



Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament

An International Journal of Nordic Theology

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/sold20>

The Eighth Day: The Appointment of Adam as Priest in Eden and the Priestly Profile of Genesis 2-3

Benjamin Kilchör

To cite this article: Benjamin Kilchör (2022) The Eighth Day: The Appointment of Adam as Priest in Eden and the Priestly Profile of Genesis 2-3, Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament, 36:2, 255-266, DOI: [10.1080/09018328.2022.2114188](https://doi.org/10.1080/09018328.2022.2114188)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09018328.2022.2114188>



Published online: 12 Sep 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

The Eighth Day: The Appointment of Adam as Priest in Eden and the Priestly Profile of Genesis 2-3¹

Benjamin Kilchör

Staatsunabhängige Theologische Hochschule Basel

Mühlestiegrain 50

4125 Riehen

Switzerland

benjamin.kilchoer@sthbasel.ch

ABSTRACT: While it has often been observed within the framework of classic source criticism that Genesis 1 and Exodus 25-40 are conceptually related in the *Priestergrundschrift* (Creation and Tabernacle), it is argued here that Genesis 2-3 is associated too with the priestly sanctuary concept and has parallels especially in Leviticus 9-10. In Genesis 2, Adam and Eve are appointed as priests in the Garden of Eden like Aaron and his sons in Leviticus 9. The death of Adab and Nabihu in Leviticus 10 mirrors the fall of Adam and Eve in Genesis 3. Since there are parallels both in conception and in language between Genesis 2-3 and P, it is argued that the distinction of P and non-P in Genesis 1-3 is questionable.

Key words: Creation; Genesis 1-3; Tabernacle; Leviticus 9-10; Pentateuchal Theory

1. Introduction: No sanctuary without cult

Anyone today pointing out the relationship between creation in Genesis 1 and the construction of the tabernacle in Exodus 25-40 offers nothing new. However, this relationship is almost always seen as part of the theological program of the P-source or -redaction. Janowski (2004), for example, discusses the relationship between tabernacle and creation as part of the priestly concept of the sanctuary. Or, Ziemer (2012) discusses the relationship between creation, sanctuary, and Sabbath as part of the priestly concept of the covenant.

What is common to both, as well as to further research on this relationship (e.g. Blenkinsopp: 1976; Kearney: 1977), is that only Gen 1,1-2,3 is considered as a counterpart to the creation motifs in the tabernacle account, while

1. I am grateful to John Bergsma and Michael Cox for helping me improve the English of this paper and to Simon Gröbe for his help with formatting issues.

Gen 2,5-3,24 is disregarded and not viewed as being part of an overall creation-sanctuary conception.² The climax of the corresponding features is then localized in the completion of the creation and the tabernacle as formulated in Gen 2,2 and Exod 40,33 with the verb כלה: “So God/Moses finished his work.”³ On this basis, Pola (1995) proposed to see the end of the basic layer of P (*Priestergrundschrift*) in Exodus 40: the tabernacle as a cipher for Zion is thus the goal of creation and land promises to the fathers. One of the main critiques of this thesis has been that the sanctuary remains incomplete without a cult (e.g. Römer: 2014, 72; Zenger and Frevel: 2014, 200). Zenger (1995) proposed in the same year in the first edition of the Introduction to the Old Testament which he edited, that the end of the *Priestergrundschrift* should be placed in Lev 9,23-24. It is not the building of the sanctuary and the indwelling of YHWH by the glory-cloud that concludes the *Priestergrundschrift*, but the first sacrifice by Moses and Aaron, which is answered by YHWH with a theophany. Without agreeing with Zenger on the end of the *Priestergrundschrift* (since I doubt the existence of a *Priestergrundschrift* at all), I would like to take his considerations as the starting point for my own. I will argue that not only the tabernacle but also the “creation-sanctuary” of Genesis 1 does not remain without cult if we read it together with Genesis 2-3.

