

Linguistic and Thematic Parallels Between Genesis 1 and 3

Roberto Ouro
Sagunto Adventist Theological Seminary

Introduction

A superficial glance may give the impression that there are no points of correspondence between Genesis 1 and 3. However, a deeper and more exhaustive analysis from linguistic, literary, and thematic perspectives reveals that there are indeed significant similarities between these two chapters. Generally, scholars have attributed Genesis 1 and 3 to two different literary sources: the Priestly (P) source for the redaction of Genesis 1 and the Jahvist (J) source for the redaction of Genesis 3. The immense majority of the studies on Genesis 1 and 3 sustain this view.¹

Scholars have analyzed the linguistic and thematic parallels between Genesis 1 and 2, but there are no systematic and deep studies of the linguistic, literary, and thematic correspondences between Genesis 1 and 3.² This article will establish that such linguistic and thematic parallels between Genesis 1 and 3 do indeed exist.³

¹See, for example, C. Westermann, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, trans. J. J. Scullion (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 74-76, 80-93, 178-81, 186-97; G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, WBC (Waco: Word Books, 1987), 1-2, 41-44; Ch. Cohen, "Jewish Medieval Commentary on the Book of Genesis and Modern Biblical Philology. Part I: Gen 1-18," *JQR* 81 (1991): 1-11; J. Kselman, "The Book of Genesis: A Decade of Scholarly Research," *Int* 45 (1991): 38-92.

²See, for example, J. B. Doukhan, *The Genesis Creation Story* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews UP, 1978); W. H. Shea, "The Unity of the Creation Account," *Origins* 5 (1978): 9-38; idem., "Literary Structural Parallels between Genesis 1 and 2," *Origins* 16 (1989): 49-68; H. P. Santmire, "The Genesis Creation Narratives Revisited: Themes for a Global Age," *Int* 45 (1991): 366-79.

³For a detailed study of Genesis 2-3 and its linguistic relationship with Genesis 1, see R. Ouro, *The Garden of Eden Account: The Literary Structure of Genesis 2-3 and its Linguistic Relationship with Genesis 1* (Entre Rios, Argentina: River Plate Adventist UP, 1997) (Spanish); idem., "The Garden of Eden Account: The Chiastic Structure of Genesis 2-3," *AUSS* 40 (2002) (forthcoming).

OURO: LINGUISTIC AND THEMATIC PARALLELS

The thesis of this article is that there are nine texts within these two narratives that are parallel in form and content.⁴ This suggests that both accounts were written by the same author, resulting in a similar linguistic, literary, and thematic model and establishing a common literary design.

We will analyze what it is objectively fixed and observed (the current Masoretic Text [MT]), rather than what is subjectively supposed and proposed (the Documentary hypothesis). As D. W. Baker urges, we should study the text as a literary unity to find where it is divided into smaller sections, using the mechanisms used to mark the divisions to indicate the unity.⁵

On the other hand, as M. Kessler points out, each passage must be studied in its objective context, its *Sitz im Text* (“text setting”) before it can fairly be studied in its vague and subjective *Sitz im Leben* (“vital setting”).⁶

Using these considerations and positions, our investigation will proceed as follows. We will analyze the Masoretic Text in its objective *Sitz im Text*, which is the fundamental principle for a sound and rigorous scientific methodology of exegesis. We will observe the linguistic and literary dependence of Genesis 3 on Genesis 1, noticing how different antithetical and synonymous parallels correlate both accounts. We will observe the thematic dependence of Genesis 3 on Genesis 1 at certain levels, based on the linguistic and literary dependence noted in the previous point. Finally, the presence of coherences, consistencies, correspondences, and intertextual parallels between the two accounts will allow us to verify the homogeneity and internal unity of both accounts. This will falsify the presupposition of heterogeneity and internal incoherence based on the subjectivity of *Sitz im Leben* studies.

Taking into account all of the above, we begin our analysis of the correspondences and parallels between Genesis 1 and 3.

