

## **GENESIS CHAPTER 3**

INTRODUCTION. I am taking this article from the 71 page paper on my internet site (karlkempteachingministries.com) that is titled, "Genesis Chapters 1-3." (I was able to use footnotes, bold, italics, small caps, some Hebrew letters, dashes, etc. in the internet version of the paper, but not for this version that I will put on several Christian article sites.) That 71 page paper was taken from my 273 page paper that is titled "Verse-by-Verse Study of Genesis Chapters 1-3: These Three Chapters, the First Three Chapters of the Bible, Provide the Foundation to Understand God, Creation, Man, the Devil and his Kingdom of Darkness, Sin and the Fall of Man, the God-Man and His Kingdom of Light, Righteousness, Salvation, and Judgment."

The lengthy Appendix that was included in the original paper was not included in the internet version. (I'll include the listing of the Contents of the Appendix as we continue.) I had quoted extensively from others in the Appendix of the original paper. I wanted to do a rather thorough study of this important topic; I spent a year doing the research and writing the original paper. I had received permission to include the lengthy quotations in the original paper, but I did not receive permission to publish those lengthy quotations on the internet. For the 71 page verse-by-verse study of Genesis Chapters 1-3, I abbreviated the few lengthy quotations that were included in the original paper, since I had not received permission to include the lengthy quotations.

I still have quite a few copies of the original 273 page paper, which I will make available to you for \$5 plus the cost of the postage. You could send me an e-mail (kkemp7753@sbcglobal.net).

### **EXTENDED NOTES (in the Appendix):**

- A. Excerpts Dealing with the Gap View of Creation (8 pages)
- B. Excerpts Dealing with a Modification, or Two, of the Gap View of Creation. (8 pages)
- C. Ezekiel 28:1-19 (7 pages)
- D. The Symbolic Use of the Words "Light," "Darkness," "Night," and "Day" in the Bible (12 pages)
- E. A Study of the Hebrew Verb "Badal," To Separate, To Divide, To Distinguish Between, To Set Apart (7 pages)

F. The Use of "Day" and the "Seven Days" in the Creation Account of Genesis 1:1-2:3, Using an Artificial Literary Structure (14 pages)

G. Galileo's Condemnation and the Interpretation of Scripture (10 pages)

H. The Bible and Science (19 pages)

I. When Was Adam Created? In this Extended Note we also consider the question, When was Noah's Flood? It includes "A Discussion Regarding Carbon 14 Radiometric Dating and the Accuracy of this Method" (20 pages)

J. When Was the Universe Created? This Extended Note contains extensive excerpts from Hugh Ross. It also includes excerpts from "The Dynamics of Dating: The Reliability of Radiometric Dating Methods" by Roger C. Wiens (46 pages)

K. Intelligent Design, Not Evolution. This lengthy Extended Note consists almost entirely of excerpts from scholars involved in the Intelligent Design movement (43 pages)

All quotations from the Bible were taken from the New American Standard Bible, 1995 edition, unless I mention otherwise. I very often make comments in the middle of quotations using brackets [ ] or [[ ]] to make them more obvious.

**"Now the serpent was more crafty than any beast of the field which the LORD [Yahweh] God had made.** [[(This double bracket continues for twelve paragraphs.) The most common view among evangelicals is that Satan was possessing, or at least speaking through, the serpent. I could live with that view (but it would be difficult for me); I believe it was intended (by the ultimate Author) that the serpent be equated with Satan; the serpent was a symbol for Satan. The first three chapters of Genesis are packed with super-important revelation, as is the super-important book of Revelation, but both writings use a lot of symbolic language (symbols that deal with things that are very real) in very effective ways.

As we discussed under Gen. 1:2-5 (not included in this article), Satan's initial rebellion took place before Gen. 1:1. God's judgment of that rebellion led to the chaotic, dark, dead state of the earth pictured in Gen. 1:2.

[[I had a two paragraph footnote: I'll quote what Bruce K. Waltke says here ("Genesis" [Zondervan, 2001], page 90). "... Although [the serpent is] not named here, he is the adversary of God and humanity, called the Satan (Hebrew 'satan' ['adversary, persecutor, or accuser']) in the Old Testament and the devil ('diabolos,' the Greek equivalent) in the New Testament. He originates in heaven, standing outside earth's natural order. [Waltke has a footnote here,

"Seemingly (a mystery) he does not belong to this creation, which is good." He was created and fell before Gen. 1:1; he was not, therefore, part of God's good creation spoken of in Gen. 1:1-2:3.] He is malevolent and wiser than humans, bringing them under his rule. [Satan's wisdom didn't give man an excuse for the fall; Adam and Eve had been given all they needed to remain faithful to God.] He knows divine matters (3:5) [Waltke has a footnote here, "This inference becomes explicit in later revelations (Job 1:6-12; Zech. 3:1-2)."] and uses speech to introduce confusion. [Waltke has another footnote, "Cf. John 8:44; 2 Cor. 11:14; Rev. 12:9. Despite his power, he will be destroyed by Christ and his seed (Gen. 3:15; Luke 10:18-19; Rom. 16:20)."]."

I'll quote several sentences from what James Oliver Buswell says on this topic. ("Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion," Vol. 1 [Zondervan, 1962], pages 264, 265. Dr. Buswell was a founding theologian of Covenant Theological Seminary, where I attended. I never had any classes with Dr. Buswell. He had pretty much retired before I started taking classes there, but based on what I know of him, I have a lot of respect for him. For one thing, he was the primary one who introduced the teaching of the mid-week rapture at Covenant Seminary. Also, he put a lot more emphasis on Christian holiness than most Calvinists do.) "The tempter in the Genesis record is an evil personal intelligence. The words, 'the Serpent,' I suggest should be read as a proper name [Buswell has a footnote, "Compare Isaiah 65:25 and Revelation 20:3 [2] where the 'Serpent' is a person. In this suggestion I am not for a moment questioning the inerrancy of the record."], or as a title functioning as a proper name. The Genesis account has nothing to say about a biological reptile. 'The Serpent' is not said to be *one* of the 'beasts of the field'.... Snakes do not literally eat dirt (Gen. 3:14; Isa. 65:25), but to be prostrated, and to eat dust, is an ancient metaphor for the humiliation of an enemy. ... 'The Serpent' is Satan, and figures throughout the Bible as the arch-enemy of God and man, the instigator of all kinds of evil." (This is the end of the two-paragraph footnote.)) The one we call Satan and the devil was created by God - he was created good, but he rebelled and fell through pride (1 Tim. 3:6); he was created and fell before Gen. 1:1; he was not part of the creation pictured in Genesis chapters 1, 2, which was pronounced good.

Although God undoubtedly created literal serpents in the creation that is spoken of in Genesis chapters 1, 2, the Hebrew noun ("nachash") translated "serpent" here in Gen. 3:1 was not used in those chapters. (Those literal serpents would have been part of what God pronounced good.) God speaks to the serpent in Gen. 3:14, 15; the fact that what He says to him in 3:15 clearly refers to Satan (not to a literal serpent) provides one of several strong reasons to equate the serpent with Satan. (What God says to the serpent in Gen. 3:14 fits Satan well too.) Revelation 12:8 (with 12:3, 4, 7-9) and Rev. 20:2 provide an equally strong reason for equating the serpent and Satan: "And the great dragon was thrown down, THE SERPENT OF OLD [referring to Genesis chapter 3] WHO IS CALLED THE DEVIL AND SATAN [my emphasis], who deceives the whole

world; he was thrown down to the earth, and his angels were thrown down with him" (Rev. 12:8); "And he laid hold of the dragon, THE SERPENT OF OLD, WHO IS THE DEVIL AND SATAN [my emphasis], and bound him for a thousand years" (Rev. 20:2). [[I had a footnote: Revelation 12:4, 7-9 picture the devil and his angels being cast down to the earth (from their privileged position in heavenly places) at the time Christ returns to judge the world in the middle of Daniel's 70<sup>th</sup> week. (Revelation chapter 12 is discussed in a verse-by-verse manner in my book, "The Mid-Week Rapture" and in my e-book, "Introduction to the Mid-Week Rapture." They are both available at amazon.com.) Revelation 20:2 shows that the devil will be bound throughout the millennial kingdom.]] Revelation 12:4 indicates that a "third" of the angels followed the devil in his rebellion against God. That was a major rebellion. This important information, a "third," is not mentioned anywhere else in the Bible.

The use of the word "serpent" in Isa. 27:1 also serves as a rather strong confirmation that the serpent is to be equated with Satan. So does 2 Cor. 11:3; cf. Isa. 65:25. [[I had a footnote: The fact that "dust will be the serpents food" (Isa. 65:25) when the other animals are transformed ("the wolf and the lamb will graze together, and the lion will eat straw like the ox") fits well with the idea that the serpent is Satan; eating dust speaks symbolically of his overthrow (cf. Isa. 27:1). It is significant that Isa. 11:8 (with 11:6-8) shows that the literal snakes/serpents will be transformed along with the other animals for the millennial kingdom.]] Under Genesis chapter 2 (not included in this article), I quoted extensively from Henri Blocher on the meaning of the two special trees in the middle of the garden of Eden. I also quoted extensively from him regarding the concept that the serpent was Satan in the original 273 page version of this paper.

