

FAITHFUL TO THE WORD

Systematic Theology Series

HAMARTIOLOGY

The Doctrine of Sin

The Catastrophe from Which the Gospel Rescues Us

UNIT 2: THE ORIGIN OF SIN THE FALL OF ADAM

Lesson 3

The Temptation in the Garden

How Sin Entered the World

The Serpent, the Lie, and the Unraveling of Everything

“The serpent of old who is called the devil and Satan, who deceives the whole world”

Key Texts: Genesis 3:1–7; 1 Timothy 2:14; 2 Corinthians 11:3; Revelation 12:9; 1 John 2:16

“When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was desirable to make one wise, she took from its fruit and ate; and she gave also to her husband with her, and he ate.”

Genesis 3:6, NASB 1995

Dr. Joshua Nichols

Pastor, Theologian, Author

faithfultotheword.com

Introduction

We arrive now at the event that stands at the center of the entire biblical narrative and at the root of every human misery: the fall of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden. Everything that came before Genesis 3, the six days of creation, the formation of the man from the dust and the woman from his side, the provision of paradise, the unbroken communion between creature and Creator, was the perfect context within which the catastrophe unfolded. Everything that comes after Genesis 3, the spread of sin through the human race, the judgment of the flood, the confusion of Babel, the long history of human violence and self-destruction, and ultimately the cross of Jesus Christ, is the consequence of and the response to what happened in the garden. Genesis 3 is not merely the beginning of the problem; it is the problem. To understand it rightly is to understand what the entire Bible is about.

The previous two lessons have established the theological and historical framework within which this narrative must be read. Lesson 1 established why the doctrine of sin matters and why the church must have the courage to teach it without minimization. Lesson 2 traced the history of the church's engagement with the doctrine, from Augustine's decisive confrontation with Pelagianism through the Reformation recovery of Augustinian anthropology and onward to the modern erosion of the doctrine under therapeutic and Enlightenment pressures. In this lesson, we turn to the text itself, the account in Genesis 3:1–7 of the serpent's approach, the anatomy of the temptation, the voluntary disobedience of our first parents, and the catastrophic significance of that disobedience for the entire human race.

Several features of the text demand careful theological attention before we proceed. First, the account is historical, not mythological. The Reformed tradition, grounded in the conviction of biblical inerrancy, has consistently maintained that Genesis 3 records a real event that occurred in real time and space, involving real persons, a historical Adam and Eve, in a real place. Paul's argument in Romans 5:12–19 and his statements in 1 Timothy 2:13–14 and 2 Corinthians 11:3 treat the garden narrative as straightforward history, and the integrity of the doctrine of original sin depends upon it. A mythological or allegorical fall cannot account for the historical, universal, and forensic consequences that Paul attributes to Adam's actual transgression.

Second, the narrative is profoundly theological, not merely historical. Genesis 3 is not simply a report of what happened; it is a theologically structured account that reveals the nature, the mechanism, and the consequences of sin in a way that has illuminated the church's understanding of human nature and divine grace across every generation. The brevity of the account, seven verses to describe the event that undid everything, belies the depth of its content. Every phrase repays careful exegetical attention, and the theological tradition has spent two millennia exploring its implications. In this lesson, we will follow that tradition, bringing the full resources of biblical theology and systematic theology to bear on a text that is, in every sense, the most consequential seven verses in the Old Testament.

Third, the account of the fall must always be read in light of the redemption that follows it. The serpent's triumph in the garden is real and devastating, but it is not the final word. Genesis 3:15, the protoevangelium, the first gospel, announces within the very narrative of judgment that a Seed of the woman will bruise the serpent's head. The fall is the problem; Christ is the answer. The garden of Eden is lost; the garden of the new creation (Revelation 22) is promised and will be infinitely greater than what was lost. To study the temptation in the garden rightly is to be driven, by the very horror of the catastrophe, toward the beauty of the gospel that has answered it.

I. The Setting

The Garden as the Context of Perfection, Provision, and Probation

A. *The Garden as Sanctuary: Provision and Communion*

Genesis 2 prepares us for the catastrophe of Genesis 3 by establishing, with great care, the perfection of the world that sin would shatter. The Lord God planted the garden (2:8), made every tree grow that was pleasing to the sight and good for food (2:9), and placed the man there to cultivate and keep it (2:15). The Creator had provided everything that the creature could possibly need: material provision, meaningful vocation, the companionship of a suitable helper, and, most importantly, unbroken, unashamed communion with God Himself. The garden was not merely a pleasant natural environment; it was the dwelling place of God among His people, the original sanctuary where creature and Creator met without the alienation that sin would introduce.

The theological tradition has consistently recognized Eden as a type of the tabernacle and the temple. As John Sailhamer and others have observed, the description of Eden in Genesis 2 shares significant literary and theological features with the descriptions of the tabernacle in Exodus and the temple in Ezekiel: the presence of God, the role of the man as a priestly figure who “cultivates and keeps” the sacred space (the same Hebrew verbs used of priestly service in Numbers 3:7–8), the cherubim guarding the tree of life (later positioned at the entrance to the holy of holies), and the rivers flowing outward from the garden to water the earth (recalling the river of the water of life in Revelation 22). Eden was not merely the beginning of the human story; it was the beginning of the story of God’s dwelling among His people, a story that would culminate in the new Jerusalem, where “God Himself will be among them” (Revelation 21:3, NASB 1995).

The significance of this Edenic background for Hamartiology cannot be overstated. Sin did not enter the world through a neutral or indifferent environment; it entered through the violation of the most privileged situation in which any creature has ever been placed. Adam and Eve were not ignorant, impoverished, or abandoned; they were informed, abundantly provided for, and in unbroken fellowship with their Creator. The fall was not an understandable failure under difficult circumstances; it was a voluntary defection from a position of extraordinary privilege and grace. This is why the Augustinian-Reformed tradition has consistently resisted any attempt to explain or excuse the fall as the inevitable product of human finitude or the foreordained result of divine design. The fall was a genuine, freely chosen, morally inexcusable act of defiance against a God who had given every possible reason to trust and obey.