1. Gen 1:10 || Gen 3:17: Antithetical Parallelism

Gen 1:10 wayyiqrāʾ ʾlōhîm layyabāšâ ʾereš ûlʾmiqʿwēh hammayim qārāʾ yammîm wayyarʿ ʾlōhîm kî-ṭob. And God called the dry land earth, and the gathering together of the waters He called seas. And God saw that it was good.

Gen 3:17 ʾa-rûrâ hāʾdāmâ baʿbûrekâ bʿiṣšābôn tōʾkʿlennâ kōl yʿmē hayyeykā. “Cursed is the ground for your sake; in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life.”⁷

⁴For a study of biblical parallelism, see, for instance, A. Berlin, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 1985), 31-102.

⁵D. W. Baker, “Diversity and Unity in the Literary Structure of Genesis,” in A. R. Millard & D. J. Wiseman (eds.) *Essays on the Patriarchal Narratives* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 197.

⁶M. Kessler, “A Methodological Setting for Rhetorical Criticism,” *Semitics* 4 (1974), 22-36.

⁷Scriptural texts are taken from the NKJV.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

In this first antithetical parallelism⁸ between Genesis 1 and 3, we can see that “the dry land (ground)” [*layyabāšā*]⁹ appears in Gen 1:10. This Hebrew term is a noun feminine singular. God called “the dry land (ground)” “earth” [*ʔereš*] and saw “that it was good.”¹⁰ In Gen 3:17, an antithetical linguistic and thematic parallelism appears with the curse of “the ground” [*hā^ʔdāma*]¹¹ on account of the man. Where before God, seeing the land/ground, thought “How good!” [*kî-ṭob*], He now said it would be “cursed” [*ʔrûrâ*]. The Hebrew word *hā^ʔdāma* is also a noun feminine singular, like *layyabāšā*. There is a synonymous parallelism between *layyabāšā* [“the dry land (ground)”] (Gen 1:10) and *hā^ʔdāma* [“the ground”] (Gen 3:17).

2. Gen 1:12 || Gen 3:18: Antithetical Parallelism

Gen 1:12 *watôšēʔ hāʔāreš dešeʔ ʕēseb mazʔrîaʕ zeraʕ lʔmînēhû weʕēš ʕōseh-pʔrî ʔšer zarʕô-bô lʔmînēhû wayyarʕʔ ʔlōhîm kî-ṭôb.* And the earth brought forth grass, the herb that yields seed according to its

⁸As Watson points out when referring to the parallel types of words: “*antonymic word-pairs* are made up of words opposite in meaning and are normally used in antithetic parallelism” see W. G. E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, JSOT Supplement Series 26 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 131.

⁹The Hebrew term *yabāšā* means “the dry land,” “the dry ground.” It appears in Exod 4:9 to refer to “dry land/ground” (close to water): “And it shall be, if they do not believe even these two signs, or listen to your voice, that you shall take water from the river and pour it on the *dry land*. And the water which you take from the river will become blood on the *dry land* (NKJV).” Exodus 14:16, 22, 29; 15:19 refer to the crossing of Israel on the “dry land/ground” of the Red Sea: “But lift up your rod, and stretch out your hand over the sea and divide it. And the children of Israel shall go on *dry ground* through the midst of the sea. . . . So the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea on the *dry ground*, and the waters were a wall to them on their right hand and on their left. . . . But the children of Israel had walked on *dry land* in the midst of the sea, and the waters were a wall to them on their right hand and on their left. . . . For the horses of Pharaoh went with his chariots and his horsemen into the sea, and the Lord brought back the waters of the sea upon them. But the children of Israel went on *dry land* in the midst of the sea (NKJV).” In Josh 4:22 the word refers to crossing of Israel on the “dry land/ground” of the Jordan River: “Then you shall let your children know, saying, ‘Israel crossed over this Jordan on *dry land* (NKJV).’” See also Neh 9:11; Ps 66:6 (F. Brown, S. R. Driver & C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951], 387; cf. W. L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1971], 127).

¹⁰Literally, in Hebrew *kî-ṭob* is a preposition + adjective in exclamative form, giving God’s thought on “seeing” the excellence of His work and its fidelity to his intentions, perhaps most adequately translated in Spanish as “Que bueno!” and in English as “How good!” though the formula “and God said” does not occur, so the thought was unspoken.

