

Essay 5a: Genesis 2-3 and Headship (Part 1)

Stephen Bauer, Ph.D.

© June, 2014 by Stephen Bauer, Ph.D.

In this essay, I continue the *sola Scriptura* analysis of key texts used to argue for male headship and thus to exclude women from ordination to eldership and ministry. I am reviewing the study process that culminated in my position stated in Essay 1. This essay continues my evaluation of texts used to proscribe women from ordination to be elders or pastors.

In the context of the committee discussions of which I have been part, those opposing ordaining women to certain forms of ministry affirm that Gen 1 expresses the ontological equality¹ of man and woman, while also asserting that Gen 2-3 reveals a pre-fall male-headship with hierarchal difference in authority and function. In particular, I compiled a list of seven features in Gen 2-3 which are used by the Gender Exclusive (GE) position to assert a pre-fall headship of male over female. These seven features are framed as assertions as follows:

From Gen 2:

1. Adam (a male) was formed first, therefore the male has headship preeminence over the female.
2. God commanded the man (the male) to till the ground and care for the Garden, thus Adam was set in authority over Eve (the female).
3. God commanded Adam (the male) concerning the prohibition on eating the fruit, thus Adam had the headship duty to instruct Eve.
4. Adam names the woman, like he did the animals. This shows his headship authority over Eve.

From Gen 3:

5. The couple did not become naked until after Adam sinned. Eve did not become immediately naked when she sinned, nor did both become naked simultaneously when only Eve had sinned. The fact that God waited for Adam to sin before making both naked shows Adam's pre-fall headship over Eve.
6. God calls to Adam, not Eve, because Adam is the one with headship in the relationship.
7. Eve follows Adam out of the Garden. This shows Adam as leader, indicating headship.

¹Ontological equality means equal in essential nature. Femaleness as such is thus not inferior in essence to maleness. In this view, subordination is only in function, not in essential nature.

The Vocabulary of “Adam”

Before addressing these seven points, I need to acknowledge the complexity of the Hebrew term, *'adam* /*ha'adam* (אָדָם / הָאָדָם). For clarity, *ha'adam* is merely *'adam* with the definite article (*ha* - the) [literally, “the adam”]. The term generally connotes a human being. In Gen 1-6, both the definite and indefinite forms are used with no particular pattern distinguishing one form from the other. For example, in Gen 1:26, *'adam* is all humanity, but in 1:27, so is *ha'adam*. In the flood story, *ha'adam* is repeatedly used of the whole human race, not just of one couple. (See Gen 6:1-7; 7:21, 23, etc.).

By contrast, in Gen 5, *ha'adam* is humanity while *'adam* functions as a proper name. Furthermore, in Gen 2:25 and 3:8, the formula of “*ha'adam* and his wife” mimics the formulas expressing marriage which are based on proper names such as “Noah and his wife” (Gen 7:7; 8:18) or “Abraham and his wife” (Gen 13:1). This suggests that *ha'adam* might be functioning as the proper name (Adam) for the husband in these two passages. Thus when reading Gen 2-3, we must recognize the possibility that *ha'adam* (the dominant use in this passage) may be sometimes used as a proper name for the first human, and sometimes a designation for humankind in general, and that it may alternate meanings in the same literary passage.

The plasticity of *'adam/ha'adam* is reinforced by the fact that in Gen 1:26-27, and again in Gen 5:1-3, God makes *'adam/ha'adam* in His image, *'adam/ha'adam* is comprised of both male and female together, and this male-female coupling is called “him” (masculine singular) as well as “them” (masculine plural). The use of the masculine singular, “him,” in Gen 2 is thus no guarantee that only the first male is being referenced. This is a critical point for consideration as we process the seven claims made by those of the GE persuasion. Let us now move to those assertions, starting with the four related to Gen 2.

Assertions Made Based on Gen 2

Assertion1:

Adam (a male) was formed first, therefore the male has headship preeminence over the female.