It is very clear that the serpent already was an extremely evil being (and also quite competent) when he first comes on the scene in the Bible here in Genesis chapter 3; he already was extremely evil and at war with God (and man). [[I had a footnote: It must be emphasized that there never was any doubt about who is going to win this war. The Bible confirms from beginning to end that God is God; He is in sovereign control; and He definitely limits what He permits Satan to do. God knew that man was going to fall, and He had made plans before the creation of the world to send His Son to save man (those who would submit in faith to His plan of salvation) and to overthrow, judge, and totally remove Satan and all who follow him.]] The serpent's being a symbol for Satan fits perfectly with what I said earlier in this paper (and in the Appendix) regarding the strong symbolic/spiritual component of Genesis chapters 1-3. I'll list the most relevant points here: The strong symbolic/spiritual components of the words "darkness" and "light" in Genesis chapter 1 is significant (where "darkness" symbolizes sin, Satan and his kingdom, and the consequences and penalties for sin and "light" symbolizes God and His life, truth, righteousness, peace, order, and blessings). The emphasis on the need to separate the darkness from the light and to keep them separated in Genesis chapter 1 is a dominant biblical theme, and it helps

confirm the symbolic/spiritual component of the words light and darkness. The state of the earth pictured in Gen. 1:2, with the "darkness," chaos, absence of life, with water covering everything had undoubtedly resulted from God's earlier judgment (before Gen. 1:1) of the rebellion led by Satan that at least included the earth. The fact that Adam and Eve were informed that they must "subdue" the earth (Gen. 1:28) is significant, especially since the animals were at peace with man and with one another before the fall of man (according to Gen. 1:26-31). Also, at that time, Adam and Eve were at peace with the environment; they had no problems with things like tornadoes, droughts, bad ground, weeds, pests, sicknesses, etc. The enemies that Adam and Eve needed to resist and subdue were in the spiritual dimension. They had to keep separate from the darkness and evil; they had to refrain from eating of the tree of the knowledge of good AND EVIL. The EVIL fruit of that tree (like the darkness) symbolized sin and the consequences and penalties for sin; to eat of that forbidden fruit was to join Satan and his kingdom in rebellion against God.

If these points are accepted, it is not at all unexpected or surprising for Satan to come on the scene here in Genesis chapter 3. Most Christians, however, understand Genesis chapters 1, 2 in a way that doesn't leave hardly any room for the fall of Satan, or his relationship with the earth, or God's (initial, partial) judgment of his rebellion. They understand Genesis chapter 1 in a way that doesn't even mention the "creation" of the cherubim, angels, etc. They typically say that their creation is included in Gen. 1:1, but you certainly have to strain to see their creation there. And if you believe that there were only five twenty-four hour days and some hours between the time God began His creation of everything in Gen. 1:1 and the time He created Adam on the sixth day (which is a widely held viewpoint), you certainly don't leave much time for the righteous existence of the high-level being who became Satan and the angels who followed him before they fell.

Satan (along with sin, death [spiritual death and physical death], and darkness) did not have authority over Adam and Eve until after they had sinned. Satan (along with sin, death, and darkness) gained authority (but not total dominion) over man (which includes Adam, Eve, and all their offspring) through the sin of Adam and Eve.

The Hebrew noun ("arum") that is translated "crafty" here in 3:1 is used in a negative (evil) sense, as it was in Job 5:12; 15:5. (This Hebrew noun was sometimes used in a positive sense in the Old Testament, where it was translated "prudent" four times and "prudent man" four times by the NASB.) The translation of the NASB at the beginning of 3:1 (which is essentially the same as the NIV, "Now the serpent was more crafty than any of the wild animals") tends to leave what I consider to be a wrong impression. This translation tends to communicate the idea that the beasts of the field were crafty too, but less crafty than the serpent. I don't believe the author/Author intended to include the idea that the beasts of the field were "crafty." I prefer a translation like, "Now the

serpent was subtle APART FROM [in the sense of "unlike"] the wild beasts of the field which the LORD God had made."

We'll discuss this rather important point to some extent here and then further under Gen. 3:14. Many have noted that the words of 3:14 ("Cursed are you MORE THAN [The Hebrew behind "more than" here and later in the verse is the preposition "min."] all cattle, And MORE THAN ["min"] every beast of the field"), which God spoke to the serpent, build on these words at the beginning of 3:1 that compare (or you could say contrast) the serpent with the beasts of the field. (The NASB of 3:1 starts out, "Now the serpent was MORE crafty THAN." The Hebrew behind "more...than" here in 3:1, as in 3:14, is the preposition "min." As I mentioned, I prefer a translation for Gen. 3:1 like, "Now the serpent was subtle APART FROM [in the sense of "unlike"] the wild beasts of the field, where "min" is translated "apart from" instead of "more than.") There is widespread agreement that the idea intended in 3:14 is *not* that the serpent was cursed more than the cattle and beasts of the field, but that the serpent was singled out for the curse and there was no mention of the cattle and/or beasts of the field being cursed in 3:14. The one who was crafty/subtle in a very evil sense and who manifested great hatred for God in his temptation of Eve was singled out for the curse.

Commenting on the use of the Hebrew preposition "min" in Gen. 3:14, the BDB Hebrew Lexicon (page 582, 6b) says, "cursed *above* all cattle ["cursed above" is comparable in meaning with "cursed...more than all cattle" of the NASB] (but WITHOUT IMPLYING ANY JUDGMENT WHETHER OTHER CATTLE ARE CURSED LIKEWISE [my emphasis])." Applying that same reasoning in Gen. 3:1, I wouldn't object to the translation "the serpent was more crafty than any beast of the field" if we could agree that we are not implying that the other beasts were crafty/subtle too.

I'll quote a few sentences from what Edward J. Young says here ("Genesis 3" [Banner of Truth Trust, 1966], pages 9, 10). "... The snake was crafty. Its wisdom was not something good but something evil. ... The word 'subtil' [This is the word used in the KJV.] is evidently used with respect to what follows, where the words spoken by the serpent tempt the woman and lead her into moral evil. It is this fact that throws the true light upon the meaning. And in the light of this fact it would seem that the subtlety is something which could belong only to a responsible being. No mere snake could of itself display the craftiness and cunning which manifest themselves in the subsequent discourse with Eve. [Young believes Satan spoke through a literal serpent.] When therefore the Bible asserts that the serpent is subtle it is taking the first step, it would seem, in going behind the scene and letting us know that there is more here than meets the eye. A subtlety is at work such as does not belong to [literal] snakes. That much, it appears, we must grant, if we are to do justice to what the Bible says. The word 'subtil' is the first hint that we have to deal with more than a snake [At least this is the first hint in Genesis chapter 3; as I mentioned, I believe there

are several such very strong "hints" in Genesis chapters 1, 2.]" (This completes the twelve paragraph double bracket; we are now ready to continue the quotation of Gen. 1:3.))] **And he said to the woman, 'Indeed, has God said, "You shall not eat from any tree of the garden"?' [(This double bracket continues for seven paragraphs.)** In the margin the NASB has or "every" instead of "any." I believe the translation "every" is better; or we could translate, "not eat from ALL the trees in the garden." I'll quote part of what H. C. Leupold says here ("Exposition of Genesis," Vol. 1 [Wartburg Press, 1942], page 144). "We must definitely reject [the translation] 'not from any'.... ... The exaggeration [that Adam and Eve were prohibited from eating from any of the trees in the garden] would be too gross and crude. The devil would have completely overshoot his mark and roused a feeling of resentment at the course insinuation. Therefore A. V. [KJV (also the NKJV)] is correct: 'not from every.' Cf. K. S. [Koenig's Syntax] 352s."

Satan knew, of course, that Adam and Eve had been prohibited from eating of the *one* tree in the center of the garden. He wanted to direct Eve's attention to that one tree; he wanted Eve to begin to think of God as a withholder, a withholder of something that was very good, so good in fact that everything else in the garden was garbage in comparison with the fruit of this one very special, forbidden tree. What kind of God would deny Eve the one really good thing in the garden?

We must remind ourselves at the outset that Satan was (and still is) a liar (cf. John 8:44) and a deceiver (cf. Gen. 3:13; 2 Cor. 11:3; 1 Tim. 2:14). Although Satan mixes in elements of truth when it's convenient (like they say, if you want an animal to eat poison you mix it with some good food), we certainly cannot assume that something is true because he says it, including what he says to Eve. Even though this first question to Eve was stated in a way that tended to question the goodness of God, Satan certainly knew that Eve wouldn't be challenged much by this preliminary question.

Based on what is revealed here (there could be a lot we don't know; we are dependent on how much God chose to reveal to us; I'm confident that He always reveals as much as we need to know, even if we would frequently like to know more), Eve may not have done anything wrong to answer the serpent's first question. (It could be, however, that she was responsible for adding the words about NOT TOUCHING the forbidden fruit recorded in Gen. 3:3; if so, that seems like a minor problem.) On the other hand, Eve's communicating with the serpent, or even allowing Satan to remain in her presence, may have involved incredible stupidity and rebellion against God. It depends on how much she knew about Satan to begin with. If she knew that he was a malicious enemy of God and the prince of darkness, then she had no right to talk with him. She could have called on God for help (or on Adam for a start).