B. *The Covenant of Works: The Probationary Command*

The perfection of Adam’s situation was not unconditional. Genesis 2:16–17 records the probationary command that constituted the terms of what Reformed theology has called the covenant of works: “From any tree of the garden you may eat freely; but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat from it you will surely die” (NASB 1995). The structure of the command is significant: it begins with abundance and permission before it announces restriction. God’s generosity precedes and frames His prohibition. Adam was free to eat from every tree, every tree except one. The one restriction was not arbitrary; it was the moral test by which Adam’s allegiance to God’s sovereign authority over the definition of good and evil would be expressed or denied.

The Westminster Confession of Faith (VII.2) describes this arrangement as a covenant of works, “wherein life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience.” While the word “covenant” does not appear in Genesis 2, the covenantal elements are all present: the two parties (God and Adam), the condition (obedience to the command), the sanction for disobedience (death), and the implied promise of confirmed life for obedience. Hosea 6:7 likely refers to this arrangement when it accuses Israel of transgressing “the covenant” like Adam, and the parallelism Paul draws in Romans 5 between the condemnation that came through Adam’s transgression and the justification that comes through Christ’s obedience presupposes that both men functioned as covenant representatives, not merely as private individuals.

The tree of the knowledge of good and evil was not magical or intrinsically dangerous; it was the designated object of the moral test. To eat from it was not merely to perform a physical act but to assert creaturely autonomy against the Creator's revealed word, to claim the right to determine for oneself what is good and evil rather than receiving that determination from the God who alone has the authority and wisdom to make it. The serpent understood this perfectly, which is why his temptation culminated in the promise that eating would make the woman "like God, knowing good and evil" (Genesis 3:5). The temptation was not primarily to sensory pleasure but to moral independence, to the exchange of creaturely dependence for pseudo-divine autonomy. In this sense, every sin that has followed in the history of the human race has repeated the same fundamental gesture: the creature claiming for itself what belongs to God alone.

II. The Serpent

The Agent of Temptation and the Identity of the Enemy

A. *The Creature and Its Character*

Genesis 3:1 introduces the antagonist with terse and chilling economy: "Now the serpent was more crafty than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made" (NASB 1995). Several features of this introduction demand attention. The serpent is described as a created being, "which the Lord God had made", establishing from the outset that the agent of temptation is not an uncreated, co-eternal rival to God but a creature operating within the sovereign governance of God's purposes. The serpent's activity in the garden does not represent a failure of divine control but a divinely permitted test of human obedience, however incomprehensible the permission of evil may seem to finite minds.

The characteristic attributed to the serpent is craftiness, the Hebrew *arum*, the same root used in Proverbs for shrewd discernment, here employed for sinister cunning. The serpent's approach was not frontal but oblique; not commanding but questioning; not forceful but insinuating. This is consistently the biblical portrait of satanic temptation: the adversary rarely presents sin as sin. He presents it as wisdom, as freedom, as self-fulfillment, as the logical conclusion of legitimate desires. Paul warns the Corinthians that "Satan disguises himself as an angel of light" (2 Corinthians 11:14, NASB 1995), and his description of the serpent's approach to Eve as a parallel to the danger the Corinthians face (2 Corinthians 11:3) confirms the identification. The craft of the serpent is not a weapon of brute force but of subtle distortion.

B. *The Serpent's Identity: Satan Himself*

The narrative of Genesis 3 does not explicitly identify the serpent with Satan, but the rest of Scripture makes the identification unambiguous. Revelation 12:9 provides the clearest statement: "And the great dragon was thrown down, the serpent of old who is called the devil and Satan, who deceives the whole world." The fourfold designation, great dragon, serpent of old, devil, Satan, links the apocalyptic adversary directly to the garden tempter. Revelation 20:2 repeats the identification: "the dragon, the serpent of old, who is the devil and Satan." John 8:44, where Jesus calls the devil a murderer from the beginning and the father of lies, likely alludes to the garden, where the serpent's lie produced the first human death. 1 John 3:8, "The devil has sinned from the beginning", points in the same direction.

The pre-fall rebellion of Satan, his original defection from his creaturely station of glory and his consequent judgment, is addressed in other passages, most notably Isaiah 14:12–15 and Ezekiel 28:12–17, though the precise exegetical status of those texts is debated. What is unambiguous is that by the time Satan approaches Eve in the garden, he is already a fallen being, already the adversary of God and the deceiver of creatures, already committed to the project of drawing human beings into the rebellion that has already defined his own existence. His purpose in the garden is not curiosity but malice: to destroy the crown of God's creation, to separate creature from Creator, and to establish himself as the "prince of the power of the air" (Ephesians 2:2, NASB 1995) over a race that has chosen his word over God's.

“You are of your father the devil, and you want to do the desires of your father. He was a murderer from the beginning, and does not stand in the truth because there is no truth in him. Whenever he speaks a lie, he speaks from his own nature, for he is a liar and the father of lies.”

John 8:44, NASB 1995

III. The Anatomy of Temptation

Three Movements That Unravel Faith

A. The First Movement: Questioning God’s Word

The serpent’s opening gambit is one of the most consequential sentences in all of human history: “Indeed, has God said, ‘You shall not eat from any tree of the garden?’” (Genesis 3:1, NASB 1995). The craftiness of this opening lies in its form: it is a question, not a statement; it plants doubt rather than announcing error. The serpent does not say “God has not spoken” or “God’s word is false”; he says, in effect, “Are you sure you have understood what God said?” He subtly misrepresents the divine command, God said not to eat from one tree; the serpent implies that God has restricted all the trees, and invites Eve to engage in a dialogue about the content and reasonableness of divine revelation rather than simply resting in the trustworthiness of the One who revealed it.

This is the paradigmatic form of all subsequent attacks on the authority and sufficiency of Scripture. The question “Indeed, has God said?” has echoed through every generation of the church’s life in a thousand different forms: Has God really said that this act is sinful? Has God really said that repentance is necessary? Has God really said that Christ is the only way? Has God really said that sexual ethics are as restrictive as the text implies? The form changes; the strategy is identical. Every assault on biblical authority, from the most sophisticated higher-critical methodology to the most casual dismissal of inconvenient texts, is a sophisticated repetition of the serpent’s first move. And the antidote is the same in every generation: not a more clever argument but a firmer resting in the trustworthiness of the God who has spoken.