2. The appointment of priests: Genesis 2 and Leviticus 9

Leviticus 9, the chapter Zenger (1995) considered as the conclusion of the *Priestergrundschrift*, starts with Moses calling Aaron and his sons and the elders of Israel “on the eighth day” (Lev 9,1). After offering the first sacrifice, Moses and Aaron enter the tent of meeting for the first time (Lev 9,23). On the eighth day—after the seven-day consecration of the priests (Lev 8,33)⁴—the first sacrifice takes place, the priests start their daily service, and the tabernacle becomes approachable for them. Lev 9,23 continues Exod 40,34-35 where Moses cannot enter the tent of meeting because the cloud settles on it.⁵ Entering the cloud obviously presupposes a seven-day conse-

2. Cf. Janowski: 2004, 46: “Dass zwischen dem Ende (Gen 1,31; 2,2f. PG) der priesterschriftlichen Schöpfungsgeschichte Gen 1,1-2,4a* PG und dem Mittelstück (Ex 19,1-40,35* PG) der priesterschriftlichen Sinaigeschichte Ex 16,1-Lev 9,24* PG mehr als nur zufällige Entsprechungen bestehen, ist seit längerem bekannt.”

3. See Sonnet: 2016, 1131–1132.

4. Cf. Nihan: 2007, 123.

5. According to Frevel: 2000, 154, the counterpart of Exod 40,34-35 is not Lev 9,1 but rather Lev 1,1, where God calls Moses from the tent of meeting, wherein he now dwells (like before on Mount Sinai). However, the unique formulation of Lev 1,1 that God does not speak to Moses *in* the tent of meeting but rather *from* the tent of meeting (מאהל מועד) emphasizes that Moses still cannot enter the tent. This, however, requests that the story will continue until Moses is enabled to enter the tent. Lev 1,1 is followed by God’s instructions regarding the sacrifices and by the appointment of the priests who then offer the first sacrifice, before Moses and Aaron can enter the tent in Leviticus 9. Therefore, Lev 1,1 and Lev 9,1 should not be regarded as com-

creation ritual (cf. Exod 24,16⁶). Similarly, after the return of the glory of YHWH to the visionary temple of Ezekiel, the priests must purify the altar for seven days (Ezek 43,27):

And when they have completed these days, then from the eighth day onward the priests shall offer on the altar your burnt offerings and your peace offerings...

If one compares these findings to the seven-day creation in Gen 1,1-2,3, what would be expected in a priestly conception to happen on the eighth day after God created the world as a cosmic sanctuary? Should one not expect that in a cosmic temple a cosmic cult would start on the eighth day, while God's glory draws back (into the holy of holies) and allows these cosmic priests to do their everyday service before his face in the sacred space?⁷

This is indeed—thus the thesis of this paper—the function of Genesis 2 in relation to Genesis 1:⁸ God creates man (Gen 2,7) and plants a garden in the east of Eden (as in all sanctuaries in the Old Testament the holy antechamber and the courtyards are located in the east of the holy of holies) (Gen 2,8).⁹

petitive but as subsequent counterparts of Exod 40,34-35. If one eliminates Lev 9 from PG, as Frevel does (2000, 148–180), it remains puzzling how the “problem” of Exod 40,34-35 is resolved in a PG lacking Leviticus 9. Nihan: 2007, 111-124.231-237 has argued with good reasons both for the literary coherence of Leviticus 9 and for Leviticus 9 as an integral part of PG.

6. According to Jacob: 1905, 157-158, these seven days are related to the seven days of creation in Genesis 1: “Für einen Zeitraum von sechs Tagen mit einem darauffolgenden ausgezeichneten siebenten Tage gibt es keine andere Analogie als die sechs Werkstage mit dem Sabbat. Die sechs Tage sind die Zeit, innerhalb deren Gott, im dunklen Gewölke verborgen, das Urbild des Heiligtums schafft, um am siebenten Mose hineinzurufen und ihm das vollendete Werk zu zeigen und zu erklären.”

7. Römer: 2014, 133, comes quite close to these considerations, when he writes on Leviticus 8-9: “Die achttägige Feier zur Einsetzung des Opfergottesdienstes und der Priesterschaft sowie die Erscheinung der Herrlichkeit Gottes am achten Tag verweisen auf den Schöpfungsbericht in Gen 1,1-2,3 zurück: Der Opferkult gehört somit in den Beginn der Zeit nach der Schöpfung (wie im priesterlichen System der achte Tag auch den Zeitpunkt der Beschneidung oder der wiedererlangten Reinheit einer Frau nach ihrer Menstruation markiert).” However, it is unclear where he sees the eighth day in Gen 1,1-2,3.

8. On Gen 2,4b („in the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven“) see Kline: 2006, 9: “The use of this same idiom in Leviticus 6:20[13] is illuminating. There the Lord directs that ‘in the day’ that Aaron is anointed he shall present a certain offering, which in fact was offered not during the seven-day period of the anointing-consecration but subsequently and indeed as a perpetual offering thereafter.”

