

Dr. Jeffrey Niehaus, Biblical Theology, Session 2, The Adamic Covenant, Part 2

© 2024 Jeffrey Niehaus and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Jeffrey Niehaus in his teaching on Biblical Theology. This is session 2, The Adamic Covenant, Part 2.

As we had said, we are going to continue with the Adamic Covenant considerations.

As we said, we will be talking about the relationship between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2. You may read that you often hear that there are two creation accounts. And that's not a bad expression as long as one understands it in a way that's true to the material. If by two creation accounts we mean two different accounts by two different writers with two different theologies and points of view, that's, I think, not a good way to look at it.

A better way to look at it is to look at it as an ancient Near Eastern flow of material and narrative, in which you get a general account and then zooming in on some particulars about that account. Of course, when higher criticism evolved, ancient Near Eastern writing was virtually unknown. And since there were no external controls, nobody had anything outside the Bible to compare it with in terms of how people composed things.

People could imagine whatever they wanted about who wrote what. And so we have this JEDP business, which is completely untrue to the way the ancients wrote. Having said that, there is this view, this has been this view, and it's still around, that you have two contradictory accounts.

S.R. Driver, the English scholar at Oxford, who is the English Old Testament scholar at Oxford, was probably the major proponent of this in the English-speaking world. Ironically, he was hired by Oxford because they wanted to be sure they got someone who did not buy into the higher criticism that prevailed on the continent. And when they hired Driver, he had an orthodox view of the Bible.

But he eventually became a convert to the higher critical view and became a major exponent of it. And you can read Driver and learn a lot, but you've got to understand that the presuppositions are wrong. So, the way he sees some of the things in Genesis and the Old Testament is deeply flawed.

But anyway, he thought that there were these two different documents due to different sources. The classic reason for this is that, well, Genesis 1 is written by a Priestly writer. In Genesis 2, you have documents J and E combined.

The Priestly writer likes to be repetitive and formulaic, whereas, in Genesis 2, you have a different, just flowing narrative. We now know, and I haven't talked about this, but it's in the first volume, and it's in an article, too, that I wrote on the covenant and narrative for the Journal of Evangelical Theological Society. Another way to understand Genesis 1:1 through 2:3 is as an ancient Near Eastern list.

And like the Sumerian king list, it has a narrative, a formulaic introduction, a conclusion to each component, and narrative content. And so it's a list. The higher critics didn't understand that, but they could sense that it was repetitive and list-like, so they attributed it to P, who liked to write that way, according to them.

We now know that's kind of silly. I mean, you or I could write a narrative account of something in an email or a letter to a friend and include in it a list of places we'd visited or something like that. You don't need to call in a different author to produce the list because there's only one author who likes to write lists.

So, it's kind of silly, but that's the way they thought. But anyway, there's that, and there's also the different order of creation, supposedly. In Genesis 1, God creates the animals first, then the man.

In Genesis 2, apparently, God creates man first, and then the animals. But that is only apparently, and it depends very much on how one translates the verb. King James says, Out of the ground, the Lord God formed every beast of the field and fowl of the air, and he brought them to Adam to see what he'd call them.

Well, he formed them. So, if you read that, you get the impression, okay, here was Adam, and then God formed the animals and brought them to have them named. If we drop down to the different order of creation here, it depends on the translation.

The verb can be translated the way that King James does, but it can also be translated as a pluperfect or a past perfect, as the NIV does. Now, the Lord God had formed out of the ground all the beasts of the field and so on. If it's translated that way, the contradiction disappears because the picture then is, okay, here's Adam in Genesis 2. And by the way, God had formed the animals.

He created them sometime before, but now he brings them to Adam to have them named. If you translate it that way, the contradiction disappears. And it has to be said, Driver knew this.

He was a Regius professor of Hebrew at Oxford. But you just don't mention it, and so you apparently have an argument. Ken Kitchen, in his book, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament*, well-named because he's looking at the Old Testament with respect to the ancient Near East and how they wrote, says that, no, we don't have contradictory accounts here.

We have complementary accounts. As I've said, in ancient Near Eastern documents, we find the same thing: a general account. Followed by a detailed account.