In my view, this argument depends primarily on the “creation order” interpretation of Paul’s statement in 1 Tim 2:13. We have already analyzed 1 Tim 2:13 in Essay 3 and discovered that Paul does not explain or interpret the meaning of the phrase, “Adam was formed first, then Eve.” The whole headship interpretation assigned to Paul turns out to be the expositor’s opinion, baptized in the name of Paul, and which I christened as “Quasi-Paul.” The existence of plausible alternative interpretations demonstrates that the Quasi-Paul interpretation is not logically required by 1 Tim 2:13. Since Quasi-Paul is not an inspired author of scripture, his headship interpretation of the Adam-Eve creation sequence is not an authoritative exposition of Gen 2. Nowhere else in the Bible is the Adam-Eve creation sequence used to build this particular theological point.² Likewise, Moses makes no such interpretation of the chronological

²In 1 Cor 11, Paul does mention that woman came out of man in the creation, which implicitly depicts the creation sequence of Adam first, Eve second. However, in 1 Cor 11, Paul

sequence of human creation in Gen 1-2. (I shall discuss Gen 3 later). Moses simply tells the story in Gen 2 without explicitly applying any facts of the chapter to a male-headship principle.

Without the help of Quasi-Paul, the establishment of male headship in Gen 2 depends solely on drawing inferences since Gen 2 itself lacks explicit expositions and applications which prescribe a general male headship. Crafting theology on a mostly-inferential basis, in spite of lacking explicit textual data, seems spiritually dangerous. This is because what is perceived as implied inference is easily influenced by culture and personal preference, readily morphing into Quasi-Paul or Quasi-Moses without textual basis. I believe we need more than inference or Quasi-Paul in order to properly establish the male-headship principle from the Adam-Eve creation sequence. Because of this, it appears to me that the headship interpretation may commit the is-ought logical fallacy, in which an obligation (the “ought,” in this case, male headship) is derived from a basic fact (the “is,” in this case, Adam’s being formed before Eve) without sufficient support. Such seems to be the case here. While the *fact* of the creation sequence for Adam and Eve does not automatically exclude the headship interpretation, neither does it logically require the headship view. Thus, the creation sequence alone is insufficient to establish a pre-fall headship of Adam over Eve.

Assertion 2:

“God commanded the man (male) to till the ground and care for the Garden.
Thus, Adam was set in authority over Eve (the female).”

This assertion appears to be referencing Gen 2:15. While the grammar of Gen 2:15 is not that of command, it is that of a stated design or purpose. God placed *ha’adam* in the garden with the express purpose that *ha’adam* “serves and protects” it. Assertion 2 seems to suggest that this means God placed the male in charge of the garden, and that the woman would thus be under the male’s command to assist him in his task of maintaining the garden. I believe there are several problems with this exposition.

First, we have seen that *ha’adam*, and the masculine singular pronoun using *ha’adam* for its antecedent, can refer to humankind as both male and female together (Gen 1:26-27; Gen 5:1-3; Gen 6:1-7). Moses clearly knew other vocabulary expressions for male and female (Gen 1:27; זָכָר - *zakar* and נְקֵבָה - *neqebah*) and for man/husband and woman/wife (Gen 2:24; אִישׁ - *ish* and אִשָּׁה - *ishah*). If Moses had said that God placed *ha’ish* (the man/husband, male gender) or *ha zakar* (the male) in the garden to serve and protect it, THEN the GE position *might* have some textual basis. Instead, Moses said God placed *ha’adam* (humanity) in the garden. By using the gender-inclusive noun *’adam* (which can include both male and female in its meaning) and not the gender-specific terms *’ish* or *zakar*, Moses communicates this task is for all humanity, not just for humans of the male gender.

That the duty to care for the Garden was assigned to humanity, not specifically to the male, harmonizes with the how tasks were assigned to *ha’adam* in Gen 1:26-28. In Gen 1,

makes no theological development of this sequence in reference to leadership positions or functions. In 1 Cor 11, men and women both pray and prophecy and Paul makes no hierarchal application to gender roles in 1 Cor 11. Rather, he applies these matters to a dress code in the church without any overt ties to leadership theology. See Essay 4 for more details.