Eve’s response to the serpent’s question reveals that the doubt has already begun its work. Her quotation of the divine command in verse 3 slightly misrepresents it: she adds “or touch it” to the prohibition, a phrase that does not appear in the original command (Genesis 2:17). Whether this represents an unconscious exaggeration, a common psychological response to rules one finds burdensome, or a deliberate addition by the serpent in his misrepresentation that Eve has simply absorbed, the effect is the same: the conversation has shifted from simple, faithful reception of the divine word to a negotiation about its content and scope. Once the word of God becomes a subject of debate rather than a settled authority, the first movement of the temptation has succeeded.

B. The Second Movement: Denying God’s Judgment

The serpent’s second move is bolder: a direct contradiction of the divine word. “You surely will not die!” (Genesis 3:4, NASB 1995). This is the first lie in human history, and it is the lie that lies at the root of every subsequent human rationalization of sin: the denial that disobedience has consequences. God had said, “In the day that you eat from it you will surely die” (2:17). The serpent says, in effect, that God’s threat is empty, that the consequence announced for disobedience will not materialize, that the divine word of judgment can be safely discounted. This is the lie that every sinner tells himself in the moment of temptation: the consequences will not be as severe as promised; God’s warnings are exaggerated; the pleasure of the sin is real and certain while its punishment is distant and doubtful.

The pastoral significance of this second movement is enormous. One of the primary reasons that human beings persist in sin is the suppression of the knowledge of its consequences. Romans 1:18 describes the unregenerate project as the “suppression of the truth”, and one of the truths most consistently suppressed is the reality of divine judgment. The culture that has abandoned the doctrine of hell has effectively adopted the serpent’s second lie as its foundational anthropological assumption: there are no ultimate consequences for moral failure, no final judgment before a holy God, no wrath to be feared and fled from. The church that accommodates itself to this

assumption, that softens its proclamation of divine judgment in order to make its message more palatable, has allowed the serpent's lie back into the garden. And the antidote is not a more balanced approach but a clearer, braver, more urgent proclamation of the biblical reality: the wages of sin is death (Romans 6:23), and that death is not merely biological but eternal.

C. *The Third Movement: Impugning God's Character*

The final and most subtle movement of the temptation is the most devastating: the accusation that God's prohibition was motivated not by love and wisdom but by self-interest and jealousy. "For God knows that in the day you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil" (Genesis 3:5, NASB 1995). The serpent implies that God has withheld something genuinely good from His creatures in order to maintain His own superiority, that the command not to eat is not a loving boundary but a jealous restriction, that God is not a generous Father but a threatened rival. This is the lie that has done more damage to the human soul than any other: the suggestion that God's law is not the expression of His love and wisdom but the instrument of His control.

The theological tradition has recognized this third movement as the most fundamental form of all human sin. At its deepest level, every act of disobedience is an accusation against God's character, an implicit statement that God cannot be trusted, that His word is not reliable, that His commands are not for our good. This is why the root sin, in both the garden narrative and throughout Scripture, is identified not primarily as a particular act but as a disposition of the heart: the failure to trust God, to love God, and to rest in God's sovereign goodness. Augustine's analysis in *The City of God* is profound: the fall was, at its core, a failure of love, the displacement of love for God by love for self, the preference of the creature's own judgment over the Creator's revealed will. Every specific sin is the expression of this fundamental misdirection of love, and the healing of sin requires not merely the correction of behavior but the renovation of desire.

"For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the boastful pride of life, is not from the Father, but is from the world."

1 John 2:16, NASB 1995

IV. The Three Dimensions of the Temptation

1 John 2:16 Applied to Genesis 3:6

A. *The Lust of the Flesh: "Good for Food"*

The first dimension of the temptation as described in Genesis 3:6 corresponds to what John calls "the lust of the flesh": the woman "saw that the tree was good for food." The appetite for food is a God-given, morally neutral desire, one that God Himself had abundantly satisfied in the provision of the garden. What the serpent's temptation did was redirect that legitimate appetite toward an object that God had placed outside the boundary of lawful satisfaction. The lust of the flesh is not the desire for physical pleasure per se but the misdirection of bodily appetite toward objects, acts, or experiences that God has not authorized. The legitimate desire is twisted by sin into an instrument of disobedience.

The relevance of this first dimension to the full range of sinful behavior is immediately apparent. Gluttony is the lust of the flesh applied to food. Sexual immorality is the lust of the flesh applied to the God-given desire for physical intimacy outside the boundaries of the covenant of marriage. Substance addiction is the lust of the flesh applied to the desire for pleasure and relief. In each case, the sin lies not in the desire itself, appetite, intimacy, and comfort are God-given goods, but in the refusal to receive those goods within the limits that God's word has established. Jesus faced this same temptation in the wilderness, where Satan said, "Command that these stones become bread" (Matthew 4:3, NASB 1995), an appeal to the lust of the flesh under the conditions of genuine physical hunger. Where Eve yielded, Jesus held firm, answering not with argument but with the Word of God:

“Man shall not live on bread alone, but on every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God” (Matthew 4:4, NASB 1995).

B. *The Lust of the Eyes: “A Delight to the Eyes”*

The second dimension is what John calls “the lust of the eyes”: Eve “saw... that it was a delight to the eyes.” The visual appeal of the forbidden fruit represents the capacity of the eyes to generate desire, the power of what is seen to move the heart toward what is not possessed. Again, the faculty itself is a gift of God; the problem is its misdirection toward the forbidden object. The tree was genuinely beautiful; the beauty was real. But the beauty of a forbidden object is not a justification for pursuing it but an intensification of the moral test: beauty in the service of disobedience is among the most potent of all temptations.

The covetousness that David experienced when he “saw a woman bathing” (2 Samuel 11:2, NASB 1995) and allowed his eyes to linger rather than turning away is a paradigmatic instance of the lust of the eyes operating with catastrophic effect. Job’s covenant with his eyes (Job 31:1), the psalmist’s prayer that his eyes be turned away from looking at vanity (Psalm 119:37), and Jesus’ radical teaching about the eye and adultery in the heart (Matthew 5:28–29) all reflect the biblical awareness that the eyes are a primary gateway for temptation and that the governance of what we see and linger upon is a matter of profound moral and spiritual consequence. The second dimension of the garden temptation explains why the media saturation of the contemporary world is not a spiritually neutral phenomenon: what we habitually expose our eyes to shapes our desires, and desires shaped by the forbidden become the seedbed of sin.