¹¹The “ground” *hā^ʔdāma* is the area of the arable ground/land that one can work for food production (E. Jenni and C. Westermann (eds.) *Diccionario Teológico del Antiguo Testamento* [Madrid: Cristiandad, 1978], 1:110-15). Originally this word meant the arable red ground/land. Starting from this meaning, it ended up denoting any ground to plant or cultivate and/or goods (R. L. Harris, G. L. Archer and B. K. Waltke (eds.) *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* [TWOT] [Chicago: Moody, 1980], 1:10).

OURO: LINGUISTIC AND THEMATIC PARALLELS

kind, and the tree that yields fruit, whose seed is in itself according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.

Gen 3:18 *w^eqôš w^edardar tašmîḥa*. “Both thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you.”¹²

In this second antithetical parallelism between Genesis 1 and 3, we can see that “grass” *dešeʿ* (noun masculine singular) and “herb” *ʿešeb* (noun masculine singular) appear in Gen 1:12. God looked at them and thought, as we have previously indicated “How good!” [*kî-ṭob*]. Then, in Gen 3:18, God saw that to these “good” things would be added harmful “plants,” such as “thorns and thistles” [*w^eqôš w^edardar*] (noun masculine singular + noun masculine singular), harmful to those now doomed to cultivate the land/ground and to the other plants God found to be “good” in the Creation account. This is an antithetical thematic parallelism, because it pertains to the same topic, but with consequences opposite to what had been intended.

3. Gen 1:25 || Gen 3:14: Antithetical Parallelism

Gen 1:25 *wayyaʿas ʾlōhîm ʾet-ḥayyat hāʾāreš l^emînāh w^eʿet-hab^ehēmā l^emînāh w^eʿet kol-remeš hāʾdāmā l^emînēhû wayyar^e ʾlōhîm kî-ṭob*. And God made the beast of the earth according to its kind, cattle according to its kind, and everything that creeps on the earth according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.

Gen 3:14 *wayyōʾmer yhwḥ ʾlōhîm ʾel-hannāḥāš kî ʿāsītā zzōʾt ʾārūr ʾatā mikol-hab^ehēmā ûmikōl ḥayyat haššādeh*. So the Lord God said to the serpent: “Because you have done this, you are cursed more than all cattle, and more than every beast of the field.”¹³

In this third antithetical parallelism between Genesis 1 and 3, God again saw “How good!” [*kî-ṭob*] as He viewed “the beast of the earth” [*ʾet-ḥayyat hāʾāreš*], “the cattle” [*hab^ehēmā*], and especially “everything that creeps on the earth according to its kind” [*kol-remeš hāʾdāmā l^emînēhû*] that He made in Gen 1:25. Look at the use of the noun masculine singular in the construct state—“everything that creeps” [*kol-remeš*—referring to all the reptiles in absolute terms.¹⁴ By contrast, in Gen 3:14, God curses one reptile, “the serpent” [*hannāḥāš*], saying to it: “you are cursed more than all cattle, and more than every beast of the field” [*ʾārūr ʾatā mikol-hab^ehēmā ûmikōl ḥayyat haššādeh*]. This is linguistic and thematic parallelism between these texts of Genesis 1 and 3. (There is also reverse parallelism in the order of presentation: beast, cattle, creepers in 1:25, then serpent, cattle, beast in 3:14.) These texts constitute the narrative nucleus of the antithetical parallelism between Genesis 1 and 3.

¹²NKJV.

¹³NKJV.

¹⁴ There is debate over whether *kol-remeš* means reptiles or might include small animals or insects, but the parallel between these two verses suggests at the least that the serpent was among *kol-remeš*, and may even mean that the author understood *kol-remeš* to mean serpent-like reptiles.

4. Gen 1:12 || Gen 3:6: Synonymous Parallelism

Gen 1:12 *watôṣēḥ hā'āreṣ deše' ešeb maz'ria' zera' l'minēhū we'eš* 'ōseh-p'ri 'šer zar'ō-bō l'minēhū wayyar' lōhīm kî-ṭob. And the earth brought forth grass, the herb that yields seed according to its kind, and the tree that yields fruit, whose seed is in itself according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.

