6-1-1959

The Doctrine of Man in Genesis

Pyeng Seh Oh

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN IN GENESIS

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

---

by

Pyeng Seh Oh

June 1959

Approved by: Alfred von Rohr Sauer
Advisor

Walter A. Fuchs
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A student of the Bible and theology today often notes a topic in Christian periodicals such as "Return to Biblical Theology,"[1] "The Death and Rebirth of Old Testament Theology,"[2] "The Reviving Theology of the Old Testament,"[3] or "The Renaissance of Biblical Theology."[4] These are only a few examples. Since the publication of Eduard König's Theologie des Alten Testaments in 1922, as the first-fruits of a new development, numerous volumes of Old Testament theology have been written and published.[5]

It seems probable that the present revival of Old Testament theology has several causes. One of the causes

---

[1]W. F. Albright, Christian Century, Nov. 19, 1958, pp. 1328-31.

[2]J. D. Smart, The Journal of Religion, XXIII (Jan., 1943), 1-11; XXIII (April, 1943), 125-36.

[3]W. A. Irwin, Ibid., XXV (Oct., 1945), 235-46.

[4]E. R. Lacheman, The Journal of Bible and Religion, XIX (April, 1951), 71-75.

[5]For the bibliographical studies on the subject, see W. A. Irwin, "Trends in Old Testament Theology," Ibid., XIX (Oct., 1951), 183-85; E. Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, translated by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: Hodder & Stoughtone, 1958), pp. 20-26; E. J. Young, The Study of Old Testament Theology Today (London: J. Clark & Co., 1958), pp. 7-13.

is the increasing emphasis on the full trustworthiness of the Bible. Archaeology has shed light upon Old Testament history as being far more trustworthy than was acknowledged by Wellhausen and others.[6] Commenting on Old Testament history, William F. Albright, one of the greatest of American archaeologists, says:

> Thanks to modern research we now recognize its substantial historicity. The narratives of the patriarchs, of Moses and exodus, of the conquest of Canaan . . . have all been confirmed and illustrate to an extent that I should have thought impossible forty years ago.[7]

Along with the interest of archaeology, the advance of linguistic study brought to us the old languages of the neighbors of the patriarchs such as Sumerian, Akkadian, Hurrian, Hittite and Ugaritic. These languages contributed to a better understanding of the background of the Old Testament. Furthermore the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1945[8] greatly increased interest in the Old Testament field.

---

[6] H. H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord and other Essays on the Old Testament (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952), p. 271.

[7] W. F. Albright, op. cit., p. 1329.

[8] This used to be dated in 1947. Cf. Joachim Jeremias, "The Qumran Texts and the New Testament," The Expository Times, LXX (Dec., 1958), 68; W. H. Brownlee, "Muhammad ed-Deeb's Own Story of His Scroll Discovery," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XVI (Oct., 1957), 236-39.

In the nineteenth century, thinkers, Old Testament scholars without exception, were greatly influenced by the "dialectical concept" of the Hegelian philosophy of history and Darwinian evolution. The application of Hegelian principles to the reconstruction of the Old Testament was established by Julius Wellhausen.[9] His formulation of a system of the religious evolution of Israel is demonstrated in Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels. Consequently, Wellhausen concludes that Genesis is an unhistorical book.[10] This view is primarily contrary to the testimony of the Bible; its erroneousness is also proved by modern science. We quote from W. F. Albright's monumental book From Stone Age to Christianity:

> In dealing with historical evolution there are many seductive errors of method into which historians have been beguiled by insufficient facts or by inadequate perspective. For example, the sequence of evolution is sometimes reversed and vestigial features are considered as rudimentary. . . . Then, again, evolution may be telescoped into an impossible brief period, as has been done by the Wellhausen school in reconstructing the development of the religion of Israel or by Breasted in dating the dawn of conscience. Evolution is not always homogeneous in human history--in fact the reverse is probably more common, as in the development of Egyptian civilization, for example.[11]

---

[9] W. F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, (Second Edition with a new Introduction; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1957), pp. 86-89. This will be cited as FSAC.

[10] Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels, Dritte Ausgabe (Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1886), pp.309ff.

[11] W. F. Albright, FSAC, pp. 118-119.

Since the power of the radical literary criticism of the Old Testament has declined because of the fresh light from new discoveries, Old Testament studies have gradually turned toward exegetical and theological fields. Along with this trend we have observed that a more conservative mood has characterized Old Testament scholars.[12] However, the demand for a new interest in the Old Testament does not claim to be the revival of an older orthodoxy.

Many commentaries and expositions on Genesis came out in past generations. Many books also appeared on the history of the religion of Israel. However, scarcely any synthesizing treatment of Genesis has ever appeared. Voluminous books on the doctrine of man have appeared in Christendom as a branch of Systematic Theology. On the other hand, there are ethnological and sociological studies of the Old Testament. In The Religion of the Semites,[13] William Robertson Smith correlated ethnological and Semitic data with great skill and learning. Max Weber's sociological study influenced contemporary German students of the history of Old Testament religion.[14] One of the most important sociological approaches to the Old Testament is done by J. Pedersen in his

---

[12]H. H. Rowley, op. cit., p. 271.

[13]Reprint (New York: Meridian Books, 1956).

[14]W. F. Albright, FSAC, p. 95.

book Israel: Its Life and Culture.[15] There are many books dealing with Old Testament in general and Pre-Mosaic revelation in particular. A special study, however, has not been made about the teaching concerning man in the Pre-Mosaic age, namely in Genesis.

The present writer's interest deals with "the doctrine of man in Genesis." "Doctrine" here means plainly "teaching," or "instruction" as the Greek word διδαχή suggests. It is, therefore, the fundamental teaching about man in the Pre-Mosaic revelation that is dealt with in this thesis. This study will treat both individual man and a group of men, viz., a society. It is plain from the previous explanation that this study is not limited by the traditional dogmatic division of Christian anthropology. It is a synthetic or systematic exegesis instead of the familiar consecutive exegesis, chapter by chapter, as presented in commentaries.[16] This material will be collected under five cardinal themes on the doctrine of man in Genesis, with each theme displaying disparities and similarities of opinion in various

---

[15] I-IV (London: Oxford University Press, 1926 and 1940). For various aspects of Old Testament studies, see H. F. Hahn, Old Testament in Modern Research (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1954).

[16] J. Barr, "The Problem of Old Testament Theology and the History of Religion," Canadian Journal of Theology, III (July, 1957), 141-49.

passages of Genesis. These themes will be assessed as a whole, and related to one another. Since this thesis is a synthetic treatment of Genesis, it requires thorough lexicographical work, and a patient, grammatico-historical interpretation of the text. Thus this is primarily a descriptive work; it seeks a clearer understanding of God's revelation concerning man. Because the doctrine of man comes from the revealed will of God, our investigation of the anthropology is reflected and deeply rooted in theology, - i.e., the doctrine of God. We are indeed studying about man, but it is not a record of man's search for himself or man's investigation at all. It is rather what God has said - about man, what God has revealed of man's nature and his need in His supernatural revelation. In a proper sense Genesis is a genuinely oriental book speaking with oriental images and thought patterns. "God did not give His revelation in a vacuum. He gave it in the language and in the modes of expression that would be understood by those who received it."[7] Therefore it is necessary to search the historical and social background of the people who are mentioned in Genesis and to find fresh light from the various sources.

---

[17] E. J. Young, op. cit., p. 45.

As the nature of the thesis demands, the present work is a selective study. The first theme is the creation of man. In this chapter we shall attach special attention to the nature of man on the basis of lexicographical investigation. There will be an emphasis on the basic meaning of the נֶפֶשׁ. It will be noted that there is no discussion of the natural scientific approach to the creation accounts. In connection with "the image of God," its concept and its state after the Fall will be discussed. The second theme is man's sin. We shall consider in this section the origin of sin: the origin of evil, the Fall of man and original sin. In "the nature of sin" we shall examine the concept and the principle of sin. The third theme is God's covenant with man. In the concept of בְּרִית we shall see the usage of בְּרִית and the significance of διαθήκη; special attention will be given to the covenant as God's monergism. Then we shall investigate the historical development of "covenant" in Genesis. Lastly the emphasis will be laid on the covenant as God's redemptive gift. The fourth theme is man's worship of God. The special characteristics of Yahweh worship will be discussed first. In the second part, "the distinctive sacrifice in Genesis," a lexicographical and historical investigation will be offered. The fifth and final theme is man's relation to society. First we shall discuss the problem of the individual and the community. Consideration

will be given to archaeological discoveries and the customs and laws of the neighboring peoples of the patriarchs. Throughout the chapter we shall take note of fresh light from Near Eastern studies. Finally we shall observe the grace of God even in sinful human society.

Since it is a synthetic approach, the paper will not contain an exhaustive theological and philosophical discussion of each topic. No attempt will be made to give the historical development of the interpretation of each passage, as some commentaries do. The translation of the Hebrew passages employed will generally be the writer's own literal translation, although other versions will constantly be checked.

CHAPTER II

THE CREATION OF MAN

The Nature of Man

The book of Genesis offers us two narratives of the creation of man: the first chapter gives a general story and the second chapter a more specific account. According to the latter, "Yahweh God formed man of dust from the ground" (Genesis 2:7).[1] This passage suggests that man was moulded (יָצַר)[2] by the immediate operation of the Creator. The material used for the creation of man was dust,[3] therefore physically man is an earthen creature, nothing but dry, fine crumbs of earth, and small particles of ground.

Man was not generated either as the offspring of God or as a part of the universe, nor did he develop from a

---

[1] The reference of Genesis will be only by numbers.

[2] Cf. Jer. 18:1-4.

[3] עָפָר is the accusative of the material employed. C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, in Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, translated from the German by J. Martin (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1951), I, 78; E. Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, second English edition by A. E. Cowley (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946), p. 371. Cf. LXX καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

lower animal, but he was made from lifeless dust. The word עָפָר could be used by itself, as is seen in other places, but עְפַר מִן הָאֲדָמָה clearly indicates the natural dust of the ground. These words עְפַר מִן הָאֲדָמָה are certainly related to the word אֲדָמָה, and they seem to stress the significance of earthly origin. This is proved not only by God's expression (3:19), but also by man's own expression when he thinks of himself as a creature (18:27).

Man was created of dust, but men were also collectively called "all flesh" כָּל-בָּשָׂר (6:12).[4] In Genesis the word בָּשָׂר is used for "flesh of a living individual" (2:21), for flesh of animals (41:2-19), for the material of the male organ of generation (17:11,14,23,24,25), for kindred (2:23,24; 29:14; 37:27), for man as over against God (6:3), for all living beings (6:13,17,19; 7:21; 9:11,15,16,17), and for all creatures (7:15,16; 8:17). The word בָּשָׂר, as it has been shown above, is used of either blood relation or of the muscular part of the body in distinction from other parts, such as skin, bones, blood and the like.[5]

The two words, בָּשָׂר, עָפָר are both used for man's nature, but neither of them indicates, strictly speaking, the modern sense of "body." Therefore it is fair to say, "Hebrew has

---

[4]Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 141.

[5]A. B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, edited from the author's manuscripts by S. D. F. Salmond (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), p. 188.

no proper word for body; it never needed one so long as the body was the man."[6]

There is another Hebrew word for body גְּוִיָּה. It is used in Genesis only once (47:18) and less than a dozen times in the whole Old Testament. Therefore this גְּוִיָּה would not be a representative word for body either in Genesis or the rest of the Old Testament, since we find נֶפֶשׁ nine times in Genesis and בָּשָׂר thirty-two times. Furthermore the word גְּוִיָּה is sometimes used for a living body (47:18, cf. Neh. 9:37) or bodies of supernatural beings (Ezek. 1:11; Dan. 10:6), but more probably for the dead body or carcass.[7]

Besides these terms, the word "bone" עֶצֶם (2:23; 7:13; 17:23,26; 29:14; 50:25) and "bowel" מֵעַיִם (15:4; 25:23) are used for the human body in Genesis. However these are the names of human organs, and they do not represent the total body.

---

[6]H. W. Robinson, "Hebrew Psychology," The People and the Book (Oxford: A. S. Peake, Clarendon Press, 1925), p. 362. Cf. D. R. G. Owen, Body and Soul (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1956), p. 175; A. B. Davidson, op. cit., p. 188.

[7]Judg. 14:8,9; 1 S. 31:10,12; Psa. 110:6; Neh. 3:3. Cf. A. B. Davidson, op. cit., p. 188. The most of the reference work I owe to The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament (Fifth edition; London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, n.d.), and Robert Young, Analytical Concordance to the Bible (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, c.1955).

Man was not only formed of dust, but there was also breathed into his nostrils the breath of life נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים by God (2:7). This word is used once again (7:22) in Genesis. The word נְשָׁמָה denotes breath of God (Job 37:10), of man (1K. 17:17), and even including animals (7:22). Therefore it is applicable to any living thing; it means simply "breath" and also "blast" (II S. 22:16). נְשָׁמָה also goes with חַיִּים and designates "the breath ensuring life."[8]

To indicate the breath of man Genesis also employs רוּחַ (6:17; 7:15) and in the twenty-second verse of the seventh chapter it is used with נִשְׁמַת רוּחַ חַיִּים :נְשָׁמָה. The Septuagint and Vulgate, however, omit רוּחַ, possibly because it seemed to them as a conflicting reading. By רוּחַ is also meant "spirit" (1:2; 6:3; 41:38) and "wind" (3:8; 8:1). Some scholars think that the primary meaning of רוּחַ is "wind."[9] רוּחַ is likewise used of the "emotional aspect of life" (26:35; 41:8; 45:27).[10] The word רוּחַ with חַיִּים (6:17; 7:15) seems to be "breath producing life" or

---

[8]L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, editors, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953), p.294.

[9]H. W. Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1952), p. 82; A. B. Davidson, op. cit., pp. 193ff.; R. B. Girdlestone, Synonyms of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956), p. 59.

[10]H. W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911), p. 19. For further treatment of רוּחַ, see Ibid., pp. 17ff.

"the principle of vitality."[11]

The relationship of נְשָׁמָה and רוּחַ is very close, and they are often used synonymously (Job 27:3; 32:8; 33:4; Isa. 42:5). The two words are both the expression and sign of the inward life and therefore seem to be identical. But if one examines them precisely, he may conclude that רוּחַ would be the expression, and נְשָׁמָה, the principle of life.[12] Yet when these words were employed concerning God's activity, they of course signify the principle, not of His own life, but of that imparted to His creatures.[13] Consequently, the expression: "God breathed into man the breath of life" would mean, man was vitalized by God.[14]

When God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life he became a living being (נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה), i.e., he became alive. What, then, is נֶפֶשׁ? First of all נֶפֶשׁ is "the breathing being" or "that which breathes" (1:20,21,24,30;

---

[11] A. B. Davidson, op. cit., p. 193.

[12] J. R. Van Pelt, "Breath, Breathe, Breathing," The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, edited by J. Orr (Chicago: The Howard-Severance, 1915), p. 518a. This will be cited henceforth as ISBE.

[13] Ibid.

[14] G. E. Wright, God Who Acts (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1952), p. 88.

2:1,9; 35:18). נֶפֶשׁ is possibly derived from Akkadian napištu and it seems originally to have meant "throat."[15] It also means "self" or "person" (12:5,13; 14:21; 19:20; 27:4,19,25,31; 36:6; 46:15,18,22,25,26,27). Therefore in Hebrew "every soul" is every man and "seven souls" means seven people. The other significances of נֶפֶשׁ are "life" (9:4,5,10,12,15,17:14; 19:17; 32:30;[16] 37:21) and "desire," "appetite" or "person" (23:8; 34:3,8; 42:21; 44:30; 49:6).[17]

As we have seen above נֶפֶשׁ represents the living principle. This may be either man or animal. It is interesting to notice the words, "So the man became a living being" וַיְהִי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה. Man does not receive a "soul" נֶפֶשׁ, but he becomes "a being," in other words, one who lives by breathing.[18] This breathing of man is a sign of

---

[15] Koehler and Baumgartner, op. cit., pp. 626-27; H. W. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946), p. 70.

[16] Hebrew, 32:31.

[17] For further statistics of the use of נֶפֶשׁ in the Old Testament, see H. W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man, pp. 15ff.

[18] W. Visoher, The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ, I. Pentateuch, translated by A. B. Crabtree (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), p. 53.

life as it is also a characteristic of animals (1:21). God took dust and caused it to live. He did not take a living animal and make it human. When the breathing of man ceases from man we say he dies. It is good to notice that our breath is not in our power, and that man is from birth to death directly dependent on God.[19]

As it has been seen above נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים (or) רוּחַ חַיִּים and נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה are both related to the idea of "breath" or "life." This similarity is further demonstrated by the interchangeable use of רוּחַ and נֶפֶשׁ. In the Flood account, all living creatures, particularly animals, are called רוּחַ חַיִּים (7:15, cf. 7:22); on the other hand they are also called נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה (9:10, cf. 9:12,15,16). In the description of man's suffering in Genesis the words רוּחַ and נֶפֶשׁ are both employed, e.g., "bitterness of spirit" מֹרַת רוּחַ (26:35) or "His spirit was troubled" וַתִּפָּעֶם רוּחוֹ (41:8), and "the distress of his soul" צָרַת נַפְשׁוֹ (42:21).

The two words are proved to have similar meaning from their parallel use in the rest of the Old Testament; e.g., "I will speak in the anguish of my רוּחַ; I will complain in the bitterness of my נֶפֶשׁ (Job 7:11); and "My נֶפֶשׁ yearns for thee in the night, my רוּחַ within me earnestly seeks

---

[19] Ibid. Cf. H. W. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, pp. 69-70.

thee" (Isa. 26:9), and Psalms 77:3 (Hebrew 4) רוּחַ is used as synonym of נֶפֶשׁ.[20]

In Genesis any distinction of a substantial or elemental kind between רוּחַ and נֶפֶשׁ is not to be understood. Neither is רוּחַ higher than נֶפֶשׁ, or more allied to God.[21] Hence after a careful study of Genesis, we may say with P. Heinisch that it "shows no evidence for considering man trichotomous."[22] Likewise נְשָׁמָה does not denote the spirit of man as distinguished from body and נֶפֶשׁ.[23] However there are certain shades of difference in these two terms; נֶפֶשׁ is well represented as the individual personality in Genesis; but the concept of individual personality is not applicable to רוּחַ, and there seems to be no such idea in Genesis.[24] On the other hand, Genesis does not explain to what degree they differ from each other.[25]

---

[20] Cf. נֶפֶשׁ in Jonah 2:7 (Hebrew 8).

[21] A. B. Davidson, op. cit., p. 200.

[22] P. Heinisch, Theology of the Old Testament, English edition by W. Heidt (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1950), p. 161. Cf. R. F. Weidner, The Doctrine of Man (Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, c.1912), p. 17.

[23] Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 79.

[24] A. B. Davidson, op. cit., p. 200.

[25] The present writer would like to see a further study of this problem as applied to the entire Old Testament.

As we have already seen, man, as a special handiwork of God, was made of dust and became a living being. Whenever one thinks of human nature, immediately he thinks of the terms: "body" and נֶפֶשׁ or their equivalent. It has already been suggested in this paper that there is no exact term for "body" in Hebrew, therefore "body" would simply mean the physical organ of man; and נֶפֶשׁ is the "person" or "being." The words "The man became a living being" (2:7) suggest that man is not a body containing a soul or spirit, nor is he a soul temporarily inhabiting a physical body, but man is described according to his total being.[26] Nevertheless man's nature is precisely given by the two facts: the physical element and the breath of life. In fact Eve was created from one of Adam's ribs, and not from his נֶפֶשׁ or breath-life.