C. *The Pride of Life: “Desirable to Make One Wise”*

The third and deepest dimension is what John calls “the boastful pride of life”: the tree was “desirable to make one wise.” This is the most essentially spiritual of the three dimensions because it reaches not to the bodily appetites or the visual imagination but to the deepest aspiration of the human heart: the desire to be more than one is, to transcend one’s creaturely limitations, to possess divine wisdom and moral autonomy. The serpent had promised that eating would make the woman “like God” (Genesis 3:5), and it is this promise that corresponds to the third dimension of the temptation: the appeal to human pride, to the ambition for a greatness and a knowledge that belong to God alone.

This is the sin of which Isaiah 14:13–14 speaks in describing the original defection of the one who became Satan: “I will ascend to heaven; I will raise my throne above the stars of God... I will make myself like the Most High.” The creature’s desire to be like God, not in the sense of reflecting the divine character in creaturely obedience, which is the calling of all image-bearers, but in the sense of claiming divine autonomy and self-sufficiency, is the root form of all pride, all self-will, and all refusal to receive existence as gift and knowledge as revelation. The antidote, accordingly, is not the suppression of the desire for wisdom but its radical redirection: “The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom” (Proverbs 9:10, NASB 1995), and true wisdom is not the autonomous possession of the creature but the received gift of the Creator who alone knows good and evil in their full and final sense.

V. The Act of Disobedience

She Saw, She Took, She Ate, She Gave

A. *The Sequence of the Fall*

Genesis 3:6 records the act of disobedience with a series of verbs that move from perception to action to consequence with terrible brevity and precision: “When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was desirable to make one wise, she took from its fruit and ate; and she gave also to her husband with her, and he ate” (NASB 1995). Four verbs: saw, took, ate, gave. The structure is important. The seeing comes first, the threefold assessment of the tree through the three dimensions of temptation. The taking follows, the transition from desire to action, from looking to reaching. The eating consummates the act, the transgression is complete. And the giving extends the transgression to another, sin rarely confines itself to its first perpetrator but immediately seeks company in disobedience.

The Augustinian and Reformed tradition has observed that this sequence, from perception to desire to action to propagation, mirrors the anatomy of sin in every subsequent generation. James 1:14–15 articulates the general principle: “Each one is tempted when he is carried away and enticed by his own lust. Then when lust has conceived, it gives birth to sin; and when sin is accomplished, it brings forth death” (NASB 1995). The garden account is not merely a one-time historical event but the paradigm case of a pattern that repeats itself in every act of human disobedience. To study what happened in the garden is to study what happens in the human heart whenever temptation is entertained rather than resisted, whenever desire for the forbidden is permitted to become the basis for action rather than being brought under the authority of the divine word.

B. Adam’s Culpability: Sin with Eyes Open

The grammar and theology of Genesis 3:6 contains a detail of enormous theological significance: “she gave also to her husband with her.” Adam was present. He had heard the serpent’s words; he had watched the dialogue unfold; he saw Eve take and eat. And he ate. The narrative gives no indication that Adam argued with the serpent, warned Eve, or attempted to call her back from the edge of disobedience. He was present, passive, and then complicit. He abdicated the responsibility that God had given him as the head of the covenantal relationship, the one who had received the command directly from God (Genesis 2:16–17) before Eve was formed, and allowed the catastrophe to proceed without resistance.

Paul’s statement in 1 Timothy 2:14 is decisive for the theological evaluation of this scene: “And it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression” (NASB 1995). Eve was deceived by the serpent’s lie; Adam was not deceived. He ate with full knowledge that he was transgressing the divine command. This does not diminish Eve’s guilt, her transgression was real and consequential, and the serpent’s deception did not absolve her of responsibility. But it establishes that Adam’s sin was of a different order: deliberate, knowing, willful rebellion against a command he had received directly from God, without the mitigating circumstance of deception. This is why Paul consistently attributes the fall and its consequences not to Eve but to Adam (Romans 5:12–19; 1 Corinthians 15:21–22): as the federal head of the human race, his knowing, voluntary transgression was the decisive covenant-breaking act.

The pastoral implications of this distinction are profound. It establishes that the most dangerous temptations are not always those that approach with demonic cunning and elaborate deception; sometimes the most devastating failures are simply the quiet decisions not to act, not to speak, not to lead, not to hold the line against a transgression that one clearly sees unfolding. Adam’s sin was a sin of abdication as much as commission. The husband who fails to lead his household in the fear of God, the pastor who sees false teaching enter his congregation and says nothing, the elder who knows that a member is walking in sin and declines the hard work of confrontation, all are repeating in some measure the pattern of Adam’s failure in the garden. Leadership is always covenantal responsibility, and the abdication of that responsibility always has consequences that extend far beyond the individual who abdicates it.

VI. The Theological Significance of the Fall

What the Garden Account Reveals About the Nature of Sin

A. Sin as Voluntary, Not Inevitable

One of the most important theological lessons of the garden narrative is that sin was not inevitable. Adam was not a flawed mechanism that was bound to fail under sufficient pressure; he was a genuine moral agent possessed of genuine freedom, the *posse non peccare*, the ability not to sin, who chose to sin. The Reformed tradition has consistently maintained this against any account of the fall that makes it the necessary product of human finitude, divine determination, or the inevitable development of creaturely freedom. To make the fall inevitable is to undermine the justice of the condemnation that follows it and to implicate God in the origin of evil. The fall was a genuine contingent event: it happened, and it did not have to happen. Adam and Eve were capable of obedience; they chose disobedience.

This has significant implications for the Christian understanding of evil and suffering. The world is broken, not because God made it to be broken, but because Adam chose to break it. The pain and death and futility that characterize human existence are not features of divine design but the consequences of human defection. God made the world very good (Genesis 1:31); it is human sin that has subjected it to futility (Romans 8:20). This means that the question “Why did God allow such a world?” is, in an important sense, misdirected: God did not make such a world. He made a world of extraordinary perfection and provision, and human beings, in the exercise of genuine moral freedom, chose to shatter it. The weight of that shattering lies not on the Creator but on His creatures.