It's very clear that when Eve continued to listen to the serpent after he started his unrestrained attack against the truthfulness and goodness of God, starting in Gen. 3:4, she was far out of order and heading for a fall of gigantic proportion. She had no right whatsoever to listen to such attacks against the only God and the Creator, who had demonstrated nothing but perfection and goodness in His creation and in His dealings with her (and with Adam). If all we knew about Eve's sin was the following, we would know enough to understand the extreme seriousness of her rebellion, for which there was no excuse: By accepting the devil's challenge to eat of the forbidden fruit, she had to first accept as true the evil, malicious, blasphemous things the devil said against God (she had to agree that God was a liar; she had to agree that He had been withholding from Adam and her that which was good for them because of His own self-centered interests - if they ate of the forbidden fruit, they would gain knowledge and be like God); she had to side in with the devil in his rebellion against God; and she had to do what she knew they had been forbidden to do by the very Word of God on penalty of death.

The Bible says that Eve was *deceived* (2 Cor. 11:3; Tim. 2:14; cf. Gen. 3:13); in some ways she was. The bait (forbidden fruit) that Satan used looked so good to her that she (like a fish) took the bait and ran with it; she took the fruit and ate it, but it should be obvious, based on what I have said, that her sin involved full-scale, willful, informed rebellion against God and His word and a siding-in-with His enemy, which involved a lot more than just being *deceived*.

I'll say more about the specific nature of the forbidden fruit (the details regarding the bait the devil used to tempt Adam and Eve) as we continue (see the excerpts that deal with this issue from Henri Blocher and from others, along with my comments in brackets at the end of this three-part article), but there are quite a few different ideas regarding what the bait for that original sin was, and I don't believe we know enough to be dogmatic on that specific point. As I indicated in the last paragraph, however, we really don't have to know more than what I have mentioned already to understand the essence of the rebellion and fall of Eve. (Now I'll quote Gen. 3:2)] **(2) The woman said to the serpent, 'From the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat; (3) but from the fruit of the tree which is in the middle of the garden [referring to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil], God has said, "You shall not eat from it or touch it, or you will die." ' [See under Gen. 3:1.] (4) The serpent said to the woman, 'You surely will not die! (5) For God knows that in the day you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God** [[The KJV has "gods" instead of "God." ((I had a two-paragraph footnote: The NKJV has "God." The plural Hebrew noun "elohim" can be translated "gods," and some commentators opt for that translation here. The NASB translates "elohim" "gods" 204 times in the Old Testament, but it translates "God" 2,326 times. I believe the translation "God" is correct here. For one thing *elohim* was used earlier in this verse (Gen. 3:5) for God.



The Hebrew plural participle translated "knowing" (here in Gen. 3:5) ties to the plural "you" used here, which refers to Adam and Eve. Plurals are used throughout Gen. 3:2-5 in that Adam was included with Eve in what was being said: "we may eat" (3:2); "You [plural] shall not eat from it or touch it, or you [plural] will die" (Gen. 3:3); "You [plural] surely will not die!" (Gen. 3:4); "in the day you [plural] eat from it your [the eyes of you (plural)] will be opened, and you [plural] will be like God, knowing [plural] good and evil" (Gen. 3:5.)), **knowing good and evil.** [[Talk about a direct, unrestrained, non-subtle, vicious attack against God: "He is a liar! And a lot more about Him is bad too! But don't worry Eve, I'm here to help you against that mean, oppressive, manipulative, withholding, lying God. Listen to me, Eve, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil. You will be exalted to a new dimension; you will have the extreme privilege of knowing good AND EVIL." Adam and Eve did not become more like God by eating the forbidden fruit; they lost their innocence and became more like the devil. As we discussed under Gen. 2:9, 16 (not included in this three-part article), the knowledge they gained turned out to be evil. They had known the good, and all that was "added" to them was the KNOWLEDGE OF EVIL. We shouldn't expect good to come from doing evil. The apostle Paul hated the charge that some of his opponents falsely and slanderously brought against him, that he taught, "Let us do evil that good may come" (see Rom. 3:8).

By eating the fruit of this tree, which can also be called the TREE OF DEATH, they died as God had said they would. (They died spiritually that day, and the physical death process was initiated in them.) God hadn't been withholding that which was good after all. He was/is a good God! He isn't a liar! He will, however, let His people be tested, and rightly so. Let's wake up if we need to and decide once and for all that God's ways are always right; our sin is always against God and is evil; it NEVER works for our good, but ALWAYS works for our evil. Sin and the devil are the liars!

God clearly knows *good*, and in some limited ways, but only in some limited ways, He knows *evil*. (He does, of course, know all about evil, but not in an experiential way.) In one sense God had already experienced evil through the rebellion of Satan and his followers that took place before Satan tempted Eve, but He did not know evil in the sense that Adam and Eve came to know it through doing evil. And He did not know evil by suffering the consequences/penalty for doing evil that rebels know. (For Adam and Eve that included having guilt feelings. As far as I know, the devil doesn't have guilt feelings.) It seems to me that it was a total lie for Satan to tell Eve that she and Adam would become like God, knowing good and evil. "God is light, and in Him there is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5). It is true, however, that Satan can provide those who follow him with supernatural knowledge and power (I believe that was the forbidden fruit), but judgment day is coming.

Genesis 3:22 is relevant to this discussion; it includes the words, "Then the LORD God said, 'Behold, the man has become like one of Us [us], knowing good and evil....' " As we will discuss in some detail under 3:22-24, I believe, in agreement with many, that these words of God were intended in a sarcastic, ironic sense to mock the idea that Adam and Eve would actually accept the devil's lie that they could gain something good and become like God through rebelling against Him and believing His lying accuser, who called Him a liar. Apparently God took these words from what the devil had said (in Gen. 3:5), "you will be like God, knowing good and evil." He did not intend these words to reflect reality/truth.]] **(6) When the woman saw that the tree was good for food** [[The devil had told Eve "that the tree was good for food." That was a total lie! The fruit on that tree *wasn't* good; that forbidden fruit was deadly. Eve was deceived (with no excuse) by accepting that lie into her heart and mind. The devil has a million lies (or more) for those who will listen to him. We are not supposed to listen to him; we have no right to listen to him; it constitutes rebellion against God to listen to the devil; we don't have to listen to him. He tries to make sin look good; it NEVER is good. Sin may be fun for a while, and it may make a person feel good for a while, but it NEVER is good, and it NEVER brings real good to the one sinning.

Eve saw the things spoken of in verse 6 (at least for the most part) with the eyes of her heart, not with her physical eyes. This is like verse 7, which speaks of the eyes of Adam and Eve being opened and their then knowing that they were naked. It wasn't that their physical eyes were then opened, but that (after they had fallen though eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good AND EVIL) THEY THEN KNEW EVIL, including the fact that they then knew that they were naked, and they knew shame and were afraid of God because of their nakedness (see verses 8-10).]], **and that it was a delight to the eyes** [[See 1 John 2:15-17 (1 John 2:16 mentions "the lust of the eyes."); James 1:14, 15 ((James 1:15 mentions being "enticed by his own lust." A. T. Robertson points out that the Greek verb behind "enticed" was derived from a word meaning "bait," "to catch fish by bait or to hunt with snares...." ("Word Pictures in the New Testament," Vol. VI [Broadman Press, 1933], page 18).)) The forbidden fruit (the bait the devil used) was a delight to the eyes because Eve had accepted the lie in her heart and mind that the forbidden fruit was good. Sinful fruit NEVER is good!]], **and that the tree was desirable to make one wise** [[That was a lie too! The only "wisdom" she gained was the experiential knowledge of evil (of doing evil and experiencing the evil consequences of doing evil); that isn't wisdom.]], **she took from its fruit and ate; and she gave also to her husband with her, and he ate.** [[(This double bracket continues for 4 paragraphs.) This certainly is a brief account of the rebellion of Adam in that the Bible speaks so much more of his rebellion than Eve's. For one thing, Adam was the authority figure. The apostle Paul spoke of the serious, far-reaching consequences of the transgression/rebellion of Adam. In Rom. 5:12-21, for example, he shows that it was Adam's sin that caused the death of all his offspring, very much including spiritual death.

Paul makes the point in 1 Tim. 2:14 that "it was not Adam *who* was deceived, but the woman being deceived fell into transgression." I believe it is important to see that Adam was *deceived* too in some ways. It seems clear that he thought that good would come from eating of the forbidden fruit, or he wouldn't have eaten it. And it is quite clear that he was rebelling against God and following the devil just as much as Eve was, and he, like Eve, had no real excuse. The fact that Adam was influenced by Eve certainly didn't constitute a legitimate excuse.

It's clear that *pride* was involved in the temptation and transgression of Adam and Eve. Satan, who had fallen through pride, knew how to appeal to the pride of man. I'll quote part of what James Montgomery Boice says under the heading "Pride" when commenting on Gen. 3:1-6 ("Genesis," Vol. 1 [Baker, 1982, 1998], pages 168, 169). "What lay at the root of the woman's determination to eat the forbidden fruit and give some to her husband, Adam, if it was not pride? What lay at the root of Adam's determination to go his own way rather than adhere to the path God placed before him, if this was not pride? ...