ha'adam as male AND female are assigned joint dominion over the earth and animals without distinction, and they jointly receive the command to be fruitful and multiply, and to fill the earth. Likewise, there is no expression of a gender-based distinction of authority or roles between male and female members of humanity (*ha'adam*), and finally, there is no expression of one individual *ha'adam* having dominion over another. Thus, when Gen 2 expresses the duties assigned to *ha'adam* (now stated in terms of serving and protecting the garden), it strongly suggests that this passage is reiterating and interpreting the joint duties of Gen 1. Therefore, based on the language of *ha'adam*, it is highly plausible to conclude that the duties of Gen 2 were meant for all mankind, not just the male gender. Like Gen 1, this aspect of Gen 2 makes no suggestion that one part of *ha'adam* (male) is to exercise authority or dominion over another portion of *ha'adam* (female). Gen 1 and 2 do not contradict each other in terms of humankind having universal duties shared by both genders in relation to the world and nature. The attempt to use Gen 2:15 to ground male authority over female appears to pit Gen 2 against Gen 1 in a manner which mimics the higher critics.³ In my estimation, one cannot infer a pre-fall headship in this verse without first believing in a headship doctrine. While it is *possible* that God commanded the man as the head, the text does not logically entail this conclusion. Headship is not explicitly in the text of Gen 2:15 and there are good reasons to conclude it is not implied there.

Assertion 3: God commanded Adam (the male) about not eating the fruit, thus Adam had the headship duty to instruct Eve.

Assertion 3 is a clear allusion to Gen 2:16-17, and in this case the GE view is correct in recognizing the language of the imperative. God does indeed “command” *ha'adam* not to eat of the tree. He then uses the grammar of juridical penalty against disobedience,⁴ which further emphasizes the sense of a command being given. Two points mitigate against the text teaching that this command invested the male with authority over the woman, and with the duty to instruct the female.

First, I reiterate the previous argument that the command was given to *ha'adam* (humanity) not specifically to *ha'ish* (the man/husband, male gender). This means that the command targeted all humanity, not just one man or gender.

On the other hand, if *ha'adam* is functioning as a proper name, then those of the GE view might have some basis to justify their interpretation. I am not convinced, however, that the “proper name” option can support the GE headship doctrine. This is because the “proper name” option does not require the GE interpretation. It can just as easily be argued that the command was ONLY for Adam, and God would have had differing, non-overlapping responsibilities to prescribe to Eve once she was created. Two people with differing, egalitarian duties might well manage a garden together.

Furthermore, if *ha'adam* is functioning as a proper name, this could be equally argued as

³Unlike the higher critics who see Gen 1 and 2 as separate, contradictory creation stories, I see Gen 2 as a harmonious theological explanation of Gen 1.

⁴See, Stephen Bauer, “Dying You Shall Die,” Ministry, December, 2011, 6-9, where I show that the grammar of Gen 2:16 is consistently used in a juridical context, announcing a death penalty for breaking a certain law.

evidence of Adam's headship over the whole race, a single head over all males and females for as long as he would live. Such a headship is not analogous to a general male headship over female. Certainly these points demonstrate that the "proper name" interpretation is insufficient in itself to establish the GE understanding of headship.

In like manner, it is significant that Scripture has no record of Adam being commanded to instruct a wife in this matter, nor is there a record of him doing so. In fact, at this point in the story, Adam would have had no concept of "wife" for she had not been made and he had not yet discovered his need of a companion. Thus, at this point of development in the story, an implicit duty to instruct one's wife makes no sense. More critically, in Gen 3:3, Eve's own testimony does not credit her husband for teaching her this command. Rather, she credits her knowledge of the dietary prohibition directly to God. "God said." To suggest that Adam relayed God's message as spiritual head over Eve is thus utter speculation. Such a concept is not explicitly in the text. Thus, Eve's ascription of her knowledge to God's command (and not her husband) is reasonable evidence that God commanded her directly and not through some prophetic ministry of Adam. Again the GE view appears to require a preexisting belief in headship in order to sustain this interpretation of Gen 2. It seems much better, contextually, to understand Gen 2:16-17 as a universal command for all humanity together to care for the Garden and earth, given to the first living human specimen.

Second, in God's conversation with Eve in Gen 3, God deals directly with Eve instead of appointing Adam as the authoritative head to question and discipline her for her disobedience. God was more than willing to work directly with Eve on matters of law and obedience, bypassing Adam entirely. If Adam had a special spiritual headship over Eve, as part of a larger chain of command (i.e., God to Christ to Adam to Eve)⁵ why did God not follow His own appointed command chain and have Adam pronounce the judgement sentence over Eve? The fact that both Adam and Eve were each held accountable directly to God, with neither one being used to judge or punish the other is strong evidence there was no chain of command in the Garden and that their status before God was equal. They stood before God and received their judgments together as *ha'adam*, not as head and subordinate. It seems to me that in Assertion 3, we have yet another example of the GE view making a claim that is devoid of explicit textual support, depending solely on speculative inference for its efficacy. While the reader has the freedom to speculate, the reader has no right to invest their inferential opinion with biblical authority, and thus creating a Quasi-Moses.