B. Sin as Vertical Before It Is Horizontal

The garden narrative also establishes the fundamentally vertical character of sin, its primary orientation toward God before it expresses itself in horizontal relationships. The first consequence of eating the forbidden fruit was not harm to another human being but the rupture of the relationship between the creature and the Creator: “They heard the sound of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day, and the man and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God among the trees of the garden” (Genesis 3:8, NASB 1995). The hiding is the first expression of the guilt that sin produces, and the direction of the hiding is vertical: away from God. Horizontal consequences, the blaming, the conflict, the pain, follow from the vertical rupture; they do not precede it.

David’s confession in Psalm 51:4, “Against You, You only, I have sinned and done what is evil in Your sight”, captures this vertical primacy with complete theological precision. David’s sin had massive horizontal consequences: Bathsheba was violated, Uriah was murdered, a child died, and a kingdom was destabilized. And yet in his deepest confession, David identifies the sin as fundamentally vertical: against God, God only. This is not a denial of the horizontal harm; it is an affirmation of the theological truth that every sin, however it manifests in human relationships, is first and finally an offense against the holy God whose authority has been violated and whose character has been impugned. The gospel addresses this vertical dimension first: justification is the forgiveness of guilt before God, the restoration of the vertical relationship that sin has ruptured. Horizontal restoration follows from and depends upon this vertical reconciliation.

“And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; He shall bruise you on the head, and you shall bruise him on the heel.”

Genesis 3:15, NASB 1995

Theological Terms and Definitions

Term	Definition
The Garden of Eden	From the Hebrew <i>'eeden</i> , variously understood as a proper place name or as derived from a root meaning delight or luxury. The location in which God placed the man He had formed from the dust, providing him with every form of natural provision, unbroken fellowship with the Creator, and a specific moral test expressed in the command not to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Genesis 2:8–17). Eden was not merely a pleasant environment but a sanctuary, the dwelling place of God among His people, the prototype of the tabernacle and the temple, and the original form of the covenant of works by which obedience would have been rewarded with confirmed, permanent blessedness. Its loss through the fall is the foundational catastrophe of the biblical story, and its restoration through Christ in the new creation (Revelation 22:1–5) is the goal toward which all of redemptive history is moving.
The Covenant of Works	The pre-fall arrangement between God and Adam, described in Genesis 2:15–17, by which God placed Adam in the garden as the federal head of the entire human race with the obligation of perfect, personal, and perpetual obedience to the divine command, under the threat of death for disobedience and the implied promise of confirmed, eternal blessedness for obedience. Also called the covenant of nature or the Adamic administration. The Westminster Confession of Faith (VII.2) states: “The first covenant made with man was a covenant of works, wherein life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience.” The failure of Adam under this covenant is the event that makes the covenant of grace, and the work of the Second Adam, Jesus Christ, both necessary and glorious.
The Serpent (Nachash)	The Hebrew <i>nachash</i> , translated “serpent” in Genesis 3:1, describes the creature through which Satan approached Eve in the garden. The serpent is described as “more crafty than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made” (Genesis 3:1, NASB 1995), indicating that it was a real creature, not a symbol or allegory, employed as the vehicle of satanic temptation. Scripture elsewhere identifies the serpent of the garden as Satan himself: Revelation 12:9 calls him “the serpent of old who is called the devil and Satan, who deceives the whole world,” and Revelation 20:2 applies the same identification. The serpent’s approach through a creature rather than in direct form was consistent with his characteristic strategy of deception and disguise (2 Corinthians 11:14).
Federal Headship	The covenantal-theological principle by which Adam functioned not merely as a private individual but as the appointed representative of the entire human race in the probationary test of the covenant of works. His obedience would have secured blessing for all his posterity; his disobedience incurred condemnation for all his posterity. The same principle governs the saving work of the Second Adam, Jesus Christ, whose perfect obedience secured righteousness for all those He represents (Romans 5:12–19). Federal headship is the structural logic that makes both the transmission of sin and the imputation of righteousness intelligible: in both cases, the many stand or fall with their representative head. The federal headship of Adam is explicitly distinguished from the natural (seminal) headship by those who hold the federal view of imputation, Adam’s guilt is imputed because he represented us, not merely because we were physically present in him.
The Anatomy of Temptation	The pattern by which the serpent approached Eve in Genesis 3:1–5 has been recognized by theologians and pastors throughout church history as a paradigm for understanding the structure of all temptation. Three movements are identifiable: (1) the questioning of God’s word (“Indeed, has God said?”, the introduction of doubt about the divine revelation); (2) the denial of God’s judgment (“You surely will not die!”, the dismissal of the divine threat of consequences); and (3) the impugning of God’s character (“God knows that... you will be like God”, the accusation that God’s command is motivated by self-interest rather than love). This threefold pattern, doubt the word, deny the consequences, distrust the character, underlies