Is there, then, a dualism of "body" and נֶפֶשׁ in Genesis? The answer is negative. It is not only proved by the non-existence of the word "body" in Hebrew, but also by the fact that in Hebrew there is no sharp distinction between physical and psychic terms. The simple reason for the

---

[26] J. Pedersen, Israel (London: Oxford University Press, 1926), p. 99; O. J. Baab, The Theology of the Old Testament (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949), p. 264; S. B. Babbage, Man in Nature and in Grace (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1957), p. 13.

latter is that such exact differentiation was never made in Genesis.[27]

Therefore we would say with H. W. Robinson, "The idea of human nature implies a unity, not a dualism. There is no contrast between the body and the soul, such as the terms instinctively suggest to us."[28] Man is a vital unity and is composed of various interdependent elements, and was conceived as "a unified psycho-physical organism."[29] Man, according to Genesis, is נֶפֶשׁ, but not נֶפֶשׁ imprisoned in a body,[30] nor is there a contrast between the body and נֶפֶשׁ,

---

[27]H. W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man, p. 26.

[28]H. W. Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, p. 83; H. H. Rowley, The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, n.d.), p. 209; G. E. Wright, "The Faith of Israel," The Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952), I, 367-68; D. R. G. Owen, op. cit., p. 175; S. B. Babbage, op. cit., p. 11.

[29]G. E. Wright, "Faith of Israel," p. 368; A. R. Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1949), p. 88; S. B. Babbage, op. cit., p. 11; H. W. Robinson illustrates this idea by, "steam setting an engine in motion," in The Religious Ideas of Old Testament, p. 80

[30]H. W. Robinson, "Hebrew Psychology," p. 362; The Christian Doctrine of Man, p. 27; S. B. Babbage, op. cit., p. 13.

but he is essentially a unitary being. This is clearly shown by the fact that the soul does not live by itself, likewise a body without a soul is not a man but a carcass.

When God made a woman from the man,[31] the man did not call the woman "soul of my soul" but "bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh" עֶצֶם מֵעֲצָמַי וּבָשָׂר מִבְּשָׂרִי (2:23a). This expresses their common humanity (29:14) and the kinship of personality. These terms "bone" and "flesh" along with "bowel" are used for the physical organs of man. These words are sometimes also employed in the figurative or psychical sense in Genesis, like "heart."[32] Surely in Genesis the body of man acts, his mouth eats, his heart thinks, and his spirit desires. Yet it is not easy to determine the inter-relationship of these organs.

The word נֶפֶשׁ, as we have considered previously, does not stand opposed to body, but is rather the principle of "life," which manifests itself on the one hand in the corporeal functions, and on the other in the conscious activities of the mind. Therefore נֶפֶשׁ has the idea of

---

[31] 2:22a: וַיִּבֶן יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת הַצֵּלָע אֲשֶׁר לָקַח מִן הָאָדָם לְאִשָּׁה literally: And Yahweh God built up the rib which He took from the man into a woman.

[32] The word "heart" לֵב is used thirteen times in Genesis and exclusively for psychical sense. Cf. H. W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man, pp. 22ff.

"total person" and it is a representative name for man. If the above statement is correct, then body or physical organs are a partial name for man, or the physical aspect of נֶפֶשׁ, and governed by נֶפֶשׁ. Consequently the physical organs or the body are functional aspects of נֶפֶשׁ.[33]

The Image of God

In the first chapter of Genesis, the twenty-seventh verse says, "So God created the man in his own image; in the image of God he created him." The word "image" in Genesis is used exclusively in the sense of resemblance; four times referring to God (1:26; 1:27 bis; 9:6) and once to man (5:3). צֶלֶם (image) probably had an idea of "shadow" then it was more likely used for "a representation." Before the actual creation of man, God had said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness" נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ (1:26). Here we see that God not only mentions "image" but also "likeness" דְּמוּת. This word is used three times in Genesis (1:26; 5:1,3) for "similitude" or "a copy."

As regards the words "in our image" בְּצַלְמֵנוּ, "after or as our likeness" כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ, the Greek and the Latin Fathers have made a distinction, referring "image" as εἰκών,

---

[33] O. J. Baab, op. cit., p. 264.

imago, to the physical or even inborn side, and "likeness" as ὁμοίωσις, similitudo, to the ethical or even to the still-to-be acquired side of the divine image.[34] However, if one closely examines the above usages, there is no word "and" ו between "in our image" and "after our likeness," except καί in the Septuagint. This fact is not favorable to a distinction between the two words. Also the preposition "in" ב and "after" כ are equally interchangeable. This is shown as we compare this verse with 5:1 "God created man, in the likeness בִּדְמוּת of God," and 5:3 "And (Adam) begat a son in his own likeness כִּדְמוּתוֹ, after his image וּכְצַלְמוֹ."[35]

Furthermore the usage of "image" and "likeness" shows no distinction between them. The first chapter says, "God created the man in his image בְּצַלְמוֹ, in the image of God" (1:27), but the fifth chapter says, "In the day God created man, he made him in the likeness בִּדְמוּת of God" (5:1); then in chapter nine we read: "for in the image בְּצֶלֶם of God made he the man" (9:6).[36] From the above evidence one can easily

---

[34] J. Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), p. 32; A. Dillmann, Genesis, translated from the last edition by W. B. Stevenson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897), I, 78.

[35] Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 63.

[36] G. von Rad, Das erste Buch Mose: Genesis Kapitel 1-12,9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), p. 45.

draw the conclusion that the two words are synonymous and interchangeable. Therefore in the first chapter the two words "image" and "likeness" are merely combined to add intensity to the thought and are an example of Hebrew parallelism and emphasis.[37]

When God was about to create man, He said, "Let us make (נַעֲשֶׂה) make in our image (בְּצַלְמֵנוּ), after our likeness" (כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ). God referred to himself in the plural. This usage was regarded as indicative of the Trinity (the older theologians; Calvin, Gerhard); as a plural of self-deliberation (Tuch, Kautzsch), as communicative (Delitzsch, Gunkel); as an indication of the fullness of power and might implied in אֱלֹהִים (Dillmann, Driver) and most likely as pluralis majestatis (Grotius, Gesenius, Knobel, Keil). The plural of majesty is used not only in the early writings of the Scripture with reference to God (11:7, Isa. 6:8), but is also known with reference to the Near Eastern rulers such as, "The letter which you sent to us has been plainly read before me" נִשְׁתְּרִנָא דִּי שְׁלַחְתּוּן עֲלֵינָא מְפָרַשׁ קֳרֵי קֳדָמָי

---

[37] Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 63; G. E. Wright, God Who Acts, p. 88; R. F. Weidner, op. cit., p. 36; O. T. Allis, The Five Books of Moses (Second edition; The Presbyterian and Reformed, 1949), p. 109.

(Ezra 4:18).[38]

Since God has no physical body, what, then is the image of God? It is quite clear from the above fact that the image of God does not consist of any physical form.[39] On the other hand the image of God is not "the soul" or any natural property of "the soul."[40] At the time of man's creation, he was like God and among many kinds of beings He created, this "image of God" was found only in man. Of course this does not mean that man is in any sense divine or that he possesses any portion or "spark" of the divine being within him.[41] Therefore the image of God is something unique to God and man, yet not divinity. Thus we may define the image of God as "the God-like personality."

When God created man, dignity was attached to man: "And let them have dominion over" the animal world. This rulership was not given to any other living creature, not

---

[38] Cf. I Macc. 10:19; 11:31; 15:9. For the further use of the plural, see Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 62; Skinner, op. cit., p. 30; Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 398; Dillmann, op. cit., p. 78.

[39] H. H. Rowley, The Unity of the Bible (New York: Living Age Books, 1957), pp. 47f.; The Faith of Israel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1957), p. 57; G.E. Wright, "Faith of Israel," p. 368; Oehler, op. cit., p. 146.

[40] T. F. Torrance, Calvin's Doctrine of Man (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), p. 53.

[41] G. E. Wright, God Who Acts, p. 88.

even to the angels.[42] Therefore the nobility of man is, no doubt, included in his creation. He was the head of the creation, because he was created in the image of God. Man would not be man if he were not created in God's image. Surely man had supremacy over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, over the cattle, over all the earth and every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth.

However, is this lordship of man simply identical with the image of God? The answer is that it is only a purpose and a consequence of the image of God. If the image of God is only the lordship of man, then God would not tell man after the creation, "Have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth" (1:28b). He would already have such power according to his innate nature. Further, if the image of God is only the supremacy of man, how can man hold communion with God and be his representative on earth?[43] God spoke to no other creature except man because he alone was created in the image of God and deserved to converse

---

[42] Psa. 8:5-8 (Heb. 6-9). Cf. Psa. 104; 139; C. R. North, The Thought of the Old Testament (London: Epworth Press, 1949), p. 26.

[43] Oehler, op.cit., p. 146.

with God.[44] Therefore we would think that when we are told that man was made in God's image this refers to his fellowship with God, and this was the essence of the dignity of his manhood.[45] Thus the lordship of man is merely a consequence of the image of God but not that image itself.[46] This image of God gives man his position of lordship in creation. Therefore the latter is the secondary element.[47]

When Adam and Eve ate the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, certainly their spiritual state and their relation to God were changed. It is true to say that after this, particularly at the time of the Flood, all human activities were pictured as entirely corrupt (6:3). This fact is clearly indicated by the separation of man from God. There was no more close fellowship between God and man, rather he fled from the presence of God (3:10,23,24). It also cannot be doubted that when man lost his fellowship with God, the full authority of lordship could no longer be exercised (3:18; 4:12). Thus after the Fall the relationship of man to God and to the universe was entirely changed.

---

[44] H. H. Rowley, The Unity of the Bible, p. 75.

[45] H. H. Rowley, Faith of Israel, p. 88.

[46] Oehler, op. cit., p. 146

[47] J. Orr, "Image of God," ISBE, p. 1264b.

However no Old Testament writer states that man lost the image of God.[48] Rather, even after the Flood God said to Noah and his sons, "Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he the man" כִּי בְצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה אֶת־הָאָדָם (9:6).

At this point, two Pauline epistles[49] help us to understand the matter better. Colossians 3:10 we read, "And have put on the new man, which is being renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." And in the epistle to the Ephesians, we are urged "And put on the new man, that after God is created in righteousness and holiness of the truth" (4:24). It seems that in these passages, the apostle Paul is speaking of the original likeness of God in which man was created, and to which the Christian is restored or renewed. This fact is supported by both usages: "The new man which is being (or is) renewed" τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον (Col. 3:10); and "Put on the new or renewed man" τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον (Ephes. 4:24). Thus these passages show us that man needs to be renewed and repaired after the image of God was damaged.

---

[48] P. Heinisch, op. cit., p. 162; G. E. Wright, "Faith of Israel," p. 369.

[49] Col. 3:10; Ephes. 4:24.

Wherefore, as is implied by the New Testament, the image of God was not utterly effaced and destroyed in man.[50] Nevertheless the image of God in man was so corrupt and seriously damaged by sin or by what is described as the Fall that it needed to be restored in Christ.

---

[50]E. Liggtt, "Man," Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, edited by L. A. Loetscher. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955), p. 698; J. Orr, op. cit., p. 1264b.

CHAPTER III

MAN'S SIN

The Origin of Sin

When God finished the creation of the whole universe, the whole work of creation and not only of the creation of the earth, was very good before His eyes (1:31). Not simply the esthetic beauty of the universe was good (טוֹב) before Yahweh, but it was also good in an ethical sense. This is proved by the fact that there was no disorder and corruption in the garden of Eden.

There was, however, a tree in the garden and it was called "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil" עֵץ הַדַּעַת טוֹב וָרָע (2:9). The phrase הַדַּעַת טוֹב וָרָע is regarded here as one word; therefore, הַדַּעַת, the infinitive, has a definite article.[1] Therefore it is correct for Geerhardus Vos to say:

> The phrase is not: "knowledge of the good and the evil." It reads, literally translated: "knowledge of good-and-evil," i.e., of good and evil as correlated, mutually conditioned conceptions. Man was to attain something he had not before. He was

---

[1] C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, in Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, translated from the German by J. Martin (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1951), I, 85; E. Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, second English edition by A. E. Cowley (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946), p. 354.

> to learn the good in its clear opposition to evil, and the evil in its clear opposition to the good.[2]

On the basis of the above explanation, we can define this tree as follows: The tree of the knowledge of good and evil was a tree which gave the man a knowledge he did not have before; he came to an experimental knowledge of the difference between good and evil. Therefore this tree was a tree of probation.

The existence of evil in the garden of Eden cannot be denied, because the third chapter of Genesis says, "Now the serpent was more subtle than any animal of the field" (3:1). The word "subtle" עָרוּם might have the meaning of "prudent" (φρόνιμος), though the context makes it certain that the bad sense of "clever" (πανοῦργος) is intended.[3] From the above evidence the serpent was the tool or agent of the temptation. As such it had the element of evil in itself.[4]

Where did evil come from? Who originated this evil? These are open questions and incomprehensible to human

---

[2]G. Vos, Biblical Theology (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954), p. 42. For detailed explanation of the tree, see ibid., pp. 39-43.

[3]J. Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), p. 71.

[4]R. F. Weidner, The Doctrine of Man (Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, c.1912), p. 59.

knowledge, because there is no detailed explanation in the canonical books of the Old Testament, except the mentioning of Satan or the devil. But the later writings, particularly the book of Wisdom (Σοφια Σαλωμων 2:23-24) shows us some allusions to the cause of evil:

> For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity. Nevertheless through envy of the devil came death into the world: and they that are of his side do find it.

Furthermore, the rabbinical writings and the New Testament books tell us of the existence of the evil one,[5] but none of them fully describe the origin of evil.

Some religions explain the problem of evil as having a divine origin: there came to be two gods who co-exist from all eternity, a good god and an evil god.[6] Others again try to trace the two eternal principles of good and evil back to a single godhead,[7] and thus make of God a dual being. These theories are speculations of human thought; nevertheless they are not the correct explanation of Genesis. There is no thought of a universal theogony

---

[5]Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 92; Skinner, op. cit., pp. 72-73.

[6]H. Bavinck, Our Reasonable Faith (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956), p. 227.

[7]P. Tillich, The Interpretation of History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936), p. 79. Further theological, philosophical questions are beyond the scope of the present thesis.

or dualism of opposing forces, not any form of pantheism, whether personalized or impersonal, in Genesis.[8] The origin of evil, on the other hand, does not belong to the things of nature (for example, stars, trees, and beasts), because they are not ethical beings. Such things are created by God for good (1:4,10,12,18,21,25), so they cannot produce evil by themselves. The book of Genesis records the existence and reality of evil, but not as being originally located in man. Because man was created in the image of God, he was not evil. There was no thought of locating evil in the human body in Genesis, because the book has no adequate word for human body.

The narrative of Genesis never pictures evil as a necessary thing in the world. The existence of evil can never be justified. It is clear that evil is something different from the divinely intended process of development.[9] It is something unnatural and it is a corruption of the original universe, because the original state of the universe did not include any evil element before the sight of God.

---

[8]G. E. Wright, "Faith of Israel," The Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1952), I, 365.

[9]I. A. Dorner, A System of Christian Doctrine, translated by A. Cave and J. S. Banks, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882), III, 36.

What, then, is the origin of evil? The account of Genesis does not give the full answer about this point. However, this much is clear that the entrance of evil in the world was related in some way to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and the command of God. God was holy and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil did not contain any evil. In Genesis there is no tendency to regard matter as evil; it was created by God and was good.[10] As a consequence, we can say that the evil can only come after the good, can only exist through the good or upon the good. At the time of the creation there was no evil on the earth. Of course no one can deny the existence of the possibility of evil. This is related to the whole plan of God's creation and His will, so it is beyond the aim of this paper. It is, however, clear from the Scripture that evil did not exist in eternity. Therefore the corruption of the good is the origin of evil.[11]

The possibility of evil became a reality in the garden of Eden and that reality is called "the Fall of man." The age of innocence was broken by man's failure in his temptation: first by the woman, then also by the man. Attention is directed to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

---

[10] D. R. G. Owen, Body and Soul (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1956), p. 169.

[11] H. Bavinck, op. cit., p. 229.

The tree itself, as we have seen previously, is not an agent of evil, nor is evil produced from its fruit.[12] It was only "the probation-tree." The serpent was surely the tool of temptation, but if man had rejected the evil desire; then man would not have sinned. Therefore, the blame for failure in the temptation was man's own responsibility. The temptation was "You will be like God" וְהְיִיתֶם כֵּאלֹהִים (3:5).[13] Thus the temptation was not a physical desire of any kind. Of course the result of the Fall affected the sensuous nature of man (2:7,10), but sexual relation is not the origin of sin.[14] If sexual intercourse were sin, then we would reasonably expect the prohibition of eating the fruit to be placed after Genesis 2:24, viz., not previous to the creation of the woman. The account also does not say both the man and the woman ate simultaneously; but the woman ate first, then she gave to the man and he ate.[15] The Scriptures never condemn the lawful sexual life of man, but rather approve of it.

---

[12]Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 96.

[13]The Septuagint has ὡς θεοί and AV has also plural form "as gods."

[14]Skinner, op. cit., p. 76; Reinhold Niebuhr, "Sin," A Handbook of Christian Theology (New York: Meridian Books, 1958), p. 348.

[15]P. Heinisch, Theology of the Old Testament, English edition by W. Heidt (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1950), p. 165.

Some think that since man was good, since his heart was uncorrupted in the beginning, therefore sin was attached to man from without. The evil lies in the circumstances, in the environment.[16] But one should be reminded of the motive of God's prohibition. It is true that man was originally good, but God gave him the freedom of choice and He saw the possibility of man's action, whether good or bad. This is not fully explainable, but it is the reality. Furthermore, the action of the eating of the fruit of the tree was the occasion rather than the proper cause of the Fall. The inner motive and decision precede the real action in activity. Therefore R. F. Weidner is right in his statement, "The fall was not in eating but took place before it. Man did not fall because he ate, but he ate because he fell."[17]

If we depart from Genesis 3, the origin of sin is not an easy problem to solve. Some try to identify the creation and the Fall. In other words, sin did not begin at the time of the Fall, but at the time of creation. Thus we quote Paul Tillich, for example, "This is the point at

---

[16] H. Bavinck, op. cit., p. 225.

[17] R. F. Weidner, op. cit., p. 58.

which the doctrine of creation and of the fall join . . . . Seen from the one side this is the end of creation. Seen from the other side this is the beginning of the fall."[18] This would mean that existence, that is being in itself, is sin. Moral imperfection is the same as finitude and man's creaturehood is his sinfulness.[19] According to such a theory, then, the Fall becomes a repeated experience of every individual and it also makes man's Fall into sin inevitable.[20] This kind of philosophy, however, is foreign to the teaching of Genesis.

After Adam and Eve ate the forbidden fruit, they were changed, not because any physical change ensued in consequence of the Fall;[21] but because they obtained a new knowledge. The prediction of the tempter was partially right; a new insight had opened up to them, but of a kind other than they had thought of. Their consciousness felt guilt and shame before God and in each other's presence. The inevitable element in man, sin, brought to man not only

---

[18] P. Tillich, Systematic Theology (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), I, 255.

[19] H. Bavinck, op. cit., p. 227-28.

[20] C. F. H. Henry, Christian Personal Ethics (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1957), p. 182.

[21] Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 96

the feeling of shame, but separation from God. There is no indication that the cause of separation of God and man was in God (3:11). Rather, man's shamefulness would not allow him to stay with a holy God. The misery of separation was not a temporary situation, but it caused an eternal gulf between God and man (3:22-23). As the result of disobedience or sin, man was cursed and stayed under the punishment of God. This state brought for man physical pain, hard labor, mental suffering and particularly death, which is the chief misery of man (3:16-19).