9. Some of the ancient translations translate מִקְדָּשׁ as “in ancient times” (e.g. Vulgate: *paradisum voluptatis a principio*; this translation is also favoured by Stordalen: 2000, 261-270; 2008, 41-43). This meaning of מִקְדָּשׁ is attested in Isa 45,21; 46,10; Ps 77,6.12. On the other hand, the meaning “in the east” is attested several times in the Old Testament. While Stordalen mainly argues against an interpretation that locates Eden somewhere in Mesopotamia, מִקְדָּשׁ in the meaning of “in the east” can also be used for a relative localisation like for example the eastern localisation of the Mount

This garden reflects, as will be argued below, the sacred space (the holy chamber) of the tabernacle (Gen 2,9-14). As Moses and Aaron could only enter the tent of meeting after the seven days of its consecration, Adam may enter the Garden of Eden only after the seven-day-creation of Genesis 1 (Gen 2,15):

The Lord God took (לקח) the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to work (עבד) it and keep (שמר) it.

The office of the man is described by the word pair עבד (“work,” “serve”) and שמר (“guard,” “keep”), a word pair otherwise used in the technical language of P (and traditions close to P) to summarize the duties of the cultic personnel in the sanctuary (Num 3,7; 8,26; 18,7; Ezek 44,14; Mal 3,14).¹⁰ The closest parallel is Num 18,6-7, which includes also the formulation that God as subject “took” (לקח) the priests:¹¹

And behold, I [God] have taken (לקח) your [Aaron] brothers the Levites from among the people of Israel. They are a gift to you, given to the Lord, to do the service (עבודה) of the tent of meeting.

And you [Aaron] and your sons with you shall guard (שמר) your priesthood for all that concerns the altar and that is within the veil; and you shall serve (עבד).

The place where Adam is meant to work and to guard is the garden. The difference between gardening and cultic service becomes smaller if one takes into account the fact that the sacred space in which the priests perform their cultic service is richly decorated with garden symbols. Neither Adam’s service in the garden nor the priests service in the tabernacle is to bring sacrifices. Rather, in the words of Gen 1,28, Adam together with Eve shall be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over every living creature in it. In her dissertation on the image of God in the garden of Eden, McDowell (2015, 207) concluded on basis of a comparison with what we know about the washing of the mouth and opening of the mouth

of Olives in relation to Jerusalem (e.g. Ezek 11,23; Zech 14,4). Reading it this way, “in the east” does not locate Eden somewhere in Mesopotamia or the “Far East”; rather, the garden as the dwelling place of men is distinguished from Eden as the dwelling place of God (cf. Gen 3,8) and located in the east of God’s dwelling place, as the holy place in the tabernacle is located in the east of the most holy place. The Septuagint explicitly translates מִקְדָּם in Gen 3,8 as “in the east” (κατα ανατολας). Since the increasing distance between God and humans towards the east plays a role throughout the primeval history (Gen 2,14; 3,8,24; 4,16; 11,2; cf. Morales: 2015, 56-57), the translation “in the east” should be preferred.

10. Cf. Wenham: 1986, 21; Wenham: 1987, 67; Morales: 2012, 89; Fischer: 2018, 203. Beside Gen 2,15, the combination of עבד and שמר appears in the Pentateuch exclusively in cultic contexts, either with regard to the cultic service of priests and Levites (Num 3,7-8; 8,26; 18,7) or the service of the Israelites (Deut 11,16; 12,30; 13,5).

11. Although לקח, שמר and עבד are very common words, they appear in this combination in the Old Testament only in Gen 2:15 and Num 18,6-7.

rituals in Mesopotamia and Ancient Egypt that the author of Gen 2,5-3,24 “incorporated selected features of divine statue animation rituals in order to redefine *šelem*,” or, more to the point, to make clear that “genuine *šalāmîm* are human beings, not statues.” This connects the anthropology of Genesis 2–3 with Genesis 1,¹² since “both presented humankind as a *šelem*,”¹³ and, of course, a *šelem* is usually erected in a temple, whereby in several ancient near eastern texts the temple garden plays an important role in the ritual (McDowell: 2015, 142–152). McDowell (2015, 188–189) also points to “Mesopotamian royal ideology [...], specifically the idea of the king as gardener and chief priest.”