Term	Definition
	every significant temptation that fallen humanity faces, and understanding it is essential to the biblical call to “resist the devil” (James 4:7).
Lust of the Flesh / Eyes / Pride of Life	The threefold taxonomy of sinful desire drawn from 1 John 2:15–17, which many interpreters have identified as the hermeneutical key to the structure of the temptation in Genesis 3:6. John writes: “For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the boastful pride of life, is not from the Father, but is from the world” (NASB 1995). Applying this to the garden account: “good for food” corresponds to the lust of the flesh (sensory desire), “a delight to the eyes” to the lust of the eyes (visual covetousness), and “desirable to make one wise” to the boastful pride of life (the desire for self-exaltation). The same threefold pattern is identifiable in Satan’s temptation of Christ in Matthew 4:1–11, where Jesus, unlike Eve, repelled each temptation with the Word of God. The identification of this pattern is practically significant because it reveals that temptation always operates by distorting the three great God-given goods of appetite, beauty, and knowledge into idolatrous substitutes for God Himself.
Adam’s Culpability	The theological judgment that Adam bears primary and definitive responsibility for the entrance of sin into the world, even though Eve was the first to eat. This judgment is grounded in the observation that it is Adam’s sin, not Eve’s, that is described as the cause of universal condemnation (Romans 5:12–19; 1 Corinthians 15:22), and in Paul’s explicit statement in 1 Timothy 2:14 that “It was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression.” Adam’s culpability is therefore heightened: he was not deceived by the serpent’s lie but sinned with his eyes open, in full knowledge of the divine command and its consequences. As the federal head of the human race, his voluntary, knowing transgression carried covenantal weight that Eve’s deceived transgression, however real, did not. This does not diminish Eve’s guilt; it establishes Adam’s representative role.
The Protoevangelium	From the Greek for “first gospel.” The promise embedded in God’s word of judgment upon the serpent in Genesis 3:15: “And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; He shall bruise you on the head, and you shall bruise him on the heel” (NASB 1995). This has been recognized throughout the history of the church, from Justin Martyr and Irenaeus through the Reformation and the Westminster Standards, as the first messianic prophecy in Scripture, the initial announcement that a descendant of the woman would decisively defeat the serpent, though at the cost of his own suffering. The protoevangelium establishes the fundamental structure of redemptive history: the fall of humanity through the serpent’s deception will be undone through the victory of the Seed of the woman, who is Jesus Christ (Galatians 3:16; Romans 16:20; Revelation 12:9–11). The curse of the fall is thus the occasion for the announcement of the gospel.
Voluntary Disobedience	The theological characterization of Adam’s first sin as fully and freely chosen rather than coerced, accidental, or the product of ignorance. Reformed theology has consistently maintained that Adam possessed genuine moral freedom before the fall, the posse non peccare (ability not to sin), and that his transgression was therefore a genuine act of voluntary defection from the good rather than an inevitable failure of a system designed to fail. The Westminster Confession (VI.1) states that Adam sinned “by the instigation of the devil” but without any compulsion, being “left to the freedom of their own will.” The voluntary character of Adam’s sin is theologically crucial because it establishes the justice of the condemnation that follows: God cannot be charged with wrongdoing in condemning the human race for a sin that was genuinely and freely chosen by its head and representative.
The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil	The specific tree in the garden of Eden from which God commanded Adam not to eat, constituting the probationary test of the covenant of works (Genesis 2:17). The “knowledge of good and evil” is not primarily epistemological, Adam already possessed the cognitive capacity to distinguish right from wrong, but experiential and moral: to eat from the tree was

Term	Definition
	to arrogate to oneself the divine prerogative of determining the standard of good and evil, to claim autonomous moral self-governance rather than living in dependent obedience to the Creator's revealed will. The serpent's promise that eating would make the woman "like God, knowing good and evil" (Genesis 3:5) was not entirely false in its prediction, but it was deceptive in its promise: what was gained was not divine wisdom but moral corruption, the knowledge of evil by participation rather than by revelation. The tree thus represents the fundamental alternative to faith: the desire to be one's own god, the assertion of creaturely autonomy against the Creator's sovereign word.

Practical Application

A. *For the Mind: What Must We Believe?*

We must believe that the fall of Adam was a real, historical event involving a real, historical person, and that its consequences are equally real and historical: the universal guilt and corruption of the entire human race. This conviction places us in direct conflict with the dominant assumption of contemporary secular culture, and with significant sectors of contemporary evangelical theology, that regards Genesis 3 as myth, allegory, or symbolic narrative rather than history. The Reformed commitment to biblical inerrancy requires that we receive the Genesis account on the terms that the Bible itself establishes: as a factual account of actual events that actually occurred, with the actual consequences that Romans 5:12–19 and 1 Corinthians 15:21–22 describe. A mythological fall cannot produce a real condemnation, and a merely symbolic Adam cannot be the genuine counterpart of the historical Christ whose righteousness is imputed to real, guilty, historically conditioned sinners.

We must also believe that the anatomy of temptation described in Genesis 3 is not merely ancient history but a map of the terrain on which every believer fights every day. The serpent has not changed his strategy: he still questions God's word, still denies the reality of divine judgment, and still impugns the character of God by suggesting that His commands are restrictions rather than gifts. The three dimensions of temptation, lust of the flesh, lust of the eyes, pride of life, still constitute the full repertoire of sin's appeal. To know the enemy's strategy from the biblical account is to be forewarned; and to be forewarned, in the spiritual warfare that constitutes the Christian life, is to be significantly forearmed.

B. *For the Heart: What Must We Feel and Desire?*

The garden narrative should produce in the believing heart a profound and honest grief, not a distant, historical grief, as one might grieve a disaster that happened long ago to people one does not know, but a personal and present grief over the condition that Adam's sin introduced into the human nature that we all share. We are not spectators of the fall; we are participants in its consequences. The guilt that Adam incurred is the guilt that belongs to every one of us by virtue of our union with him in the covenant of works. The corruption that entered human nature in the garden is the corruption that pervades every faculty of our own nature. The hiding from God that Adam and Eve did among the trees of the garden is the hiding that the unregenerate heart does in every generation, and the echoes of which the regenerate heart still feels in its moments of guilt and shame.

Desire, above all, the capacity to see the temptations you face with the clarity that the biblical pattern provides. When you are tempted to question whether a particular biblical command really applies in your situation, recognize the serpent's first move. When you are tempted to minimize the consequences of a particular sin, to tell yourself that this one time won't matter, that the effects won't be as severe as you know they should be, recognize the serpent's second move. When you are tempted to resent a divine restriction as though it were evidence of God's indifference or jealousy rather than His wisdom and love, recognize the serpent's third move. And having recognized the enemy's strategy, respond as Jesus did in the wilderness: with the Word of God, received with faith, spoken with conviction, and trusted as the final authority over the promptings of temptation.

C. *For the Hands: What Must We Do?*

- Read Genesis 3:1–24 slowly and completely, at least twice. On the first reading, attend to the narrative details: what the serpent says, what Eve sees, what Adam does, how God responds. On the second reading, attend to the theological content: what the text reveals about the nature of temptation, the character of sin, the justice of divine judgment, and the mercy of divine grace. Note especially Genesis 3:15 and 3:21 as the twin signals within the judgment narrative that grace will have the final word.
- Apply the threefold anatomy of temptation to a specific area of your own spiritual struggle. Identify a pattern of sin or temptation in your own life and ask: Is this primarily an appeal to the lust of the flesh (a misdirected bodily appetite)? To the lust of the eyes (a covetous fixation on what I see but do not possess)? To the pride of life (a desire for autonomy, recognition, or self-exaltation that does not submit to God's

revealed order)? The analysis will not solve the problem, but it will locate it with biblical precision, and a correctly located problem can be addressed with the right scriptural and gospel resources.