Kitchen says it is often claimed that Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 contain two different creation narratives. In point of fact, however, the strictly complementary nature of the two accounts is plain enough. Genesis 1 mentions the creation of man as the last of a series and without any details.

Whereas in Genesis 2, man is the center of interest, a British scholar, hence the spelling. More specific details are given about him and his setting. There's no incompatible duplication here at all.

Failure to recognize the complementary nature of the subject distinction between a skeleton outline of creation on the one hand and the concentration in detail on man and his immediate environment on the other borders on obscurantism. And that's a word that maybe we don't use all that often. Something that should never happen.

But obscurantism is where you know some things, which, if you shared with those who are reading your arguments, would undercut your argument. But since they would undercut your argument and make it seem less sure than you would like it to seem, you just suppress that information. Now, we expect this from politicians, but we would like to see it better with scholars.

But it is what it is. And it happens. We live in a fallen world.

Well, then, what about the second creation account? It has what one could call narrative naturalism. Natural processes are involved. Klein pointed this out a long time ago in his little article *Because It Had Not Rained*.

No shrub of the field had yet appeared on the earth. No plant of the field had yet sprung up. For the Lord God had not sent rain on the earth.

Again, just as Kitchen said, you're looking into details of things and getting more detailed accounts of what's going on. As I've said before, Genesis 1-2 could also be suggestive of a process. But it's only suggestive at the beginning.

And in Genesis 2, you get a lot more narrative detail. We've talked about the idea of a garden being a temple. And, of course, that's where Genesis 2 also comes in.

But that idea is reinforced because remember that the Lord God put man into the garden to work it and to keep it, which were priestly roles. We get these parallels to Genesis 2:9, and 10 with the river and the tree of life in the garden later when we have eschatological visions given to Ezekiel and John of how things are going to be

when the Lord has come and settled everyone's hash and we have a new order of things. And so, you have the water flowing, the river, if you will, flowing from the temple presence of God, the fruit trees and the tree of life growing along the river, and so on.

Those two elements are the key things. I think Ezekiel and John see the same revelation, although again, in John, you get more details. This is true as the Bible progresses; you get more detail in certain visions or doctrines as you get subsequent revelations.

What you find ultimately here, and I think this is and will remain a bit mysterious until we're with the Lord, the culmination of all this is that there's no temple in the city. We may remember that in Revelation 4, the Lord is thundering from his throne. There seems to be a temple presence there. There is a heavenly tabernacle after which the earthly is patterned; even Hebrews talk about this.

But ultimately, there's no temple because the Lord God and the Lamb are its temple. And if we understand, again, a temple as a place where the God resides, I think this points to the fundamental nature of the Imago Dei, and we'll talk about this later as well, that God has a form, and that form, if you will, contains his spirit. And we are made in his form, in his image and likeness, and we are made to contain his spirit too, which eventually, through the new covenant, happens.

And so, God is, in that sense, a temple of himself, and he seems to be the temple when all things are resolved. But before that, you have God's temple in heaven, and the Ark of the Covenant, and all the rest of it there. And so those things seem to be sequential, which incidentally suggests, you know, if you have in Revelation 11 God's temple, and then if you have at the end of the book in 10 chapters later that there's no temple because God is the temple, well, that's a sequence of events.

And, of course, Revelation is full of a sequence of events, which I'll just mention now briefly, but it does suggest, yes, there is such a thing as time in heaven. But it's not necessarily like ours; it's not our time, but it's time. If you have a sequence of events, you have time.

And so, God, in creating the universe, created it with time and sequence of events analogous to heaven. But that needs further exploration. But, okay, if we take this back to Genesis 2, we see the parallels that we've been talking about.

You have the tree of life in all three cases, and you have the river flowing from the place, God's throne in Ezekiel and Revelation, Eden in Genesis 2. And so, the idea here, I mean, is that the parallels are what they are. And so, what does that suggest? Well, it suggests that Eden was a temple, and it's consistent with what we know, that

Christ comes to make all things new. And so, it is an established biblical principle that end time parallels urzeit, which is German for end time parallels primordial time.

And as I said, you've got to throw some German and Latin in so people realize you're a scholar. So, there's some German. The Egyptians understood this.