Gen 3:6 *watēre' hāiššā kî ṭōb hā'eš l'ma'kol w'kî ta'wā-hū* lā'ēnayim w'neh'mād hā'eš l'haš'kîl watiqqah mipiryō watō'kal watitēn gam-l'šāh 'immāh wayyō'kal. So when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree desirable to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate. She also gave to her husband with her, and he ate.¹⁵

Another linguistic and thematic parallelism between Genesis 1 and 3 appears in these texts.¹⁶ In Gen 1:12 we find the Hebrew formula “How good!” [*kî-ṭob*].¹⁷ The phrase “and God saw that it was good” [*wayyar' lōhīm kî-ṭob*] refers here to all the vegetation He has created. This same formula appears in Gen 3:6, used by the woman to refer to “the tree of the knowledge of good and evil”: “So when the woman saw that the tree was good [lit. ‘How good!’—*watēre' hāiššā kî ṭōb*] for food.” The woman saw “the tree of the knowledge of good and evil” as good, beautiful, pleasant, and desirable much as “God saw that it was good” when He viewed in Gen 1:12 the grass, plants, and trees He had created.¹⁸ Consequently, the woman was in effect pronouncing her judgment on the quality of “the tree of the knowledge of good and evil,” just as God had judged the quality of the vegetation He had made.

5. Gen 1:25 || Gen 3:1: Synonymous Parallelism

Gen 1:25 *wayya'aš lōhīm et-hayyat hā'āreṣ l'mināh w'et-hab'hēmā l'mināh w'et kol-remeš hā'dāmā l'minēhū wayyar' lōhīm kî-ṭōb*. And God made the beast of the earth according to its kind, cattle according to its kind, and everything that creeps on the earth according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.

Gen 3:1 *w'hannāhāš hāyā arūm mikōl hayyat haššādeh šer ašā yhw' lōhīm*. Now the serpent was more cunning than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made.¹⁹

Again we consider Gen 1:25, but this time in synonymous parallel with another verse, Gen 3:1. This parallelism between Genesis 1 and 3 is highly signifi-

¹⁵NKJV.

¹⁶“Synonymous word-pairs comprise a large class with a broad spectrum . . . Its components are synonyms or near-synonyms and therefore almost interchangeable in character” (Watson, 131).

¹⁷Preposition + adjective masculine singular.

¹⁸“And God saw that it was good” [*wayyar' lōhīm kî-ṭob*] || “So when the woman saw that [it] was good” [*watēre' hāiššā kî ṭōb*]

¹⁹NKJV.

OURO: LINGUISTIC AND THEMATIC PARALLELS

cant because of the verb used in both passages. In Gen 1:25, the verb “to do (make)” [*‘āśā*] appears in the Qal imperfect form *wayya‘as*. The same verb appears in Gen 3:1 in the same Qal form, but in the perfect, pointing toward an action concluded. This linguistic parallelism (and as we will also see it is also thematic) is very important, because when the Documentary theory distinguishes between Genesis 1 and 2-3 as being from two separate literary sources (P for the redaction of Genesis 1 and J for the redaction of Genesis 2-3), one of the fundamental arguments is the difference between the two verbs used to describe the divine activity. This difference has been based on the use of the verb *bārā’* [“to create”] in Genesis 1 and the verb *‘āśā* [“to do (make)”] in Genesis 2-3. But here it is evident that there is a linguistic unity, for the same verb is used in both passages and so in both accounts. There is also a thematic unity marked by the use of the same Hebrew terminology and expressions:

A *wayya‘as* ^ʔ*lōhîm* [God made]

B ^ʔ*et-hayyat hā‘āreṣ l‘mînāh w^ʔet-hab^ʔhēmā l‘mînāh w^ʔet kol-remes hā^ʔdāmā l‘mînēhū* [the beast of the earth according to its kind, cattle according to its kind, and everything that creeps on the earth according to its kind.] (1:25)

B’ *w^ʔhannāhāš hāyâ ‘ārûm mikōl hayyat haššādeh* [Now the serpent was more cunning than any beast of the field]