- Memorize 1 Corinthians 10:13: “No temptation has overtaken you but such as is common to man; and God is faithful, who will not allow you to be tempted beyond what you are able, but with the temptation will provide the way of escape also, so that you will be able to endure it” (NASB 1995). This verse establishes three truths essential to the Christian’s engagement with temptation: the universality of temptation (you are not uniquely vulnerable or uniquely corrupt), the faithfulness of God in temptation (He governs the severity of the test), and the provision of an escape (there is always a way to resist). Meditation on this promise, specifically applied in moments of temptation, is one of the most practically effective spiritual disciplines the Scripture provides.
- Study the parallel temptation of Jesus in Matthew 4:1–11 alongside Genesis 3:1–7. In what ways does the structure of Satan’s temptation of Jesus mirror the structure of the serpent’s temptation of Eve? In what ways does Jesus’ response differ from Eve’s? What is the significance of the fact that Jesus answered every temptation with a quotation from Deuteronomy, the book of covenant renewal? What does this reveal about the role of the Word of God in resisting temptation, and what does it imply about the necessity of Scripture memorization and meditation as a discipline of spiritual warfare?
- Reflect on the significance of Adam’s presence in the garden during the temptation. He was “with her” (Genesis 3:6) and said nothing. Where in your own life, in your family, your marriage, your congregation, your workplace, are you allowing a failure of speech, a failure of leadership, a failure of timely warning, to constitute a form of silent complicity in something you know to be wrong? The sin of abdication is less dramatic than the sin of commission, but it is no less real and no less consequential in the lives of those for whom God has made you responsible.

Key Texts: *Genesis 3:1–7, 15; 1 Timothy 2:14; 2 Corinthians 11:3; Revelation 12:9; 1 John 2:15–17; James 1:14–15; Matthew 4:1–11; Romans 5:12–19*

Study and Discussion Questions

Opening Question

1. Before studying this lesson, how did you understand the fall? Did you think of it primarily as a historical event, a theological concept, a symbolic narrative, or something else? How has your understanding of its significance for your own spiritual life and for the doctrine of sin developed as you have worked through this material? What aspect of the garden narrative struck you as most theologically significant or most personally challenging?

Observation Questions (What Do the Texts Say?)

2. Read Genesis 3:1–7 carefully and identify each of the three movements in the serpent’s temptation strategy: the questioning of God’s word (v. 1), the denial of God’s judgment (v. 4), and the impugning of God’s character (v. 5). For each movement, note the precise language the serpent uses and compare it with the original divine command in Genesis 2:16–17. In what specific ways does the serpent misrepresent or distort what God actually said? What do those distortions reveal about his strategy?
3. Read Genesis 3:6 and identify the four verbs that describe Eve’s action: saw, took, ate, gave. Compare this sequence with James 1:14–15. How does James’ description of the anatomy of sin, desire conceiving and giving birth to sin, which brings forth death, correspond to the sequence in Genesis 3:6? What does each verb in the Genesis sequence represent in James’ theological analysis?
4. Read 1 Timothy 2:14 carefully: “And it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression.” What is the precise distinction Paul draws between Adam’s sin and Eve’s sin? What are the theological implications of the fact that Adam was not deceived? How does this distinction bear on Paul’s attribution of the universal condemnation of the human race to Adam rather than to Eve in Romans 5:12–19?
5. Read Revelation 12:9 and 20:2, where the serpent of the garden is explicitly identified as Satan. Then read John 8:44, where Jesus describes the devil as “a murderer from the beginning” and “the father of lies.” How do these New Testament texts illuminate the theological significance of the Genesis 3 account? What does the characterization of Satan as a murderer from the beginning and the father of lies tell us about the nature of the temptation in the garden and about the ongoing character of satanic opposition to God’s people?
6. Read Genesis 3:15, the protoevangelium, in its context of divine judgment upon the serpent. What is the specific promise embedded in this verse? Who are the two seeds, and what is the nature of the enmity between them? How does the New Testament identify the fulfillment of this promise (see Romans 16:20; Galatians 3:16; Revelation 12:9–11)? In what sense is the protoevangelium the first announcement of the gospel, and how does its placement within the narrative of judgment shape the overall theological structure of Genesis 3?

Interpretation Questions (What Does It Mean?)

7. The lesson argues that the garden narrative must be interpreted as history rather than myth or allegory, and that Paul’s argument in Romans 5:12–19 depends on this historical character. Evaluate this claim. What specific features of Paul’s argument in Romans 5:12–19 require a historical Adam? What happens to the doctrine of original sin, the doctrine of imputation, and the doctrine of justification if Adam is understood as a symbolic or representative figure rather than a historical individual? Is it possible to maintain the full force of Paul’s soteriology while treating the fall as non-historical?
8. The lesson identifies the third movement of the temptation, the impugning of God’s character, as the deepest and most fundamental form of sin. Explore this claim. In what sense is the distrust of God’s character the root of all other sins? How does Augustine’s analysis of the fall as a failure of love, the displacement of love for God by love for self, relate to this? Can you identify specific contemporary forms

of sin that are most clearly rooted in a distorted view of God's character and the accusation that His commands are restrictions rather than gifts?

9. The lesson draws a parallel between the threefold structure of the temptation in Genesis 3:6 and the threefold taxonomy in 1 John 2:16 (lust of the flesh, lust of the eyes, boastful pride of life), and further connects both to the structure of Satan's temptation of Jesus in Matthew 4:1–11. Evaluate the exegetical basis for these connections. Is the parallel between Genesis 3 and 1 John 2 explicit in the text, or is it an interpretive inference? What is the hermeneutical significance of the fact that Jesus' temptation in Matthew 4 follows a similar threefold structure? How does the contrast between Eve's response and Jesus' response illuminate the doctrine of Christ as the Second Adam?
10. The lesson emphasizes that sin is primarily vertical, an offense against God, before it is horizontal. How does this vertical primacy of sin shape the understanding of and the remedy for horizontal human problems: broken relationships, social injustice, personal harm to others, and so forth? If sin is fundamentally vertical, does this mean that horizontal remedies, apology, restitution, reconciliation between persons, are insufficient or secondary? Or does the vertical characterization of sin provide the foundation upon which horizontal restoration becomes possible? How does the gospel address both the vertical and horizontal dimensions of sin?
11. The lesson argues that Adam's sin was an act of abdication as much as commission, the failure to speak, to warn, and to lead in a moment when leadership was most needed. What are the specific forms that the sin of abdication takes in the contemporary church and Christian family? How does a recovery of the biblical understanding of federal headship and covenantal responsibility address this failure? What would it look like for pastors, elders, husbands, and fathers to take their representative and protective roles more seriously in light of what the garden narrative reveals about the consequences of abdicating them?