They thought it was the primary task of every pharaoh to restore all things as at the beginning. And that's one of many remarkable parallels between Egyptian thinking and biblical thinking. Very unusual, the extensiveness of it, really.

But that's a matter for another day. Other evidence for the temple nature of Eden is that once the man and the woman have sinned, the Lord drives them out, and he places cherubim and a flaming sword to guard the way back to the Tree of Life. And so, this is the first appearance of cherubim in the Bible, the first mention of them.

We later learn that figures of cherubim are woven into the tabernacle curtains. They're carved into the inner and outer temple room walls of the Solomonic Temple. We know that we are temples of the Spirit, and Jesus says that our angels in heaven protect us, and they're ministering spirits, too.

Whether those are cherubim or not is not clear. But the point is that, and I should add, too, that in the ancient Near East, there were cherubim figures, like figures. They were called from an Assyrian root, karabu, which means to be mighty, apparently.

And they guarded temples and palaces. So, the idea seems to be there that cherubs and cherubim guard temples. Incidentally, that might affect your use of the word cherub.

If you look at the cherubim in Ezekiel 1, they're pretty devastating, tremendous figures with the four faces and all the rest of it. I happened to be preaching on that passage in a church once, and before the sermon, there was a dedication of some child being made by the youth pastor, and he referred to the child as a cherub. And so then I got to talk about what cherubs really look like.

So, you might want to use a different term when you're talking about babies. But anyway, they seem to be temple guardians. Well then, so Eden as a temple.

In this created order, that could raise the question quite naturally, well, was Adam created as a temple of the Holy Spirit? God formed him out of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living being. Well, the dust on the ground seems pretty clear. What about the breath of life? The Holy Spirit is associated with life.

Does that mean that God put his spirit into man so that Adam was, before the fall, a temple of the Spirit? I think the evidence points to a negative answer here. Adam was made alive by the Spirit, I think. He was kept alive by the Spirit, but he didn't have the Spirit dwelling in him.

And how do we get to that understanding? Because it seems quite ambiguous in Genesis 2. Well, there are several pieces of evidence. Genesis 6-3, before the flood, God says, my spirit will not contend with man forever, for he's mortal. His days will be 120 years.

The verb that's translated contend could be translated remain in or remain with. Arguably, this is what is in Hebrew called a phrasal verb, and the best translation is to remain with. We mentioned John Wenham's commentary on Genesis, and he takes that view, and I think he's quite right about it.

Gordon Wenham, excuse me, his commentary on Genesis, and I think he's right about that. Gordon Wenham, incidentally, once taught here. He was invited to teach here as a guest, and I think just one lecture.

But I remember meeting him at a conference, and we were talking about it, and he said, so here I am, Gordon Wenham, teaching at Gordon College in Wenham, Massachusetts. And he said it was a little surrealistic, but he's a good guy. But I think he takes this view, and I think he's right about that, that the Lord is saying in Genesis 6-3, my spirit will not remain with.

That would indicate that the spirit sustains life, not dwells in people. And that would be, I think, consistent with the bigger picture. The limit of human lifespan to 120 years, if that's the right understanding, would seem to be related to a work of the spirit.

Some people want to think that that means it's going to be 120 years more until the flood, but I don't think that's a natural reading of what it says. And so, the work might be one of sustaining human life and not indwelling. In Job, we read Elihu making this statement: the spirit of God has made me, and the breath of the Almighty gives me life.

While these parallel kola, that's a technical term for the Hebrew here, but these parallel lines, make it clear that the spirit, the ruach of God, has made him, and the breath, the nishamah, gives him life. The nishamah is the same word that we get in Genesis 2: the Lord breathes into him, the breath, and he breathes into him, and the life is related to the verb, rather the verb is related to the word, Chayim, life, that we get in Genesis 2. So, what are we talking about here? Elihu is in a fallen state long before Pentecost, and so humans after the fall, but before Pentecost, one would conclude, were not temples of the spirit. Because incidentally, that's another thing:

the word temple is never used by a human being until Jesus comes and says, destroy this temple, and in three days, I'll raise it up.