How terrible pride is! And how pervasive; for, of course, it did not vanish in the death of the first man and woman. Pride [with unbelief] lies at the heart of our sinful race. It is the 'center' of immorality, 'the utmost evil,' that which 'leads to every other vice,' as C. S. Lewis warns us ("Mere Christianity," page 94). It is that which makes us want to be more than we are or can be and, consequently, causes us to fall short of that truly great destiny for which we were created." Pride says I want to do it myself, so I can get the glory. Pride says I don't want to be under anybody in any way, not even God. Pride motivates people to use others, even to *try* to use God. I believe we can say that *pride* and *unbelief* (lack of faith in God) are the two primary roots of sin and rebellion against God. Pride and unbelief are not two totally separate sins; there is much overlap between these two great sins.]] **(7) Then the eyes of both of them were opened, and they knew that they were naked** [[They gained knowledge all right, but none of it was good. As fallen beings, who no longer enjoyed a right, life-flowing relationship with God, they knew (for one thing) that they were naked and something was wrong. And, as we learn in the next verse, they now knew that in their new state (with its "increased knowledge") they were *guilty* before God (which is painful knowledge to have). And they knew that something had changed down inside of them; for one thing, they now knew shame. The contrast with Gen. 2:25 should be noted: That verse informed us that before the fall Adam and Eve "were both naked and were not ashamed." Now that they had eaten of the forbidden fruit, they felt a need to cover their (physical) nakedness, because they were ashamed, and after covering themselves, they still knew shame. Verse 10 shows that knowledge of their nakedness very much involved their relationship with God, not just their relationship with one another.

I'll quote part of what Boice says under Gen. 3:7 ("Genesis," pages 178, 179). "Up to this moment Adam and Eve did not know good *and* evil. They knew the

good but *not* the evil. (God knows both of course. He knows good because it is an expression of his own nature. He knows evil because it is all that is opposed to his nature.) By sinning our first parents came to know evil as well as good...but they came to know it, not from the standpoint of God, who loves good and hates the evil, but as fallen creatures, who love evil and hate the good. Satan would have been perfectly truthful if he had said, 'For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be *like me* [the devil], knowing good and evil.' "

I'll quote a sentence from what Merrill F. Unger says under this verse ("Unger's Commentary on the Old Testament," Vol. 1 [Moody Bible Institute, 1981], page 16). "They now knew evil experientially, with all its attendant guilt, sorrow, shame, and misery."]; **and they sewed fig leaves together and made themselves loin coverings. (8) They heard the sound of the LORD God walking in the garden in the cool** ["Literally, wind, breeze."] **of the day, and the man and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the LORD God among the trees of the garden.** [There is widespread agreement that God had been fellowshiping with Adam and Eve in the garden on a regular basis.] **(9) Then the LORD God called to the man, and said to him, 'Where are you?'** [God knew, of course, where Adam was and what he had done.] **(10) He said, 'I heard the sound of You in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked; so I hid myself.'** **(11) And He said, 'Who told you that you were naked? Have you eaten from the tree of which I commanded you not to eat?'** **(12) The man said, 'The woman whom You gave to be with me, she gave me from the tree, and I ate.'** [[Proverbs 28:13 says, "He who conceals his transgressions will not prosper, But he who confesses and forsakes *them* will find compassion." Adam's "excuse" didn't fly (as they say), but it did demonstrate the sinful tendency of fallen man to try to pass the blame to someone else. GUILT AND SHAME ARE PAINFUL! Thanks be to God for His marvelous plan of salvation that enables believers to get rid of guilt and shame! We should be thankful that God has given us a conscience to inform us when things are wrong so we can get rid of our sin (repentance, forgiveness, new birth, righteousness, and holiness in and through Christ Jesus). On the other hand, we must reject the devil's condemning accusations against us when they are not true. If we are in sin, we must make repentance top priority - there is no substitute.]] **(13) Then the LORD God said to the woman, 'What is this you have done?'** **And the woman said, 'The serpent deceived me, and I ate.'** **(14) The LORD God said to the serpent, 'Because you have done this, cursed are you more than all cattle, and more than every beast of the field; On your belly you will go, and dust you will eat all the days of your life** [[(This double bracket goes on for thirteen paragraphs before we come to Gen. 3:15.) **WHAT GOD GOES ON TO SAY TO THE SERPENT IN 3:15 MAKES IT CLEAR THAT HE IS SPEAKING TO SATAN, NOT TO A LITERAL SERPENT.** I have to assume, therefore, that the words of verse 14 speak, in a figurative way, of Satan's judgment (cf. Isa. 65:25). ((The fact that "dust will be the serpents food" (Isa. 65:25) when the other animals are transformed ("the wolf

and the lamb will graze together, and the lion will eat straw like the ox") fits well with the idea that the serpent is Satan; eating dust speaks symbolically of his overthrow (cf. Isa. 27:1). It is significant that Isa. 11:8 (with 11:6-8) shows that the literal snakes/serpents will be transformed along with the other animals for the millennial kingdom.) Even if Satan had spoken through a literal serpent, there would have been no basis to curse all serpents for what Satan had done. You could even question whether the particular serpent that had been used by Satan would have been cursed. From my point of view, we can abandon the idea of some that initially (before the temptation and fall of Adam and Eve) literal serpents did not move along the ground on their "belly." ((I had a footnote: I'll quote a sentence from what Kenneth A. Matthews says here ("Genesis 1-11:26" [Broadman, 1996, 1997, 2001], page 244). "While some Jewish interpreters surmised that the serpent must have originally been four-legged, there is no compelling reason for this conclusion. [He has a footnote. "E.g., "Tg. Ps.-J," Josephus, "Ant.," 1.1.50; "Gen. Rab." 19.1 and 20.5. It is thought to be reflective of an ancient view that the snake was at first upright and legged; see e.g., Skinner, "Genesis," 78-79 and Sarna, "Genesis," 27."]."))

There is another issue we must consider here. Was God informing us here (in an indirect way) that the entire animal kingdom was now cursed, though cursed to a lesser extent than the serpent(s)? As a matter of fact, the Bible does indicate that the rebellion and fall of man drastically affected everything on the earth, including the animal kingdom. Before the fall, according to Genesis chapter 1 (especially Gen. 1:30), the animals were subordinate to man and were no danger to him, and they didn't kill one another. Everything created in Genesis chapters 1, 2 was good.

Things changed drastically after the fall of man. This concept is strongly confirmed by the prophecies which show that when the Lord Jesus Christ has established His millennial kingdom on the earth the animals will no longer be a danger to man or to one another (see Isa. 11:6-9; 65:25; cf. Rom. 8:19-22).

It would be possible then to argue (and some commentators do) that the idea is included here in Gen. 3:14 that the animal kingdom was cursed because of the fall of man. There wouldn't be any idea that the animal kingdom (non-moral beings) was being cursed for any sin on their part. Genesis 3:17-19 show that everything involved with the production of food would now be cursed. That curse came because of man (see Gen. 3:17) and against man. In the same way, the curse that came on the animal kingdom came as a result of man's sin and against man (consider, for example, the danger that many animals pose to man and the fact that when domesticated animals have problems it hurts man).

The animal kingdom, being part of "the creation" (Rom. 8:19-22), certainly was adversely affected by the fall of man. I doubt, however, that God intended here in Gen. 3:14 to inform us that the animal kingdom was cursed. ((I had a nine paragraph footnote (This lengthy footnote also deals with the translation and

interpretation of Gen. 3:1.) I'll quote part of what John H. Sailhamer says in a note regarding the translation and interpretation of Gen. 3:1 and 3:14 ("Expositor's Bible Commentary," Vol. 2 [Zondervan, 1990], pages 50, 51). "The...'*min*' preposition can have the sense of either partitive ('subtil as none other of the beasts,' GKC [Gesenius, Kautzsch, Cowley's "Hebrew Grammar"], par. 119w) or the comparative...as the NIV's 'more crafty than.' In favor of the partitive sense is the use of "*min*" in verse 14: 'Cursed are you from [*min*] all the cattle and from [*min*] all the beasts of the field' (pers. transl.). In verse 14 it is the serpent who is cursed and not the other animals.... ... The close ties between verse 14 and verse 1 suggest that the partitive sense of the *min* should be read there also.

The net effect of reading *min* as a partitive is to suggest that the serpent was not in every respect an ordinary animal. He was not 'craftier than' the other beasts of the field. Rather, he was crafty 'and the other animals were not.' ... There is certainly no mention yet of the identification of the serpent with Satan, but the narrative has not closed the door on that interpretation as some commentators have supposed." Sailhamer holds the view that there was a literal serpent that Satan spoke through. I believe that is the view of all the commentators that I quote in this footnote. As I have mentioned, I believe the serpent is a symbol for Satan, that the serpent is Satan.

I'll quote part of what Edward J. Young says here ("Genesis 3" [Banner of Truth Trust, 1966], page 97). "God curses the serpent 'away from' [*min*] the cattle and beasts of the earth. The thought is not that of comparison, as though God had said that all the beasts would be cursed, but that the serpent would be cursed more than any. Rather, in the curse the serpent is separated from the other beasts. Whereas they are free, he is now in a peculiar bondage. ...

It is true that the whole creation is under bondage and groaneth and travaileth together, as the apostle says in Romans 8; but this is not the curse mentioned here. ... In this curse the serpent stands alone and unique.... ..."

