follows: Human vulnerability view, which interprets the use of the above words with spiritual and physical human experience that had psychological effect. The serpent is identified as a real creature. Sexual desire view relates that nakedness and the experience in Genesis 3:1-21 had to do with sex and had sexual connotations, while Human development views the experience of Genesis 2:25 and Genesis 3:21 as human developmental process.

Given the above varied schools of thought, Chapter 3 of this thesis pursued the historical and literary analysis of the book of Genesis. The thesis has established Moses as the author of the book of Genesis. The disparity brought about the creation story being at the beginning of earth’s history and the emergence of Moses who lived later with Israel in Egypt does not pose a challenge. The creation and the fall account came to Moses from existing records handed down, researched and compiled by Moses.

The creation and the fall accounts which testified to Seth, Noah and Abraham are used by Moses to address the Hebrews in Egypt. It is a message to God’s people

under slavery. The slavery and clothing customs in Egypt and Asia forms an informative background to historical context of Genesis 3:1-21. Slaves did not have a right to themselves and were attached to their masters. They had a forced labour and did not have a right to own land. Slaves were scarcely and poorly clothed and as such it described who they were and their feelings.

This Thesis as an Exegetical paper has examined literary context of Genesis 3 as located in the first major section of the book of Genesis (Gen. 1-11), and in its own sequence follows the two creation accounts (Gen. 1 and 2) and followed by genealogy (Gen. 4 and 5). This thesis has studied Genesis 3:1-21 together with Genesis 2:25 on account of the recurrence of the words “naked” and “shame”. The paper has observed the thematic content of the temptation and the fall as they appear in Genesis 3. It has noted the significance of the intentional literary style that begins Genesis 3 with a new character to give remarkable note on the identity of the serpent. It has been observed that there is multiple genre within the passage, such as poetic and dialogue sections in the general narrative framework of Genesis 3.

There are interpretative problems identified in the study of Genesis 2:25 and 3:1-21 and are as follows: 1. The two words in Hebrew which are translated ‘naked’ in both Genesis 2:25, and in Genesis 3:7,8, 11 may confuse the English reader. The modern reader is left with an impression that physical nakedness (nudity) as seen today is original and natural from the creator’s hand without accounting for the emergence of sin. 2. The identity of the serpent is minimized to a mere creature yet it has a speech which casts a mythical treatment of the text. The textual analysis above has proved to recognize the Serpent as the historical figure with intellects that is involved in the fall of mankind and stands in adversity to God. It is the position of this

theses that the serpent refers to Satan that has appeared early in the history of mankind.

The grammatical analysis of Genesis 2:25 on the clauses: “and they were” and “man and his wife” has attributed characters and their unique status a subject of important scrutiny. The word-play on the עָרוּמִים of Genesis 2:25 and עָרוֹם that modifies the serpent in Genesis 3:1 contributes a linguistic technical relationship between the couple and the serpent. The meaning of עָרוֹם which means naked, bare and defeat also means prudent and crafty. The author used the word to suggest that the couple was created perfectly prudent (wise) with nothing hidden from each other nor a need of an effort to conceal from God and from each other. At the same time the author used a proleptic technique to enforce an anticipation of defeat, nakedness and vulnerability on the mankind’s part in Genesis 3. The thesis has established the meaning of shame to be “dishonour and humiliation”. Adam and Eve in Genesis 2:25 were not yet dishonoured and had no loss of status attracted to them.

It is noted that the serpent’s deceptive עָרוֹם character is not stated with word but rather allowed the serpent to dramatize it to oppose and accuse God. When Adam and Eve chose to eat the fruit of the tree they became naked עֵירֹם thus they were defeated, and from there henceforth were vulnerable to the serpent’s attacks.

The couple adopted the character of their captor and began to conceal their new status with leaves, and in self-defense accused God.

The aspect of garment and covering has been defined with the word study of כְּתָנִית and לְבַשׁ. כְּתָנִית is translated garment or tunic and is modified by עוֹר which applies to both for mankind and animals. The plural is used for כְּתָנִית which suggested that God used skin for both man and his wife. The root verb לְבַשׁ is translated to

suggest that the act of covering is initiated and acted by the God. God in Genesis 3:21 ends as the major and popular character that acts to cover man and his wife.