What characterizes the garden in Genesis 2 is that it is planted to the east of Eden (Gen 2,8); it is full of trees—one or two¹⁴ of which are particularly mentioned—(Gen 2,9); it is irrigated by a stream whose source springs from Eden (Gen 2,10-14); and one finds gold and gems in its soil (Gen 2,10-11). It is well known that garden symbolism permeated ancient near eastern temples and palaces. A fresco from the palace of Zimri Lim in Mari (circa 18th century BC), known as the investiture of Zimri-Lim (today stored in the Louvre under the number AO 19826) is characteristic of Ancient Near Eastern garden imagery (Keel: 1996, 125, illustration 191).

12. This is only one of several connections between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2-3, cf. Heckl: 2012, 11: “Die beiden Schöpfungserzählungen haben offenbar mehr miteinander zu tun, als man weit über 100 Jahre annahm.” This led several scholars to abandon a source theory with two originally independent sources, and to see either Gen 1 as an editorial complementary layer of Genesis 2-3, or *vice versa*.

13. McDowell: 2015, 208. Cf. Schüle: 2005, who regards Gen 2,4-3,24 as a commentary on Gen. 1,1-2,3.

14. Possibly, the ך by which Gen 2,9bβ is opened should be understood as an explicative *waw* (cf. Lettinga and von Siebenthal: 2016, 188). Gen 2,9b should then be translated: “The tree of life in the middle of the garden, <namely> the tree of the knowledge of good and evil” (cf. the similar construction in Zech 9,9 “on a donkey, <namely> a colt”). This suggestion is supported by Gen 3,3, where the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is described by the same formulation (בתוך הגן) as the tree of life in Gen 2,9. In this interpretation, the forbidden fruit would be the fruit from the tree of life. Then, this dietary law could be related to the prohibition of blood consumption: as it is forbidden to eat the fruit of life it is also forbidden to eat the lifeblood (cf. Gen 9,4; Lev 17,11). The prohibition לא תאכל („you shall not eat“) is attested in the Pentateuch only in cultic contexts: Gen 2,17; 3,17 (fruit of the forbidden tree), Lev 6,16.23 (specific parts of the sacrifices), Lev 11,47; Deut 14,3 (unclean animals), Lev 17,12; Deut 15,23 (blood consumption), Lev 22,12-13 (priestly laws), Deut 16,3 (Passover legislation).



Figure 1. Fresco from the palace of Zimri Lim in Mari (c. 18th century BC). Keel: 1996, 125, illustration 191 (copy permitted by Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht)

The fresco shows a two-roomed temple or palace. While in the inner room Zimri-Lim seems to receive regalia from Ishtar, in the outer room stand two goddesses, each with a jug of water in their hands. From each jug flows water, divided into four streams. To the right and the left side, the temple is guarded by winged beings. In addition, trees—two of them identifiable as date palms—in rows on both sides of the building.

This basic concept in which water flows from the sanctuary, trees grow to the right and left of this temple stream, and the temple stream finally flows out of the temple into the sea, can be found in the Old Testament in Solomon's Temple, the tabernacle, and the visionary temple of Ezekiel.¹⁵

In the temple of Solomon, the temple stream is indicated by the two rows of five lampstands, which, decorated with flowers, represent the trees growing on either side of the stream (1 Kgs 7,49). Outside the temple stand the two freestanding pillars Jachin and Boaz, which are decorated as trees (1 Kgs 7,15-22). The symbolically indicated stream flows into the pool, which is called the sea (1 Kgs 7,23-26). The temple walls are also decorated with cherubim, palm trees, and flower work (1 Kgs 6,29-35), and the floor of the temple house is overlaid with gold.

All these items are also found in the tabernacle. However, while the rows of lampstands in the temple of Solomon represent the rows of trees along the river, a single tree is highlighted in the tabernacle by the menorah. It has been suggested by several exegetes that the menorah symbolizes the tree of life (e.g. Beale: 2004, 71; Meyers: 1976, 174-181; Morales: 2012, 89; Sarna: 1991, 165; Wenham: 1987, 62). This interpretation is indicated in early Judaism (cf. Beale, 2004: 79) and also reflected in Rev 2,1-7, where the epistle to

15. Cf. Stordalen: 2008, 34.

Ephesus is framed by allusions to both the menorah and the tree of life.