I'll quote part of what H. C. Leupold says here ("Exposition of Genesis", Vol. 1 [Wartburg Press, 1942], page 161). "The use of the preposition *min* bears close watching. Although it may be used to express a comparative, and so grammatically one might arrive at the meaning 'cursed *above* all animals' [KJV], yet nothing indicates that all animals are cursed. ... Consequently, the *min* partitive in the sense of 'out of the number of' (G. K. 119w; K. S. 278b) is under consideration. This particular or exclusive meaning of *min* is established by cases such as Ex. 19:5; Deut. 14:2; 33:24. Therefore, this beast is singled out for a curse over against 'all the animals'...in general as well as over against 'the wild beasts'...in particular."

I'll quote part of what George Herbert Livingston says here ("Beacon Bible Commentary," Vol. 1 [Beacon Hill Press, 1969], page 46). "ABOVE ALL

[Livingston is using the KJV translation of Gen. 3:14, "thou art cursed ABOVE (*min*) all cattle, and ABOVE (*min*) every beast of the field"] is not in the sense 'more than,' thus suggesting that other animals were cursed too, but in the sense 'apart from' or 'separated out from among.' "

I'll quote part of what C. F. Keil says here ("Commentary on the Old Testament," Vol. 1 [Eerdmans, 1976 reprint], page 38). " 'min,' literally 'out of the beasts, separate from them (Deut. 14:2; Jud. 5:24), is not a comparative signifying 'more than'...; for the curse...was not pronounced upon all the beasts, but only upon the serpent alone."

I'll quote part of what F. Delitzsch says here ("Genesis," Vol. 1 [Klock & Klock, 1978 reprint], page 160). "The 'min'...[used twice] is not comparative (more cursed than...) but selective, like e.g. Jud. 5:24."

I'll make a few concluding remarks in this footnote before leaving this rather important topic. I don't believe it is fully adequate to understand "min" in a "partitive" sense here, though I believe that's quite close to the right idea. Technically the *partitive* sense applies when the person/thing is viewed as being part of the whole. That could apply in Gen. 3:1 IF the serpent is being considered part of the wild beasts of the field that God had made, that is, IF you are willing to assume that the serpent was a literal serpent (but I rather strongly resist that assumption). And the *partitive* sense of *min* could apply to the second use of "min" in 3:14 IF you assume the serpent was a literal serpent and part of the beasts of the field (again, I rather strongly resist that assumption). However, when it comes to the first use of "min" in 3:14, which speaks of the serpent in relation to the cattle, a *partitive* use of *min* could hardly apply since the serpent was not part of the cattle. (The Hebrew noun ["behemah"] translated "cattle" here probably includes more than literal "cattle"; the NIV translates "livestock"; but it seems clear enough that the serpent was *not* part of both the "behemah" and the wild beasts of the earth.) This fact helps steer the translation for *min* in 3:14 to something like "Cursed are you APART FROM [in the sense "unlike"] all cattle, And cursed are you APART FROM [in the sense "unlike"] all the beasts of the field." We could call this a "separative" use of the Hebrew preposition "min." This same use of *min* would also be understood in 3:1, where we would translate something like "the serpent was crafty APART FROM [in the sense of "unlike"] all the beasts of the field." This translation for 3:1 has the added benefit that it doesn't infer that the serpent (who I understand to be Satan) is part of the beasts of the field. (This is the end of the nine paragraph footnote.) ) What God says here in Gen. 3:14, 15, it seems to me, doesn't go beyond dealing with the curse coming to Satan/the serpent (and his kingdom). Satan, a fallen being, was already under God's condemnation before he came on the scene in Genesis chapter 3. (This is the end of the thirteen paragraph double bracket. Now we'll go on to Gen. 3:15.)); **(15) And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; He shall bruise you on the head** [In the margin the NASB has "Or

*crush*" instead of "bruise"; the NIV translates "he will crush your head."], **and you shall bruise him on the heel** [[The NIV has, "you will strike his heel." The Hebrew verb used earlier in this verse was also used here; the NASB translates "bruise" in both places. The translation "bruise" seems far too mild for the destruction of Satan and his kingdom, which is what is being prophesied here.]]." [[(This double bracket continues for eight paragraphs.) There is widespread agreement that this verse constitutes the first preaching of the gospel of salvation through the Lord Jesus Christ found in the Bible. We eventually learn (as God's progressive revelation continues in the Bible) that the "seed" of the woman heads up in the Messiah, the Son of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, the One who mortally wounds Satan - He crushes his head. When His work of judging is done (after the great-white-throne judgment at the end of the millennium), He will have overthrown and totally removed Satan and all who follow him from God's kingdom forever. It is important to understand that God wasn't caught off guard by the rebellion and fall of Adam and Eve. First Peter 1:20, for example, shows that before the fall of man God had already planned to send His Son to die for us and to overthrow Satan and his followers.

We eventually learn that the "seed" of the woman doesn't include all mankind, as you might have expected based on Gen. 3:15. The seed that will overthrow Satan is limited to that part of mankind that become aligned with the Lord Jesus Christ, the Seed, by faith. I'll say more about this seed as we continue.

However we translate the verb at the end of verse 15, it is clear that Satan (and his seed) attacks the people of God, very much including the Lord Jesus Christ. We now know that Satan even "succeeded" in having the Lord Jesus Christ put to death, but he was making a big mistake (cf. 1 Cor. 2:8). The atoning death of the Lamb of God was the primary thing that caused the downfall of Satan and his kingdom of darkness (cf., e.g., John 12:31-33; 16:11; and Heb. 2:14). It was also the primary thing that opened the door of salvation for all who will have a place in God's eternal kingdom (cf., e.g., Rev. 21:27).

Although it is clear that the Lord Jesus Christ (who was a man born of woman, of a virgin, a descendant of Eve, but who was/is much more than just a man; He never ceased being the eternal Son of God, deity with God the Father) was/is the primary One engaged in warfare with Satan, all the people of God of all ages have been engaged in this warfare. God's people have a part in the overthrow of Satan: Romans 16:20 says, "The God of peace will soon CRUSH Satan under your feet," and the Bible shows that we will be involved in God's end-time judgments from the time of the rapture, at which time we will begin to reign with Christ, even reign with a rod of iron (cf., e.g., Psalm 110:3; 1 Cor. 6:2, 3; Rev. 2:26, 27; 3:21; 17:14; and 19:14).

Satan's "seed" (those who are united with him in his rebellion and warfare against God and the people of God) includes the evil angels and demons, but in the fullest sense it also includes the descendants (seed) of Eve who follow him.



The Bible speaks of Satan's being the *father* of evil men, and of evil men being his *sons/children* (cf., e.g., Matt. 13:38; Acts 13:10; John 8:38, 41, 44; and 1 John 3:8, 10). It is clear, therefore (even if it wasn't clear to Adam and Eve back then), that some of the descendants of Eve are not engaged in warfare against Satan; many have rejected God and aligned themselves with the devil. We don't have to read very far in Genesis to confirm this fact. In Genesis chapter 4 we learn that Cain, the first son of Adam and Eve, sided in with Satan and slew his brother Abel. 1 John 3:12 informs us that Cain was "of the evil one" (cf. 1 John 3:8-10; I'll quote 3:10, "By this the CHILDREN OF GOD and the CHILDREN OF THE DEVIL are obvious: anyone who does not practice righteousness is not of God, nor the one who does not love his brother").

REVELATION CHAPTER 12 IS AN IMPORTANT CROSS-REFERENCE. The "woman" of Revelation chapter 12 and her "seed" corresponds with the "woman" of Gen. 3:15 and her "seed," which is that part of mankind who are faithful to God and against the devil; (part of) her "seed" is specifically mentioned in Rev. 12:17. I'll quote Rev. 12:1-6, 13, and 17 and make a few comments in brackets, but I'll be brief here (Revelation chapter 12 is discussed in a verse-by-verse manner in some detail in my book, "The Mid-Week Rapture" and my recently published e-book, "Introduction to the Mid-Week Rapture." The e-book should be read first, but the paperback book contains very much information that is not included in the e-book. Both books are available at amazon.com.):

**"A great sign appeared in heaven: a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars** [[Genesis 37:9, 10 help confirm that the "woman" here is a symbol for true Israel. Her seed (descendants, offspring) that we read about as we continue embraces all the believers from the days of Adam and Eve to the time the millennial kingdom begins.]]; **(2) and she was with child** [more literally, "**she was having in the womb**"] **and she cried out** [[better, "**she was crying out**"; the woman has been "crying out" since the fall of Adam and Eve because of the attacks of Satan and his followers; the first such attack that is recorded in the Bible came against faithful Abel]], **being in labor and in pain to give birth**. [[This birth (see Rev. 12:5) refers to the birth into the fullness of eternal life and glory that God's people will begin experience at the time of Christ's mid-week return.]] **(3) Then another sign appeared in heaven: and behold, a great red dragon having seven heads and ten horns, and on his heads were seven diadems**. [[Revelation 12:7-9 make it clear that the "dragon" is Satan. It is quite significant the he is called "the serpent of old" (referring to Genesis chapter 3) and "the devil and Satan who deceives the whole world" in Rev. 12:9. The "red" undoubtedly pictures the blood that he has shed, especially the innocent blood, starting with Abel. The "seven heads" represent the seven world-kingdoms of the Bible and show that Satan (the god of this world) is behind all the world-kingdoms. The "ten horns" represent the ten rulers of the revived Roman empire, who are spoken of in the book of Daniel and in the book of Revelation.