In Chapter 4 the thesis presents the theological and practical analysis. Genesis 2:25 registers the meaning of a man created in the image of God; the man who is not under captivity of any foreign master. It is an indicator of a man whose identity is with God the creator. Genesis 3:1 portrays the lurking enemy who waits to change man to his image. It is a demonstration to Israel that their slavery is a matter of cosmic conflict, and present to us the reality of the concept of the great controversy.

Nakedness in Genesis 3:7 shows the nature of sin and its effect of mankind. Sin is aimed at negatively changing man's relationship with God and with one another. A committed sin leaves man weak and vulnerable to the subsequent attacks of the enemy. Adam lost the honorable status of having dominion on the earth and was humiliated to be the subject of Satan.

The thesis presents the application of the message to Israel and to the audience of today. Moses posed to Israel in Egypt under slavery, the message based on the covenant God made with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The promise reiterated by Joseph, which was the promise to be returned to their land. While the slavery forced the Hebrew people to have lost right to own land and status, God remembered them to grant them land, personal and national status.

God's response to mankind's fall is the manifestation of his grace. It is shown in God providing a garment of animal skin. God offered atonement for man to have a garment. It was a way to restore Adam to his priestly status dressed in the righteousness of Jesus Christ. The righteousness of Christ restores both human's relationship with God and his appearance when serving before God.

## Conclusion

The theological implication of “Naked but not Ashamed” עָרוּמִים... וְלֹא יִתְבַּשְׁשׁוּ in Genesis 2:25 point to the fact that man and his wife were wise, prudent, not yet defeated by the enemy and vulnerable. They did not need to conceal themselves before God. They were covered with the light of God’s presence.

The emergence of sin in Genesis 3 changed the perfect status from being not ashamed to shame, from being prudent and open to God to being defeated and vulnerable to sin and to satanic temptations, thus the use of two words עָרוּם and עֵירָם clears the apparent conflicting use of the English word naked in both Genesis 2:25 and Genesis 3. The understanding of עֵירָם is more than absence of physical clothes. It is the change from the image of God to the image of the serpent. It is an experience of defeat and subjugation under the authority of the enemy. It is a loss and a departure of the glory that covered Adam and Eve.

The use of the adjective עָרוּם to describe the serpent is an intentional revelation of the deceptive character of the serpent and pre-emptive statement of his attack on mankind. Genesis 2:25 is important to the understanding of Genesis 3:1 on the identity of the serpent.

בוֹשׁ is not just the psychological shame as understood in English, instead it is a loss princely and priestly status and humiliation.

The use of קָגוּר, the human made covering on the part of Adam is an indicator that a form of a physical covering has escaped or lost from them. The act of concealing behaviour indicates the new nature of his nakedness as psychological, physical and spiritual. It shows the loss of oneself and now possessed by another being.

The garment made of skin served the atoning function to restore man to a saving relationship with God. The nature of a garment has a positive effect to the inner self. It did not only end on the skin but it redefined his identity before God. It reassigned him priestly responsibility. The act of covering reflects God's gracious posture towards mankind.

### **Contribution**

This thesis contributes to the body of knowledge in the following ways: Thesis add to the Theological and Biblical body of research as it sheds light on the use of words: “naked”, “shame” and “covering” in Genesis 2 and Genesis 3, particularly in view of How God relates with mankind. The thesis presents nakedness of עֲרוּמִים as reflection of the initial purpose of God's relationship with mankind based on him being made in His image. עֲרוּמִים establishes God's dignified, unfallen, authoritative representative relationship with Adam and Eve. The paper in the sense of the above word submits expectations of God upon mankind as an exclusive subservience to God and to no other authority. Mankind were not ashamed; thus, they were not serving God from result of humiliation and defeat, which would render a an unwilful service. It reverts that God does not take a forced service. Nakedness of עֵירֶם brings the biblical understanding that sin carries along itself a loss of image of God, vulnerability to the enemy, the consequential propensity to sin, and thus a loss of status and duties assigned by God to Adam. The relationship based on the “covering”; As stated above, that Adam and Eve were created in the image God, that signified similarity of glorious and estimable character of God and its presence in the life Adam. The glorious covering fitted Adam for service before God in the Garden. This similarity is what made Adam and Eve comfortable in the presence of God. The act of

“covering” לְבַשׁ Adam and Eve with “tunic” כְּתָנִים still remained God’s gracious prerogative to reinstate His character and status for service.