Read together, Gen 2,8-15 therefore describes the appointment of Adam as priest in the garden sanctuary of Eden.¹⁶ Gen 2,10-14.15 is, however, sometimes regarded as a later addition to the non-P-creation account (cf. Bühner: 2014, 214-220). Yet it should be noted that the relationship between the sanctuary and the garden of Eden is not limited to these verses, but includes at least Gen 2,8-9; 3,7-8. 21-24.¹⁷ Furthermore, Carr (1993, 578-579) argued that while Gen 2,10-14 are indeed a later insertion with Gen 2,15abα as redactional *Wiederaufnahme*, Gen 2,15bβ (לעבדה ולשמרה) belongs to the original account and was originally linked with Gen 2,8. Yet the problem with this suggestion is that while in Gen 2,8.15bβ Adam is anointed as priest in the Garden of Eden, Gen 2,10-14 describes the garden as a sanctuary. If Carr is correct with his suggestion that Gen 2,15bβ belongs to the same layer as Gen 2,8, it is difficult to exclude Gen 2,10-15abα without losing this cultic connection.¹⁸

The work of the priest-man in the Garden of Eden does, of course, not include sacrificing. Rather, it is kind of a duty of a gardener or farmer, with the goal to nourish humanity and multiply life. This resembles the duty of Aaron and his sons in the tabernacle, who are responsible to pour drink offerings (Exod 25,29), to set the bread of the presence on the table before YHWH regularly (Exod 25,30), and to provide the treelike menorah with oil permanently (Exod 27,20-21).

This shows that sacrificing is not the essence of the priestly duty. Since the altar is not inside but in front of the entrance to the tent of meeting, the sacrifice merely has the function to enable the priests to enter the tabernacle in order to concentrate on what is the true priestly duty, namely, to serve there before the face of YHWH. This is exactly what is stated in Leviticus 9, where Moses and Aaron can enter the tent of meeting only after the first sacrifice is offered. Similarly, only after Adam and Eve are banished from the Garden of Eden do Cain and Abel start offering sacrifices east of—that is, outside of—Eden (Gen 3,24; 4,3), possibly at the entrance to Eden from where Cain later on moves further east (Gen 4,16).

3. *The Fall: Genesis 3 and Leviticus 10*

If, as suggested, Genesis 2 has a parallel in Leviticus 9 as the appointment of the priests on the eighth day, a parallel can also be drawn between the

16. The identification of Adam as a priest is already attested in the book of Jubilees (3.27).

17. Cf. Wenham: 1987, 64: “the symbolism of these verses coheres well with the rest of the chapter.”

18. See also Ganzel and Holtz: 2014, who argue on basis of Mesopotamian material that temple architecture and access authorization are closely related concepts.

priestly “fall” in Genesis 3 and Leviticus 10.¹⁹ Lev 10,5 emphasizes that Nadab and Abihu, after they died before the face of YHWH (Lev 10,2), are carried out of the camp “in their coats” (בכִּתְּוֵתָם). This is the same word used in Gen 3,21 for the coverings God makes for Adam and Eve before he sends them out from the garden of Eden.²⁰ In Genesis 3, the necessity of coverings is obviously the result of men’s sin against God, presumably because they lose their bodily glory under the sign of death. Therefore, after eating the fruit from the forbidden tree, the eyes of Adam and Eve were opened and they knew that they were naked (Gen 3,7a). They first cover their own nakedness by sewing together fig leaves (Gen 3,7b). Later on, God makes for them garments of skin (Gen 3,21). According to *Numbers Rabbah* 4.8, the animal skins were considered priestly “robes of honor.” Obviously, Adam and Eve could not be naked anymore in the presence of God and therefore were in need of clothes to cover their imperfection by robes before YHWH. This is reflected in the prohibition of going up by steps to the altar, to make sure “that your nakedness be not exposed on it” in Exod 20,26, regarded as a post-P addition to the altar law of Exod 20,24 by some scholars (e.g. Berner: 2019). Furthermore, the linen garments of the priests in Exod 28,42 have the function “to cover their nakedness.” As mentioned, the priestly garments are also emphasized in Lev 10,5, and, later on, also in Lev 16,4.32.²¹

After the dead of Nadab and Abihu, Moses reminds Aaron, Eleazar, and Ithamar, not to go outside the entrance of the tent of meeting, “lest you die” (פֶּן תָּמוּתוּ), for the anointing oil of YHWH is upon them (Lev 10,6). This is reminiscent of Gen 3,3, where Eve quotes God: “You shall not eat of the fruit of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, neither shall you touch it, lest you die (פֶּן תָּמוּתוּ),” referring back to Gen 2,17.²²

These connections between Genesis 3 and Leviticus 10 demonstrate that we cannot simply exclude Gen 2,10-14.15 as post-priestly insertions from an otherwise non-priestly account, because the relationship between the garden of Eden and the tabernacle concerns also other parts of Genesis 2-3.