We should clearly understand that Adam had an innocent period; he had become a sinner by his disobedience, and the undesirable miseries are the result of sin. Thus we can firmly say that sin is not an essential part of man, but man's product. Therefore it is clear from Genesis that sin is not the original constitution of man nor his essence; but a self-gained evil.[22]

According to the holy will of God, man would not have committed any sin, if he had chosen not to. His doubt, however, in the divine word became stronger than his desire to obey. Then his selfish will opposed God's explicit command in the form of disobedience.[23]

---

[22]E. Liggtt, "Man," Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, edited by L. A. Loetscher (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955), p. 698.

[23]G. F. Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament, translated by G. Day (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House,n.d.), p. 158.

Therefore on the basis of the account, we are compelled to say that sin is not a necessary factor in human history, but rather a product of man's free choice. The fault was his alone. The account of the Fall points out that man and woman were fully conscious of the divine prohibition, and of the penalty with which its transgression is threatened; then doubt, unbelief and pride were mixed against God's command and man made his own choice.[24]

Man did not need to learn how to commit a specific sin. Cain learned from no one; yet he proceeded to murder his brother Abel and to be angry and to speak a lie. Likewise at Noah's time the whole population of the world had both learned evil and committed it. Also the genealogy of Genesis 5 shows that every individual except Noah suffered death as the consequence of sin.

From the above observation we see that sin consists not merely in acts, but sin seems to be deeply rooted in man and springs from deepseated causes in the inner part of man. This situation is not limited to any particular place or time, but it is universal in its scope and hereditary in nature. This is called "original sin" in the theological field.

---

[24] R. F. Weidner, op. cit., p. 58.

The book of Genesis after the account of the Fall pictures man as a degenerate person and knows nothing of absolutely perfect persons. We find, however, the words "righteous" צַדִּיק (adjective, ten times), צָדַק (verb, once) and "righteousness" צְדָקָה (feminine noun, three times). Noah was described before the Flood as "a righteous (or just, צַדִּיק) man and blameless in his generations; Noah walked with God" (6:9). The word "righteous" here, along with "blameless," is used in a relative or comparative sense. This is shown by the qualifying word that follows, "in his generations" (in his times).[25] Further, Noah's righteousness is manifested by the last phrase of the verse "Noah walked with God." The first verse of the seventh chapter also says "For you I have seen righteous before me in this generation." But we should never forget the statement, "But Noah found favor in the eyes of Yahweh" (6:8).

The adjective צַדִּיק is used seven times in the course of the conversation between Abraham and Yahweh (18:23,24 bis, 25 bis, 26, 28). In the form of a hypothetical question, Abraham asked Yahweh, "Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked?" (18:23). What Abraham had in mind was

---

[25] J. P. Lange, A Commentary on the Holy Scripture: Genesis, translated from the German, and edited, with additions, by P. Schaff (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), p. 292; Skinner, op. cit., p. 159.

to save Lot from the destruction of Sodom, so "the righteous" whom Abraham was referring to were men of the same type as Lot. Therefore Abraham's use of "righteous" was in relation to the wickedness of the men of Sodom.

The comparative use of "righteous" is further demonstrated in two other places (20:4; 38:26). The noun צְדָקָה is used for Abraham's faith (15:6); God's justice (18:19) and Jacob's activity (30:33). The latter's many deceitful activities are recorded elsewhere, so Jacob's צְדָקָה would hardly make him absolutely a righteous person. From the above evidences, we may say that the word צַדִּיק is used in Genesis in a comparative sense, viz., one is more righteous than another. Thus the existence of an innocent man after the Fall is entirely foreign to the book of Genesis.

The Authorized Version of Genesis 6:9b gives us the following words, "Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations." The word for "perfect" is תָּמִים. This word means "free from defect,"[26] and is used for "soundness" and "integrity." Thus תָּמִים is not a judicial word, for righteous living, but rather the result of a person's opinion.[27] As we have seen above, תָּמִים is used along with

---

[26]Skinner, op.cit., p. 159.

[27]L. Köhler, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Dritte, uberarbeitete Auflage; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953), p.156.

צַדִּיק for Noah's noble character as compared with the men of his time. God also gives Abraham the standard of perfection for his life (18:1); nevertheless no passage mentions Abraham's absolutely perfect character.

Thus the non-existence of an absolutely righteous man is demonstrated in Genesis. Therefore the book teaches that every individual man is a sinner.

It is true that there is never any specific mention in Genesis of any sins being inherited from Adam.[28] And yet concerning sin, Genesis teaches not a partial but a complete corruption of the entire human race (6:5; 8:21). Genesis not only teaches that what man does is sin, but also that man's being is corrupted; sin becomes his habit and inclination.[29] This sinful inclination cleaves to man from his birth so that man has no point in his existence at which he is without sin.[30] This kind of sin is deeply rooted in human nature, and there is no other way to explain it but as the fundamentally corrupt nature of man. This corruption is an inborn state and it is the cause of all

---

[28]A. Gelin, The Key Concept of the Old Testament, translated by G. Lamb (London: Sheed and Ward Co., 1955), p. 87; D. R. G. Owen, op. cit., p. 169; M. Burrows, An Outline of Biblical Theology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1946), p. 170. The latter's statement, however, is an over-simplification.

[29]A. B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, edited from the author's manuscripts by S. D. F. Salmond (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), p. 217; G. F. Oehler, op. cit., p. 162.

[30]A. v. R. Sauer, "The Concept of Sin in the Old Testament," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXII (October, 1951), 709.

sinful acts. Although man knows his faults (42:21), the corrupt nature cannot be changed by his own power. That this was not limited to any location, but was a universal actuality, was proved by God's judgment on the world in the Flood.

If the corruption of human nature is not something natural, normal and necessary, then the actuality of sin in man is only explainable as hereditary, although we are not fully informed on this in Genesis.[31] These facts help us to draw a conclusion that Genesis clearly teaches the idea of total depravity.

At the time of creation man's death was not presupposed in human life; death is not a physical necessity in man or an essential attribute of living matter. Life did not include the element of death; otherwise life would not be a blessing (1:28). Therefore death is not a primary necessity, but it has been acquired secondarily, as an adaptation. This undesirable adaptation caused the chief sorrow in man. Death is a universal thing in man's history. Because of it Adam lost the blessing of immortality. But can it be said that death and original sin are synonymous,

---

[31] At this point the Pauline Epistles give us a clear explanation (Rom. 5:12-21; I Cor. 15:21-22).

as H. W. Robinson proposes?[32]

God's threat for eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was certainly death. Death was given as the penalty of man's disobedience. According to God's word death ruled over every individual man and man had to pass the gate of death (5:4-30). Genesis, however, does not identify original sin as death. If it were so, we would have no explanation for the fact that man committed various sins, particularly deep rooted sins. If original sin were merely death, the history of the patriarchal lives would not have included so much degenerated behavior. Although the universal corruption included Enoch, he did not see death, but God took him (5:24). Therefore the idea that implies that original sin is death is a well thought out hypothesis, but it is not the teaching of Genesis.

The Nature of Sin

After the Fall of man, human activity was pictured by various terms for sin. The principal terms employed in the book of Genesis with reference to sin may be grouped in four

---

[32] "Here belongs also the story of man's first sin as told by the Yahwist (Gen. 3). This involves no doctrine of 'original' sin, though we may say that it implies 'original' death, since through the disobedience of Adam the race he represented (by corporate personality) lost its opportunity of immortality." "The Characteristic Doctrines," Record and Revelation (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 338.

classes.[33]

1. The deviation from the true path.

The first word for this class of sin is חטא. The word חטא denotes "missing," (Judg. 20:16) and "deviation" from a goal or way. In Genesis חטא is used a total of fifteen times; as a verb חטא eight times and as a noun in the rest. The word חטא is used either as an offence against a human being or sin against God. And it gives the idea of failure with respect to an objective norm or duty. חטא also refers to the external corruption of an action; rather than the moral intention. Thus Judah asserted that he would be a sinner forever if he failed to bring Benjamin back.[34]

Next to חטא there is also the word עון. This means properly "crookedness" and "perversion"; primarily it does not designate an action, but the character of an action, viz., a sinful state or condition.[35] This is proved by the fact that it is used entirely as a noun, not only in Genesis, but throughout the whole Old Testament. In Genesis עון is used as "guilt" caused by transgression or "sin" (15:16; 44:16) and "punishment" for guilt (4:13; 19:15). If finally

---

[33]H. W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911), p. 43; "The Characteristic Doctrines," Record and Revelation, p. 335.

[34]Gen. 43:9: וְחָטָאתִי לְךָ כָּל הַיָּמִים, literally "then I may commit sin to you for ever." Cf. I K. 1:21; Skinner, op. cit., p. 480.

[35]G. F. Oehler, op. cit., p. 160; A.v. R. Sauer, op. cit., p. 709.

one takes בְּשִׁגְגָתָם (6:3) as infinitive construct of שָׁגָה=שָׁגַג with the third person plural suffix (ם) and preposition (ב), then it means "in their erring," and has an idea of "by reason of their going astray." This word, בְּשִׁגְגָם, however, is favored by many as a compound word of ב, שְׁ (a contraction of אֲשֶׁר) and גַּם (also).[36] Thus a sinner is one who has not met his stated obligation with respect to God and man, who deviates from a right way.[37]

2. The status of guilt before a judge.

The first word of this group is רָשָׁע and it is used only as an adjective in Genesis. It is supposed originally "to refer to the activity, the tossing, and the confusion in which the wicked live, and the perpetual agitation which they cause to others."[38] רָשָׁע is used usually as a substantive, "one guilty of crime," deserving punishment. It is the opposite of צַדִּיק (18:23,25 bis) and an habitual

---

[36] For further treatment, see, E. Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 180; Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., pp. 135-36; G. von Rad, Das erste Buch Mose: Genesis Kapitel 1-12.9 (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), p. 93; Skinner, op. cit., p. 143-44.

[37] G. E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society (London: SCM Press, 1954), p. 44.

[38] R. B. Girdlestone, Synonyms of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956), p. 81.

feature of man's disposition and actions.[39] This idea is well pictured in the sinful activity of the people of Sodom. The crime is not quiet, but active in its motion. This is well illustrated as a stormy excitement (cf. Isa. 57:20).[40]

The word חָטָא is associated with the idea of guilt in Genesis 26:10, where Abimelech speaks of guilt contracted unwittingly. On some occasions חָטָא means man's unwitting offences and trespasses.[41] As an adjective חָטֵא occurs in Genesis 42:21, one of three usages in the whole Old Testament, and means "guilty," although it is possible to understand the term as "having sinned."[42] These words seem, from their usage, to give the idea of one who changes his original status.

3. Rebellion of subject against a ruler.

The only word for this class in Genesis is שָׁגָה. The word signifies to revolt or refuse subjection to rightful authority.[43] שָׁגָה also represents sin under its most active,

---

[39] L. Köhler, op. cit., p. 161.

[40] G. F. Oehler, op. cit., p. 160.

[41] L. Morris, "ASHAM," The Evangelical Quarterly, XXX (1958), 200; Girdlestone, op. cit., p. 84.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Girdlestone, op. cit., p. 81.

and therefore least formal aspect.[44] Hence פֶּשַׁע expresses the relationship of man to God, viz., "apostasy" or "rebellion," and that of man to man, viz., "revolt" or "transgression." Before the covenant of Mizpah, when Jacob charged Laban, he said, "What is my trespass (פִּשְׁעִי)?" (31:36). This conveys the thought of rebellion against a superior. The similar thought is expressed in the speech of Joseph's brothers, after Jacob passed away (50:17 bis).

4. Intrinsic evil.

The final class of sin is expressed by several words. The word רַע (adjective) designates, "breaking up" or "ruin." רַע signifies both natural and ethical evil.[45] The ethical evil, viz., "wickedness" is shown in Noah's contemporaries who were punished by the flood (6:5; 8:21); the Sodomites (13:13; 19:7); Er the son of Judah (38:7) and in Joseph's speech to Potiphar's wife (39:9). In these cases, רַע seems to be related with a sexual offence. Of course this is not

---

[44] W. Grundmann, "ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμάρτημα, ἁμαρτία," Theologisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by G. Kittel, erster Band (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933), p. 273.

[45] For classification of natural evil, see, Koehler and W. Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953), pp. 896-97; F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1952), pp. 948-49.

surprising, because it is one of the greatest sins in human life and an abominable vice of man. The rest of the ethical nature is revealed in the opposite to "good" (2:9,17; 3:5,22; 24:50;31:24). The verb, רָעַע is also used for man's wicked activities (19:7; 44:5). Thus the word רַע expresses absolute evil in an ethical sense.

The next word חָמָס indicates the concept of "wrong," which includes injurious language, harsh treatment, etc. For example it describes the wrong deeds done to Sarah by Hagar (16:5). Generally it refers to the wickedness of man (6:11,13; 49:5).

The word שְׁחִתָה expresses the moral corruption of human nature (6:11,12 bis). Another word סָכָל signifies a "fool" or foolish action of man in the moral or spiritual sense (31:28).

Finally the word נְבָלָה designates "senselessness" as shown in disregard of moral claims, especially of disgraceful sins.[46] Particularly one does a thing that is disgraceful according to his own standard (34:7). Thus all these words express the idea of vice and they are characterizations of the quality of moral evil itself.

When the serpent tempted the woman, he said to her, "You shall surely not die" לֹא מוֹת תְּמֻתוּן (3:4). This

---

[46]Brown, Driver and Briggs, op. cit., p. 615.

indicates "You will positively not die."[47] The word of the serpent caused a transformation in the woman's whole attitude toward God; her loyalty to God was weakening; then began her distrust in God's order (2:17). Man's distrust did not only remain what it was, but brought positive action, viz., breaking God's command (3:6). Thus sin takes the specific form of disobedience to the requirement of God.[48] Man's disobedience to God's word is not a reluctant activity of man, but a positive and wilful perversity of man (3:6).[49]

Sin is an attempt on the part of man to cut himself loose from God.[50] Sin is, therefore, not "a necessary stage in the development of spirit" (Hegel); nor "relative weakness of the spirit as compared with sense" (Schleiermacher); nor "an apparently unavoidable product of human will under the given conditions of its development" (Ritschl); nor

---

[47]A detailed grammatical explanation, see, E. Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 344; Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 95; Skinner, op. cit., p. 74; G. Vos, op. cit., p. 46.

[48]H. W. Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1952), p. 161.

[49]S. B. Babbage, Man in Nature and in Grace (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans), p. 166; G. E. Wright, God Who Acts (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1952), p. 59.

[50]H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1957), p. 89; G. E. Wright, "The Faith of Israel," The Interpreter's Bible, p. 380.

should we view "all sins as arising so much from ignorance" (Ritschl).[51] Rather sin is a specific evil, differing from all other forms of evil. Thus sin is man's disharmony with the will of God; his apostasy from Yahweh; a voluntary rebellion against God.[52]

After Adam had eaten the fruit of the tree, God said to him "Because you have listened (שָׁמַעְתָּ) to the voice of your wife, and have eaten of the tree which I commanded you, 'you shall not eat of it'" (3:17). It is interesting to note that the word שָׁמַע also has a meaning of "obeying."[53] In other words Adam had a distinct possibility of choosing to obey God's command but he listened to the woman. He did not have to follow the woman's example, but he wished to do so. When Cain became angry in connection with his sacrifice, God warned him not to sin but to rule over sin saying, "If you do not do well, sin is couching at the door; its desire is for you, but you must rule over it" (4:7). But Cain

---

[51] J. Orr, The Christian View of God and the World (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954), pp. 175-79.

[52] S. B. Babbage, op. cit., p. 18; C. R. North, The Thought of the Old Testament (London: Epworth Press, 1949), p. 45; H. H. Rowley, The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, n.d.), pp. 218-19; The Faith of Israel, pp. 89, 123; G. E. Wright, "The Faith of Israel," pp. 369, 384.

[53] Brown, Driver and Briggs, op. cit., p. 1034; A. v. R. Sauer, op. cit., p. 706.

voluntarily yielded to the power of sin and killed Abel. Of course man has not an absolute power to overcome sin, "But according as men seek or do not seek to rule over sin, there arises a difference of relation to God and a difference in the degree of sinfulness."[54] Therefore the evil element of sin is a heart-attitude of man. This is well demonstrated by a Hebrew word תָּמִים, "sound" or "upright" (6:9; 17:1) and תֹּם "integrity" or "completeness" (20:5,6). There is no perfect person on the earth, but one who wholeheartedly accepts God's grace and mercy is counted as righteous. On the other hand one who seeks only his own profit, and acts according to his own desire separates himself from God. "The setting up of a false independence, the substitution of a life-for-self for life-for-God" is an abominable sin before God.[55] Man is not the Supreme Being, but a creature; he is not an eternal One, but mortal dust; he is not the autonomous Almighty, but a dependent person; he is not the holy God, but a corrupted sinner. Therefore man could not make a good decision by himself.

On the other hand, sin is not only an imperfection in man, but rather "the contravention of what ought to be."[56]

---

[54] G. F. Oehler, op. cit., p. 164.

[55] J. Orr, op. cit., p. 172.

[56] I. A. Dorner, op. cit., p. 36-37.

Therefore sin is "the selfish elevation of self-will above the divine will."[57]

Sin, a characteristic human product, not only causes trouble in man, but unconditionally ought not to be in man. Sin is, however, practically the second nature of a human being. Now the question is, how can sin be removed from man? What is the way of redeeming man from sin in Genesis? This question deserves further investigation in a later chapter.

---

[57] G. F. Oehler, op. cit., p. 159; R. F. Weidner, op. cit., p. 115.

CHAPTER IV

GOD'S COVENANT WITH MAN

The Concept of בְּרִית

The Hebrew word בְּרִית appears in the Old Testament over 285 times,[1] and its frequency shows its importance. In Genesis this word is used twenty-six times and is generally translated into English by "covenant." The word בְּרִית is rendered by "agreement," "arrangement" or "covenant" between human individuals (14:13; 21:27,32; 26:28; 31:44) as well as "covenant" between God and mankind (6:18; 9:9-17; 15:18; 17:2-21).

When the word בְּרִית is used in patriarchal and nomadic society, it shows the legal arrangement between individuals and groups. Abram made an alliance with Mamre for war (14:13); and a treaty with Abimelech agreeing to keep peace in the future (21:27,32). Isaac also made a covenant with Abimelech for peace (26:28). Finally Jacob made a covenant with Laban, the sign of their peaceful agreement (31:44). In making this covenant they called upon the God of their fathers as the witness or the third party (31:49-53). From the preceding usages, we see

---

[1] L. Köhler, Theologie des Alten Testaments, (dritte, überarbeitete Auflage; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953), p. 44; of. 286 times, L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, Lexicon in Vetris Testament Libros (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953), p. 150.

that "covenant" means a mutual contract between individuals, especially between kings and rulers, established by an oath or a statement of terms agreed upon (26:31; 31:48-53). בְּרִית is also used of pacts between two or more parties (14:13).

It is a generally accepted theory that the Hebrew word בְּרִית is connected with Akkadian berîtu, "bond, fetter." At this point we are grateful for the Qatna documents, which are probably from the fifteenth century B.C. The phrase TAR be-ri-ti which means "to cut a berîtu," occurs in two separate documents. The Akkadian TAR be-ri-ti is undoubtedly identified with the Hebrew words לִכְרֹת בְּרִית, "to cut a covenant," i.e., "to make a pact or contract."[2]

When the word בְּרִית is used for a covenant between God and man, the prerogative of initiating the arrangement belongs to God alone, and with Him alone lies the right of determining its content.[3] The noun בְּרִית quite often accompanies certain verbs and appears in recurring phrases. Hence, "to make a covenant" is usually כָּרַת בְּרִית "to cut a covenant" (15:18; 17:2; 21:32; 26:28; 31:44). It has been

---

[2]W. F. Albright, "The Hebrew expression for 'Making a covenant' in Pre-Israelite Documents," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, No. 121 (Feb., 1951), pp. 21-22.