A’ ^ʔ*ser ‘āśā yhwh* ^ʔ*lōhîm*. [which the Lord God had made.] (3:1)

Besides the linguistic relationship already signaled, B||B’ establishes a literary and thematic correspondence by means of the use in B of “beast of the earth” [*hayyat hā‘āreṣ*], “cattle” [*hab^ʔhēmā*], and “everything that creeps on the earth” [*kol-remes hā^ʔdāmā*] and in B’ of “the serpent” [*hannāhāš*], as representative of the reptiles of the land/ground, and “any beast of the field” [*kōl hayyat haššādeh*]. By means of the use of the Hebrew term *kōl* [“all/everything”] the author includes both “beast of the earth” and “cattle.” Remember that for these animals B does not use the word *kōl*. This way, a precise correspondence and parallelism on all levels between both accounts is established.

6. Gen 1:26-27 || Gen 3:8-9, 12, 17, 20-22, 24: Synonymous Parallelism

Gen 1:26-27 *wayyō^ʔmer* ^ʔ*lōhîm na^ʔseh ʔādām b^ʔsal^ʔmēnū . . . wayyib^ʔrā^ʔ* ^ʔ*lōhîm ʔet-hāʔādām b^ʔsal^ʔmō*. Then God said, “Let us make man in our image” . . . So God created man in His own image.

Gen 3:8-9, 12, 17, 20-22, 24 *wayyithabē^ʔ hāʔādām w^ʔʔštō*. And Adam and his wife hid themselves . . . *wayyiqrā^ʔ yhwh* ^ʔ*lōhîm ʔel-hāʔādām*. Then the Lord God called to Adam . . . *wayyō^ʔmer hāʔādām*. Then the man said . . . *ūl^ʔādām ʔamar*. Then to Adam He said . . . *wayyiqrā^ʔ hāʔādām*. And Adam called . . . *wayya‘as yhwh* ^ʔ*lōhîm l^ʔādām ūl^ʔʔštō*. Also for Adam and his wife the Lord God made . . . *wayyō^ʔmer yhwh* ^ʔ*lōhîm hēn hāʔādām*. Then the Lord God

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

said, “behold, the man . . . waygāreš ’et-hā’ādām. So He drove out the man.²⁰

In this correspondence and parallelism between Genesis 1 and 3, the noun masculine singular “man” [’ādām] is often used.²¹ The same term is used both in Genesis 1 to refer to God’s creation of the man (male and female), and in Genesis 3 to refer, in many verses, to the “man” in relationship to God or to the action of “individual man.”

7. Gen 1:28 || Gen 3:16: Synonymous Parallelism

Gen 1:28 way^ebārek ’ōtām ^elōhīm wayyō’mer lāhem ^elōhīm p^erū ūr^ebū ūmil’ā ’et-hā’āreš w^ekibšuhā ūr^edū bidgat hayyām ūb^e’ōp haššāmayim ūb^e’kol-ḥayyā hārōmešet ‘al-hā’āreš. Then God blessed them, and God said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it; have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth.”

Gen 3:16 ’el-hā’iššā ’āmar harbā ’arbeh ‘iṣṣbônēk w^ehērōnēk b^e’eṣeb tēldī bānīm w^e’el-’iššēk t^ešūqātek w^ehū’ yimšāl-bāk. To the woman He said: “I will greatly multiply your sorrow and your conception; in pain you shall bring forth children; your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you.”²²

These texts reveal another very significant synonymous parallel between Genesis 1 and 3. In Gen 1:28 the verb *rābā* [“to multiply, increase”]²³ appears in Qal imperative form, while in Gen 3:16 it appears in Hiphil infinitive absolute—Hiphil imperfect *harbā*, in a very characteristic form found in Genesis 2-3.²⁴ But, while in Genesis 1 it is a simple Qal action in imperative form, in Genesis 3 it is a causative verbal form expressing the simple action caused by another.

Consequently, in Genesis 1, God blesses the couple and tells them by means of three Qal imperatives “be fruitful; multiply; fill the earth.” Therefore, they have children in abundance. However, in Genesis 3, He tells the woman He

²⁰NKJV.