Assertion 4: Adam named the woman, like he did the animals. This shows his headship authority over Eve.

Assertion 4 is referencing Adam's exclamation when he first saw his wife, "she shall be

⁵In 1 Cor 11, Paul does mention that woman came out of man in the creation, which implicitly depicts the creation sequence of Adam first, Eve second. However, in 1 Cor 11, Paul makes no theological development of this fact in reference to leadership positions or subordinate functions. Men and women both pray and prophecy without restriction. There is no hierarchal application in 1 Cor 11. Rather Paul applies the principle to a dress code. See Essay 4 for more details.

called woman.” I believe this claim is factually wrong on two counts. First, the text of Gen 2:23 does not conform to the standard grammatical form of naming formulas found in Genesis, and in the rest of the OT. The typical naming formula uses the verb “called” in the active voice with the one doing the naming grammatically functioning as the subject of the verb. The normal formula also has the term, “name,” usually with a possessive pronoun (“his name,” “her name”). Finally, the person or thing being named is the direct object of the verb. For example, “Judah called her name Anna.”

By contrast, the phrase, “she shall be called woman,” uses the verb “called” in the passive voice. Nowhere else in the Old Testament (OT) can I find the passive form of “called” used in the context of naming. Furthermore, the term “name,” is entirely absent. Finally, the person being called “woman” is the subject of the verb instead of being the object as in the standard naming formula. Additionally, “woman” is not a personal name. Gen 2:23 thus lacks each of the three grammatical elements found in typical naming formulas elsewhere in the OT. By contrast, in Gen 3:20, after the fall, Adam DOES name his wife “Eve,” and this text is grammatically constructed in the form of the classic naming formula. If naming implies authority and headship, then Adam naming Eve in Gen 3, after the fall, would strongly suggest headship came post-fall, contrary to GE belief.

The second factual error is the claim that naming someone implies having authority over them. Certainly, the fact that we do not name ourselves, and examples like Nebuchadnezzar renaming Daniel and his friends may suggest that naming indicates authority. However, this is not universal. For example, Hagar names God using the classic naming formula (Gen 16:13), yet no one would see her naming of God as implying that she had some kind of authority over God. Hagar’s story demonstrates that the act of naming does not automatically imply the one doing the naming has some vested authority over the one named.

More critically, in Gen 2, the naming of the animals is set in the context of bringing Adam to feel his need for a mate. First, God declares “It is not good that the man [*ha’adam*] should be alone; I will make him a helper fit for him.” God then goes about accomplishing this goal by bringing all the animals to *ha’adam* to be named. Moses gives the theological meaning in verse 20: “But for Adam there was not found a helper fit for him.” The stated purpose of naming the animals was not related to authority but was, rather, to bring Adam to an awareness of his need of a corresponding companion. No inferential reasoning is required to reach this conclusion for the point is explicitly stated in the text. The stated theological purpose of the naming passage stands in stark contrast to the GE interpretation of this passage. The GE interpretation creates a Quasi-Moses going beyond Moses’ own application of his own text, purely on an inferential basis.

The language of “helper corresponding to” – in Hebrew, *‘ezer kenegdo* – reinforces the aura of equality. There are many kinds of helpers (*‘ezer*). The Hebrew term is often used of God as our helper. Certainly God would be a helper superior to us, not one corresponding to us, but this usage shows that “helper” (*‘ezer*) does not implicitly suggest subordination. Likewise, one may get help from a servant, a helper inferior to oneself, but again the helper is not one corresponding to one helped. Here, however, the helper is one who stands before, eye-to-eye, not above or below. Thus Eve, as Adam’s *‘ezer kenegdo* is a helper who is equal in the same way that each animal companion corresponded equally with its mate. The theological context culminating in Gen 2:23 is not conducive to the GE headship interpretation.

We have examined the first four assertions offered by the GE view, all of which come

from Gen 2. In each case, the facts of the text do not logically entail any of these assertions. To this point, each GE assertion either infers ideas from the text which are not explicitly there or makes claims contrary to the facts stated in the text. Let us see if this pattern continues or changes with the three assertions based in Gen 3.