[3]G. Vos, "Hebrews, the Epistle of the Diatheke," The Princeton Theological Review, XIII (October, 1915), 597 (This will be cited as PTR). The subject is to be discussed further.

widely held that the expression is derived from the cutting asunder of animals and the ceremony connected with it by which covenants were confirmed. To make a covenant by slaying victims in forming the agreement is the standard usage. This form is used both in religious and secular practice. Anything agreed upon by two persons or two parties under such solemn conditions was a covenant.[4] In Genesis, the technical phrase for making a covenant is exclusively כָּרַת בְּרִית with the preposition אֵת (15:18; 17:14) or עִם (26:18). On the other hand, the preposition ל is never employed in Genesis, although it is the preposition most often used in the later books for the expression "to make a covenant."[5]

כָּרַת בְּרִית is also accompanied by הֵקִים and means "establish a covenant" (6:18; 9:9,11,12,17; 17:7,19,21). Unlike כָּרַת בְּרִית, the phrase וַהֲקִמֹתִי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי "I will establish my covenant," is used entirely of God's own action. Another phrase to denote a God-initiated-covenant is וְאֶתְּנָה בְרִיתִי "And I will give my covenant" (17:2). As the word indicates,

---

[4]A. B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, edited from the author's manuscripts by S. D. F. Salmond (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), p. 239.

[5]G. F. Oehler, The Theology of the Old Testament, translated by G. E. Day (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), p. 175; F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1952), p. 136.

this covenant is a God-given (נָתַן, to give) promise. The covenant is, consequently, not only a legal relationship with exactly defined, mutual duties and performances, but also a wholly one-sided arrangement. Therefore the covenant is more than an alliance; it is rather that which is bestowed by God upon man.[6]

In connection with God's covenant, it is interesting to note that the God-established covenant is called "an everlasting covenant" בְּרִית עוֹלָם (9:16; 17:7,13,19). This covenant is valid for all times. Here again man is not dependable, so that God can trust him to make the arrangement; the covenant is not a mutual act at all, but it comes from God alone.[7]

The word בְּרִית was translated in the Septuagint by διαθήκη 257 times out of the 285 times that it occurs in the Old Testament.[8] In Genesis in every case except one (14:13)[9] בְּרִית was translated by διαθήκη. This fact is

---

[6] H. S. Gehman, "The Covenant--The Old Testament Foundation of the Church," Theology Today, VII (April, 1950), 33; L. Köhler, op. cit., p. 47; R. B. Y. Scott, The Relevance of the Prophets (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944), p. 22.

[7] H. S. Gehman, op. cit., p. 33.

[8] L. Köhler, op. cit., p. 44.

[9] συγκοινωνοί, A. V., confederate, R. S. V., allies.

significant. If mutual agreement belongs to the essence of the covenant in these cases, we should have expected the translators to use συνθήκη .[10] It is interesting to investigate the meaning of διαθήκη at the time when the Septuagint came into existence. Geerhardus Vos says that διαθήκη "not only could mean 'testament', but such was the current meaning of the word." He continues:

> It was, to be sure, not its original meaning. The original sense was quite generic, viz., 'a disposition that some one made for himself' (from the middle form of the verb diatithemi). The legal usage, however, referring it to a testamentary disposition had monopolized the word. Hence the difficulty with which the Greek translators found themselves confronted. In making their choice of a suitable rendering for berith they took a word to whose meaning of 'last will' nothing in the Hebrew Bible corresponded. And not only this, the word chosen seemed to connote the very opposite of what the Hebrew berith stood for.[11]

Thus the concept of בְּרִית as a "testament" is utterly foreign to Old Testament thought.[12]

The Septuagint translators stress the one-sided promise

---

[10]John Murray, The Covenant of Grace (London: The Tyndale Press, 1954), p. 9.

[11]G. Vos, Biblical Theology (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954), p. 33; cf. R. B. Girdlestone, Synonyms of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956), pp. 213-214.

[12]G. Vos, PTR, p. 594.

or ordinance by using διαθήκη for בְּרִית rather than συνθήκη. Thereby they were able to avoid unnecessary confusion in the meaning of בְּרִית. For this reason the translators of the Septuagint used διαθήκη rather than συνθήκη, "mutual agreement." The word συνθήκη seems to suggest strongly the idea of equality and partnership between the persons entering into the arrangement. While διαθήκη is not an adequate translation of בְּרִית, the translators might have felt that it was the best way to retain the idea of the "supremacy and monergism of God."[13] Therefore it seems that the Septuagint translators were not governed by the thought of mutual agreement when they came to these instances of בְּרִית. The term συνθήκη appears only a couple of times in the whole Old Testament, in none of them as the translation of בְּרִית.[14]

Thus the word בְּרִית is used for the relationship between God and man. It no longer means simply a "pact" or a "treaty" (συνθήκη), i.e., a human covenant of a

---

[13] G. Vos, Biblical Theology, p. 34.

[14] LXX A has συνθήκη as a translation of בְּרִית in 2K. 17:15, but this textual reading is not commonly accepted. For further treatment of συνθήκη, see J. Murray, op. cit., p. 9 n.; cf. J. Behm, "διαθήκη," Theologishes Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Zweiter Bank, edited by G. Kittel (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1935), p. 129.

commercial, social, political or international character. Instead it means a divine institution and not a mutual agreement.[15] Therefore it is right for C. H. Dodd to say, "God's covenant is a diathēkē, and not a synthēkē; that is to say, God fixes the terms of the covenant and offers it to man that he may accept it: the acceptance is also essential."[16]

The covenant is sometimes thought of in the somewhat sordid terms of a bargain, as we have seen previously. Yet the relation of the parties is not purely mutual. This is true even in human relations, since בְּרִית sometimes refers to a one-party guarantee which a more favored person gives a less favored one (cf. Josh. 9:6,15; 1 S. 11:1; Ezek. 17:13).[17]

When we look at the covenant of God with man, it is a marked peculiarity of this divine covenantal deed that it is a one-party guarantee. Even in the case of an avowed bilateral בְּרִית there is already seen to exist a supremacy of God's monergism. A strong motivation and an

---

[15] A. Gelin, The Key Concepts of the Old Testament, translated by G. Lamb (London: Sheed and Ward, 1955), p. 38.

[16] This is quoted by H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1957), p. 69 n.

[17] H. N. Ridderbos, The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1953), p. 130.

initiative on the part of God are predominantly demonstrated in the covenant. The initiative does not in any sense come from man, but from God alone.[18] When God made a covenant with man, man did not receive it as a mutual agreement, but he took a purely receptive part. There was no bilateral participation on man's part (6:18; 9:9; 17:7). Therefore these covenants are also called "promise" (Dt. 6:3; 19:8; 27:3; Rom. 4:13,14; Gal. 3:17).

At this point we point to an aspect of the בְּרִית to demonstrate its character as a one-sided covenant. In some instances there is no pact at all, but God alone pledges himself, and refers to it by the phrase כָּרַת בְּרִית (Ex.34: 10).[19] In secular life, the two parties to a covenant are occasionally on the same level, have equality and participate mutually. However, in the Old Testament בְּרִית, God and man are not on the same level; in the בְּרִית God remains God, the holy, supreme One, and man cannot reach His level.[20]

It would appear that the patriarchs were familiar with a one-sided covenant because this type of covenant was a common feature of the second millennium B.C. in the Near

---

[18] G. F. Oehler, op. cit., p. 175.

[19] Ibid.

[20] H. S. Gehman, op. cit., p. 27.

East.[21] Even in the old Sumerian texts of the third millennium B. C. references were found to inter-state covenants; therefore, it would seem likely that oral covenants upheld by an oath go back many centuries prior to this.[22] V. Korosec very carefully analyzes the Hittite covenants. There were two types of covenant: "suzerainty treaties" or "parity treaties." Comparing the two, we find that "the suzerainty treaty is the basic form" and indicates "the inferior is bound by an oath--the vassal is obligated to obey the commands stipulated by the Hittite king."[23] G. E. Mendenhall explains a further characteristic of Hittite covenants in these words: "The covenant is regularly spoken of as that which the sovereign gave to his vassal--it is the sovereign's covenant. He is the author."[24] A distinguishing character of this unilateral covenant is shown in the inferior's trust, "A most important corollary of this fact is the emphasis upon the vassal's obligation to trust in the benevolence of the sovereign."[25]

---

[21] G. E. Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," The Biblical Archaeologist, XVII (Sept., 1954), 54-55.

[22] Ibid., p. 53.

[23] Ibid., p. 55.

[24] Ibid., p. 57.

[25] Ibid., p. 56.

A similar type of Aramaic suzerainty treaty has been disclosed lately by J. A. Fitzmyer, under the title, "The Aramaic Suzerainty Treaty from Sefîre in the Museum of Beirut."[26] Although it is not contemporary with the patriarchs,[27] it helps us to understand more clearly the meaning of covenant. J. A. Fitzmyer divides the documents into nine parts, every section ending with a statement like the following, or its equivalent: "You will have been false to this treaty."[28] It seems that the sovereign makes this pronouncement; then the subject merely takes an oath in accordance with the master's will. There is, therefore, no mutuality or equality in such a treaty. In this type of suzerainty treaty, a vassal simply affirms his loyalty to his master.

God's בְּרִית with man is generally a one-sided covenant as Genesis itself teaches. There is in some cases the element of two-sidedness in the covenant, but it plays a very subordinate role in the Genesis usage of בְּרִית; and where it does enter, it is very much restricted in scope.[29] Therefore the general usage and its historical background

---

[26] The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XX (October, 1958), 444ff.

[27] Fitzmyer and Dupont-Sommer think that this would be 8th century B.C. Ibid., pp. 474, 475.

[28] Ibid., pp. 449-51.

[29] G. Vos, PTR, p. 598.

certainly show us בְּרִית as God's one-sided covenant.

The Covenant as a Divine Gift

Explicit reference to the covenant is first found in the sixth chapter of Genesis, just before the flood. It is clear that Noah did not deserve to have fellowship with God. He was an unworthy man. But he was favored by God (6:8). Therefore the fundamental purpose of the covenant itself was to bestow a special gift. Why then did God command Noah to do certain things in the covenant (6:18-21)? This covenant included a command because Noah could neither expect a favor nor hope for it. It was surely an unexpected favor. It would appear though that there was a participation on the part of Noah, viz., obedience to the covenant. On Noah's part it was certainly obedience (6:22), but God had made his obedience possible. Therefore the obedience of keeping the covenant was not meritorious, but only a part of the gift of the covenant. Thus this covenant was established (וְהֲקִימֹתִי בְּרִיתִי) by God and was a gift to Noah and his family (6:18).

If one examines the post-diluvian Noachian covenant, the divine character of the covenant appears more clearly. It is purely of divine origin, because it is determined, established and confirmed by God Himself (9:9,11,12,13,17).[30]

---

[30] J. Murray, op. cit., p. 15.

The covenant is intensely monergistic. Nothing exhibits this more clearly than the sign attached to the covenant, namely the rainbow in the cloud (9:13).[31] Man can do nothing with this rainbow, God alone has control and rules over it. Likewise this covenant shows God's faithfulness and rigidly excluded human cooperation. This covenant is an everlasting covenant (בְּרִית עוֹלָם 9:16, cf. 9:12 לְדֹרֹת עוֹלָם). God said, "And I will establish my covenant with you, that never again shall all flesh be cut off by the waters of a flood, and never again shall there be a flood to destroy the earth" (9:11). The assurance which God gives is perpetual and is beyond man's own ability. The perpetuity of the covenant certainly reflects its divine character. At this point J. Murray well expresses the thought, "Perpetuity and divinity are complementary and mutually inter-dependent."[32]

Finally this is an unconditional covenant. It is a promise which is unconditional. There is no indication of Noah's participation nor responsibility therein. God said, "When the bow is in the clouds, I will look upon it for remembering (לִזְכֹּר) the everlasting covenant between God

---

[31] A. A. Hodge, Outline of Theology (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949), p. 368.

[32] J. Murray, op. cit., p. 14.

and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth" (9:16). The bow as the sign of the covenant is the assurance of God's gracious activity in the future and an indication giving assurance of the fulfilment of this unconditional covenant.[33]

Thus the idea of man's agreement or man's cooperation in the covenant is completely absent in the Noachian covenant. If there seems to be human cooperation in the covenant, it is the cooperation of response which the grace of the covenant demands. Therefore the Noachian covenant clearly shows that in this type of divine covenant man can do no more than receive what God arranges and provides.[34]

The Abrahamic covenant is explicitly set forth in Genesis 15 and 17, and is expressed in terms of a promise. In the fifteenth chapter of Genesis God reassured Abraham with His covenant. When God gave it, Abraham was quite old and had given up the hope of having his own child (15:2-3). It does not seem easy to convince one who had given up hope of an offspring, who could inherit the land. It was natural, humanly speaking, that Abraham would hesitate

---

[33]H. S. Gehman, op. cit., p. 14.

[34]J. Murray, op. cit., pp. 15-16; E. H. Trenchard, "Grace, Covenant and Law," The Evangelical Quarterly, XXIX (1957), 134.

to rely on what seemed to him an uncertain agreement that he and his descendants would inherit the land (cf. 15:8). However God's unilateral covenant could and did convince him. Thus the God-initiated nature of the covenant is clear. This feature of the covenant is signally distinctive in its divinity, being divine in origin, establishment, confirmation and fulfilment. Abraham did not make any pledge because he was not sure of the future (15:8); this would have been a natural human reaction. God, however, assured Abraham three times (15:7,16,18) that the land of Canaan had been given to him, and particularly to his children. If one interprets this promise as "a self-maledictory-oath" on God's part, it would be one of the most striking events in the whole Scripture.[35] When Abraham divided the animals, God's theophany passed through between the divided pieces of animals, but Abraham himself did not. There is also no indication of Abraham's confirmation of the covenant; rather God's undisputable object-lesson in giving the unilateral covenant strengthens His servant's faith.[36] Thus the whole covenant from its origin to its fulfilment was a pure act of divine promise.

---

[35] J. Murray, op. cit., p. 16

[36] E. H. Trenchard, op. cit., p. 136.

A further-developed form of the covenant was given to Abraham in the seventeenth chapter. The covenant was now more specific in its character and wider in its scope. It was to consist of this: (a) that God would make Abraham the father of a multitude of nations (17:4), the ancestor of nations and kings (17:6); (b) that He would be God to him and to his posterity (17:7); and (c) that He would give them the entire land of Canaan for an everlasting possession (17:8).[37] As an immediate pledge of this promise God changed his name אַבְרָם i.e., high father, into אַבְרָהָם i.e., father of a multitude (17:5). The divine element of the covenant was manifested in His word, "I will give my covenant" וְאֶתְּנָה בְרִיתִי (17:2). When Abraham received it, he "fell on his face" (17:3). This was exactly a vassal's attitude toward his sovereign.

This time God instructed Abraham that he and his male posterity should be circumcised. Circumcision was not originally an obligation, but "a sign of the covenant" between God and His people (17:11). It, like the rainbow of the Noachian covenant, indicates the existence of a covenant, and serves to identify the recipient of the covenant. Circumcision is a concrete indication of God's

---

[37] C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, in Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, translated from the German by J. Martin (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1951), I, 223-24.

promise and the protection it affords.[38] Thus circumcision is the mere sign of God's gracious gift. In this בְּרִית, the distinctive feature is the reference to keeping and breaking the covenant (17:9,10,14). It is, however, to be noted that in the express terms of the covenant with Abraham, obedience is not stated as a condition. But that obedience is taken for granted is clearly indicated by the following facts: (a) The first is that obedience is always a part of the blessing; this is true even with regard to the gospel invitation (Jn. 3:16; Acts 2:38; 16:31; Rom. 16:26). (b) The second fact is that in the case of Abraham the obligation of obedience is particularly stressed (cf. 22:2, 18; 26:5).[39] It is also true to say that in the relation of any two moral persons there ought to be some moral obligation (obedience). It is even conceivable that a condition may be involved in a command or promise without its being specially stated, as in case of Jonah.[40] Thus this covenant is specifically called a "promise" (ἐπαγγελία

---

[38] G. E. Mendenhall, op. cit., pp. 62-63; W. Vischer, The Pentateuch, in The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ, translated by A. B. Crabtree (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), I, 101.

[39] O. T. Allis, Prophecy and the Church (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed, 1947), p. 33.

[40] Ibid., p. 32.

Gal. 3:17), as an antithesis to the demand of the law of Moses.

God further confirmed the covenant by changing the name of Sarai into Sarah (שָׂרָה) "princess" and by telling Abraham that she was to become a mother of "nations," kings of nations would come from her (17:15,16). Another confirmation of God was manifested by the prediction of Isaac's birth and the giving of the name of Isaac, who was to be born the following year (17:19,21). Thus the absolute nature of God's covenant did not require Abraham's agreement. This is an act of God's sovereign administration and His self-determined activity.

The main difference between the Noachian covenant and the Abrahamic covenant is the spirituality of the latter. The Noachian covenant is not only for man but "every living creature" (9:12); the Abrahamic covenant, on the other hand, is for Abraham and his descendents (17:7,9,10). If the Abrahamic covenant were strictly for his posterity alone, then the foreign-born slaves in the house would be excluded, and the woman descendents of Abraham would need to be circumcised. However "A similar operation for woman does not occur among the Hebrews, though it is not unknown among other peoples."[41] There is, therefore, room for a

---

[41] L. Köhler, Hebrew Man, translated by P. R. Ackroyd (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957), p. 32.

broad interpretation of the term "Abraham's descendents" in the covenant. We are led to think of the fact that the Abrahamic covenant involves a special religious relationship with God.[42]

The covenant, as God's monergistic, divine promise, is also the divine redemptive gift to man. It is significant that election and covenant are so closely related in Genesis.[43] Thus the covenant is not a temporary thing; but frequently its eternal nature and irrevocability are emphasized.[44] God does not make a covenant with man only for the present. Its origin and fulfilment belong purely to God. Therefore the covenant deserves to be called "an everlasting covenant" (9:16; 17:13,19).

The covenant is also the instrument for man's redemption. God promised to Abraham that He would be his God (17:7). This does not mean a nominal sponsor or

---

[42] J. Murray, op.cit., p. 17.

[43] G. E. Wright, "The Faith of Israel," The Interpreter's Bible, I. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1952), 356; cf. W. Eichrodt regards "covenant" and "election" as the central concept of the Bible, Journal of Biblical Literature, LXV (1946), 215, 207. His "covenant-centered theology" is demonstrated by his Theologie des Alten Testaments (3 vols; Stuttgart: Ehrenfried Klotz Verlag, 1957); H. S.Gehman, op. cit., pp. 34, 38.

[44] H. H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), p. 33 n.

guardian; but the holy and eternal God will receive sinful men and make them His people and have communion with them. The covenant is a special privilege to those who receive it, because they do not deserve to have such a great blessing. God did not promise a way for men to approach Him outside the covenant, but only His people who had a covenant with Him in the post-diluvian world could do so. If God had not revealed Himself to man for communion by means of the covenant, man would never have approached to God. Thus the covenant is the channel for God's blessing and the instrument for the redemption of man.

The covenant is that which binds the people of God to Yahweh in a solemn relationship of obedience. There is an engagement or commitment in the covenant indeed. It is, however, not the contractual terms that are in prominence so much as the solemn engagement of one person to another. Rather it is the giving of one's self over in the true commitment which is the promise of unreserved fidelity.[45] In other words, the fundamental essence of the covenant was not a commercial bargain or a legal contract, but rather man's response to the divine grace.[46]

---

[45] J. Murray, op. cit., p. 10.

[46] H. H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 48.