The fact that the seven heads are crowned in this symbolic word-picture shows that this verse is describing what takes place throughout this entire age, with each of the world-kings having their time to rule on the earth. (In Rev. 13:1, by contrast, it is the ten horns that are crowned, which shows that that word-picture just deals with the last days, the days in which the ten horns reign.)] **(4) And his tail swept away a third of the stars of heaven and threw them to the earth.** [[This is the only verse in the Bible that indicates how many of the angels (a third) followed the devil in his rebellion against God. When the devil is cast down to the earth at the time of Christ's return in the middle of Daniel's 70<sup>th</sup> week, his angels will be thrown down with him (see Rev. 12:7-9).] **And the dragon stood [better, "was standing"] before the woman who was about to give birth [better, "who was going to give birth"], so that when she gave birth he might devour her child.** [[It is important to understand that Satan doesn't wait for the ultimate birth of the child to attack; he does everything he can do to try to stop this birth from taking place; he attacks every godly person in every way that he can (God limits what he is permitted to do) throughout the history of man, and especially those clearly singled out by God (like Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David and his offspring, especially the Lord Jesus Christ, then the apostles, and every born-again Christian).] **(5) And she gave birth to a son, a male child** [[This is the birth of the male child prophesied in Isa. 66:7. Both verses prophesy of the all-important birth into the fullness of eternal life for all believers (all the members of God's true Israel; whether still living or having died) who have become believers before the time of that birth. Two other verses that prophesy of this same birth are Psalm 2:7 and Mic. 5:3. (These verses are all discussed in some detail in my book, "The Mid-Week Rapture," and in less detail in my e-book, "Introduction to The Mid-Week Rapture."))] **, who is to rule all the nations with a rod of iron** [Revelation 2:26, 27 demonstrate that the believers will rule (with Christ) with a rod of iron from the time of their mid-week birth and rapture.]; **and her child was caught up to God and to His throne.** [[These words speak of the mid-week rapture of the saints. We will be "caught up" to the throne of God and begin to reign with Him at that time. Significantly, the Greek verb ("harpazo") translated "was caught up" here is the same verb used for the catching up/rapture of the saints in 1 Thess. 4:17.] **(6) Then the woman fled into the wilderness where she had a place prepared by God, so that she would be nourished there for one thousand two hundred and sixty days.** [[The "woman" still represents true Israel, but, in this subsequent context, she is minus the very large number of believers who were glorified at the mid-week birth and rapture. (Satan can't attack those believers any more.) The woman pictured in Rev. 12:6 is limited to those who will become believers (Christians) after the mid-week rapture, centering in the conversion of the end-time remnant of literal Israel (the Jews). Revelation 12:13, which is quoted next, shows why the woman flees into the wilderness. Revelation 12:17, which is quoted after Rev. 12:13, confirms that (after the mid-week birth into the fullness of eternal life of Rev. 12:5) the woman has more "seed" waiting to be born again through faith in Christ and then to be born into the fullness of eternal life/glorified. The "seed" of Rev. 12:17 (the NASB translates "children" but has

"Lit[erally] 'seed;' " in the margin) are Christians; they "keep the commandments of God and HOLD TO THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS [my emphasis.]" ... **(13) And when the dragon saw that he was thrown down to the earth, he persecuted [or, pursued] the woman who gave birth to the male *child*. ... (17) So the dragon was enraged with the woman** [The dragon will be enraged against the woman (which equals being enraged against "the rest of her seed") from the time he is cast down to the earth in the middle of Daniel's 70<sup>th</sup> week (on his being cast down with his angels, see Rev. 12:4, 7-10).], **and he went off to make war with the rest of her children ["seed"], who keep the commandments of God and hold to the testimony of Jesus."**

PSALM 8 WITH HEBREWS 2:5-18 IS ANOTHER IMPORTANT CROSS-REFERENCE; IT DEALS WITH GOD'S PLAN TO USE MAN (THAT PART OF MANKIND THAT IS SAVED THROUGH AND UNITED WITH THE GOD-MAN, THE LORD JESUS CHRIST) TO TOTALLY OVERTHROW SATAN AND HIS SEED. See the verse-by-verse discussion of Psalm 8 in my paper on my internet site that deals with selected eschatological psalms (dated September 2004). Hebrews 2:5-14 are discussed there, and other important cross-references. (Now we are ready to discuss Gen. 3:16.)] **(16) To the woman He said, 'I will greatly multiply your pain in childbirth, in pain you will bring forth children** [[(This double bracket goes on for three paragraphs.) Apparently these words don't include the idea that if Eve would have had children before the fall, she would have had pain in childbirth, but less pain. The Hebrew verb could be translated "make great [your pain in childbirth]," or the equivalent. In footnote 53, on page 32 of my paper on Genesis chapters 1-3 on my internet site, I mentioned some of the things that God used under the old covenant as powerful, often-recurring reminders that things were not right with man on the earth - man had fallen from a right, life-flowing relationship with God, and that is a very big deal. (Things change substantially under the new covenant, but many such reminders are still around.)

For one thing, everything associated with sexual relations and the bearing of children was greatly affected by the fall. This isn't surprising. Now, instead of children being born in the garden of Eden and having a right relationship with God, they are born outside the garden, they are spiritually dead, and the physical death process is already working in them. Although Adam and Eve (and their offspring) were spiritually dead after the fall, the death wasn't complete or final. God didn't totally withdraw His presence, His life, or His blessings from them. Spiritual death won't be complete and final until the time of second death of Rev. 20:14, 15.)

After the fall, instead of not having shame even though they were naked (Gen. 2:25), Adam and Eve knew that they were naked, and they knew shame. Although there was no sin associated with having sexual relations under the Mosaic Law (assuming, of course, that the relations were proper, by God's definition), sexual relations rendered the persons unclean (cf. Lev. 15:16-18;

Ex. 19:15). Such *ceremonial* uncleanness, though not sinful, rendered the persons unfit to worship at the tabernacle, or to touch any consecrated thing. The menstrual cycle, which undoubtedly was adversely affected by the fall, served as another reminder for the people of Israel. Apart from the discomfort, the woman was unclean for seven days each cycle, and whoever touched her, or the chair she sat on, etc. became unclean (cf. Lev. 15:19-24). And, even though it was clearly recognized that having children was a blessing from God, giving birth rendered the woman unclean for forty days if a male child was born (Lev. 12:1-4) and for eighty days if a female child was born (Lev. 12:5, 6). Furthermore, after the days of ceremonial uncleanness were over for the woman who had given birth, she was required to offer burnt offerings and sin offerings to make atonement (Lev. 12:6-8).]; **yet [and] your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you.** [[Before the fall, Adam was the authority figure in that he was created first and Eve was created to be a "helper" for him; the New Testament shows that it was Adam's sin, not Eve's, that caused the fall of mankind. Before the fall, however, that authority wasn't abused and it didn't involve any negative overtones. After the fall, the Old Testament (and the history of man in general) offers all too many examples where men have sinfully abused their authority. Christianity did a lot to eliminate such abuses, but Christian men haven't always walked as Christians are required to walk (which includes loving their wives as Christ loves the church, for one thing).]] **(17) Then to Adam He said, 'Because you have listened to the voice of your wife** [[See Gen. 3:6. Gordon Wenham "Genesis 1-15," page 82) comments that the words "listen to the voice of" is an idiom meaning 'obey'; cf. 16:2; Ex. 18:24; 2 Kings 10:6 (BDB, 1034a).] It is very clear that Adam listened to (obeyed) the wrong voice - God was his God; Eve (who passed on to Adam what she had "learned" from Satan) was his wife, his companion, and his helper.]], **and have eaten from the tree about which I commanded you, saying, "You shall not eat from it"; cursed is the ground because of you; in toil you will eat of it all the days of your life. (18) Both thorns and thistles it shall grow for you [cf. Heb. 6:8]; and you will eat the plants of the field; (19) By the sweat of your face you will eat bread** [[Compare Gen. 5:29; Rom. 8:20-22. Before the fall and the curse that came on the ground and the growing of plants, etc. for food, the needs of man were met with very little labor and no hassle. After the fall, it became a full time job, with much opposition (including such things as bad ground; thorns, thistles, and weeds; animals, insects, etc. eating the crops; plagues and other diseases that attack crops; and too little water or, in some cases, too much water. These things were designed, for one thing, to remind man of his changed (fallen) status before God to help humble him, and to help motivate him to constantly look to God for His salvation (salvation in the spiritual/heavenly and earthly dimensions).]], **till you return to the ground, because from it you were taken [see Gen. 2:7]; for you are dust, and to dust you shall return.**' [[Compare Psalm 90:3; 104:29; and Eccl. 12:7. God had warned Adam and Eve that they would die if they rebelled against Him and His word and ate of the forbidden fruit (Gen. 2:17). The very day they rebelled they died spiritually and the physical death process was

initiated.]] **(20) Now the man called his wife's name Eve** [[The Hebrew noun "chawwah," which was translated "Eve," was only used twice in the Old Testament, here and Gen. 4:1. This Hebrew noun means "living," or "life." The name "Eve" is found twice in the New Testament (2 Cor. 11:3; 1 Tim. 2:13).]], **because she was** [The NIV translates, "because she would become."] **the mother of all the living.** [[(This double bracket goes on for three paragraphs.) "Living" is a translation of the Hebrew adjective "chay," which means *alive, living*. Eve was the mother of all the people that would ever live on the earth - they would all descend from her. In the light of Gen. 3:15, we can apparently also think of Eve in a more restricted sense as the mother of all believers. Christians participate in the life of God, having been born again through the outpoured Spirit. And although the new birth wasn't available yet to believers in the days of the Old Testament, they knew something of the life of God through His grace and Spirit. Ultimately (through the Lord Jesus Christ and His all-important atoning death and resurrection) all believers of all ages will be caught up into the fullness of the glory of the eternal life of God.