Assertions Made based on Gen 3

Assertion 5:

The couple did not become naked sequentially—Eve when she sinned and later Adam when he sinned—nor did they become naked simultaneously when only Eve had sinned. God waited for the one with headship to sin before making both naked.

It appears to me that the essence of this assertion is that by waiting until Adam sinned before both became naked, God was recognizing Adam's special headship position over Eve. While this explanation is theoretically possible, I know of no inspired author making such a theological interpretation of this event. Thus, this claim is simply a speculative opinion that has no inspired support to ground it. While entitled to their opinion, it is not proper for GE expositors to transform their speculation into Quasi-Moses. Furthermore, the GE assertion falters in light of the fact that from a GE perspective, God did not follow His prescribed chain of command by commissioning Adam-as-head to strip his guilty wife naked. Again, why would God set a poor example for us by ignoring His prescribed chain of command?

The fact of simultaneous nakedness does NOT logically entail the GE headship option. Rather, this interpretation springs from a preexisting belief in the GE headship view. Without prior belief in the GE headship doctrine, this interpretation of their nakedness is untenable because simple correlation does not automatically imply that one event caused the other. The correlation could be a coincidence and the nakedness may not be related at all to the timing of their sins. Other plausible explanations are possible.

One such credible alternative might suggest that, had God immediately struck Eve naked before Adam had wrestled with the temptation, then Adam would have had an unfair advantage over Eve. He would have had clearer evidence of the consequences of disobedience than Eve had when she was tempted. Thus, in order to avoid the appearance of unfairness or favoritism, God waited to act until both had faced the temptation under the same circumstances and the dynamics of the situation had run their course. In fact, one could easily interpret the simultaneous change to nakedness as evidence of their equality. While this alternative view is as much a personal opinion as is the GE view, it demonstrates that other equally plausible explanations are available.

A more textually based alternative would note a previous reference to nakedness in Gen 2:25.⁶ Here, *ha'adam* and his wife had already been naked with each other and not ashamed.

⁶The Hebrew words for nakedness in Gen 2 and in Gen 3 are slightly different forms of the same verbal root. Gen 2 uses עָרֹם (*'arōm*) while Gen 3 uses the rarer עֵרֹם/עִירָם (*'eyrōm*). A simple word search offers no significant differences with the possible exception that *'arōm* may

The context is that of the couple becoming one flesh, and the result of that oneness is they can be naked with each other without shame. Along with Adam's statement, "bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh" the one-flesh condition evokes a strong sense of egalitarian unity. This could suggest that God was treating the couple, in their oneness, *ha'adam* together (Gen 1:26-27) as a single unit. Thus He waited for the whole unit to sin together or divide by one not sinning before moving to "open their eyes" to their nakedness. In Gen 3, they seem still to have no shame at nakedness with each other, but the new sense of public nakedness before God sent them running for cover. Thus, the nakedness in Gen 3 centers on their joint nakedness before God, as a corporate unit. Once naked and hiding, their oneness implodes into blaming and power-struggle. Thus, we have a viable, textually-based option differing from the GE view, again showing that the headship interpretation is by no means logically required by the text. Therefore, the facts of how Adam and Eve became naked do not automatically imply a headship model as advocated by GE proponents.

Assertion 6:

God calls to Adam, not Eve. This shows He is calling to the one with headship, who was male.

This assertion is a possible explanation, but the text by no means logically demands it. The plasticity of *ha'adam* certainly allows for the possibility that God was calling to mankind—all two of them—and not just to the male. It is true that Adam answers in the first person singular, "I," and proceeds to blame his wife, but just because only he answered does not eliminate the option that God was calling to the whole human population, not just the male. Adam being the sole person to verbally reply is quite explainable based on normal, sinful dynamics. Eve was the initiator of temptation to Adam, yet she had been first deceived (1 Tim 2:14). Thus, in typical human dynamics it would be natural for the one drawn into the transgression, and who had not been deceived to take charge. "You blew it so let me handle it." We see such dynamics regularly demonstrated among siblings and small groups when they get in trouble. While the male appears to initiate the response to God's voice, there is nothing in the text that demands that God called to the male because he was the divinely ordained leader. He could just have easily been calling to *both* in their joint dominion over the earth.