It is, therefore, significant that the covenant is a religious relationship between God and man. Here a relationship between two beings is involved. A covenant is an activity of rational beings, not merely a mechanical unity. Since it is a fellowship between two moral beings, there must be a mutuality. Fellowship is always mutual and when mutuality ceases fellowship ceases. If the above statement is true, then the response of faith and obedience arises from the nature of the relationship which the covenant expects (15:6; 22:16-18).[47] The same principle is applicable to Abraham's descendants (17:9-14).

If there is a condition in the covenant, it is simply receptive obedience, it is merely the hand for receiving things. Thus the breaking of the covenant is not a failure to meet the terms of the contractual agreement at all. "It is unfaithfulness to a relation constituted and to grace dispensed. By breaking the covenant what is broken is not the condition of bestowal but the condition of consummated fruition."[48] In the circumcision, for example, man's response could not be a contribution to God's covenant, but a sign for "the reception of what is wholly God's in

---

[47] J. Murray, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

[48] Ibid., p. 19.

inception, operation and provision."[49] In other words, those who are heirs of the response could therefore be heirs of the covenant. Thus what man seems to do in the covenant is merely a response to the gracious redemption provided by a faithful God.

---

[49] E. H. Trenchard, op. cit., p. 134.

CHAPTER V

MAN'S WORSHIP OF GOD

The Characteristics of Worship

According to the Biblical record there was a new development in the relationship between God and man after the Fall. This was in the form of an act or an exercise of worship. The English word "worship" is generally a translation of the Hebrew word הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה.[1] The word הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה occurs in Genesis twenty-three times, and always in the Hithpalel form. הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה can be rendered (a) "bow down," "prostrate oneself" before a monarch or superior in homage (18:2; 19:1; 23:7,12; 27:29 bis; 33:3,6,7 bis; 37:7,9,10; 42:6; 43:26,28; 48:12; 49:8); (b) frequently expressing cultic homage before Yahweh (22:5; 24:26,48,52; 47:31).[2] The word הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה, therefore, originally signifies prostration as a mark of respect, and is applied in this broader sense to

---

[1]It is interesting to note the Ugaritic word for "prostrate." It suggests that the stem consonates for "bow down" are חוה instead of חוה: hwy II: št 'to bow down': tštḥwy (49:I: 10; 51: IV: 26; 2Aqht: VI:50-51; etc.) 'she prostrates herself.' C. H. Gordon, Ugaritic Handbook (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1947), p. 228. Cf. W. F. Albright, "The Old Testament and Canaanite Language and Literature," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, VII (Jan., 1945), 17-18.

[2]L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953), p. 959.

prostration before both God and man.[3]

The explicit usage of the term שָׁחָה for man's worship of God is found in the accounts of three men, viz., Abraham, Eliezer and Jacob. When Abraham went to Mt. Moriah to offer Isaac as a sacrifice to God he said to his servants, "Stay here with the ass; I and the lad will go yonder and worship, and come back to you" (22:5). Although Abraham was saying, "I and the lad . . . will worship and come back," he was actually going to offer his son to God as a sacrifice. Thus this worship was a serious and solemn occasion. Here the word שָׁחָה was an inclusive term for the religious activity of Abraham, particularly the offering of his son as a burnt-offering to God.

Another instance of the use of שָׁחָה is in the account of Abraham's sending his old, faithful servant Eliezer (this is the common view, cf. 15:2-3) on the mission of securing a wife for Isaac (chapt. 24). שָׁחָה expressed his personal gratitude for the success of the mission; an outward token of his inward praises of God. In the case of this response the word for "bow down" (קָדַד) accompanies שָׁחָה and emphasizes the whole activity: "The man bowed his head and worshipped Yahweh, and said, 'Blessed be Yahweh God of my lord Abraham who has not forsaken his lovingkindness

---

[3]R. B. Girdlestone, Synonyms of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956), p. 215.

and his faithfulness toward my lord . . . " (24:26,27). Here we see the servant's whole-hearted adoration of God, as a response to what He has done for him.

The last use of the word הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה is found in the account of the death-bed worship of Jacob (47:31). When Jacob had heard that his son Joseph would bury him in Canaan, "the father's burying place," he worshipped God. It was not only a sign of his satisfaction, but an adoration of God because he knew that God was going to fulfil the promise which He had given to him on his journey into Egypt. God had said, "I am God, the God of your father . . . I will go down with you to Egypt and I will also bring you up again; and Joseph's hand shall close your eyes" (46:3,4). Therefore the worship of Jacob was adoration of and thanksgiving for God's faithfulness and a token of his heartfelt appreciation for God's blessing.

The mode of worship included not only man's obeisance to God, but it was exercised in various ways, namely, by sacrifice, prayer, and vows. Thus worship is a formal communion between God and His people; man's acknowledgment of his inward sentiment and its outward manifestation through reverential adoration, obedience, and service to God in His supreme dominion.[4]

---

[4]A. Coleman, "Worship," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, edited by S. M. Jackson (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), p. 433a.

In man's worship of God the initiative is on God's side. Although there is no specific statement of the divine origin of worship in Genesis, we know it to be so from the following scriptural evidences: (a) The divine command to worship is stated; God commanded Abraham to offer a covenant-sacrifice, "Bring me a heifer three years old, a she-goat three years old, a ram three years old, a turtle-dove, and a young pigeon." (15:9). In the incident which tested Abraham's faith God said, "Take your son . . . and offer him there as a burnt-offering upon one of the mountains which I shall tell you" (22:2). (b) God is pleased with man's worship; God "regarded favorably (שָׁעָה, "gaze with interest" or "regard with favor") Abel and his offering" (4:4).[5] This was a visible sign of satisfaction.[6] Also, at the moment when Abraham was going to sacrifice Isaac, God was satisfied with Abraham's obedience and said, "Do not lay your hand on the lad or do anything to him; for now I know that you fear God, seeing you have not withheld your son, your only son, from me." (22:12). (c) God grants His

---

[5]F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1952), p. 1043a.

[6]C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, in Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, translated from the German by J. Martin (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1951), I, 110.

blessing after or by means of man's worship. When Noah offered his sacrifice after the Flood, God smelled a sweet savor and said in His heart, "I will never again curse the ground because of man, for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I ever again destroy every living creature as I have done . . ." (8:21). Abraham's unselfish obedience to God's command also resulted in manifold blessings (22:16-18; cf. 15:17-21).

(d) All true worship is man's response to the divine promise and blessing. When Abraham's old servant saw that God had provided Isaac with a wife, he made an obeisance to God (24:26; 48:52). After Jacob heard Joseph's oath and knew that God had been faithful to His promise, he worshipped God (47:31).[7] (e) Finally there is no mention of human invention of worship, rather "the strange gods" (הַנֵּכָר אֱלֹהֵי, or the foreign gods) are to be forsaken in the worshipping life of God's people (35:2). As a preparation for the flood God commanded Noah to take with him "seven pairs of all clean animals" (7:2). It appears that these animals, unlike the two pairs intended for preservation were to be for sacrifice and human food.[8] Thus the sacrifice was

---

[7]C. E. B. Cranfield, "Divine and Human Action," Interpretation, XII (October, 1958), 388.

[8]J. Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), p. 152.

planned by God and He expected it of Noah after the flood. Therefore God is the only One who is worthy to be worshipped, for He has initiated man's worship and provided all convenient means for this worship.

Worship is also man's responding activity to God's gracious plan. The human action in worship is altogether secondary, being made possible by the activity of God.[9] If one examines Abraham's life, he will find, many times, the following phrase or its equivalent: "he built there an altar to Yahweh" (וַיִּבֶן שָׁם מִזְבֵּחַ לַיהוָה). When Abraham moved into Canaan from Haran, Yahweh appeared and said, "To your seeds I will give this land," then he built there an altar of Yahweh (12:7). Again after Abraham was separated from Lot, his nephew, God appeared to him and promised to give him the land; then Abraham "built an altar to Yahweh" (13:18). Finally on the Mt. Moriah, Abraham built an altar according to the command of God (22:9). Like his father, Isaac also built an altar for Yahweh after God had blessed him (26:25). Jacob, too, built an altar for Yahweh according to the command of God (35:1,3,7). The patriarchs' worship, in which they built altars, was probably the result of one of the two following causes: either man's grateful acknowledgment for God's blessing,[10] or according

---

[9]C. E. B. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 391.

[10]J. P. Lange, A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Genesis, translated from the German and edited, with additions, by P. Schaff (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), p. 392.

to the command of God.

Abraham, as a worshipper, was fully aware that he was unworthy of having Sodom spared, he recognized his unworthy nature before God and said, "I am dust and ashes" (אָנֹכִי עָפָר וָאֵפֶר, 18:27). The next morning, after Jacob had met God in a dream, he said, "How dreadful is this place! This is none other than the house of God and this is the gate of heaven " (28:17). A man fleeing from his brother because of his deceitful action, Jacob's consciousness of sin reached its peak, when he met the Holy God. Jacob then poured oil upon the stone to consecrate it as a memorial to God's mercy.[11] In the above incidents, both Abraham and Jacob were conscious of their unworthiness of being in the presence of the Holy God and because of this confessed their infirmities. Thus humility and reverence are the basic elements of worship.[12]

Both the post-diluvian sacrifice of Noah and the sacrifice of Jacob were external expressions of their gratitude for God's gracious protection (8:20).[13] Jacob had been commanded by God to go to Bethel, and explained

---

[11]Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 282.

[12]F. Davidson, "The Scriptural Doctrine of Worship," The Evangelical Quarterly, VII (1935), 54-55.

[13]Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 151.

God's purpose for him there in the following words, "I may make there an altar to the God who answered me in the day of my distress and has been with me in the way which I have gone (הַהֹלֵךְ אִתִּי)" (35:3). Jacob was humbly obeying God's order, expressing his gratitude for guidance and responding to God, who is the only One worthy of thanksgiving and praise.[14]

Thus worship was a mediatory institution for fellowship between God and man. Where there is a divine-human encounter, it is exercised by means of worship. And yet worship is not only outward harmony of God and man, but it is the expression and fruit of Man's response to God's grace.[15] Therefore the vitality of worship is the unique feature of divine-human fellowship.

Since the patriarchs were a nomadic people, they worshipped God in various places. It is a generally accepted opinion that the expression "to call upon the name of Yahweh" (4:26), denotes "the essential act in worship, the invocation (. . .) of the Deity by solemn utterance of His name."[16]

---

[14]Cranfield, op.cit., p. 391-92.

[15]H. W. Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1952), p. 186; G. F. Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament, translated by G. E. Day (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), p. 246.

[16]Skinner, op. cit., p. 127.

The phrase קָרָא בְּשֵׁם יהוה, literally "call in (or by) the name of Yahweh" is used in cultic activity in Genesis: Abraham (12:8; 13:4; 21:33) and Isaac (26:25). Although the patriarchs worshipped Yahweh in various places, it would seem that they had communion with their God wherever God led them in order that they might meet with Him.[17]

The worship in this period was generally private in nature. The patriarchs practiced the worship of God individually: Abraham offered sacrifice by himself (15:9-17); Eliezer worshipped God by himself even though he was with others (24:26,48,52); and Jacob worshipped in the same manner (47:46). While worship was private, the worshippers were often in the closest association with others, perhaps with a family significance: Noah and his family (8:20); Abraham and his family (12:7; 13:4; 22:5). It may well be observed that the worship of God in this period was carried out by the patriarchs or any individuals and was not done for them by a priest.[18] Thus every individual had the privilege and right to draw near to Yahweh freely.[19]

---

[17]W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, Hebrew Religion (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1937), p. 330.

[18]Girdlestone, op. cit., p. 216.

[19]A. B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, edited from the author's manuscripts by S. D. F. Salmond (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), p. 242.

One peculiar thing in the patriarchal worship is that no image of the deity is ever mentioned.[20] It is a clear evidence for the spirituality of God; the patriarchs worshipped God as spirit; and this is the uniqueness of their worship. There are, however, the "teraphim" in Laban's family (31:19, 30-35). "Teraphim" (תְּרָפִים)[21] seem to be "the family gods because they are called 'gods' in chap. 31:30,32."[22] At the same time they were not an image of Yahweh. They were put away by Jacob at Shechem as being incompatible with the pure worship of God.[23] Therefore Dillmann correctly states, "The worship of God in the house of Abraham was imageless."[24] This is not surprising, for the patriarchs never made or worshipped God by an image of a deity.

In contrast to the neighboring peoples, the patriarchs

---

[20]G. E. Wright, The Old Testament Against Its Environment (London: SCM Press, 1950), p. 24; J. Bright, The Kingdom of God (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953), p. 25.

[21]This will be further discussed in Chapter VI of the thesis.

[22]G. E. Wright, Biblical Archaeology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957), p. 44.

[23]J. Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1908), p. 142.

[24]Ibid.

abstained from using any object in their worship.[25] The "pillar" (מַצֵּבָה) of Jacob (28:18) is often identified as being stone-worship.[26] But the pillar appears as a mere memorial structure "without any definite significance,"[27] and a symbol and expression of "gratitude for a Divine revelation."[28]

The Distinctive Sacrifices in Genesis

The worship of God's people consisted not only in words and physical obeisance, but above all in a special service to Yahweh, viz., the offering of something dear to the worshipper, as a sacrifice to God.[29] Thus the offering, as a part of worship, is expressed by various terms in Genesis.

---

[25]H. Schultz, Old Testament Theology, translated from the fourth German edition by J. A. Paterson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892), I, 209.

[26]J. J. Orr, op. cit., p. 138.

[27]W. R. Smith, The Religion of the Semites (New York: Meridian Books, 1956), p. 203.

[28]E. König, "Symbol, Symbolical Actions.--," A Dictionary of the Bible, Extra Volume, edited by J. Hastings (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923), p. 170. For further treatment concerning the object of worship, see, J. Orr, op. cit., pp. 137-39.

[29]C. Orelli, "Sacrifice," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, edited by S. M. Jackson (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), p. 163b.

The oldest term for offering is מִנְחָה and is generally translated by "gift," "present" or "offering." Probably the etymological meaning of מִנְחָה was a gift.[30] The word is used quite frequently in a non-religious sense to describe the formal present which signifies one's subjection to a person of authority.[31] For example Jacob offered a present (מִנְחָה) to Esau (32:13,18,20,21;[32] 33:10), and to Joseph who was in Egypt (43:11,15,25,26). The most common usage of מִנְחָה, however, in the whole Old Testament was "offering." At this point it is also worthy to note that מִנְחָה was translated in the Septuagint as "sacrifice" (θυσία) in 140 places, and as "gift" (δῶρον) in thirty-two places.[33] It seems clear from the sacrifices of Cain

---

[30] N. H. Snaith, "Sacrifice in the Old Testament," Vetus Testamentum, VII (1957), 309; H. H. Rowley, The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament (Manchester: University Press, 1950), p. 84; G. B. Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament (Oxford: The Calrendon Press, 1925), pp. 14, 15, 398.

[31] F. D. Kidner, Sacrifice in the Old Testament (London: Tyndale Press, 1952), p. 15; N. H. Snaith, op. cit., p. 309; W. Vischer, The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ, translated by A. B. Crabtree (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), I, 213.

[32] Hebrew 32:14,19,21,22.

[33] Girdlestone, op. cit., p. 190.

and Abel that originally מִנְחָה denotes "either an animal sacrifice or cereal offering, in fact, anything given wholly to Yahweh."[34] Thus the offering of both "the fruit of the ground" of Cain and "the firstlings of his flock and the fat thereof" of Abel are called מִנְחָה (4:3-4).[35]

Noah's sacrifice after the flood is called עֹלָה, viz., "whole burnt-offering," "whole-offering" or "burnt-offering" (8:20). The word עֹלָה or עוֹלָה, derived from עָלָה (go up or ascend), seems to indicate "that which goes up to heaven," namely the flame and smoke of animals.[36] In the term עֹלָה, the idea of "wholly burnt" or "entirely consumed" is emphasized, for when the flame goes up, complete burning follows.[37] Thus since the sacrifice goes up, it is interesting to note that the sacrifice itself is an embodied prayer.[38] As can

---

[34]H. W. Robinson, Record and Revelation (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 267; Brown, Driver and Briggs, op. cit., p. 585a.

[35]At this point H. H. Rowley incorrectly states, "Probably the minhah was gift . . . . It seems clear that originally it denoted an animal sacrifice, since the term is used of Abel's sacrifice, but it became in later times a meal offering." Op. cit., p. 84; cf. The Faith of Israel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1957), p. 94.

[36]Brown, Driver and Briggs, op. cit., p. 750a.

[37]N. H. Snaith, op. cit., p. 310.

[38]G. F. Oehler, op. cit., p. 247.

be seen, the word עֹלָה itself allows no possibility of regarding this term as being used to denote a common sacramental meal between the deity and man.[39] When God commanded Abraham to offer Isaac, He required of him "a burnt-offering" עֹלָה (22:2,3,6,7,8), and Abraham later offered a ram "as a burnt-offering" (22:13).

Another word for offering is זֶבַח (sacrifice). G. B. Gray suggests that "slain-offering" would be a suitable translation of זֶבַח, since the verb זָבַח simply means "what is slain."[40] Thus זֶבַח is primarily an animal offering. In Genesis זֶבַח occurs twice and accompanies a cognate verb (31:54; 46:1).

The last word for the term "offering" is נֶסֶךְ. It is derived from נָסַךְ (pour out) and signifies "libation-offering." At Bethel Jacob "poured out a libation offering" on the pillar (35:14), and it was not drunk.

Sacrifice or offering was the basic rite of Yahweh worship. It was made already by the first children of the human race. Cain brought to Yahweh "of the fruit of the ground" (4:3) and Abel also brought "of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof" (4:4), as their offering

---

[39] A. B. Davidson, op. cit., p. 314.

[40] Op. cit., p. 6.

(מִנְחָה). In the case of the latter's offering, it was "the fattest of the firstlings."[41] This is proved by the usage of waw (ו) in an explanatory sense, as indicated in Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar:

> Frequently waw copulatium is also explanatory (like isque et-quidem, and the German und zwar, English to wit), and is then called waw explicativum, e.g. Gn. 4:4 and (i.e. namely) of the fat thereof.[42]

Thus וּמֵחֶלְבֵהֶן is not "and of their fat portions,"[43] namely, of the animals, as in the Levitical law of sacrifice. This sacrifice was not connected with a sacrificial meal; the animal was not eaten at this time.[44] By its etymology sacrifice denotes a holy gift, but it does not imply a transfer of value to Yahweh. After all, He is the Lord of all things and there is no possibility of enriching Him. Therefore the sacrifices of Cain and Abel were much more than mere gifts.[45]

---

[41] Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 109.

[42] E. Kautzsch, second English edition revised in accordance with the twenty-eighth German edition by A. E. Cowley (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946), p. 484.

[43] RSV.

[44] Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 109.

[45] G. B. Gray, op. cit., p. 2.

The reason why they were not equally acceptable to God is not clear from the context. However it is clear that the problem is in their heart attitude (Heb. 11:4). This is suggested by the words "Abel and his offering" and "Cain and his offering"; not only were "the offerings" regarded favorably or disregarded by God but also the hearts of the worshippers.[46] It is also quite probable that both Cain and Abel were instructed by Yahweh to offer the firstlings of the flock as blood sacrifice to Him. Since this event occurred after the expulsion of the first parents from the garden of Eden, it is reasonable for us to conclude that Cain and Abel offered sacrifice to God as a mediation for fellowship with Yahweh.[47]

After Noah came out of the ark, he built an altar for whole burnt-offering. This is the first altar mentioned in the Bible (8:20). Noah took his offerings from the clean birds which he had taken into the ark. This action indicates two important facts: (a) The offering is according to the instruction by God and should be clean (7:2); (b) The essential point in animal sacrifice is the blood; in other words blood sacrifice signifies an offering of life (9:4). These were whole burnt-offerings, which by fire turned into

---

[46]Kidner, op. cit., p.7.