God gave Adam and Eve much basis for hope. We discussed the significance of the promise contained in Gen. 3:15, which included the ultimate total defeat of the serpent and his seed. Even though 3:15-24 spoke of quite a bit of suffering for Adam and Eve (much such suffering is redemptive if it helps humble people before God and causes them to repent and to look to Him for everything they need, especially salvation), nevertheless, in spite of the fall and the death penalty, they would become parents, and God would provide food, etc. to sustain them. Also, as the next verse shows, He even made garments for them. God, in His mercy, did not totally abandon man to sin and death.

Will Adam and Eve have a place in God's eternal kingdom? Before doing this study, I didn't have much assurance that they would have a place in heaven, though I thought it was quite possible that they would. After spending some time with these verses, I have much more assurance regarding their future. Based on the things God said to them here in chapter 3, I have to assume that they will have a place in heaven if they didn't rebel against God in a major way later, and the Bible doesn't mention further rebellion on their part. Assuming that they will have a place in God's eternal kingdom, their entrance into that kingdom will be through the atoning death of the Lamb of God. Only those whose names are written in the Lamb's book of life will be permitted to enter (cf., e.g., Rev. 20:12, 15; 21:27). There will not be any people in heaven who earned the right to enter through their own righteousness - salvation is by grace (but, significantly, the grace of God in Christ sanctifies).]] **(21) The LORD God made garments of skin for Adam and his wife, and clothed them.** [[This kind gesture on God's part confirms that He did not totally sever all relations with Adam and Eve, even though they did lose the life-flowing relationship they had enjoyed with Him in the garden. The "garments of skin" undoubtedly came from animals that were killed.]] **(22) Then the LORD God said, 'Behold, the man has become like one of Us** ["us"] [[(I'll comment further on this verse under 3:24.) I agree with

the widespread viewpoint that God was addressing His heavenly court/council (cf. Psalm 89:7), which would have included the cherubim ("the cherubim" are mentioned in Gen. 3:24). See under Gen. 1:26, on pages 33, 34 of my paper on Genesis Chapters 1-3 on my internet site. To be "like the sons of God" (the cherubim, seraphim, archangel(s), angels, etc.) includes (with some gigantic qualifications) being "like God." The angelic beings are called "sons of God" in Gen. 6:2; Job 1:6; 2:1; and 38:7; they are called "sons of the mighty" in Psalm 29:1. Job 38:4-7 show that they were there when God "laid the foundation of the earth" and "laid its cornerstone" etc.

I believe in the Trinity, but I don't believe the Trinity is in view here. I have four papers/articles dealing with the Trinity on my internet site: "Who Do We Worship?"; "Who Do We Pray To?"; "More on the Trinity"; and "The Name Yahweh and God the Father and God the Son."], **knowing good and evil; and now, he might stretch out his hand, and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever' - (23) therefore the LORD God sent him out from the garden of Eden, to cultivate the ground from which he was taken. (24) So He drove the man out; and at the east** [[In the margin the NIV has, "or, placed in front." The cherubim were apparently stationed at the entrance of the garden, which would have been on the east side of the garden. The tabernacle of Moses' day was entered from the east, as was the subsequent temple in Jerusalem.]] **of the garden of Eden He stationed the cherubim and the flaming sword which turned every direction to guard the way to the tree of life.** [[I don't believe that God intended the words of 3:22 ("Behold, the man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil"), which He spoke to the cherubim and other heavenly beings in His presence, to reflect reality/truth. I believe, in agreement with many, that these words were sarcastic (irony). The words of 3:22 build on what Satan had told Eve in Gen. 3:5 ("For God knows that in the day you [plural] eat from it your eyes will be opened, and YOU WILL BE LIKE GOD, KNOWING GOOD AND EVIL [my emphasis].").

((I had a seven paragraph footnote here: I'll list several other examples from the Old Testament where God used mocking sarcasm: 1 Kings 18:27; 22:15-23; Isa. 1:10; 28:1, 7, 8, 14, 15, 18; Jer. 2:27, 28; Ezek. 13:1-16; and Joel 3:10, but I'm not suggesting that any of these examples is fully comparable with the sarcasm (irony) of Gen. 3:22.

I'll quote a few sentences from what G. Charles Aalders says under Gen. 3:22 ("Genesis," Vol. 1 [Zondervan, 1981], page 112). "The statement, 'the man has now become like one of us, knowing good and evil,' needs some careful consideration. Was the serpent right after all? Among some ancient scholars the statement was considered to be irony. A few more recent interpreters have also taken this position. ... ..it is difficult to conceive of God expressing agreement with the words of the serpent which were used to lead the woman into sin." Aalders doesn't fully accept the viewpoint that the statement was irony.

I'll include two excerpts from the section on Gen. 3:22-24 from the "Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture," Vol. 1, "Genesis 1-11" (Inter-Varsity Press, 2001), pages 100, 101. The first excerpt is from Ephrem the Syrian, who was born AD306. The editors put this excerpt under the heading "God Lampoons Adam." "God said, 'Behold, Adam has become like one of us, knowing good and evil.' ...the point is...that God was mocking Adam in that Adam had previously been told [Satan spoke to Eve, but what he said included Adam], 'You [plural] will become like God, knowing good and evil.' ...before they ate the fruit they had perceived in reality only good, and they heard about evil only by hearsay. After they ate, however, a change occurred so that now they would only hear about good by hearsay, whereas in reality they would taste only evil. For the glory with which they had been clothed passed away from them, while pain and disease that had been kept away from them now came to hold sway over them" ("Commentary on Genesis 2:34.1-2"; "Fathers of the Church" series, 91:122).

The second excerpt is from Chrysostom, who died AD407. The editors put this excerpt under the heading, "The Devil Lies in Promising that the Tree Gives Knowledge [It did give knowledge of evil]." "... In fact the devil said, 'On the day when you eat of the fruit of the tree, your eyes will be opened and you will be like gods [better, "God"], knowing good and evil.' How can you maintain, you ask me, that it did not provide him with the knowledge of good and evil? Who said, in fact, that it provided him with this knowledge? The devil, you will answer. So do you put forward the testimony of the enemy and the conspirator? ... For the devil is a liar.... ..." ("Homilies on Genesis 7"; PG 54:610).

I'll quote part of what Chrysostom says regarding the tree of the knowledge of good and evil from a different book ("Homilies on Genesis 1-17"; Homily 17, paragraphs 18, 19 [Catholic University of America Press, 1986], page 220). "...called it the tree of the knowledge of good and evil...because after eating it they were divested of the glory from above and also had experience of their obvious nakedness. ... Consider...how much shame they were eventually seized with after eating it and thus breaking the Lord's command: 'They stitched fig leaves together, and made themselves skirts.' See the depths of indignity into which they fell from a condition of such great glory. Those who previously passed their life like angels on earth contrive covering for themselves out of fig leaves. Such is the evil that sin is: not only does it deprive us of grace from above, but it also casts us into deep shame and abjection, strips us of goods already belonging to us, and deprives us of all confidence."

I'll quote a paragraph from what John Calvin says under Gen. 3:22 ("Genesis" [Crossway Books, 2001], page 51). Under the words, "And the LORD God said, 'The man has now become like one of us,'" Calvin said, "This was an ironical reproof by which God not only pricked the heart of man but pierced it through and through. He [God] did not, however, cruelly triumph over the miserable and afflicted but, according to the necessity of the disease, applied a more drastic

remedy. For though Adam was confounded and astonished at his calamity, yet he did not so deeply reflect on its cause as to become weary of his pride, that he might learn to embrace true humility. We may add that God inveighed by this irony not more against Adam himself than against his posterity, for the purpose of commending poverty of spirit to all ages."