So, no one in the Old Testament is ever called a temple, Adam, or anyone else, and the word was certainly available. And you're never told in the Old Testament that the Holy Spirit dwelt in anyone, and the word was certainly available. It was easy to say if it was ever the case. And so we'll look more at that, but the indication here is Elihu is a good guy, but he's a fallen person, and he's before Pentecost, so there's no indication he has a spirit dwelling in him, but he does have the spirit making him and kind of sustaining him, the spirit and the breath you could take as parallel and meant to be indicating the same thing.

Well, you might say, well, okay, Elihu was a good guy. He's rather approved in the book of Job, but he may just be giving his own take on things, and he may not have it exactly right. I don't display this for you, but you can look at Isaiah 42:5 where you find the same terms, and we're told that the Ruach, God gives Ruach to everybody on the planet, and Neshama, breath. NIV translates Ruach as life there, but clearly, in Isaiah's day, the Lord, through this prophet is saying that he gives life, Ruach, spirit to everybody on the planet, and I think we've got to understand that doesn't mean everybody on the planet has the Holy Spirit dwelling in him or her, and they're not all temples of the spirit.

So, but these are the same, this would indicate then that certainly after the fall, nobody's a temple of the spirit, and yet they all have Ruach and Neshama somehow, and if Adam had the Neshama breathing into him, that could easily mean he had the spirit sustaining him, giving him life, and yet not dwelling in him, and I think that's the picture. So, we would affirm that the spirit was the breath of life by whom God gave Adam life, but that as Adam and Elihu are parallel in this, and everybody else on the planet according to Isaiah, they, you know, Adam was not a temple of the spirit. Okay, oh, and yes, you know what? I don't remember that I included this, but I do have it, so here you have it.

He gives breath to all its people and life to those who walk on it, and so that's exactly what we were talking about. Life is actually spirit here. Okay, so all people under common grace have this, but that doesn't mean they're temples of the spirit.

Another line of argument here regarding the spirit and people now more broadly in the Old Testament, the preposition upon or to is used almost all the time when the talk is of the spirit in relation to somebody, and we'll just look at some examples here, the point being again that you're not ever told that the Holy Spirit dwelt in anybody. So, what are we doing here? We're concluding that Adam, in all likelihood, on the evidence, the most reasonable conclusion is that he was not a temple of the spirit. He didn't have the Holy Spirit dwelling in him.

He was without sin. He could have avoided sin, but he didn't have the Holy Spirit dwelling in him. This is a classic understanding, too, and sometimes people think that, well, if he had successfully defeated Satan, then at some point, he would have had the spirit fill him or whatever, and that's reasonable.

It's speculative. We don't know. After the fall, certainly, nobody has the Spirit dwelling in him.

That terminology is never used, dwelling in. But there are other expressions that are used, and as we've said, mostly the preposition upon, sometimes the preposition to. If we look at these examples, Numbers 11, Moses says, I will take of the spirit that is on you.

So, even Moses, we're not told he had the spirit dwelling in him, but the spirit that is on you, and put the spirit on them. And these are the 70 who are going to help him carry the burden of the people. When Samuel anoints Saul to be king and tells him what's going to happen, it happens: the procession of prophets met Saul, and the spirit of God came upon him in power, and he joined in their prophesying, and so the people said, is Saul also among the prophets? And then he goes out and does kingdom work, but the spirit is upon him.

With David, you might think, well, if there were ever an Old Testament person after Moses who had the spirit in him, it would be David, but we're not told that. Samuel anoints him, and from that day on, we read the spirit of the Lord came down to, literally, David in power. So, the spirit is with him, coming down to him, and that's a good thing, but it's not the same as having the spirit in one.

There are a couple of cases that would indicate an apparently temporary or occasional filling for some function or task. You get some pagan ideas here. Pharaoh, for instance, can we find anyone like this man, Joseph, one in whom is the spirit of God or the gods? Well, the Lord's giving Joseph the wisdom he needs, and Pharaoh is able to tell that there's something divine about this.

There's a divine spirit at work in him, but that's all Pharaoh knows. You're not going to get an accurate theology of the Holy Spirit from Pharaoh, but that's his impression. In Exodus 28, we read, tell the skilled men whom I have given wisdom, and the Hebrew says, I've filled with the spirit of wisdom to make garments for Aaron, and so on.