²¹The Hebrew word ’ādām appears 554 times in the OT. It has the collective meaning of man (as gender), mankind, and men, and it is only used in singular and absolute state, and never with suffixes. The “individual man” is expressed with *ben ’ādām*, and the plural “men” with *b^ene/b^enot (ha) ’ādām*. The meaning of the word continues unchanged throughout the OT (Jenni and Westermann, 1:92).

²²NKJV.

²³This is a very common form in northwestern Semitic, similar to the Ugaritic *rb* and the Akkadian *rabū*. This is the common suffix of many Assyrian-Babylonian names, e.g. “Hammurabi”: “the god Ham (maybe ’ammu) is big.” The root appears about 200 times in the OT. Two more important differences with relationship to the meaning are related with the appearance in Qal form (60 times) and in Hiphil form (155 times). The first time it appears is in Gen 1:22, where it translates as “to multiply,” but other varied translations appear in later texts. In Hiphil, the most common translation is “multiply,” but many other translations are also given (TWOT, 2:828).

²⁴See, for example, Gen 2:16-17 (Qal verbal form) and Gen 3:16.

OURO: LINGUISTIC AND THEMATIC PARALLELS

“will greatly multiply” not only her conception but her sorrow, and He reiterates it when He tells her “in pain you shall bring forth children.” Thus, these verses directly correspond linguistically and thematically with Genesis 1, showing that at the beginning it was not this way. That is to say, bearing children was not meant to be painful (the expression “in pain you shall bring forth children” implies that this had not been so in the past).

8. Gen 1:29-30 || Gen 3:2-3, 6: Synonymous Parallelism

Gen 1:29-30 wayyō^{mer} ʾlōhîm hinnēh nātātî lākem ʾet-hol-ʿēšeb zōrēʿa zeraʿ ʾšer ʿal-p^{nē} kol-hāʾāreš ʾšer-bō p^{rî}ʿēš zōrēʿa zāraʿ lākem yihyeh l^ʾāk^{lā}. U^l kol-hayyat hāʾāreš ū^lkol-ʿōp haššāmayim ū^lkōl rōmēs ʿal-hāʾāreš ʾšer-bō nepeš ḥayyā ʾet-kol-yereq ʿēšeb l^ʾāk^{lā} way^{hî}-kēn. And God said, “See, I have given you every herb that yields seed which is on the face of all the earth, and every tree whose fruit yields seed; to you it shall be for food. Also, to every beast of the earth, to every bird of the air, and to everything that creeps on the earth, in which there is life, I have given every green herb for food.” And it was so.

Gen 3:2-3, 6 watō^{mer} hāʾiššā ʾel-hannāḥāš miprî ʿēs-hagān nō^{kēl} ū^{miprî} hāʿēs ʾšer b^{tōk}-hagān ʾāmar ʾlōhîm lō^ʾ tō^kʾlū mimmennū w^{lō} tinn^ʿū bō pen-^tmutūn . . . watēreʾ hāʾiššā kî tōb hāʿēs l^{ma}ʾkol w^{ēkî} ta^{wā}-hū^ʾ lāʿenayim w^{neḥ}ē^{mād} hāʿēs l^{has}ʿkîl watiqqāḥ mipiryō watō^{kal} watitēn gam-l^ʾišāh ʿimmāh wayyō^{kal}. And the woman said to the serpent, “We may eat the fruit of the trees of the garden; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God has said, ‘You shall not eat it, nor shall you touch it, lest you die.’” . . . So when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree desirable to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate. She also gave to her husband with her, and he ate.²⁵