And, lastly, I'll quote part of what B. Vawter says under Gen. 3:22 ("New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture" [Thomas Nelson, 1981 reprint], page 180). "This is usually translated 'Man has become like one of us,' i.e., like one of the heavenly court or, simply (cf. 1:26), like God. In this case, the statement is taken as one of irony, echoing the lying promise of the tempter. The chief difficulty for this interpretation (which is at least as old as Ambrose) is that the text gives no indication that any part of it is to be read ironically. ...." This interpretation (seeing sarcasm, irony) doesn't come from any special indication in 3:22, but from all that Genesis chapters 2 and 3 have to say about the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and the temptation and fall of man. (This is the end of the seven-paragraph footnote.) )

The devil had told Eve that she (and Adam [The verb "YOU WILL BE like God, knowing good and evil" in Gen. 3:5 is plural in the Hebrew.]) would become "like God, knowing good and evil" (Gen. 3:5). What a perverse lie! What he said was a million miles from the truth, and (as we discussed in some detail) Eve had no excuse to believe the devil, especially when it required her to agree that God was a liar, a withholder, etc. For Eve (and Adam) to eat of the forbidden fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil would *not* make them like God. Instead of becoming more like God, they became more like the devil. Adam and Eve had been created in the image of God, and they were already like Him in many ways before the fall. Eating of the forbidden fruit brought only the knowledge of evil. (I'll quote a sentence from what Merrill F. Unger says under Gen. 3:22 ("Unger's Commentary on the Old Testament", Vol. 1 [Moody Press, 1981], page 20), "But man, created with only the knowledge of good, acquired the experiential knowledge of evil through pride and disobedience, and in this manner fell into a state of sin and misery.") They now knew sin/evil by having sinned, and by having come to know experientially at least some of the penalty for sin. (Neither God nor His heavenly court [I'm speaking of the cherubim, angels, etc. who remained faithful to God] had sinned or come to experience the penalty/consequences of sinning.) After the fall the Bible still speaks of man as being made in the image of God (e.g., Gen. 9:6; James 3:9), but it's clear that that image has been defaced.

There was no magic fruit from a literal tree of life that would enable Adam and Eve to cancel the fact that they had lost their life-flowing relationship with God and that the physical death process had now begun to work in them. It was impossible for Adam and Eve to partake of the fruit of the tree of LIFE after they had died spiritually through partaking of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good AND EVIL, which can also be called the tree of DEATH. The tree of life



was a symbol for participation in the life and blessings of God that were available to Adam and Eve before they (in rebellion against God) ate of the tree of death (the tree of the knowledge of good and evil), which only brought death, spiritual death and physical death, it brought only the knowledge of evil. As born-again Christians, we participate in the life of God, but only in a preliminary, partial sense; after we are glorified, however, we will participate in the life of God in a much fuller sense than what Adam and Eve had before the fall (cf., e.g., 1 Cor. 15:45-57). What a salvation plan! What a Savior! What a salvation!

I'll say more about the tree of life, and what it meant/means to eat the fruit of that tree, and a little bit more about the tree of death, in a follow-up article that deals with Gen. 2:9, which I'll quote from the NIV: "And the LORD God made all kind of trees grow out of the ground - trees that were pleasing to the eye and good for food. In the middle of the garden were the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil."

WHEN ADAM AND EVE WERE DRIVEN OUT OF THE GARDEN, THEY WERE, FOR ONE THING, BEING DRIVEN FROM THE PRESENCE OF GOD, WHO IS THE ONLY SOURCE OF LIFE, AND THE WAY INTO HIS PRESENCE WAS CLOSED AND GUARDED. To say the same thing using symbolic language, the "way to the tree of life" was closed and guarded. One of the primary functions of the "cherubim" ("cherubim" is the Hebrew plural of the singular noun "cherub") was/is to guard the way into the presence of God (not that God needs to be protected). I suppose that's the primary reason the cherubim/living creatures have a large number of eyes - you don't sneak up on them (cf. Ezek. 1:18; 10:12; and Rev. 4:6).

The time came, and it could have been right after Adam and Eve were cast out of the garden of Eden, that the garden ceased to exist in the physical dimension on the earth. It certainly has not existed for a long time in the physical dimension. However, God still exists, as do the cherubim, and wherever He is (heaven), the cherubim guard the way into His presence. Christians are enabled to dwell in the presence of God in a very real way, and His life is in us by His Spirit who was poured out starting on the day of Pentecost, because of the incarnation, atoning death, resurrection, and ascension of the Son of God, but most of the glory is reserved for the (near) future.]]

Excerpts from Henri Blocher; the First Excerpt Deals Mostly with the Fact that the Serpent of Genesis Chapter 3 Was Satan ("In the Beginning," translated by David G. Preston [Inter-Varsity Press, 1984]):

I quoted some five paragraphs from Blocher in the original paper, dealing with the fact that the serpent was Satan (from his pages 150-152; 179, 180). Here I'll just mention that he makes the point that Gen. 3:15 pictures Satan's defeat "after many generations of the human race" and that the book of Revelation shows clearly that the serpent of Genesis chapter 3 was Satan.

The following excerpt from Blocher and my comments and quotations from others that are included in brackets deal, for the most part, with THE MOST PROBABLE SPECIFIC FORBIDDEN FRUIT (BAIT) THE DEVIL USED TO ENTICE EVE AND ADAM:

"...the snake of the Garden of Eden stands for the attraction of pagan religion and its magic spells. It was the emblem of fertility rites and of cults involving prostitution. It was the animal of divination. ... There is nothing arbitrary about seeing in the snake, in Genesis, the representation of the lying spirit which empowers paganism. This we believe to have been the thought of the writer. [[I'm more interested in the thought of the One behind the writer of Genesis and the One behind the writer of the book of Revelation. The book of Revelation came mostly by direct revelation (there was little room for input by the apostle John); I assume that the first three chapters of Genesis came mostly (if not entirely) by direct revelation also. ((I had a footnote: Blocher doesn't deny God's immediate revelation in Genesis chapters 1-3, but I'm not satisfied with what he says on page 159, "If we recognize that the first event of history is reached by means of mental reconstruction [He has a footnote here, "Dubarle, p. 190n., quotes Renckens, K. Rahner and L. Alonso-Schokel as sharing this opinion. We admit that it is probable, without excluding a more immediate form of revelation."], intuitive and imaginative at first and then taken up by the theologian, we by no means admit thereby that its historicity is unimportant for the writer. It is precisely because the historical cause is so important to him that he reconstructs what occurred.")) As his next paragraph shows (which I am not quoting), Blocher isn't denying the existence of the literal devil here in Genesis chapter 3.

The primary reason I wanted to quote the paragraph I just quoted from Blocher was to make the point that I believe the most likely forbidden fruit (bait) that Satan used to tempt Eve and Adam was the desire for mysterious, exciting, occult knowledge and powers and the attendant baggage that comes along with satanic inspired "religion." It may look good for a while, but no true/real/ultimate good ever comes from Satanic, demonic knowledge and powers.

I'll quote what Merrill Unger says under Gen. 3:5 ("Unger's Commentary on the Old Testament," Vol. 1 [Moody Bible Institute, 1981], page 16). "What could be wrong in acquiring knowledge? Nothing, if it were acquired in the will of God and according to His word. But the knowledge the tempter offered Eve was contrary to both. Eve was tricked into a false or occult knowledge of the evil world of supernaturalism that would bring with it sorrow and misery (1 Tim. 2:14)."

I'll quote a few sentences from what Allen P. Ross says under Gen. 3:7 ("Creation and Blessing" [Baker, 1996, 1998], page 137). "They knew more [after they ate the forbidden fruit of the knowledge of good and evil], but that

additional knowledge was evil. ... The message to Israel, and to all God's people, should now be clear: *A thorough knowledge of the Word of God and an unwavering trust in the goodness of God are absolutely essential for spiritual victory over the world, the flesh, and the devil.* The appeal by the Tempter to humankind's desire to know, under the guise of spiritual development, is thereby set aside. In practical terms, this lesson would mean for Israel that the subtle claims of the pagans to achieve divinity and superior knowledge through their corrupt [from the devil; demonic] practices were false. The people of God were to avoid the satanic appeal to an elevated life and superior knowledge [the devil promises these things] if that appeal also required transgressing God's barriers [and God's people are clearly forbidden to fellowship with the devil or to look to him (or anyone but God) for "help"]."

And I'll quote two paragraphs from what Victor P. Hamilton says under Gen. 3:5 ("The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1-17" [Eerdmans, 1990], page 190). "Should she decide to proceed and implement the serpent's suggestion she will begin her heavenward climb. Von Rad is quite correct when he says that 'the serpent's insinuation is the possibility of an extension of human existence beyond the limits set for it by God at creation, an increase of life not only in the sense of pure intellectual enrichment but also familiarity with and power over, mysteries that lie beyond man.' " ("Genesis" [Westminster Press, 1972], page 89.)

Deification is a fantasy difficult to repress and a temptation hard to reject. In the woman's case she need give in to both only [This is a very big "only."] by shifting her commitment from doing God's will to doing her own will. Whenever one makes his own will crucial and God's revealed will irrelevant, whenever autonomy displaces submission and obedience in a person, that finite individual attempts to rise above the limitations imposed on him by his creator." Now I'll finish the excerpt from Blocher.]]

... In the light of later revelation, what name are we to give to that spirit which constantly opposed the LORD and sought to turn Israel [and not just Israel] away from him, unless it is the devil and Satan? ..." (pages 153, 154).

Now I'll quote a relatively small part of what Blocher says under the heading "The historicity of the material" (pages 154-170). I'll skip this section in the internet version of this paper. One major point that Blocher made here is that our goal must be to interpret Genesis chapters 1-3 the way God intended. For one thing, we aren't supposed to alter God's intended interpretation to build a better defense against heretics. Blocher insists (and rightly so) that Adam and Eve were real persons and that their fall was a historical event and that without this truth the message of the gospel would be jeopardized.

May the will of God be fully accomplished and His people be edified through this four-part article. In Jesus' name!

© Copyright by Karl Kemp