So, the Lord has put his spirit in them for a task. We're not told that the spirit resided in them. Likewise, Bezalel, I filled him with the spirit of God, with all this skill and ability in order to do work that is necessary to prepare the tabernacle.

We're not told that the spirit dwelt in him. We're told that the spirit was, he was filled with the spirit for a certain task. Likewise, in Exodus 35:31 through 35:31, he's filled him with the spirit of God, 32, to make artistic designs, 33, to cut and set stones, and so on.

And likewise, in verse 35. So, if we add all this up, we have God giving his spirit to accomplish certain tasks. And so, this is an emerging picture that the spirit comes upon people for things.

The expression can sometimes be that God fills somebody with his spirit for a certain work, but there's no indication that the spirit dwells in that person all the time. Even Micah 3, I'm filled with power with the spirit of the Lord, justice, and might declare to Jacob his transgression. Filled with the spirit to declare his transgression to Jacob.

Reasonably, one would figure, okay, and once that prophetic work is done, he's no longer filled with the spirit. And here again, this is a matter of being really strict with ourselves about the data. We talk about Christians as being spirit-filled, and so you read Micah, we think, well, he must have been a spirit-filled man, just as a Christian can be.

That's not the point at all. That's not stated. And one just has to be strict if one's going to get at the truth in these matters and a lot of matters.

Okay, in Daniel, here you get another pagan opinion. There's a man in your kingdom who saw this at Belshazzar's feast when he saw the handwriting on the wall, and nobody could interpret it. The queen says, well, there is this guy who has the spirit of the holy gods in him, and so on.

Well, she knows some of what Daniel has done. Her conclusion is that he has the spirit of the holy gods in him. Well, again, she knows that some divine spirit is at work, but she's thinking polytheistically, so what does she really understand? There's no evidence there that the spirit dwelt in Daniel all the time.

As we've said, no Old Testament person has ever called a temple, and that would have been easy enough to do. Very significant in this regard is Ezekiel 36:27, where you have an open-ended promise to people who are under the Mosaic covenant now. They have the Torah.

They have a lot of God's revelation. But the promise of something that has not yet happened but will happen, I will put my spirit in you and move you to follow my decrees and be careful to keep my laws. That is a forecast of the great promise of the new covenant.

A similar thing, in terms of the events that surround the statement, which have to do with exile and restoration, is somewhat parallel structurally in Deuteronomy 30, where the Lord says, I will circumcise your hearts. That's another way of saying, I think, the same thing, which in Romans 2 we learn is done by the spirit. The circumcision of the heart is by the spirit.

In the Old Testament, God's people are told and exhorted to circumcise their own hearts, which, of course, they can't do. But we're never told that their hearts are circumcised. And it's only the Lord who does that.

And you get that in Romans 2. And the promise of it in Deuteronomy 30. But so here you have, I will put my spirit in you and move you to follow my decrees and keep my laws. And in John, we also read this statement that the spirit who we're talking about here, in people, that donation of the spirit to dwell in us, to be streaming and flowing within us, is yet to happen.

By this, he meant the Spirit whom those who believed in him were later to receive. Up to that time, the spirit had not yet been given since Jesus had not yet been glorified. And finally, on this topic, Jesus' statement in John 14, the spirit of truth, he lives with you and will be in you.

So, he's, the Greek is there for you. With you, he remains or is. And in you, he will be.

That's quite a difference. And I would say that perfectly captures the difference between life under the old covenant and life under or in the new. Having the spirit with you is pretty good.

David had the spirit coming to him every day. He was with him every day. The disciples had the spirit with them.

What does that mean? They went out, and they preached the gospel. They healed the sick. They cast out demons.

Having the spirit with you is very good. But it's much better to have the spirit in you, to move you to obey God and live more for him. And that's what we have under the new covenant.

And as we've said, although Adam was without sin, the indication would be that he didn't have the spirit dwelling in him. Okay, well, again, under the Adamic covenant material, the creation of the woman, we get more detail in Genesis 2, which, as we've said, is what you'd expect on a lot of issues. Of course, there's occasionally a lot of controversy and the whole male-female thing in the church regarding service in the church, marriage, and so on.

There are some key terms here. Again, I think we're going to find that the data tell us a lot. There's a lot that they don't tell us.