It further contributes to the understanding of Seventh-day Adventist fundamental beliefs to ordinary member of the church. Doctrine six (#6) on Creation, The Nature of Humanity, doctrine seven (#7). This thesis relates in depth meaning of nakedness in Genesis 2:25 with Genesis 1:26-28 and expounds the concept of the creation of mankind in the image of God. The idea of “Nakedness and not ashamed” presents undefeated Adam and Eve as created with glorious and wise status and did not need any other way to become wise than being obedient. The thesis shed more light on The Great Controversy, doctrine eight (#8). The serpents’ demonstrable adversity to God is explained by the use of אֱרִיץ to describe his deceptive nature. It further expressed by the way the serpent of acted his disguise. The serpent’s proposal for Eve to doubt God given wisdom and choose the serpent idea of obtaining it. This proved mankind’s standing on the great controversy.

It contributes to the understanding of Experience of Salvation, doctrine ten (#10). The concept of justification by faith is rarely seen or described in Genesis 3:21 as the Adventist fundamental believe has laboured with Zachariah 3:4. This thesis exhumes God’s act to cover Adam and Eve with the tunics a way of demonstrating God’s gracious initiative of atoning, reinstating their status to serve; a privilege which they lost. Adam’s justification, acceptance and fitness for service are intertwined in God’s one act of covering with tunics. Genesis 3:21’s use of לְבַשׁ and כְּתָנִים can become a text of reference for Seventh-day Adventist’s understanding of justification by faith. The aspect of tunic כְּתָנִים as used in the Sanctuary to refer to priestly garments. Though it is not the primary purpose of this paper to exhaustively describe Eden as the sanctuary and its priesthood, Christ’s Ministry in the Heavenly Sanctuary,

doctrine twenty-four(#24) makes reference to Levitical priesthood only. The doctrine does not explicitly trace priesthood services to Adam. This paper provides just a leading light for understanding that the effort of atoning for sin started right in its inception in Garden of Eden was preceded by Adam's right of service before God as a priest and later reinstated and covered with tunics after the fall.

### **Recommendation**

This thesis recognizes a need of more research on the establishment of the nature Adam's original garment before the fall. As other scholars point to what Psalm 104:2 and Psalm 8:5 as garment of light, while it may be true, it requires substantive research.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bal, Mieke. "Sexuality, Sin and Sorrow: The Emergence of the Female Character (A Reading of Genesis 1-3)." *Poetics Today* 6, no. 1/2 (1984), 21-42.
- Barr, James. *The Garden of Eden and The Hope of Immortality*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Bergen Robert, D. ed. *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*. Eisenbraunns: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994.
- Brown Francis, with S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. 2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_, with S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Based on the lexicon of William Gesenius. Oxford: Clarendon, 1952.
- Carr, David M. *The Erotic Word: Sexuality, Spirituality, and the Bible*. New Yoek: Oxford University Press, 2005. Accessed 13 February 2023. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=4700678>.
- Davidson, Richard M. "The Theology of Sexuality in the Beginning: Genesis 3." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 26, no. 2 (1988): 121-31.
- Davidson, Richard. "Theology of Sexuality in the Beginning: Genesis 3." Dissertation Andrews University Seminary. Berrien Spring, MI: Michigan, Andrews Univesity, 1988.
- Davidson, Richard. *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Douglas J. D. and Merrill C. Tenney. "dress." *The Zondervan Illustrated Bible Dictionary*. revised. 2011.
- Doukhan Jacques, *Seventh-day Adventist International Commentary: Genesis*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2016.
- Dyrness William, A., *Themes in the Old Testament Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1977.
- Evans A. Craig, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen. *The Book of Genesis : Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed., Craig A. Evans, et al., BRILL, 2012. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=919594>