There are still some other connections between Genesis 3 and the sanctuary. First, as has often been observed, the formulation in Gen 3,8 of God walking (הֵלֵךְ) in the garden “is used to describe the divine presence in the later tent sanctuaries in Lev 26,12; Deut 23,15; 2 Sam 7,6-7. The LORD walked in Eden as he subsequently walked in the tabernacle” (Wenham:

19. Cf. Morales: 2015, 171: “[T]he drama of the tabernacle’s defilement by the sin and corpse pollution of Aaron’s sons mirrors the drama of Adam’s own transgression and defilement of the cosmos” [italics by Morales].

20. Apart from Joseph’s coat in Genesis 37, כִּתְּוֵת is used in the Pentateuch exclusively for the priestly garments in P-texts (Exod 28,4.39.40; 29,5.8; 39,27; 40,14; Lev 8,7.13; 10,5; 16,4).

21. As Morales: 2015, 170, rightly observes, „both the Nadab and Abihu tragedy and the Day of Atonement legislation occur on the same day, the latter given as a response to the former”.

22. In the rest of the Old Testament, this formulation only occurs in Gen 26,9; 38,11; Exod 20,19; Deut 20,5-7 (cf. Fischer: 2018, 233).

1986, 20). Secondly, Adam and Eve are banished from the garden, which is guarded by the cherubim and the flame of the whirling sword²³ (Gen 3,24). These cherubim are worked into the curtains that build the wall of the tabernacle according to Exod 26,1.31 (cf. Wenham: 1986, 21). Finally, if we take into account that out of Eden (i.e., out of the “priestly”, holy space) the sons of Adam and Eve offer sacrifices for the first time (Genesis 4), it becomes clear that as in Leviticus 1-9, sacrifices are closely connected to the priests prohibition to enter the holy space.

It would be possible to draw the parallels even further and include the allusions not only to Genesis 1 but also to Genesis 2-3 in the dietary laws in Leviticus 11. Harper (2013 and 2018: 111-148) has done so and concluded that there are indeed distinctive allusions to Genesis 2-3 in Leviticus 11, which reinforces the argument presented here.²⁴

4. Conclusion: Genesis 1-4 as an introduction to the cosmic symbolism of the tabernacle

In sum, the parallels between the tabernacle account and the creation account are not limited to Genesis 1 and Exodus 25–40, but they include also Genesis 2–4 and Leviticus 1–10(11). In other words: not only is the erection of the tabernacle anticipated in Genesis 1 but also the installation of cultic service in Genesis 2-3. Although several scholars have noticed the parallels between Eden and the tabernacle (e.g. Wenham: 1986; Beale: 2004, 79-80; Morales: 2013, 88-90), they did not relate this observation to questions of Pentateuchal composition. Without going into the details of Genesis 1 and 4, I would suggest to read Genesis 1-4 as an introduction to the cosmic symbolism of the tabernacle, whereby Genesis 1-3 introduces the three levels of holiness (holy of holies, holy antechamber, court yard) and Genesis 4 the place of sacrifice at the entrance of the tent:

Genesis 1: The glory of YHWH fills the cosmic sanctuary of creation for seven days (holy of holies, where the glory of YHWH dwells).

Genesis 2: God plants a garden east of Eden and appoints Adam and Eve to serve as priests from the eighth day on (holy space: the holy antechamber in the tent with the menorah as tree of life).