In these passages, we have several linguistic, literary, and thematic correspondences. The most significant parallels between Genesis 1 and 3 are the use of three similar Hebrew words: “tree” [ʿēš], “fruit” [p^{rî}], and “to eat” [ʾāk^{lā}] (the antecedent of Gen 1:29-30 is found in Gen 1:11-12, where the terms “tree” and “fruit” appear twice). These are repeated several times in Gen 3:2-3, 6: “We may ‘eat’ [nō^{kēl}] the ‘fruit’ [miprî] of the ‘trees’ [ʿēs] of the garden; but of the ‘fruit’ [ū^{miprî}] of the ‘tree’ [ʿēs] which is in the midst of the garden, God has said “‘You shall not ‘eat’ [tō^kʾlū] it” . . . So when the woman saw that the ‘tree’ [ʿēs] was good for ‘food’ [maʾkol], . . . and a ‘tree’ [ʿēs] desirable to make one wise, she took of its ‘fruit’ [mipiryō] and ‘ate’ [tō^{kal}]. She also gave to her husband with her, and he ‘ate’ [yō^{kal}].” Therefore, we can see that there is a linguistic, literary, and thematic unity, because both chapters take into account

²⁵NKJV.

vegetation, food/diet, and human attitude regarding the divine command of not eating of the fruit of a tree.

9. Gen 1:29-30 || Gen 3:18: Synonymous Parallelism

Gen 1:29-30 wayyō^{mer} ʾlōhîm hinnēh nātātî lākem ʾet-hol-ʿēšeb zōrēʿa zeraʿ ʾšer ʿal-p^{nē} kol-hāʾāreš ʾšer-bō p^{rī}ʿēš zōrēʿa zāraʿ lākem yihyeh l^ʾāk^{lā}. U^l kol-hayyat hāʾāreš ū^lkol-ʿōp haššāmayim ū^lkōl rōmēš ʿal-hāʾāreš ʾšer-bō nepeš hayyā ʾet-kol-yereq ʿēšeb l^ʾāk^{lā} way^{hī}-kēn. And God said, “See, I have given you every herb that yields seed which is on the face of all the earth, and every tree whose fruit yields seed; to you it shall be for food. Also, to every beast of the earth, to every bird of the air, and to everything that creeps on the earth, in which there is life, I have given every green herb for food.” And it was so.

Gen 3:18 w^ʿqōš w^ʿdardar tašmīḥa lāk w^ʿākaltā ʾet-ʿēšeb haššādeh. “Both thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you, and you shall eat the herb of the field.”²⁶

In this synonymous parallelism, we find both linguistic and thematic levels, marked by the appearance of the Hebrew words “herb” [ʿēšeb; twice] and “for ‘food’” [ʾāk^{lā}; twice] in Gen 1:29-30. We find the same Hebrew words in Gen 3:18: “you shall ‘eat’ the ‘herb’” [ʾākaltā ʿēšeb], with the added term “of the ‘field’” [haššādeh]. This points to an alteration of the diet specified in Gen 1:29, adding the “[wild and cultivated] herb of the field” for the man as a consequence of his disobeying the divine command to not eat from “the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.” Now “the ground” [hā^ʾdāmā; Gen 3:17] will provide him with other plants God had not included in his original diet, establishing a precise and exact correspondence between Genesis 1 and 3.

Summary

A detailed outline of the linguistic and thematic parallels between Genesis 1 and 3 may now be presented:

²⁶NKJV.