- Fretheim, Terence E. *Genesis, The New Interpreter's Bible, A Commentary in Twelve volumes*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1994.
- Fowler, John M. "Humanity before Sin" *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, ed. Raoul Dederen, 271-313. Hagerstown: Review and Herald, 2000.
- Gibson, John C. L. *Genesis*, Daily Study Bible series.1 Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1981.
- Goelet Ogden. "Nudity in Ancient Egypt." *University of Chicago Journal*, winter, 12 (1993):22.
- Gottstein, Alon Goshen. "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature." *The Harvard Theological Review* 87, no. 2 (1994): 171-95.
- Grossfeld Bernard, trans. *The Aramaic Bible: The Targum Onqelos*, (MN: Liturgical Press, 1990), 46.
- Grudem Wayne, *Bible Doctrine: Essential Teaching of the Christian Faith*, ed., Jeff Purswell. Leicester, ENgland: IVP, 1999.
- Gwala, Mzonzima. "The Reception of Genesis 1-3 in Nguni Culture" Doctoral Dissertation, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch, South Africa, 2004.
- Hamilton, Victor P. *The New International Commentary of the Old Testament: The Book of Genesis chapters 1-17*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Hanley, Ryan Cole. "The Use of Nakedness Imagery as Theological Language in The Old Testament." PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2019. Accessed 9 February 2023. [https://repository.sbts.edu/bitstream/handle/10392/5818/Hanley\\_sbts\\_0207D\\_10517.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://repository.sbts.edu/bitstream/handle/10392/5818/Hanley_sbts_0207D_10517.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y).
- Harrison R. K. "Genesis" *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*. Completely Revised. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1915-1982. 2.
- Hartley, John E. *New International Biblical Commentary: Genesis*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Jackson, Bill. *The Biblical Metanarrative*. Corona: Radical Middle Press, 2014.
- Jason, Borges. "'Dignified': An Exegetical Soteriology of Divine Honour." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 66, no. 1 (2013): 74-87. Accessed 10 February 2023. 10.1017/S0036930612000312.
- Jayson, Georges and Mark D. Baker. *Ministering in Honor-Shame Cultures: Biblical Foundations and Practical Essentials*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2016. Accessed 10 February 2023. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=4689221>.

- Kaufman Gershen, *The Psychology of Shame: Theory and Treatment of Shame-Based Syndromes*, 2nd ed. New York: Springer Publishing Company, 1996.
- Kempf Stephen, "A Discourse Analysis of Genesis 2:4b- 3:24 With Implication for interpretation and Bible Translation." Ph.D. Dissertation, Laval University, Quebec, Canada. 1995.
- Lambden, Stephen N. *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden*, edited by Paul Morris, and Deborah Sawyer. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1992. Accessed 13 February 2023. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=436140>.
- Robert Letellier, *Creation, Sin and Reconciliation: Reading Primordial and Patriarchal Narrative in the Book of Genesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015. Accessed 10 February 2023. *ProQuest eBook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=4535114>.
- Leupold, H. C. "Genesis." *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopaedia of the Bible*. Edited by Merrill, C. Tenney. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975.
- Lim, T. K. Johnson. *Grace in the Midst of Judgment: Grappling with Genesis 1-11*, De Gruyter, 2002. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=935771>.
- Marks, John H. *The Interpreter's One-volume Commentary on the Bible*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1971.
- Matthews, A. Kenneth. *The New American Commentary: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of the Holy Scripture, Genesis*. Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 1996.
- Matthews, H. Victor. and Don, C. Benjamin. *Social World of Ancient Israel 1250-587 BCE*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1993.
- Nichol Francis, ed. *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary (SDABC)*, rev. ed. Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1976-1978.
- Nichol, Francis D. "Humanity before Sin." In *Handbook of the Seventh-day Adventist Theology: Commentary Reference Series*. Edited by Raoul Dederen, Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 2000. 12:235.
- Nichol, Francis D. Ed. *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary (SDABC)*, rev. ed. Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1976-1978.
- Niehr H. "ārôm" *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Grand Rapids: Erdmans, 2001.

- Ojewole, Afolarin Olutunde “The Seed in Genesis 3:15—An Exegetical and Intertextual Study” (PhD Dissertation, Andrews University Seminary Studies, Michigan, 2002.
- Ouro, Roberto. “The Garden of Eden Account: The Chiastic Structure of Genesis 2-3.” *Andrews University Seminary studies* 40, no. 2 (2002): 219-243.
- Pârvan, Alexandra. “Genesis 1-3: Augustine and Origen on the coats of Skin.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 66, no. 1 (2012): (2012): 56-92.
- Pattison, Stephen. *Shame: Theory, Therapy, Theology*. Cambridge University Press, 2000. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=143892>.
- Patton, H. Matthew and Putnam Frederic Clarke. *Basics of Hebrew Discourse A Guide to Working with Hebrew Prose and Poetry*, Edited by, Miles V. Van Pelt. Grand Raids: Zondervan, 2019.
- Rennalls, David E. “How Penal Substitution addresses our Shame: The Bible’s Shame Dynamics and their Relationships to Evangelical Doctrine,” *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 23, no. 3 (2019): 81.
- Rodriguez, Angel Manuel. “Eden and Israelite Sanctuary,” *Biblical Research Institute*, (April 2002), 1-5. Accessed on 8 February 2023. [https://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/eden-israelite-sanctuary\\_0.pdf](https://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/eden-israelite-sanctuary_0.pdf).
- Routledge Robin. *Old Testament Theology: A Thematic approach*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2008.
- Sailhame, John H. *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Regency Reference Library, 1990.
- Sailhamer, John. H. *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary: Genesis to Leviticus*. Edited by Tremper Longman III and David E. Garland. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.
- Sailhamer, John. H. *The Pentateuch as Narrative: A Biblical- Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.
- Sarna, N. M. *Genesis*. English and Hebrew; Commentary in English; Title on half t.p.: Genesis Be-reshit. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia, PA: Jewish, 1989.
- Sarna, Nahum. M. and Shanks Hershel. *Ancient Israel: From Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple*. Edited by Hershel Shanks. Washington DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 2011.
- Satlow, Michael L. “Jewish Constructions of Nakedness in Late Antiquity.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116, no. 3 (1997): 429-454.