[47]Oehler, op. cit., p. 54; Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 111.

rising smoke and ascended to God. Yahweh smelled "a sweet savor" and was pleased with it (8:21). This phrase is an anthropomorphic expression of God's favorable acceptance. Indeed, the phrase "sweet savor unto Yahweh" in the book of Leviticus was "a technical expression referring to an offering's acceptability unto God (Lev. 1:9,13,17; 2:2,9,12; etc.)."[48] In fact Noah's sacrifices were entirely animals, in other words, there was shedding of blood. But sacrifices were never offered to nourish God; there is nothing said of God's eating them or any thought of God's need of physical sustenance.[49] Furthermore what pleased God was not the physical value of the offering, but the spirit with which the sacrifice was offered.[50] It seems that the primary motive of this offering was thanksgiving for the deliverance experienced. Yet Noah draws near to God in offering, seeking at the same time grace for the future. Since the sacrifice had an appeasing effect (cf. 8:21), Noah obtained the blessing from God.

---

[48] G. E. Wright, "The Faith of Israel," The Interpreter's Bible, I (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952), 379.

[49] M. Burrows, An Outline of Biblical Theology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1946), p. 266.

[50] P. Heinisch, Theology of the Old Testament, English edition by W. Heidt (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1950), p. 208.

Genesis tells us that Abraham built an altar in many places (12:7,8; 13:18) and offered a covenant sacrifice to God according to the command of Yahweh (15:9-17).[51] The peculiar sacrifice of Abraham is recorded in the twenty-second chapter. Here God says to Abraham, "Take your only son Isaac, whom you love, and go to the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt-offering upon one of the mountains of which I shall tell you." (22:5). This section of narrative is governed by the sentence "God tempted (נִסָּה) Abraham." (22:1) and shows God's purpose.[52] Nevertheless the divine command had no further explanation by which Abraham could expect any other outcome; it looked to him as though God were requiring his complete obedience in the offering of Isaac as a burnt offering. It is possible that human sacrifice was the custom of the natives of the land, so that the practice was not too great a shock to Abraham's ethical nature.[53]

In this inimitable story, Jewish tradition strangely lays the emphasis on the phrase, Abraham "bound Isaac his

---

[51]We have indicated this in the previous chapter, supra, p. 65.

[52]Skinner, op.cit., p. 328.

[53]J. J. Reeve, "Sacrifice in the Old Testament," The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, edited by J. Orr (Chicago: The Howard-Severance Co., 1915), p. 2642.

son" (עֲקַד אֶת־יִצְחָק בְּנוֹ, 22:9), as the temptation, the test of Abraham's religious obedience, and "the symbolic picture" of the atonement for Israel's sins.[54] Abraham's fear of God (יְרֵא אֱלֹהִים) and his obedience of faith were ascertained by God when Isaac was bound and ready to be slain (22:9,10). Keil says, "The sacrifice was already accomplished in his heart, and he had fully satisfied the requirement of God."[55] In this eventful moment God prevented Abraham from slaying Isaac and showed him a ram. Here God prepared the ram, which possessed blood and life. This clearly shows that the true character of sacrifice is the life for life.[56] M. Burrows suggests that the ram as an animal sacrifice was used as a substitute for the human sacrifice; God Himself provided an offering instead of the human victim, Isaac.[57] This sacrifice indicates that God wants the heart of man, viz., his faith in God. Then the offering is prepared by God Himself for the symbolical representation of the person who presents the sacrifice. In such a way sinful man

---

[54]H. J. Schoeps, "The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's Theology," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXV (1946), 385-87.

[55]Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 250.

[56]G. Vos, Biblical Theology (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954), p. 107.

[57]M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 226; cf. Skinner, op. cit., p. 330; Lange, op. cit., p. 468.

can have a fellowship with a holy God; this is the entrance of the advanced blessing.

The slain-offering (זֶבַח), not מִנְחָה or עֹלָה, was offered to God by Jacob. After he made a covenant with Laban, "Jacob offered a sacrifice" (וַיִּזְבַּח יַעֲקֹב זֶבַח, 31:54). It was a sacrifice followed by a family meal (אֲחָיו, a broad term "his relations") which was a sacrificial meal. Thus the covenant between Jacob and Laban was sealed by a feast of love before Yahweh, the witness (31:54). Jacob and Laban made a covenant of peace by means of the parting feast. The sacrifice was to serve peace. When Jacob offered his sacrifice, he may have had some other purposes, viz., adoration and guidance for the future etc., but at the time when he made a reconciliation with Laban it would be proper for him to offer a sacrifice for peace. Years later when Jacob was on his way to Egypt, "he offered sacrifice" (וַיִּזְבַּח זְבָחִים, 46:1) to Yahweh. It was necessary at that time for Jacob to secure peace on his journey and seek an encouragement for his unknown future from God, because he was transplanting his whole house (almost a clan) to a strange country. Although Joseph, his beloved, powerful son, was preparing his father's coming into Egypt, it was not an easy task for Jacob, humanly speaking. Thus it seems reasonable for him to offer "peace offering" to Yahweh at

Beer-sheba (46:1).[58]

In Genesis the sacrifices as acts belonging to the sphere of worship are described in general terms and are not yet hardened into a system as is found in the Mosaic law. But many of the offerings show "some step of progress towards their fully developed form."[59] As we have seen previously, sacrifices are exercises of fellowship between God and His people, a means of intercourse between them. Although the individual member of God's people has a covenant with God, still he is a sinner. In other words the idea of sacrifice has an intimate connection with the fact of sin; it is necessitated by the state of sin.[60] Before the Fall man did not need any sacrifice because he had a full fellowship with God. After the Fall man was cast out of the garden of Eden and no longer enjoyed the full blessing of God. Therefore he needed the restoration of such fellowship with God.

When man rightly offered a sacrifice to God, then He was pleased and satisfied with the worshipper (4:4; 8:21; 22:12,16-18). By the act of offering the sacrifice the

---

[58]Kidner, op. cit., p. 7; Lange, op. cit., p. 631.

[59]Kidner, op. cit., p. 6.

[60]G. Vos, op. cit., p. 172.

fellowship between God and man was restored; through this communion man had the privilege of gaining peace and blessing.[61] Although there is no specific mention of securing pardon for sin by means of the sacrifice, God's satisfaction with the blood offering indicates His longsuffering of man's sin (8:21-22). Thus sacrifice is symbolically a mediation for the restoration of communion between God and man and does picture atonement.[62]

While there is no clear explanation of the rationale of sacrifice in Genesis,[63] there is a similarity as well as difference between the sacrifice of God's people and that of the surrounding peoples.[64] There are various theories of the primary meaning of sacrifice.[65] As we have proved by previous examination, sacrifice in Genesis claims that

---

[61] W. P. Paterson, "Sacrifice," Dictionary of the Bible, edited by J. Hastings, IV (1902) 329-30.

[62] H. W. Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, pp. 166-67.

[63] V. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice (London: Macmillan & Co., 1951), p. 49.

[64] J. Pedersen, Israel, III-IV (London: Oxford University Press, 1954), p. 299.

[65] For good bibliographical references, see H. H. Rowley, The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament, pp. 76-79.

it is of divine origin, viz., by invitation of God and as the worshipper felt moved.[66] Since sacrifice was practiced not only by God's people but also among nations universally and since there is a similarity between Hebrew sacrifice and heathen rites, some try to identify the former with the latter. In this connection F. D. Kidner well states:

> But this fact no more weakens the Israelite claim to a divine sanction, than the ability of the Nazarenes to name the brothers and sisters of Jesus disproved the incarnation.[67]

The sacrifice was a symbol of mediation for the restoration of fellowship between God and man, though indeed far from efficacious in itself.[68] There were at least three types of sacrifice in Genesis, viz., the whole burnt-offering, peace-offering and the meal offering, and the worshippers had to offer them many times. The lives of the patriarchs were full of these sacrifices. If the sacrifice had restored the full degree of fellowship between God and man, then a single sacrifice would have sufficed for such a purpose.

---

[66] Kidner, op. cit., p. 5, 19.

[67] Ibid., p. 5; cf. G. A. Hadjiantoniou, "Sacrifice: Its Origin and Purpose," The Evangelical Quarterly, XVII (1945), 44.

[68] Kidner, op. cit., p. 19; Rowley, The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament, p. 110.

Furthermore there is no clear statement of the absolute remission of sin by the sacrifice. Although God was pleased with Noah by virtue of his sacrifice, still "Yahweh said in His heart . . . 'for the imagination of man's heart is evil (כִּי יֵצֶר לֵב הָאָדָם רַע) from his youth up'" (8:21). In other words, God covered man's sin with His mercies and was longsuffering toward it.

Thus the sacrifice was the effective means for communion between God and man because it pointed forward to a perfect and eternal sacrifice. Therefore, as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews indicates, the sacrifice was "a shadow of the good things to come" (Heb. 10:1), God's sacrifice of man, namely Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER VI

MAN'S RELATION TO SOCIETY

Man in Society

The creation account in the first chapter of Genesis indicates that the word אָדָם is used here in a collective sense. "So God created the man (הָאָדָם) . . . He created him: male and female he created them" (זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם, 1:27). It is true that the Hebrew word אָדָם is used in three different senses: (a) as a common noun, "man" (Mensch in German), "a human being"; (b) in a generic or collective sense for "mankind" (Menschheit), the human race; (c) as a proper noun without the article, the name of the first man, Adam.[1] The word אָדָם is found twenty-one times in a collective sense, for "mankind" out of fifty-four instances where it occurs in Genesis.[2] A similar usage is shown in the case of the word עֵץ. This can mean "tree" as the single specimen (2:9; 3:22,24; 18:4,8) or in a collective

---

[1] F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1952), p. 9; E. Lussier, "Adam in Genesis 1:1-4:24," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVIII (April, 1956), 137-38. This will be cited as CBQ.

[2] L. Köhler points out that אָדָם occurs 510 times in the Bible and is mostly used as a generic term, for "mankind." Theologie des Alten Testaments, Dritte, überarbeitete Auflage (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953), p. 114.

sense, "trees," designating the whole species (1:11,12,29; 2:16; 3:1,2,8).

There are also many words used collectively and at the same time serving as nomina unitatis; עָלֶה "a leaf" and "foliage" (3:7); עַיִט "a bird of prey" and "birds of prey" (15:11); מַטֶּה "staff" and "rods" (30:37); אִישׁ "a man" and "men" (32:6;[3] 33:1); נֶפֶשׁ "soul," "person" and "persons" (14:21; 46:15,18,22,25,25 bis, 27 bis).[4] This seems to suggest that the unity of the human personality is assumed. The same is true of לֵב and לֵבָב the word for "heart," "mind," "will," "inner man" and "intellect." "Your heart" (לְבָבְךָ) is used of God and his two companions (18:5); "their heart" (לִבָּם) of Joseph's brethren (42:28; 50:21).[5] In Jacob's speech to Joseph, he seems to switch easily from the second person singular to plural, and vice versa:

> And Israel said to Joseph, 'Behold I am about to die; but God will be with you (עִמָּכֶם, plural) and will bring you (וְהֵשִׁיב אֶתְכֶם) again to the land of your fathers (אֲבֹתֵיכֶם). Moreover I have given to you (לְךָ, singular) one portion above your brothers' (עַל אַחֶיךָ; 48:21,22a).

---

[3]Hebrew 32:7.

[4]E. Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, second English edition revised in accordance with the twenty-eighth German edition by A. E. Cowley (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946), p. 395.

[5]L. Kohler, op. cit., p. 149.

But we understand that Jacob was including Joseph's two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh. Jacob was free to do this, because he was counting Joseph and his two sons as a unit and a group; he was in one instance including all of them, and in another, simply speaking to Joseph alone. This type of expression appears peculiar but is commonly found among ancient people. After Ham's disgraceful act against his father, Noah, the curse was not upon Ham but on Canaan, his son. Although this curse was expressly pronounced upon Canaan alone, the fact that Ham had no share in Noah's blessing, either for himself or his other sons, was a sufficient proof that the curse upon Canaan included Ham also.[6] This account plainly reveals to us a unity and an intimate family system of the post-diluvian age.

The history of the patriarchs tells us that the family is the fundamental unit for all activity and that there is a close tie between all its members. Each patriarch generally had a large family in which two generations or even three usually lived and moved together. Terah was quite old when he moved to Haran, but he was accompanied by Abraham, his son and Lot, his grandson (11:21). Lot could have stayed in Haran because he was old enough to be independent, but he

---

[6] C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, The Pentateuch in Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, translated from the German by J. Martin (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1951), I, 158.

followed Abraham, his uncle, to the land of Canaan (12:5) and to Egypt (13:1). Particularly in the family of Jacob, the older sons were almost all grown up when Joseph was seventeen years old (37:2), but ten older children of Jacob were still living together and working for their father Jacob. Under the leadership of Jacob several generations lived together in Canaan, sharing happy and bitter experiences, and finally went down to Egypt together.

The group idea was so strong in the patriarchal period that sometimes the idea overshadowed individuality. In the matter of marriage a bridegroom often did not choose his own bride, but his family selected one for him (Gen. 24). There seems to have been less individual privacy; the community or family in the larger sense, decided even the affairs of individuals. Thus the individual was always a member, co-partner, and co-sufferer of a group; a man should not only think of himself as an individual but at the same time should reckon himself as a member of the group and within the group.[7] Every man belonged to a family which was the essential social unit. The families made clans, clans formed tribes, and tribes became a people. Therefore genealogies were respected and carefully preserved. A person's name often specified this vital fact: Ham, "the father of

---

[7] L. Köhler, op. cit., pp. 114-15.

Canaan" (9:18,22) as a part of a name; Bethuel, "son of Milcah" (24:15,24,47); Sarai, "Abram's wife" (12:17; 16:1, 3), etc. Thus these names suggest intimate relation within the family and that men existed only as members of a social unit.[8]

Although there was a strong group consciousness, the individual nevertheless played an important part in Genesis. Along with the tribal consciousness revealed in Genesis, and largely because of it, there was also a keen appreciation of outstanding men. Every family respected its own master, husband or father. A leader must lead his people in battle, act as a judge, and make every decision. Thus it is correct to say with E. F. Scott, "Nothing is known of early Hebrew history apart from the names of certain leaders who appeared from time to time."[9] All through the history of the patriarchs the leading men were respected by the people. Various individual characteristics distinguished the leaders. This diversity shows individuality, and therefore we are not only dealing with the community as a whole,[10] but with individuals.

---

[8] Ibid., p. 116.

[9] E. F. Scott, Man and Society in the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946), p. 32.

[10] Ibid., p. 33.

The life of Enoch is a typical example of individuality (5:24). His life was by no means like the community life of his contemporaries. Likewise Noah was the only man to be favored before God and blameless in his generation (6:8,9), and he and his family were preserved through the flood (8:18-19). It seems clear that the value of the individual was great even in the wicked city of Sodom; if there had been only ten righteous men in the city it would not have been destroyed. Only the individual Lot and his two daughters were saved. Even in their case Lot's wife also could have been saved if she had followed the command of God (19:17, 26). Similarly the two sons-in-law chose their own way and did not follow Lot (19:14). Esau and Jacob were born in the same blessed home, had the same mother and were born at the same time, but their lives and blessings differed widely. The lives of Jacob and his sons clearly show us that individuality was strong even in the patriarchal families.

We find then no extreme collectivism or extreme individualism, but a combination of both in Genesis. It is often said that, "Ancient thought in general, and Hebrew thought in particular, made the group primary, whilst the fuller recognition of the individual came later."[11] This

---

[11]H. W. Robinson, Record and Revelation (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 332. It is sometimes suggested that Jeremiah and Ezekiel discovered the individual and that before their time man was thought of in terms of the society to which he belonged.

idea is called "corporate personality," a term often associated with the name of H. Wheeler Robinson.[12] The idea of the identity of the individual and the group to which he belongs is further developed. H. W. Robinson calls this the "law of participation" and explains,

> Things, beings and phenomena can be (in a manner incomprehensible to us) at once themselves and something other than themselves . . . to think at the same time of the individual in the collective and the collective in the individual.[13]

Now we shall examine evidences of the status of the individual in Genesis. It seems that piety and prosperity are personal matters. In a sinful world Enoch and Noah walked with God in their individual piety. Abraham and Joseph demonstrated the nobility of their individual character even in the midst of adversities. The reward of these men was not from the community, nor through the medium of the community, but simply from God to individual. The individual's whole life is under His guidance. B. J. LeFrois, in this connection, tries to identify Jacob as the people of Israel

---

[12]The same view is defended by Otto Eissfelt independently of H. W. Robinson. Cf. E. J. Young, Studies in Isaiah (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954), pp. 105-6; C. R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah (Second edition; London: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 103.

[13]H. W. Robinson, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality, "Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 66 (1936), 55-56, which is quoted by B. J. LeFrois, "Semitic Totality Thinking," CBQ, XVII (1955), 197.

(32:28, cf. 37:13), Shem as Semites (9:27) and the twelve sons of Jacob as the twelve tribes of Israel (Gen. 49).[14] It is true that the name Israelite came from Israel and Jacob; Semites from Shem; and the twelve tribes from the twelve children of Israel. If LeFrois were correct, then how could one solve such a problem as the one which arises when the group concept does not fit the context. It is clear from the context that these men are representative of the respective names. Besides, these messages are prophecies. We should not lean too much on collective nouns. Every language has such idioms, particularly the oriental languages.[15] Therefore a collective noun may have had a specific meaning but in the course of history people may have used it without the specific sense.

The worship of God was generally a community affair, at least family-wide. However there was no conception of sacrifice as being simply a social rite. "There were always individual offerings as well as corporate, and individual thanksgivings and pleas could always be brought

---

[14] Ibid., pp. 196-97.

[15] The writer has a first-hand knowledge of such examples in Chinese, Japanese and Korean. For instance, "There is a man" and "there are men" can be expressed in the same way. Also "there is a tree on the mountain" and "there are trees on the mountains" are similarly expressed.

to God."[16] Undoubtedly man lives in family and group solidarity. This community idea is expressed at the death of a man. The death of Abraham was expressed by saying, "And he was gathered to his people" וַיֵּאָסֶף אֶל־עַמָּיו (25:8); thus also was Ishmael (25:17); Isaac (35:29); and Jacob (49:29,33). It is also true that children suffer for the sins of their fathers (cf. 9:24-27). If man were but an individual, it would not be just that he should be involved in the result of any action but his own.[17] There is a close tie and oneness in the community.

There is, however, a clear limitation to the bond between the individual and his group. L. Köhler well states this point by saying:

> The bond is set in a context of grace.[18] The sinner does not involve the righteous in destruction, but the righteous involves the sinner in salvation. The clear limitation is this: that the bond does not work in terms of proportion.[19]

Thus all members of the family of Noah, although they were by no means equally righteous, were saved with Noah.

---

[16] H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1957), p. 103.

[17] H. H. Rowley, The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, n.d.), p. 213.

[18] Die Verbundenheit ist gnadenwärts gerichtet.

[19] L. Köhler, Old Testament Theology, translated by A. S. Todd (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1958), p. 162.

Similarly ten righteous men would have saved the wicked Sodom; on the other hand, the wicked city did not involve Lot and his daughters. Thus the relationship of individual and community clearly shows God's loving grace; "God is much more a God of Grace than that of a God of judgment."[20] In Genesis the members of the social unit, whether family or tribe, were so closely tied together that the people thought of them as an organic whole, in which, though knit together, they did not lose their individuality.[21] A unity existed within the various human groups; surely Cain was a keeper of his brother. Man, being in the image of God, the welfare of his fellow-man was his concern and his responsibility. On the other hand, there was never any lack of recognition of the due rights of the individual and each individual had a personal link with God. There is no idea of the individual being a fragment of the community; the individual existed as an individual. Thus the community and the individuality of man were both preserved in the unity of a single view of the nature of man in Genesis.[22]

---

[20] Ibid.