Genesis 3: Due to their disobedience against a dietary commandment, Adam and Eve are banished from the holy space, which is guarded by cherubim

23. For the flame of the whirling sword as a heavenly being on its own see Hendel: 1985.

24. The lexical parallels between Genesis 2-3 and Leviticus 11 include על + גחון + הלח (in this syntactical arrangement only attested in Gen 3,14 and Lev 11,42), אכל + גנע (in second person forms only attested in Gen 3,3; Lev 11,8; Deut 14,8), כל + מן + בהמה (attested in Gen 3,14; 7,2; 8,20; Lev 11,2; Num 31,30). After having discussed also conceptual parallels, Harper: 2018, 134, concludes: “The implications of this are spelled out via a shared motif of eating forbidden food that connects Israel’s story to Adam’s, a connection perhaps further indicated by the (possible) structuring of Lev 11-15 on Gen 3:14-19.”

from now on; they cannot be naked anymore in the presence of YHWH (profane space: the court yard east of the tent of meeting).

Genesis 4: In the profane space, which is under the sign of death (with the altar and the symbolic sea), sacrifices are offered to restore the relationship between God and humans.

This cultic sequence has been overlooked in large parts of modern research because Gen 1,1-2,3 and 2,5-3,24 were hardly ever read together as a result of source criticism with its distinction between P and non-P. However, if the argument against the thesis of Pola (1995) is valid that Exodus 40 cannot be the original end of the *Priestergrundschrift*, because a sanctuary remains incomplete without a cult, this certainly also applies to the cosmic sanctuary erected in Genesis 1: without the establishment of the cult in Genesis 2, the cosmic sanctuary would remain incomplete. Moreover, without Genesis 3-4, impurity, death, and sin would not be taken into account both in cult and creation. Therefore, I doubt that the so-called two creation accounts²⁵ have ever been written to be read separated from each other.²⁶

5. *Postscriptum: The flood account as further evidence*

The thesis of the cultic unity of Genesis 1-4 also receives support by the evidence of the flood story, where the same pattern can be observed (cf. Morales: 2012, 121-192). The reversal of Genesis 1 in the flood, followed by recreation along the seven days of creation,²⁷ including the blessing to be fruitful and fill the earth (Gen 1,28; 9,1), is followed by Noah as a gardener (אִישׁ הַאֲדָמָה, Gen 9,20) and a “fall,” where Noah’s nakedness, that must be covered, plays a crucial role (Gen 9,21-23). Also, as in Gen 2,16-17 and Leviticus 11, dietary laws are included (Gen 9,3-4).

25. I concur with Fischer: 2018, 180, when he hesitates to designate Genesis 2 as a second creation account: “Häufig wird Gen 2 als ‘zweite Schöpfungserzählung’ oder Ähnliches bezeichnet. Das ist nur bedingt korrekt, weil der Akzent kaum auf der Schöpfung, vielmehr auf dem Park, Gottes Anweisungen und der Gemeinsamkeit des ersten Menschenpaares liegt.”

26. This corresponds to Schüle’s appraisal (2009, 61) that Genesis 2-3 wants to be read in the light of Genesis 1 and that, in turn, Genesis 1 is intended to be elaborated in content by Genesis 2-3.

27. See Berman: 2017,255-260. He shows that the parallel between Genesis 1 and Genesis 8-9 is only complete when P and non-P is combined in Genesis 8. In his words (2017, 260): “This complete set of parallels between creation in Genesis 1 and re-creation in Genesis 8 presents a major challenge to the classical source-critical approach to the flood narrative. [...] Genesis 8, in its received form, follows Genesis 1 in schematic fashion. Neither the hypothesized P version nor the hypothesized non-P version reflects this scheme independently.”