- Sawyer, John F. A. *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden*, edited by Paul Morris, and Deborah Sawyer. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1992. Accessed 13 February 2023. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=436140>.
- Seabass, Host. “shame.” *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by Botterweck Johannes and Ringgren Helmer. Translated by T. John Wills. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975. 2:50-60.
- Seventh-day Adventists Believe: A Biblical Exposition of Fundamental Doctrines*, Silver Spring: Pacific Press, 2005.
- Simpson, Cuthbert A. *The Interpreter’s Bible: Genesis*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1952.
- Snoeberger, Mark A. “Nakedness and Covering in Genesis 3: What They Are and Why they Matter.” *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 22 (2017): 21–33. Accessed 7 February 2023. <http://www.dbts.edu/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/E.-Snoeberger-2.2-Final.pdf>
- Stratton, Beverly J. *Out of Eden: Reading, Rhetoric, and Ideology in Genesis 2-3*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2009. accessed 10 February 2023. *ProQuest Ebook Central*. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=436946>.
- Swete Henry Barclay, ed. *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*, 4<sup>th</sup> (Cambridge University Press, 1930). Thomas, Robert L. and W. Don Wilkins. *NAS Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible with Hebrew-Aramaic and Greek Dictionaries*. Anaheim, CA: Foundation Publications, 1998.
- Toler, Emily. “A Recuperative Theology of the Body: Nakedness in Genesis 3 and 9.20-2.” *Denison Journal of Religion* 6 (2008): 50-65.
- Toler, Emily. “A Recuperative Theology of the Body: Nakedness in Genesis 3 and 9.20-27.” *Denison Journal of Religion* 8, no. 6 (2008). 50-65. Accessed December 2022. <http://digitalcommons.denison.edu/religion/vol8/iss1/6>.
- Unger, Merrill. F. “Genesis.” *The New Unger’s Bible Dictionary*. Edited by R. K. Harrison. Chicago: Moody Press, 1988.
- Vogt, Peter. T. *Interpreting Pentateuch: An Exegetical Handbook*. Edited by David. M. Haward Jr. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2009.
- Vos, Haward. F. *Nelson’s New Illustrated Bible Manner and Customs: How the People of the Bible Really lived*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999.
- Walsh, Jerome T. “Genesis 2:4b-3:24: A Synchronic Approach,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96, no. 2 (1977): 165.
- Walsh, Jerome. T. *Old Testament Narrative: A Guide to Interpretation*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.

- Waltke, Bruce K. *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical and Thematic Approach*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and O'Connor M. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Walton, John H. *The NIV Application Commentary: From Biblical to Contemporary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2001.
- Wenham, G. J. *Word Biblical Commentary: Genesis 1-15*. Word Biblical Commentary 1. Dallas, TX: Word, 2002.
- Westermann, Claus. *Creation*. London: SPCK, 1974.
- White, Ellen G., "Like Christ in Character." *Review and Herald*, May 21, 1895. <https://m.egwwritings.org/en/book/96.893>.
- Wolf Herbert. *Introductions to the Old Testament: Pentateuch*. Chicago: Moody Publishers, 1991.
- Zevit, Ziony. *What Really Happened in the Garden of Eden?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013. Accessed 13 February 2023. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aua/detail.action?docID=3421339>. Created from aua on 2023-02-13 07:09:46.

VITA