[21] H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel, p. 122; E. Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, translated by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958), p. 155.

[22] H. H. Rowley, The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament, p. 216.

The coexistence of a group and an individuality was well represented in a balanced view of man in Genesis.

God's creation of man and woman was the basis of society, the beginning of the marriage and the family. It is evident that marriage, as the union of the two sexes which are divinely planned, distinguishes three purposes: (a) a companionship (2:18); (b) a sexual partnership (2:24); (c) obtaining progeny (3:16; 4:1). In the course of history progeny as the means of the perpetuation of a man's name and estate was overemphasized in marriage. Since obtaining the children became almost the exclusive function of marriage (24:60),[23] choice of a spouse was more the affair of the family and of convention than a matter of personal inclination and individual preference.[24]

For the sake of preserving the same culture and preventing any harm, marriage between near relatives was a common practice in the ancient world, e.g., Abraham (20:12), Nahor (11:27-29), Isaac (24:3,48,67), Jacob (28:1-2; 29:18-30). It is true that, "The Hebrew wife was always regarded

---

[23] I. Mendelsohn, "The Family in the Ancient Near East," The Biblical Archaeologist, XI (May, 1948), 40. This will be cited as BA.

[24] L. Köhler, Hebrew Man, translated by P. R. Ackroyd (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957), p. 77.

as a person."[25] In this connection it is interesting to note the status of women in the Nuzi[26] documents. "One Amminae was actually the governor of a considerable province, which had been assigned to her by Saushattar king of the Mitanni Empire."[27] Cyrus Gordon shows us the account of another incident from a Nuzi tablet, "One of the most highly educated men of the town, none other than a scribe, was the slave of a lady of Nuzu. On all counts we can see that the ladies of Nuzu were not without power."[28] Although a man secured his wife by negotiation with her parents and the presentation of a compensation gift (מֹהַר, 34:12; cf. 24:53), he did not actually purchase her. The wife had her rights and privileges.[29] She had her own property, viz., tent, or living quarters (24:67; 31:33), gifts (34:12), and her own private maidservant (16:1-8; 24:61; 29:24,29). She had the benefit of her husband's

---

[25]D. R. Mace, Hebrew Marriage (London: The Epworth Press, 1953), p. 186. The Hebrews "never went so far as the Muhammadan poet who says that the mothers of mankind are only 'vessels' which receive the children without leaving any impress on them." J. Pedersen, Israel, I-II (London: Oxford University Press, 1954), p. 61.

[26]This can also be spelled either "Nuzu" or "Nuza." Cf. C. H. Gordon, Adventures in the Nearest East (Fair Lawn, N. J.: Essential Books, 1957), p. 181 n.

[27]Ibid., p. 111.

[28]Ibid., p. 112.

[29]D. R. Mace, op. cit., p. 186.

property (31:16). It is also true that man should "rule over" (שׁוֹל, 3:16) his wife; her subordination cannot be disputed; everything is grouped around the man.[30] She is completely bound up with her husband; she belongs to her husband for the purposes which marriage serves.

While it is true that Genesis makes a close connection between sex and propagation, it does not regard the procreation of children as dependent only on sexual intercourse. There is no claim in Genesis that parents possess the power to ensure issue. At this point Otto Piper clearly shows that the Scriptural view,

> does not regard procreation as the purpose of sexual union but rather regards children as a further blessing added by God . . . . 'Be fruitful and multiply' (Genesis 1:28 and 9:1) is not to be interpreted as a commandment (as if a person had it in his power to produce life), but just as in the parallel passages (1:22 and 9:7), as a blessing spoken by God . . . .[31]

In Hebrew society the honor paid to the wife was dependent on her bearing a son. If she was childless, particularly having no male issue, she endured a severe reproach; for barrenness was regarded not only as a misfortune (11:30) and reproach (30:23), but as evidence of the lack of the divine favor (16:2; 29:31; 30:1-2).

---

[30] J. Pedersen, op. cit., p. 70.

[31] O. A. Piper, The Christian Interpretation of Sex (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941), pp. 50-51.

Children were reckoned as a divine gift and a blessing from God: Eve (4:1), Sarah (17:19), Abimelech's family (20:17), Rebekah (25:21), Leah (29:31), Rachel (30:22-24), Jacob (33:5), and Jacob's blessing (49:25). Child-bearing was not only an honor, but one of the wife's essential functions to fulfil her marriage duty. It also assured her status as being entitled to claim her right. It is interesting to see that the code of Hammurabi decrees that upon the death of a childless wife, her father was obliged to return to her husband the bride-price which he had paid for her.[32]

Domestic happiness in Hebrew society is associated with the monogamous union,[33] if the wife bears a child. In case she cannot raise an heir for her husband--perhaps she only bears girls--the husband is given another woman by his wife, generally her maidservant (16:2; 30:3,4,9). The primary purpose of polygamy appears to be to obtain progeny, although we cannot dispute the presence of lust

---

[32]Parag. 163: "If a seignior acquired a wife and that woman has gone to (her) fate without providing him with children, if his father-in-law has then returned to him the marriage-price which that seignior brought to the house of his father-in-law . . . ." J. B. Pritchard, editor, Ancient Near Eastern Texts (Princeton University Press, 1955), p. 173a.

[33]According to the Code of Hammurabi the Babylonian family was basically monogamous in character. Ibid., p. 173; I. Mendelsohn, op. cit., p. 24.

as a factor (4:19; 26:34-35). We note as an indication that God's original will was monogamy (1:27; 2:24) the fact that bigamy was first committed by a godless person, Lamech. The question has often been asked about the polygamy of the patriarchs such as Abraham and Jacob. It is evident that there is no approval nor blessing of God on their polygamy. Genesis does not describe them as sinless men; rather they were received by God through His grace.[34] The result of polygamy clearly shows us its bitter fruit: (a) it introduces strife (16:4-6; 21:9-11; 30:1-16); (b) it depersonalizes the woman and makes her a mere instrument of man's lust.[35]

One of the precious features of Hebrew society is the close bond of the family. Since marriage is a divine appointment and children a divine gift, the home groups itself around the man into a community, and all, wife and children are merged into a unity.[36] Since the father is the master (בַּעַל) and protector in the home, he has the duty of nourishing and training and has a right to the children.

---

[34] R. L. Harris, Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957), p. 124.

[35] D. R. Mace, op. cit., p. 135.

[36] P. Heinisch, Theology of the Old Testament, English edition by W. Heidt (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1950), p. 194.

How far the father's rights over his children extended it is difficult to determine.[37] Lot suggested offering his two daughters to satisfy the lust of the men of Sodom (19:8); Abraham was prepared to sacrifice Isaac (22:9-10); Judah ordered Tamar, his daughter-in-law to be burned for playing the harlot (38:24); Reuben staked the lives of his two sons as a pledge that he would bring back Benjamin alive (42:37). Although none of the results suggested actually came to pass, yet they clearly reveal the authority of the father. In the selection of a bride the father usually had a part (24:2ff; 28:1ff; 38:6).

Motherhood in Hebrew society is the patent of nobility of woman; through it she acquires her place in life and a share in the family. It is evident that the Hebrew infant belongs to the mother and is nursed by her. When a new baby is born, its name is given more often by the mother than the father.[38] It is normal for the Hebrew mother to suckle her child; only rarely does a nurse take the mother's place.[39]

---

[37] D. R. Mace, op. cit., p. 216.

[38] The Old Testament mentions forty-six cases of naming, twenty-eight times by the mother, eighteen times by the father. L. Köhler, Hebrew Man, p. 54 n.

[39] The mention of the burial of Deborah, the nurse of Rebekah (35:8) gives us an example. Ibid., p. 58.

As a mother the woman has her share in the authority of the husband over the children. Even the slave woman feels so exalted, when she has become a mother, that she can look down upon her childless mistress (16:4-5). After the death of her husband when the son succeeded to his father's estate, his mother became the mistress of the household--a position of special dignity and importance (21:21; 24:67). In this case, of course, the son is the master of the house and he takes the initiative in various activities (24:50,53,55,60).

After the weaning of the girls they remain within the sphere of the mother and of the other women of the household; boys gradually move out to follow their father. In everyday life the children do what they see their parents do: imitating their mode of speech and behavior.[40] There is not much privacy, in the Hebrew home so that the children can easily observe and follow their parents. Hebrew children have not much time for play or self-indulgence. In a semi-nomadic group as children grow up, they are expected to share some of the work of the family. Rebekah carries a pitcher to draw water (24:16). Rachel brings the sheep to be watered (29:6). Joseph is sent by his father to observe the condition of his brethren (37:13-14). The married son is still a member of his father's house, even though he has

---

[40] Ibid., p. 59.

his own house. The sons of Noah belong to Noah's house, after they are all married (7:1). The twelve sons of Jacob who were in Egypt all belonged to the father's house (בֵּית־אָב, 46:31; 47:12).

The heir of the house generally inherited nearly all that his father had (24:36; 25:5); but the sons of a slave-woman also inherited a little (25:6). In the ancient world people had to have heirs for practical, social and religious reasons.[41] Whoever has not an own son, should adopt an heir, usually from his kinsmen in order that the adoptive parents and the adopted son can obtain mutual benefit. In this connection it is interesting to note the Hebrew adoption law, e.g., the relation of Abraham and Eliezer (15:2-4). Abraham, who had no prospect of any children of his own, refers to Eliezer as his heir, who apparently was "the elder of his house, who ruled over all that he had" (24:2). Presumably Abraham had legally adopted this trusted slave in accordance with prevailing custom. But God said: "This [servant] shall not inherit you, but the one who shall go out of your inwards, he shall inherit you" (15:4). If Eliezer was a legally adopted heir how could his rights be set aside? Some of the Nuzi tablets give the answer. It was a custom for a couple who had no children to adopt someone as their

---

[41] C. H. Gordon, op. cit., p. 107.

son. This adopted son was to take care of them as long as they lived and see to it that they received an honorable burial. In return for this service he inherited the property. If the adopters should afterward beget a son the one adopted must yield to him the place of chief heir.[42] Another Nuzi tablet gives us a good explanation of the relations between Jacob and Laban (Gen. 29-31). It seems that Laban had no male heir, so he adopted Jacob as his son and gave him two of his daughters for wives. Here we quote the tablet of adoption belonging to Nashwi, the son of Ar-shenni:

> He adopted Wullu, the son of Puhi-shenni. As long as Nashwi is alive, Wullu shall provide food and clothing; when Nashwi dies, Wullu shall become the heir. If Nashwi has a son of his own, he shall divide (the estate) equally with Wullu, but the son of Nashwi shall take the gods of Nashwi. However, if Nashwi does not have a son of his own, then Wullu shall take the gods of Nashwi. Furthermore, he gave his daughter Nuhuya in marriage to Wullu, if Wullu takes another wife he shall forfeit the lands and buildings of Nashwi.[43]

In the light of this tablet we can easily understand that after Laban had his own sons (30:35) his attitude toward Jacob changed. It is also clear why Rachel stole the house gods (Teraphim), and why Laban was so anxious to find them. We can understand why Laban should say to Jacob, "The

---

[42] C. H. Gordon, "Biblical Customs and the Nuzu Tablets," BA, III (Feb., 1940), 2ff.

[43] J. B. Pritchard, op. cit., pp. 219-20.

daughters are my daughters and the children are my children and the flocks are my flocks and all that you see is mine?" (31:43). As the patriarchal father, Laban had every right to exercise his authority over all members of his family, including Jacob.[44]

The Hebrew patriarchal society formed a close bond of blood and marriage relations. It seems that the father surrounded by children makes the father's house, even though the children are all married (31:14,30; 41:51; 46:31). The term "the father's house" (בֵּית אָב) is often used in a broader context, even when there is no father (12:1; 20:13; 24:7,23,38,40; 50:8,22). This term denotes very likely a group larger than that of the individual family. The father's house gives man security and help; when he is not in his father's house, he is without protection and safety (20:13; 24:13). The Hebrew community is usually a movable group of tents (12:8,9; 13:3,12; 26:25; 33:19; 35:21). Thus the community consists of the kinsmen's assembly and had a strong tie in family and clan.[45] It is probable that the community consisted of people related by marriage (34:8-10). Thus

---

[44]G. E. Wright, Biblical Archaeology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957), p. 44.

[45]J. Pedersen, op. cit., p. 52.

patriarchal society seems to consist of relatives and in-laws. In this way they can share hospitality and find security in danger.

Since society is a close relationship of the people they have a mutual responsibility. The responsibility of society in Genesis is a peculiar one. The duty of man to his fellow men in other societies is a mutual responsibility: it is two men's mutual relationship, which can be represented by two parallel lines. In Hebrew society, however, it is quite different. The responsibility of two men is under the observance of God. It can be represented as a triangular relationship: man, God and man. Cain's murder of his brother was not only a social crime but was also a sin before God (4:8-12). Marriage, as the relationship of man and woman, is not only their own affair; it is also God's great concern (6:1-3). One man's sin against another man is not limited to the two parties, it is also a sin against God (39:9; 42:21; 44:16; 50:19).[46] Thus every man of society should act as though he is watched every step of his life by God. Therefore there should be mutual responsibility and fairness in the society. However, if one has done wrong

---

[46]Cf. "Under God's search light." Psa. 139; H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel, p. 89; W. Eichrodt, Man in the Old Testament, translated by K. and R. Gregor Smith (London: SCM Press, 1951), p. 16.

against his fellow man, particularly before God, he is to be a fugitive and wanderer, a lonely exile, a man without a people. This "curse of loneliness" (4:10-16) put the offender into an unnatural situation and was imposed because his action was a threat to the community.[47]

Strange Actions in Society

There are many strange practices in the patriarchal society as viewed by modern eyes. When Abraham and Sarah went down to Egypt, he called his wife Sarah his sister (12:10). This was not a single event, but was repeated on another occasion (20:13). She was, in fact, his half-sister (20:12); but it was a half-truth. Not only Abraham did this, but Isaac also used the same method, when he called Rebekah his sister (26:9). Why did both generations do the same thing? It was a deceitful action; but there was such a custom in the ancient world. The Hurrians who lived in the Nuzi area clearly show us that a wife was called "sister."[48]

---

[47] S. B. Babbage, Man in Nature and in Grace (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1957), p. 19.

[48] "Tablet of sistership a Akkulenni son of Akiya, whereby his sister Beltakkadummi as sister to Hurazzi son of Ennaya he has sold." E. A. Speiser, "New Kirkuk Documents Relating to Family Laws," The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, X, for 1928-29 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), p60. Cf. C. H. Gordon, "Fratriarchy in the Old Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, 54 (1935), p. 226. This will be cited as JBL. P. Koschaker, "Fratriarchat Hausgemeinschaft und Mutterrecht in Keischriften," Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, N. F. VII (1933), 1-89.

The Nuzians had a strong "fratriarchal" or brothership idea.[49] After the death of the father, a son, generally the eldest, acted as the leader in the house and thereby received authority and power over his sister. Therefore it is probable that Abraham and Isaac tried to protect their wives as their neighbors did. Such a practice worked in Mesopotamia and Palestine, but it did not benefit them in Egypt and southern Palestine. Thus the actions of Abraham and Isaac, while not justifiable today, were understood by their contemporaries.

Another strange action in the Patriarchal age is the selling of the birthright from brother to brother. Jacob purchased from Esau the "birthright" (בְּכֹרָה, 25:31,32,33,34; 27:36), which means the title to position of the firstborn. There is a direct parallel to this in one of the tablets dealing with a Nuzi family:

> Kurpozah, the son of Hibishua, got a grove belonging to his brother Tupkitilla in exchange for three sheep. Obviously when a man exchanges a fertile grove, which is probably to be one of his chief means of subsistence, and perhaps his only inheritance portion, it means only one thing: that it was dictated by dire necessity; specifically, to avert starvation.[50]

The firstborn, who has the birthright, generally receives his father's special blessing (27:19,27). The special blessing (בְּרָכָה) was bestowed by the father as the agent of God. We distinguish this blessing with J. Pedersen, as having three

---

[49] E. A. Speiser, op. cit., pp. 58-61; C. H. Gordon, JBL, pp. 225-31.

[50] C. H. Gordon, Adventures in the Nearest East, p. 119. Cf. Nuzi tablet N. 204.

fundamental aspects: (a) it consists in numerous offspring (1:29; 9:1; 12:2; 26:24; 28:3,14; 35:11; 48:4,19); (b) fertility, the blessed man has many possessions (13:6; 24:35); (c) blessing also consists in being victorious over one's enemies (27:29; 49:8-12,22-26).[51] Thus the blessings were serious matters and were irrevocable. For this reason Isaac trembled but he could not alter the blessing, when he knew that Jacob had obtained the blessing under false pretenses (27:33-40). A similar custom is recorded in the Nuzi tablets. At Nuzi there was a case when such an oral "blessing" was upheld in court.[52]

On his death-bed Jacob blessed Judah as the next head of the family, instead of Reuben, the firstborn, because of his fault (35:22; 49:4; I Chr. 5:1). Jacob said, "Judah, to you your brothers shall praise you; your hand shall be on the neck of your enemies; your father's sons shall bow down before you" (49:8). We have a similar text in I Par. 26:10 " . . . Semri, the chief, for he was not the firstborn, but his father made him chief."[53] In another tablet (PS 56), we read:

---

[51] J. Pedersen, op. cit., p. 204.

[52] G. E. Wright, op. cit., p. 44a.

[53] R. T. O'Callahan, "Historical Parallels to Patriarchal Social Custom," CBQ, VI (1944), 401.

> My father, Huya, was sick and lying in bed, and my father siezed my hand and spoke thus to me: 'my other older sons have taken wives but thou hast not taken a wife and I give Zululishtar to thee as wife.' [54]

This text parallels Jacob's blessing as being (a) an oral will; (b) having legal validity; and (c) made to a son by a dying father.[55] We can readily see the similarity between the biblical account and the Nuzi text. The strange features in Genesis therefore are not isolated, but the similar customs are widespread in the patriarchal period.

The history of the human race is the record of a series of man's sinful activities. The man in Genesis is no exception. Sexual irregularities of man are shown even in the pre-diluvian period (4:19). After the destruction of Sodom the two daughters of Lot joined in the sexual victimization of an innocent man. The fact that it was necessary to make him drunk indicates that they could not have hoped to secure his approval of their action if he had been sober.[56] Even this incest was justified by them on the ground that it enabled them to "preserve seed" of their father (19:32-38). This is an example of perverted sexual relations. On the other hand the story seems to reflect the strong desire of woman to have

---

[54] C. H. Gordon, BA, III (Feb., 1940), 8.

[55] Ibid.

[56] D. R. Mace, op. cit., p. 196.

offspring in the ancient world. When Judah's eldest son Er died, leaving his widow Tamar, without a child, Onan, the second son of Judah, is enjoined by his father to fulfil his duty[57] toward her, and beget an heir to Er. A similar custom is recorded in a Nuzi tablet (N. 441). There a father, when obtaining a bride for his son, specifies that if the son dies, she is to be married to another of his sons.[58]

In this connection it is interesting to note an Akkadian document taken from the royal palace of Ugarit in 1952. It reads as follows:

> To be effective immediately!
> Thus says Arihalbu, King of Ugarit:
> "Whoever, after my death, takes
> (in marriage) my wife Kubaba,
> daughter of Takan (?), from my brother--
> may he not make great (his) throne,
> may he not dwell in a (royal) house;
> may Baal of Mt Casius crush him!"[59]

It seems clear that Arihalbu, the king of Ugarit did not have his own son, so Niqmepa, his brother succeeded the throne and took his brother's wife.[60] When Tamar was prevented from bearing an heir to Shelah, the third son of Judah, she made the best of her plight by tricking Judah

---

[57] יבם, "to perform the duty of a husband's brother." 38:8; cf. Deut. 25:5,7.