So, God makes the woman a helper. And the meaning of that? Well, it certainly often is used of the Lord as a deliverer. It's related to a Ugaritic word, and that word means strength, and so perhaps a power or a resource.

That the Lord is going to make the woman to be. Biblical uses of the term? Overwhelmingly, the term is used of God as a helper to Israel. But it's also used of men, and in Ezekiel 12, there's another case that may apply, but this is the clearest one.

Helpers of Israel's prince who goes into exile. I will scatter to the winds all around him, his staff, and literally his help, and all his troops. His staff.

That's the way it's translated. It may be military, and it may be not. But the point here is, in this case, in Ezekiel. Clearly, the helpers of the prince are subordinate to the prince.

And so, you come up with a completely ambiguous picture with regard to the use of the term helper when the Lord makes the woman a helper. It could mean that she's, well, probably doesn't mean that she's like God above him. It could mean that she's like the prince of Israel's helper, subordinate to him in some role sense.

It could mean she's his equal. Why not? You can't know. And I think, again, if we're going to be intellectually honest about this, that's where we have to leave that in terms of the meaning of the term.

Well, he doesn't only make her a woman, he doesn't only make her a helper, but he makes her a helper suitable. Keneg, though, in Hebrew, sort of corresponds to, before, in front of. And that certainly rests upon the idea that they're both made in God's image.

So they can correspond. The relationship is possible. But that's all that tells you, too.

And so, this harks back to the business about their being created in his image, which we argued from Genesis 1:27 has nothing to do with roles. It tells you nothing as to whether the husband in his role is somehow head of the wife or not, and so on. God builds the woman, is the Hebrew term, from the man.

She makes him from the man. And we, Peter, rather, Paul, use this idea of building. We have an eternal house.

That is a body, a glorified body, that is not built by human hands. God's going to make it. That's what we're going to be.

So, as we will see later, Paul makes something of the order in which the two were created. The woman is made out of the man, built from the man. But again, if we're going to be strict with ourselves, if we look at the material in Genesis 1 and 2, and even then in 3, it's very ambiguous, all of it.

And so, you don't want to use that kind of evidence to argue one position or the other. Because if you do, somebody who understands these things someday is going to come along and point out what you're doing and why you can't really say those things. Or if God is gracious to you, someone will come along and do that, because we need people to point out our mistakes.

Okay, what about naming? It's often said, well, he names her, so that means he has authority over her. The significance of naming. The idiom used when God names things is the verb to call and the preposition to.

So, it's literally to call to something. He names it. When Adam names the animals, the same idiom is used.

But then in Genesis 2:23, she shall be called woman, for she was taken out of man. That's the same idiom in the passive. So, in all of those cases, you have the same idiom.

Adam gives the generic name, shall we say, woman, to the woman. And that's the same idiom used when God names the created things and when Adam names the animal. Okay, well, that is what it is.

I don't think you can conclude from that that Adam is to his wife as God is to the created order, but the same idiom is used. The question here is going to be, what are these name idioms ultimately come down to? When, after the fall, he names her Eve, there's a different idiom used. Incidentally, I like to refer to her before the fall as the woman because she doesn't receive the name Eve until after the fall.

So, after the fall, Adam gives her her proper name. Before the fall, he gives her her generic name, woman. After the fall, he gives her her proper name.

That is her individual name. And it's from the root to be or to live, and so because she'll be the mother of all living. So, the idiom used there is different.

It's a combination of that same verb to call. But then you get the word name in a genitive construction with the words. So, he called the name of his wife, or woman, literally.

So, the question here is, is the difference in these idioms significant? That is, is the difference between the idiom here to call to, and the idiom here to call the name of, is that a significant difference? I don't think there's any indication that it's a significant difference. What about the idiom that he calls her Eve, that he calls the name of his wife Eve? How is that used? Well, it's used to name children. It's used later in the naming of cities.

It's used when God renames Sarai, Sarah. And it's used when God renames Jacob, Israel. So, all of these are cases in which apparently the person who is doing the naming has authority.

I don't know what it means to build a city and then name it and say, well, then you have authority. But you certainly have the authority to confer upon it an identity. A name gives an identity.