OURO: LINGUISTIC AND THEMATIC PARALLELS

<i>LINGUISTIC AND THEMATIC PARALLELS BETWEEN GENESIS 1 AND 3 (I)</i>		
<p>1. Gen 1:10 - “the dry land (ground)” <i>layya-bāšā</i> - “that it was good” <i>kî-tôb</i></p>	Antithetical Parallelism	<p>1. Gen 3:17 - “the ground” <i>hā^wdāmā</i> - “cursed” <i>ʾarûrâ</i></p>
<p>2. Gen 1:12 - “grass” <i>dešeʿ</i> - “herb” <i>ʿeseb</i> - “that it was good” <i>kî-tôb</i></p>	Antithetical Parallelism	<p>2. Gen 3:18 - “thorns” <i>w^eqôš</i> - “thistles” <i>w^edardar</i></p>
<p>3. Gen 1:25 - “everything that creeps” <i>kol-remeš</i> - “the beast of the earth” <i>ḥayyat hāʾāreš</i> - “cattle” <i>hab^hhēmâ</i> - “that it was good” <i>kî-tôb</i></p>	Antithetical Parallelism	<p>3. Gen 3:14 - “the serpent” <i>hannāḥāš</i> - “beast of the field” <i>ḥayyat haššādeh</i> - “cattle” <i>hab^hhēmâ</i> - “cursed” <i>ʾarûr</i></p>
<p>4. Gen 1:12 - “the tree” <i>weʿēš</i> - “fruit” <i>p^rî</i> - “And God saw that it was good” <i>wayyar^e ʾelôhîm kî-tôb</i></p>	Synonymous Parallelism	<p>4. Gen 3:6 - “the tree” <i>hāʿēš</i> - “fruit” <i>piryô</i> - “So the woman saw that [it] was good” <i>watēreʿ hāʾiššâ kî tôb</i></p>
<p>5. Gen 1:25 - “made” <i>wayyaʿas</i> - “beast of the earth” <i>ḥayyat hāʾāreš</i> - “everything that creeps” <i>kol-remeš</i></p>	Synonymous Parallelism	<p>5. Gen 3:1 - “had made” <i>ʿasâ</i> - “beast of the field” <i>ḥayyat haššādeh</i> - “the serpent” <i>hannāḥāš</i></p>
<p>6. Gen 1:26-27 - “man” <i>ʾādām</i></p>	Synonymous Parallelism	<p>6. Gen 3:8-9, 12, 17, 20-22, 24 - “man” <i>ʾādām</i></p>
<p>7. Gen 1:28 - “multiply” <i>ûr^ebû</i></p>	Synonymous Parallelism	<p>7. Gen 3:16 - “multiply” <i>harbâ</i></p>

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

<i>LINGUISTIC AND THEMATIC PARALLELS BETWEEN GENESIS 1 AND 3 (II)</i>		
<p style="text-align: center;">8. Gen 1:29-30</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “tree” <i>‘ēṣ</i> - “fruit” <i>p’rî</i> - “eat” <i>’āk’lâ</i> 	<p>Synonymous Parallelism</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">8. Gen 3:2-3, 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “tree” <i>‘ēṣ</i> (4 times) - “fruit” <i>miprî, ûmiprî, mipiryô</i> - “eat” <i>nô’kêl, tô’k’lû, ma’kol, tô’kal, yô’kal</i>
<p style="text-align: center;">9. Gen 1:29-30</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “herb” <i>‘ēšeb</i> - “eat” <i>’āk’lâ</i> 	<p>Synonymous Parallelism</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">9. Gen 3:18</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “herb” <i>‘ēšeb</i> - “eat” <i>’ākaltâ</i>

Conclusion

This analysis, we think, has shown clearly that there are linguistic, literary, and thematic similarities between Genesis 1 and 3. Baker claims that nothing in the structure of the book of Genesis indicates that it was *originally a heterogeneous amalgam of separate sources* as has been announced, apart from the evidence of rough unions some have proposed. In support of the ideas discussed in his article, this article shows that Genesis [or at the least, Genesis 1 and 3] seems to be a well-structured literary document.²⁷

At least nine fundamental Hebrew texts of contact exist between the two narratives. These texts present very similar linguistic, literary, and thematic forms in many aspects. These contact points suggest that Genesis 3 was modeled after Genesis 1. The comparison of linguistic and thematic parallels provides strong evidence of intentional design in the forms found in the passages analyzed previously and suggests that both accounts were written by the same hand, for the same author, following a similar linguistic, literary, and thematic model, and establishing a common literary design. It is difficult to exclude the possibility that there could have been two authors, with the second author deliberately paralleling the first, but it seems unlikely that P would try to parallel J in these ways, or vice versa. There are enough details in common between Genesis 1 and 3 to point toward both chapters being written by the same author.

Roberto Ouro teaches research methodology and paradigms of contemporary psychology at Sagunto Adventist Theological Seminary and pastors the Santander SDA Church in Spain. He holds three master’s degrees—in Pastoral Theology, Theology (Old Testament), and Psychology—and has a Ph.D. in Experimental Psychology from the University of Valencia. He has taught Psychobiology at the National Distance Learning University of Valencia and at River Plate Adventist University. He is a member of the American Academy of Religion and Society of Biblical Literature. ouror@hotmail.com

²⁷Baker, 214.