[58] C. H. Gordon, BA, III (Feb., 1940), 10.

[59] M. Tsevat, "Marriage and Monarchical Legitimacy in Ugarit and Israel," Journal of Semitic Studies, III (July, 1958), 237.

[60] Ibid., pp. 239-40.

into siring the heir. It is a strange practice, but Tamar may have heard of a similar custom from the Hittites. In Tablet II "If a vine" of the Hittite Law Code section 193 we read:

> If a man has a wife and then the man dies, his brother shall take his wife, then his father shall take her. If in turn also his father dies, one of his brother's sons shall take the wife whom he had. There shall be no punishment.[61]

The one thing that Tamar thought of was the preservation of progeny. Thus she justified herself although her excuse is not valid. The misuse of sex is not merely inexpedient, but sinful before God and man; it is a sin which cuts off the offenders from fellowship with God.

The equality of man and woman is revealed in the fact that they both were created in the image of God. It is true that the whole human race had the same ancestors, Adam and Eve (1:27; Acts 17:26). There are, however, differences between the sexes and between races. In the genealogies of Genesis we find no woman's name (Gen. 5; 10): the system of polygamy by no means shows the equality of man and woman. The functional difference between man and woman was a part of God's creation (2:15-25). But this difference does not allow us to discriminate between superior and inferior. Even though God imposed on Eve the rule over by her husband (3:16)

---

[61] J. Pritchard, op. cit., p. 196b.

after the fall, she had her own freedom and authority to name her child (4:1). There is no evidence for the depersonification of woman. The first woman victims are the wives of Lamech (4:19). It was not only the man who was to be blamed; often the cause was on the woman's side (19:30-38; 39:7-18). Woman's function is to be active in the home; as her nature is such that she is not fit for outside and rough duties, mentally or physically. Thus her functional aspects and sin combined to make woman a prey for the stronger sex. This was not in accordance with the primary will of God, but in the course of human history the status of woman degenerated from her original position.

Genesis knows nothing of races which are "naturally inferior" or unworthy of designation as being human, nor any superiority of a clan or family.[62] It is, however, evident that there are two main lines of human descent: the line of Cain (4:16-24) and that of Abel and Seth (4:25-5:32); people who were destroyed by the flood and Noah; the lines of Japheth and Ham (10:1-20) and that of Shem (10:21-30; 11:10-32); the line of Ishmael (25:12-18) and that of Isaac (25:19-26); the line of Esau (36:9-42) and that of Jacob (35:22-26; 46:8-27). From the beginning there are two groups in human society, the favored group and the group rejected by

---

[62] W. Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 37.

God. The cause of the division is on the human side: misbehaviors, grievous sins e.g. Cain and his line (4:8-24); the ante-diluvian people (6:1-7); Ham (9:22-27); the people at Shinar (11:1-9); Esau (25:29-34). Parental favoritism was another cause of division. While the Hamitic line was cursed, Japheth could have obtained an equal blessing with Shem; but the latter received the special blessing (9:26-27). The reason may have been that Shem was the firstborn son (5:32; 6:10; 9:18; 10:71). Jacob was favored more than Esau by their mother Rebekah (27:5-29).

However, the election of God was the principal cause of the preservation of the favored people (7:8-8:1; 9:26; 17:19-21; 25:23). Relying on their deep-rooted concept of election, the Hebrews often misused their privilege and assumed an attitude of unfair discrimination against others.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

"The Greeks had a genius for beauty, the Romans for law, the Hebrews for religion." This is a fashionable saying of a generation or so ago. We do not speak in this way today. Whatever appeared to be genius in the Hebrews was not their possession, but a committed treasure, viz., the revelation of God. As a man the Hebrew had no special privileges, neither genius for anything in himself. God, however, revealed His plan of man's salvation in progressive, historical form (Heb. 1:1-2). Genesis is the starting point of God's special revelation.

We have studied in the previous chapters the nature and existence of man. The creaturehood of man is the basic presupposition of the doctrine of man. Man is a special creation of God; he is the purpose and end, the head and crown of the whole work of creation. Man does not owe his origin to himself, but he is only an earthen creature of God. While many terms can represent the functional aspects of man, נֶפֶשׁ seems to be the governing name for man. By means of this word, the unity of human organs is clearly expressed. Since man is the image and likeness of God, he stands in an entirely different relationship to God from all other creatures. The lordship of man, as his distinguishing earmark, was the purpose and consequence of the image of God. After the Fall, however, the image of God was seriously

damaged, so that it needed to be renewed.

It may fairly be claimed that Genesis has more to say about sin than about any other subject, as is true of most portions of the Bible. Therefore the study of this theme cannot be too strongly stressed. In connection with sin, Genesis clearly teaches that man was once an innocent creature. The finitude of man is often confused with sin. Thus one frequently commingles the metaphysical and the ethical aspects of reality. Whatever term may have been used for describing the sin of man, it is basically man's rebellion against God. We have emphasized that sin does not come from circumstances, environment, nor even God; it is the corruption of good, man's wilful disobedience of God.

Since it has pleased God to make known His truth to mankind by means of a covenant, this covenant is a gracious gift to man. Although the elements of the covenant are already found in the second chapter of Genesis, the word בְּרִית is first used in the Noachian covenant. We have, therefore, dealt with God's covenant with Noah as the beginning of our study. As the covenant is the actualization and implementation of God's counsel for man's redemption, God is the One who took the initiative. We have clearly observed that it is always Yahweh who seeks man, who makes Himself known as He is in His grace and compassion, who opens the way of redemption. Man's participation in the covenant is his response to God's

redemptive gift. As a fallen being, man does nothing in the covenant, but only receives the gracious promise of Yahweh.

The worship of God is a necessary fact in the life of man as a creature. After the Fall man needed the restoration of fellowship with Yahweh. As manifestation of His gracious love, Yahweh took the initiative by making available to man the proper means for worship of God. A true worship is not man's natural expression toward a mystic power, but it is the worship of a living and true God. The worship of Yahweh is man's responding action to God's grace. Thus no image or object was needed in the worship of Yahweh God. As we have pointed out, sacrifice is closely associated with blood as well as sin. Although there is no full-scale expiatory offering in Genesis, the sacrifices in Genesis do picture the atonement and point toward God's perfect sacrifice, Jesus Christ.

In the final chapter, man's relation to society, we have tried to make the facts speak for themselves, so that we may see the true picture of society in Genesis. Every individual had a close tie with his family and his community, so that an individual appeared to be identical with a community. All the members in society had a sense of mutual cooperation with and responsibility to one another. Thus there was a clear identification between the individual and the community. Family life was ordained by God and a source of God's blessing. In the degenerate state, without God's blessing, family and

social life became the scene of misery and unhappiness. We also pointed out that the misuse of the blessings and privileges of God caused sin and an unfortunate development in society.

In this limited study of the doctrine of man in Genesis, we have seen the eternal truth of God: man's sinful nature, his need of redemption, and God's saving grace. In this study of man we have not treated certain problems, such as the antiquity of man, the human will, etc. We believe that further study of the destiny of man in Genesis would be a rewarding area of research, in the field of Soteriology. As we have said, Genesis is the first special revelation, but it is an incomplete one. A further study of man should be sought in an advanced revelation and finally in the accomplished revelation of God, namely Jesus Christ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albright, William F. Archaeology and the Religion of Israel. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942.

-----. From the Stone Age to Christianity. Second Edition with a New Introduction. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1957.

-----. "The Hebrew Expression for 'Making a Covenant' in Pre-Israelite Documents," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, No. 121 (February, 1951), 21-22.

-----. "The Old Testament and Canaanite Language and Literature," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, VII (January, 1945), 5-31.

-----. "Return to Biblical Theology," Christian Century, November 19, 1958, pp. 1328-31.

Allis, Oswald T. The Five Books of Moses. Second edition. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1949.

-----. Prophecy and the Church. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1947.

Baab, Otto J. The Theology of the Old Testament. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949.

Babbage, Stuart B. Man in Nature and in Grace. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957.

Barr, James. "The Problem of Old Testament Theology and the History of Religion," Canadian Journal of Theology, III (July, 1957), 141-49.

Bavinck, Herman. Our Reasonable Faith. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956.

Behm, Johannes. "διαθήκη," Theologisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Zweiter Band. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1935. Pp. 105-37.

Bloom, Alfred. "Human Rights in Israel's Thought: A Study of Old Testament Doctrine," Interpretation, VIII (1954), 422-32.

Bretscher, Paul G. "The Covenant of Blood," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXV (January, February and March, 1954), 1-27; 109-25; 199-209.

Bright, John. The Kingdom of God. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1952.

Brownlee, William H. "Muhammad ed-Deeb's Own Story of His Scroll Discovery," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XVI (October, 1957), 236-39.

Burrows, Millar. An Outline of Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1946.

Coleman, A. I. du P. "Worship," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. Edited by S. M. Jackson. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950.

Cranfield, C. E. B. "Divine and Human Action," Interpretation, XII (October, 1958), 387-98.

Davidson, A. B. The Theology of the Old Testament. Edited from the author's manuscripts by S. D. Salmond. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.

Davidson, Francis. "The Scriptural Doctrine of Worship," The Evangelical Quarterly, VII (1935), 54-61.

Dillmann, A. Genesis. Translated from the last edition by Wm. B. Stevenson. 2 volumes. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897.

Dorner, I. A. A System of Christian Doctrine. III. Translated by Alfred Cave and J. S. Banks. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882.

Driver, Samuel R. The Book of Genesis. London: Methuen & Co., 1926.

Eichrodt, Walther. "Book Review on 'A Guide to the Understanding of the Bible' by Harry Emerson Fosdick," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXV (1946), 205-17.

-----. Man in the Old Testament. Translated by K. & R. Gregor Smith. London: SCM Press, 1956.

-----. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Teil I. 5. neubearbeitete auflage. Stuttgart: Shrenfeied Klotz Verlag, 1957.

Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament, The. Fifth Edition. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, n.d.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Aramaic Suzerainty Treaty from Sefire in the Museum of Beirut," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XX (October, 1958), 444-76.

Gehman, H. S. "The Covenant--The Old Testament Foundation of the Church," Theology Today, VII (April, 1950), 26-41.

Gelin, Albert. The Key Concepts of the Old Testament. Translated by George Lamb. London: Sheed and Ward, 1955.

Girdlestone, Robert B. Synonyms of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956.

Gordon, Cyrus H. Adventures in the Nearest East. Fair Lawn, N. J.: Essential Books, 1957.

-----. "Biblical Customs and the Nuzu Tablets," The Biblical Archaeologist, III (February, 1940), 1-12.

-----. "Fratriarchy in the Old Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, LIV (1935), 223-31.

-----. Introduction to Old Testament Times. Ventnor, N.J.: Ventnor Publishing Co., 1952.

-----. Ugaritic Handbook. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1947.

Gray, George B. Sacrifice in the Old Testament. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925.

Grundmann, Walter. "ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμάρτημα, ἁμαρτία," Theologishes Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Erster Band. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933. Pp. 267-320.

Hadjiantoniou, G. A. "Sacrifice: Its Origin and Purpose," The Evangelical Quarterly, XVII (1945), 42-53.

Hahn, Herbert F. Old Testament in Modern Research. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1954.

Harris, R. Laird. Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957.

Heidel, Alexander. The Babylonian Genesis. Second Edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Heinisch, Paul. Theology of the Old Testament. English edition by William Heidt. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1950.

Henry, Carl F. H. Christian Personal Ethics. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957.

Hodge, Archibald A. Outline of Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949.

Hodge, Charles. Systematic Theology. II. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952.

Irwin, William A. The Old Testament: Keystone of Human Culture. New York: Henry Schuman, 1952.

-----. "The Reviving Theology of the Old Testament," The Journal of Religion, XXV (October, 1945), 235-46.

-----. "Trends in Old Testament Theology," The Journal of Bible and Religion, XIX (October, 1951), 183-90.

Jacob, Edmond. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1958.

Jacobson, David. The Social Background of the Old Testament. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1942.

Jeremias, Joachim. "The Qumran Texts and the New Testament," The Expository Times, LXX (December, 1958), 68-69.

Johnson, A. R. The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1949.

Kautzsch, E. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Second English edition revised in accordance with the twenty-eighth German edition by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946.

Keil, C. F. and F. Delitzsch. The Pentateuch. I. Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. Translated from the German by James Martin. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951.

Keven, E. F. "The Covenants and the Interpretation of the Old Testament," The Evangelical Quarterly, XXVI (1954), 19-28.

Kidner, F. D. Sacrifice in the Old Testament. London: The Tyndale Press, 1952.

Killen, R. Allan. The Ontological Theology of Paul Tillich. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1956.

Kittel, Rudolf. The Religion of the People of Israel. Authorized translation by R. Caryl Micklem. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1925.

Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner, editors. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953.

Köhler, Ludwig. Hebrew Man. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957.

-----. Old Testament Theology. Translated by A. S. Todd. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1958.

-----. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Dritte, überarbeitete Auflage. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953.

König, Eduard. "Symbol, Symbolical Actions.--," A Dictionary of the Bible. Extra Volume. Edited by James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

-----. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Stuttgart: Chr. Belser A. G., Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922.

Koschaker, Paul. "Fratriarchat Hausgemeinschaft und Mutterrecht in Keilschriftrechten," Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, N. F. VII (1933), 1-89.

Kraeling, Emil G. The Old Testament Since the Reformation. New York: Harper & Brothers, c.1955.

Lacheman, Ernest R. "The Renaissance of Biblical Theology," The Journal of Bible and Religion, XIX (April, 1951), 71-75.

Lange, John Peter. A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Genesis. Translated from the German and edited, with additions, by P. Schaff. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.

LeFrois, Bernard J. "Semitic Totality Thinking," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVII (1955), 195-203.

Liggtt, E. "Doctrine of Man," Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. Edited by L. A. Loetscher. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955. Pp. 697-99.

Lussier, Ernest. "'Adam in Genesis 1.1-4.24," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVIII (April, 1956), 137-39.

Mace, David R. Hebrew Marriage. London: The Epworth Press, 1953.

Mendelsohn, I. "The Family in the Ancient Near East," The Biblical Archaeologist, XI (May, 1948), 24-40.

Mendenhall, G. E. "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," The Biblical Archaeologist, XVII (September, 1954), 50-76.

Morris, Leon. "'ASHAM," The Evangelical Quarterly, XXX (1958), 196-210.

Murray, John. The Covenant of Grace. London: The Tyndale Press, 1954.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. "Sin," A Handbook of Christian Theology. New York: Meridian Books, 1958. Pp. 348-51.

North, Christopher R. The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. Second Edition. London: Oxford University Press, 1956.

-----. The Thought of the Old Testament. London: The Epworth Press, 1949.

O'Callahan, R. T. "Historical Parallels to Patriarchal Social Custom," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, VI (1944), 391-405.

Oehler, Gustave F. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated by G. E. Day. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.

Oesterley, W. O. E. and Theodore H. Robinson. Hebrew Religion. Second, Revised and enlarged edition. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1937.

Orelli, C. von. "Sacrifice," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. Edited by S. M. Jackson. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950.

Orr, James. The Christian View of God and the World. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954.

------. "Image of God," The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Edited by J. Orr. Chicago: The Howard-Severance, 1915. P. 1264.

------. The Problem of the Old Testament. London: James Nisbet & Co., 1908.

Owen, D. R. G. Body and Soul. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1956.

Paterson, W. P. "Sacrifice," A Dictionary of the Bible. IV. Edited by James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902. Pp. 329-49.

Pedersen, Johs. Israel. 2 volumes. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers, c.1948.

Piper, Otto A. The Christian Interpretation of Sex. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941.

Pritchard, James B., editor. Ancient Near Eastern Texts. Second edition corrected and enlarged. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.

Rad, Gerhard von. Das erste Buch Mose: Genesis Kapitel 12, 10-25,18. Göttingen: Vandenhoech & Ruprecht, 1952.

------. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Band I. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1957.

Reeve, J. J. "Sacrifice in the Old Testament," The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Edited by James Orr. Chicago: The Howard-Severance, 1915. Pp.2638-51.

Richardson, Alan. Genesis I-XI. London: SCM Press, 1953.

Ridderbos, Herman, N. The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. The Christian Doctrine of Man. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911.

------. "Hebrew Psychology," The People and the Book. Oxford: A. S. Peake, Clarendon Press, 1925.

------. Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956.

------. Record and Revelation, editor. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951.

------. The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1952.

Rowley, Harold H. The Biblical Doctrine of Election. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.

------. The Faith of Israel. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1957.

------. The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament. Manchester: University Press, 1950.

------. The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, n.d.

------. The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.

------. The Unity of the Bible. New York: Living Age Books, 1957.

------., editor. The Old Testament and Modern Study. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, c.1952.

Sauer, Alfred v. R. "The Concept of Sin in the Old Testament," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXII (October, 1951), 705-18.

Schoeps, Hans J. "The Sacrifice of Israel in Paul's Theology," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXV (1946), 385-92

Schultz, Hermann. Old Testament Theology. I. Translated from fourth German Edition by J. A. Paterson. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1992.

Scott, Ernest F. Man and Society in the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946.

Scott, R. B. Y. The Relevance of the Prophets. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1957.

Skinner, John. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. In the International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Edited by Samuel R. Driver, et al. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.

Smart, James D. "The Death and Rebirth of Old Testament Theology," The Journal of Religion, XXIII (January, 1943), 1-11; XXIII (April, 1943), 125-36.

Smith, W. Robertson. The Religion of the Semites. New York: Meridian Books, 1956.

Snaith, Norman H. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. London: The Epworth Press, 1950.

-----. "Sacrifice in the Old Testament," Vetus Testamentum, VII (1957), 308-17.

Speiser, Ephraim A. "New Kirkuk Documents Relating to Family Laws," The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, X (1928-29), 1-73.

Taylor, Vincent. Jesus and His Sacrifice. London: Macmillan & Co., 1951.

Tillich, Paul. The Interpretation of History. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

-----. Systematic Theology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Torrance, T. F. Calvin's Doctrine of Man. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.

Trenchard, Ernest H. "Grace, Covenant and Law," The Evangelical Quarterly, XXIX (1957), 131-48.

Tsevat, Matitiahu. "Marriage and Monarchical Legitimacy in Ugarit and Israel," Journal of Semitic Studies, III (July, 1958), 237-43.

Unger, Merrill F. Archaeology and the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1956.

Van Pelt, J. R. "Breath, Breathe, Breathing," The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Edited by James Orr. Chicago: The Howard-Severance, 1915. P. 518.

Van Til, Cornelius. The Defense of the Faith. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1955.

Visher, Wilhelm. The Pentateuch. I. The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ. Translated by A. B. Crabtree. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.

Vos, Geerhardus. Biblical Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954.

-----. "Hebrews, the Epistle of the Diatheke," The Princeton Theological Review, XIII (October, 1915), 587-632; XIV (January, 1916), 1-61.

Weidner, R. F. The Doctrine of Man. Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, c.1912.

Wellhausen, Julius. Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels. Dritte Ausgabe. Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1886.

Wright, G. Ernest. Biblical Archaeology. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957.

-----. The Challenge of Israel's Faith. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944.

-----. "The Faith of Israel," The Interpreter's Bible. I. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952.

-----. God Who Acts. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1952.

-----. The Old Testament Against its Environment. London: SCM Press, 1950.

-----, and an Ecumenical Committee in Chicago. The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society. London: SCM Press, 1954.

Young, Edward J. Studies in Isaiah. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954.

Young, Edward J. The Study of Old Testament Theology Today. London: James Clarke & Co., 1958.

-----. Thy Word is Truth. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957.

Young, Robert. Analytical Concordance to the Bible. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., c.1955.