And so that seems to be the drift here. And so, well, then, what does that mean? Does that mean that, that seems to mean then that Adam, in fact, he names her. And so he has authority over her.

Or after the fall, so you might say he usurps authority over her. But neither of those things is really the kind of thing we can insist upon because the same idiom is used when Hagar names God.

After God appears to her, we read that she gave this name to the Lord who spoke to her. It's the same idiom that we have when Adam names his wife Eve. And I think it goes without saying that when Hagar named God, she didn't have authority over him.

So the naming, the reasonable conclusion here is that the use of the naming idioms usually, but not always, seems to indicate that the namer has authority to name the thing named. One might want to argue that there's usurpation of the right to give a proper name, since Adam does that after the fall. But that's since authority is not necessarily involved in the idiom, as we see from the case of Hagar, that's, which remains ambiguous as well.

Well, what about the derivative manner of the woman's creation? In Genesis 2, we read that the Lord caused the man to fall into a deep sleep, and while he was sleeping, he took one of the man's ribs and closed up the place with flesh. Then the Lord God made or built a woman from the rib. Okay, well, I think that that in and of itself is laconic.

It doesn't tell us anything about a hierarchy. It's worth noting that the Lord made the man from the dust of the ground, but that doesn't mean that the dust of the ground

has authority over Adam, or is of a higher order of being, or anything like that. So, you can't conclude that sort of thing from the passage.

But then, if we want to do a little biblical theology and look further into the Bible and look at what Paul says, then that raises the question. Paul says a woman should learn in quietness and in full submission. I do not permit a woman to work or have authority over a man.

She must be silent, for Adam was formed first, then Eve. Now, I'm not getting into this to any extent here, but I will say there's a line of thinking and argumentation on the part of more than one scholar that, well, here's a situation in Ephesus, and it was problematic, and women were causing problems there. And so, Paul's commands, his injunctions, his instructions to Timothy were Ephesus-specific, church-specific, and not general in their import.

That becomes a bit problematic when we read the last part of the statement because his appeal is to the created order, not to the situation in Ephesus. But I leave that for what it is. People will wrestle with it.

They will disagree on these matters. But the point being here, as we look at Genesis 1 and 2, the point is that we want to limit the conclusions that we draw on the basis of these very laconic data. These materials tell us a lot.

There's a lot that they don't tell us. So, we want to look to the New Testament for further understanding. I mentioned Gordon Hugenberger here as another student of Meredith Kline's, and as adjunct professor now at Gordon Conwell.

He taught there for a while, was pastor at Park Street Church for many years, is back as an adjunct now. He wrote this piece to argue that Paul is actually talking about home and not the church. So, this has nothing to do with women in ministry.

I personally think the argument's a bit forced. He's a good brother. I love him.

But you can read that if you want to and see what you make of it. Well, what are the family or relational implications that we find in Genesis for the male-female union? In Genesis 2, what do we read about the man and the wife? The man will leave his father and mother and be united with his wife. They'll become one flesh.

The term united is the verb cleave to, which, in Hebrew, holds closely to. It shows up later in Deuteronomy 13 in a context arguing that you don't follow false prophets. It's the Lord your God you must follow, and you must revere him, keep his commands and obey him, serve him, and cleave to him.

It is a very interesting use of that term because it does, I think, prefigure the idea of a marital relationship between the Lord and his people, which we see eschatologically. Paul, of course, does appeal to this too. Paul takes up some of these Genesis verses later in Ephesians 5. And so here again, if Paul writing to Timothy in Ephesus in 1 Timothy is writing about women in ministry and appealing to the created order.

Here he's writing about the marital relationship but also appealing to the created order. And so, here's what he says, wives submit to your husbands as to the Lord, for the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church. And so on now as the church submits to Christ, so wives should submit to their husbands in everything.

Husbands love your wives just as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her to make her holy, cleansing her by washing her with water through the word and to present her to himself as a radiant church without stain or wrinkle or any other blemish, but holy and blameless. In the same way, husbands ought to love their wives as their own bodies; he who loves his wife loves himself. After all, no one ever hated his own body, but he feeds and cares for it, just as Christ does for the church, for we are members of his body.