This point is reinforced by the fact that God did not commission Adam to judge and discipline Eve. I have already explored this point above, but the fact that God does not implement the chain of command He allegedly prescribed seems suggestive that God was not calling exclusively to the man because he was the leader of Eve. By contrast, we have the double-entendre usage of *ha'adam* in the curses following this conversation (Gen 3:17-19) where the curses pronounced on *ha'adam* for listening to "your wife" were not limited to Adam or

range from being uncovered like in one's underwear to full nudity, while *'eyrōm* seems to consistently connote bareness/nudity. I see no textual indicators indicating strong theological difference between the forms in Gen 2 and 3. In spoken Hebrew, Gen seems to be playing on audible similarity of עָרוֹם (*'arōm* - naked) to עָרוּם (*'arum* - crafty, shrewd), the adjective used to describe the serpent. All three of these words derive from the same verbal stem, meaning to be subtle, shrewd or crafty.

males, but are universal for all mankind.⁷ Certainly God was addressing the male at that particular point in the curses, but the overall focus of those curses remains universal and focused, not just on the one individual named Adam, nor just the male gender, but on all of mankind.

Had God called out to *ha'ish*, a gender-specific term, then the GE assertion that God called only to the male would have clear support, but God called to *ha'adam*, a term that is not exclusively male, and whose associated masculine singular pronoun can still include the female gender. This is demonstrated when God blocks *ha'adam* from the tree of life and then drives "him" from the Garden. No one understands this event as driving just the male out. Grammatically, we have good reason to believe there is a corporate element in the term, *ha'adam* even in the divine conversations and that we indeed have a double entendre usage of *ha'adam* in this passage. I have not found any inspired writer crafting an unambiguous theology of male headship based on whom God addressed in the Garden. The GE explanation may be possible but certainly is not mandated by the text.

Assertion 7: Eve followed Adam out of the garden. This shows Adam's headship.

This assertion is unsupported in the biblical text. When God drives *ha'adam* out of the garden, there is no separate mention of specific individuals, man or woman. Nothing in the text indicates one going before or after the other. This is strong evidence that *ha'adam* is being used as in Gen 1, of humanity as a whole. God drove all humanity out of the garden, without record of individual order or sequence.

Furthermore, even if one did follow the other out, that is no guarantee that the one in front has headship over the one following. Jacob followed his wives when approaching Esau, but no one would conclude that this indicates his wives had headship since they went first. Thus, Assertion 7 is utterly speculative, demonstrating once again that one must first believe in male headship to come to this conclusion. This particular assertion especially reeks of fishing for data to fit one's own ideas, causing the proponents to add to the inspired text that which is not actually there.

Conclusion

After a careful, *sola Scriptura* analysis of the seven features of Gen 2-3 that are asserted as evidences of a pre-fall headship of Adam over Eve, and thus of men over women, I have not found sufficient support in these texts to sustain the GE interpretations. The arguments depend

⁷Some may be tempted to contend that this is precisely evidence of Adam's headship. When the head was cursed, that curse passed on to all under his headship. I am not convinced this view actually supports the male-headship view. In this scenario, Adam's headship would be the headship of one man as patriarch over all the human family, male and female. As such, this provides no logical basis to ground a gender-based headship of male over female. How does one get from one man with headship over both genders to one gender having headship over the other? If Adam's headship was only to women, then there would be a basis for arguing an extension of Adam's headship to his male descendants. Instead, patriarchal headship passed on to sons who were head over males and females in their homes. The nature of Adam's headship over both genders precludes the concept of a general gender-based headship of male over female.

heavily on inferential and speculative reasoning which seems fueled in an already-existing belief in pre-fall headship. It appears that personal preference and opinion is read into the text instead of being built on the text. While some of these assertions are theoretically possible, none are logically demanded by the text or context. Worse, some of these assertions make claims that are factually false, and some appear to exhibit traits of circular reasoning. Such interpretational sloppiness seems contrary to Paul's expository ethics found in 2 Corinthians 4:2: "But we have renounced disgraceful, underhanded ways. We refuse to practice cunning or to tamper with God's word, but by the open statement of the truth we would commend ourselves to everyone's conscience in the sight of God." I believe the evidence favors a harmonious view of pre-fall equality in Gen 1-3. Gen 2 does not contradict or subvert Gen 1 in this matter. We still have, however, Gen 3:16 to examine. That will be the focus of my next essay (5, part 2).