Bibliography

- Beale, G.K. 2004. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press).
- Berman, J. 2017. *Inconsistency in the Torah: Ancient Literary Convention and the Limits of Source Criticism* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Berner, C. 2019. "Mind the Step!" (Exod. 20:26), or, even better: 'Wear Breeches!' (Exod. 28:42-43): The Issue of (Un-)Covering One's 'shame' in Cultic Legislation," in C. Berner et al. (eds.), *Clothing and Nudity in the Hebrew Bible* (London: T&T Clark) 417-434.
- Blenkinsopp, J. 1976. "The Structure of P," *CBQ* 38, 275-292.
- Bühner, W. 2014. *Am Anfang...: Untersuchungen zur Textgenese und zur relativ-chronologischen Einordnung von Gen 1-3* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Carr, D. 1993. "The Politics of Textual Subversion: A Diachronic Perspective on the Garden of Eden Story," *JBL* 112, 578-579.
- Fischer, G. 2018. *Genesis 1–11* (Freiburg: Herder).
- Frevel, C. 2000. *Mit Blick auf das Land die Schöpfung erinnern: Zum Ende der Priestergrundschrift* (Freiburg: Herder).
- Ganzel, T. and Holtz, S.E. 2014. "Ezekiel's Temple in Babylonian Contexts," *VT* 64, 211-226.
- Harper, G.G. 2013. "Time for a New Diet? Allusions to Genesis 1-3 as Rhetorical Device in Leviticus 11," *STR* 4, 179-195.
- Harper, G.G. 2018. „I Will Walk Among You“: *The Rhetorical Function of Allusion to Genesis 1-3 in the Book of Leviticus* (University Park: Eisenbrauns).
- Heckl, R. 2012. "Die Exposition des Pentateuchs. Überlegungen zum literarischen und theologischen Konzept von Gen 1-3," in A. Berlejung and R. Heckl (eds.), *Ex Oriente Lux: Studien zur Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Leipzig: Verlagsanstalt) 3-32.
- Hendel, R. 1985. "'The Flame of the Whirling Sword': A Note on Genesis 3:24," *JBL* 104, 671-674.
- Jacob, B. 1905. *Der Pentateuch: Exegetisch-kritische Forschungen* (Leipzig: Veit & Comp.).
- Janowski, B. 2004. "Tempel und Schöpfung. Schöpfungstheologische Aspekte der priesterschriftlichen Heiligtumskonzeption," in B. Janowski (ed.), *Gottes Gegenwart in Israel: Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments* (2nd ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener) 214-246.
- Kearney, P.J. 1977. "Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25–40," *ZAW* 89, 375-386.
- Keel, O. 1996. *Die Welt der altorientalischen Bildsymbolik: Am Beispiel der Psalmen* (5th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Kline, M.G. 2006. *Kingdom Prologue: Genesis Foundations for a Covenantal Worldview* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock).

- Lettinga, J.P. and von Sieenthal, H. 2016. *Grammatik des biblischen Hebräisch* (2nd ed. Giessen and Basel: Brunnen and Immanuel).
- McDowell, C.L. 2015. *The Image of God in the Garden of Eden: The Creation of Humankind in Genesis 2:5-3:24 in Light of mīs pī pīt pī and wpt-r Rituals of Mesopotamia and Ancient Egypt* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns).
- Meyers, C.L. 1976. *The Tabernacle Menorah: A Synthetic Study of a Symbol from the Biblical Cult* (Missoula: Scholar Press).
- Morales, L.M. 2012. *The Tabernacle Pre-Figured: Cosmic Mountain Ideology in Genesis and Exodus* (Leuven: Peeters).
- Morales, L.M. 2015. *Who Shall Ascend the Mountain of the Lord? A Biblical Theology of the Book of Leviticus* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press).
- Nihan, C. 2007. *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- Pola, T. 1995. *Die ursprüngliche Priesterschrift: Beobachtungen zur Literarkritik und Traditionsgeschichte von P^s* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener).
- Römer, T. 2014. "Der Pentateuch," in W. Dietrich et al. (eds.), *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer) 53-166.
- Sarna, N.M. 1991. *Exodus* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society).
- Schüle, A. 2005. "Made in the 'Image of God': The Concepts of Divine Images in Gen 1-3," *ZAW* 117, 1-20.
- Schüle, A. 2009. *Die Urgeschichte (Genesis 1–11)* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich).
- Sonnet, J.P. 2016. "The Dynamic of Closure in the Pentateuch," in J.C. Gertz et al. (eds.), *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck) 1121-1134.
- Stordalen, T. 2000. *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2-3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature* (Leuven: Peeters).
- Stordalen, T. 2008. "Heaven on Earth—Or Not? Jerusalem as Eden in Biblical Literature," in K. Schmid and C. Riedweg, *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2-3) and Its Reception History* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck) 28-57.
- Wenham, G.J. 1986. "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story," in World Union of Jewish Studies (ed.), *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A: The Period of the Bible* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies) 19-25.
- Wenham, G.J. 1987. *Genesis 1–15* (Dallas: Word Books).
- Zenger, E. and Frevel, C. 2014. "Das Priester(schrift)liche Werk," in E. Zenger and C. Frevel (eds.), *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (8th ed. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer) 189-214.
- Ziemer, B. 2012. "Schöpfung, Heiligtum und Sabbat in der priesterlichen Bundeskonzeption," in A. Berlejung and R. Heckl (eds.), *Ex Oriente Lux: Studien zur Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt) 39-58.