And then he quotes here Genesis 2:24. For this reason, a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh. This is a profound mystery, but I'm talking about Christ and the church. However, each of you must also love his wife as he loves himself, and the wife must respect her husband.

Well, to quote Paul here, he's talking about Christ and the church, but he's not only talking about Christ and the church. He's obviously talking about marriage here. And so what do we make of that? There's a very strong statement in verse 24 that, to quote it exactly here, as the church submits to Christ, so wives should submit to their husbands and everything.

Well, that sounds pretty strong. The argument has been made that back in verses 21, 21, and 22, you actually have a double duty of the term submit. So that when it says here, wives submit to your husbands as to the Lord, the previous verse talked about mutual submission using the participle, submitting to one another in the love of Christ.

And so, the verb doesn't actually appear in verse 22. It's just carried over and understood. And so submitting to one another in Christ in verse 21, wives to your husbands.

As to the Lord. I hope that's clear. It's a double-duty use of the verb.

This kind of thing happens all the time. If I say, I went to the grocery store and to the post office, it's understood that the verb I went also applies to the post office. I went to the post office.

The verb does double duty. Those who want to argue an egalitarian position here say, well, it's double. It's mutual submission in verse 21. And the verb is assumed in verse 22.

So it must be mutual submission there, too. This, I hope can be clear, is a very flawed reasoning. Whatever view one wants to take about men and women, that's just not a good argument because double duty use of something doesn't mean it's used in the same way in both cases.

Again, the statement in verse 22 seems pretty strong. And it seems to be assigned to one part of the marriage there. So, whatever view one takes of marriage, got to be consistent with an understanding of this that makes sense of that.

And so, what parallelisms do we have then in this passage from Paul? You have the husband as head of the wife, and Christ as head of the church. The husband serves the wife as Christ serves the church and loves the wife. He cares for her as Christ does the church, his body.

The wife obeys the husband or submits to as the church submits to Christ. And I would say that on this issue, which is a sensitive issue, what I'm trying to do here is look at the material and what it actually says. As I often tell students on this and other issues, I don't really care how it plays out.

I just want to understand what it's saying. My wife and I have what one would call a complementarian marriage. So, along the lines of understanding this the way I've suggested, it should be understood, including what it means.

What does that look like? I've had women who were egalitarians looking at our marriage, and it looks to them like it's an egalitarian marriage. We share a lot of things. My wife got her PhD at Harvard in applied math.

She did her thesis on the mathematical modeling of weather fronts. And so she's quite bright. She's quite able.

She chose not to pursue a career but to homeschool our children. We share a lot of decisions. What my headship looks like really is there is some spiritual guidance, and if there's a decision to be made, the buck stops with me.

That's how that works. But I won't make the exalted claim that I love her as Christ loved the church, that I do a flawless job of that. But that is the husband's job.

And I'm just saying that a complementarian marriage doesn't have to look like a tyranny, which is what some people think. You can have a complementarian marriage. Your wife can have a career and all the rest of it.

But that gets played out in each relationship in its own way. But I think that's what the biblical data are telling us. I say data is because, in fact, data is the plural of datum or datum in Latin.

So, it's a plural. And so, although these things change over time, for instance, the plural of the stadium in Latin is stadia. But people don't say stadia.

They say stadiums. So, these things get angle-sized and change in usage. But since it is a Latin plural, I like to use the plural.

So, when you hear that, you'll understand that because I've said it more than once. What are the concluding questions here? Well, what do you think of the double-duty use of submitting? That's something to think about. What do you think of verse 24? And how do these verses relate as an active interpretation? How should they be understood together? And what do you think of the parallelism that Paul draws here? Clearly, I've tried to lay these things out for you.

I'm not going to say what you should think. But I'm trying to explain what they say. And every now and then in these lectures, we will make an excursion into the New Testament, which, after all, does have the last word on these matters that we find in the Old Testament, where it really seems relevant and to touch upon something that ought to be looked at.

But for now, that will conclude our comments on the Creation Covenant. And when we continue Creation Covenant comments, we'll be looking at what happens in the context of that covenant when the woman and the man break the covenant with all of its dynamics and unfortunate consequences.

This is Dr. Jeffrey Niehaus in his teaching on Biblical Theology. This is session 2, The Adamic Covenant, Part 2.