Application Questions (What Does It Demand of Us?)

12. The threefold anatomy of the serpent's temptation, questioning God's word, denying God's judgment, impugning God's character, provides a diagnostic tool for identifying the spiritual dynamics at work in specific temptations you face. Choose one significant temptation in your own life and apply this analytical framework. Which of the three movements is most operative in drawing you toward this particular sin? What specific lie about God's word, God's judgment, or God's character is embedded in the temptation? And what specific biblical truth is the antidote to that specific lie?
13. Jesus responded to each temptation in the wilderness with a specific, precisely chosen quotation from Deuteronomy. This suggests that effective resistance to temptation requires not merely a general commitment to Scripture but a specific knowledge of particular texts that speak directly to specific temptations. Do you have a collection of Scripture passages memorized and ready for deployment in the specific areas where you are most frequently tempted? If not, what would it take to begin building one? What three or four passages would most directly address your most frequent or most powerful temptations?
14. The lesson notes that Eve's quotation of the divine command in Genesis 3:3 slightly misrepresents it by adding "or touch it," which does not appear in the original command of 2:17. This may reflect the tendency of the tempted mind to experience divine commands as more restrictive and burdensome than they actually are, a psychological dynamic that intensifies the appeal of the forbidden. Can you identify a similar dynamic in your own relationship with specific biblical commands, a tendency to experience God's word as more restrictive, less reasonable, or less loving than it actually is? How does a deeper understanding of the character and purposes of God address this distortion?
15. The lesson argues that Adam's sin was a sin of passive complicity, he was present, he was silent, and then he participated. Reflect honestly on the role that passive complicity plays in your own spiritual life and in the corporate life of your congregation. Are there conversations that need to happen that you are avoiding? Are there patterns of sin in people you love that you are allowing to go unaddressed because confrontation

is costly? Are there false teachings circulating in your ministry context that you have been reluctant to name publicly? What would faithful, loving, courageous engagement look like in each of those situations?

16. Genesis 3:15, the protoevangelium, is embedded within the narrative of judgment as the first announcement of grace. This structural feature of the garden account, grace proclaimed within judgment, hope announced within condemnation, anticipates the structure of the entire biblical gospel: the cross, where judgment and mercy meet, where the wrath of God is both fully expressed and fully absorbed by the substitutionary sacrifice of the Seed of the woman. How does the protoevangelium shape your reading of the rest of the Bible? How does it change the emotional and theological register in which you hear the doctrine of sin? And how does it provide the pastoral framework within which the full severity of Hamartiology can be proclaimed without producing despair?

Prayer Focus

Open this lesson's time of prayer with a meditative reading of Genesis 3:8–15, the divine response to the fall. Read verses 8–13 as the account of God seeking out those who have hidden themselves from Him: "Where are you?" is not the question of an omniscient God who does not know the answer; it is the question of a personal God who comes in search of those who have fled His presence and calls them to account for what they have done. Receive that question as a personal address. Where are you in relation to God? What have you hidden? What excuses have you offered? What blame have you displaced onto others or onto God Himself? Let the divine questioning of the garden narrative be the occasion for genuine, undefended, specific confession, not the general acknowledgment that you are a sinner in the abstract, but the honest naming of what you have actually done, thought, desired, or left undone.

Then read Genesis 3:15 with the wonder it deserves, and with the awareness that this verse is being spoken, not merely to Adam and Eve in the garden, but to the serpent himself, in the hearing of fallen humanity, as the first announcement that the catastrophe will not have the final word. The God who has every right to simply execute the sentence He has announced instead announces a plan: the Seed of the woman will bruise the serpent's head. Pray with the awareness that you are living on the far side of that promise's fulfillment, that the heel-bruising of the cross has already occurred, that the head-crushing of the resurrection has already been accomplished, and that the final expulsion of Satan at the consummation (Revelation 20:10) is as certain as the promise that announced it in the garden. The protoevangelium is your gospel; receive it with gratitude and worship.

Pray together in the pattern of Genesis 3, moving through each element of the narrative in a different key. Pray in the key of confession over the ways in which you have repeated Adam's sin in your own generation: the moments when you have questioned God's word rather than resting in it; the times when you have minimized the seriousness of sin by telling yourself that its consequences will not be as severe as Scripture warns; the seasons when you have allowed resentment of God's commands to ferment in your heart rather than receiving them as expressions of His wisdom and love. Then pray in the key of gratitude for the grace that God announced in the very moment of judgment: that before the dust had settled from the catastrophe of the fall, the Father had already announced the gospel. And pray in the key of intercession for those in your life who are still hiding, still living in the posture of Adam and Eve after the fall, alienated from God, covering their shame with self-made garments, hearing the question "Where are you?" and fleeing rather than turning. Pray that the same sovereign grace that sought out Adam and Eve in the garden would go in search of those you love who are still hiding, that the same voice that called "Where are you?" in Eden would call them by name and draw them, through the gospel, back into the presence of the God from whom sin has separated them.

Close with the series verse, Romans 5:12, read alongside its counterpart in verse 20: "Through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin", this is Genesis 3. "Where sin increased, grace abounded all the more", this is the gospel. Sit in the tension between those two sentences long enough to feel both their weight and their glory. And then read Genesis 3:15 one more time, slowly, as the bridge between them: the promise that what entered through one man's disobedience would be undone through one Man's obedience, and that the grace that would abound would do so at the cost of the heel of the very Son of God.

"But when the fullness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the Law, so that He might redeem those who were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption as sons."

Galatians 4:4–5, NASB 1995

Key Texts: Genesis 3:1–24; Romans 5:12–19; 1 Timothy 2:14; 2 Corinthians 11:3; Revelation 12:9; 1 John 2:15–17; James 1:14–15; Matthew 4:1–11; Galatians 4:4–5; 1 Corinthians 10:13

Soli Deo Gloria

To God Alone Be the Glory

FAITHFUL TO THE WORD

Dr. Joshua Nichols

josh@faithfultotheword.com | faithfultotheword.com